

## CONTRIBUTING FACTORS OF EMPLOYEES' JOB SATISFACTION OF THE ROYAL BEACH SEMINYAK HOTEL

Syafri Hakim<sup>1</sup>, Putu Saroyini Piartrini<sup>2</sup>, Ni wayan Mujiati<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Faculty Economy and Business/ Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia)

<sup>2</sup>(Faculty Economy and Business/Udayana, Tourism Research Center Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia;)

<sup>3</sup>(Faculty Economy and Business/Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia)

Corresponding author: Putu Saroyini Piartrini

**ABSTRACT :** Job satisfaction plays strategic role in organizations. Information regarding job satisfaction model and its influencing factors is important to sustain both employees' performance and organization achievement. Present study aims are testing the relationship among hygiene factors and motivator aspects and employee job satisfaction. Data accumulation involved the entire employees of The Royal Beach Seminyak Hotel. The number of respondent who involved in the study is 152 employees. Research findings reported that motivator aspects has stronger impact than hygiene factor on employees' job satisfaction. Regression coefficient value and average score distribution recommended that management of The Royal Beach Seminyak Hotel need to pay more attention on developing team work training to build effective team work and supervisory training and place them on top priority to maintain employees' productivity. Achievement recognition is the strongest aspect that contributed to employees' job satisfaction. External validation of the present research findings can be improved by replicating the model by using different hotel data set.

**Keywords –***Hygiene Factors, Motivation Factors, Job Satisfaction, Achievement Recognition.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Hotel The Royal Beach Seminyak, Hotel with one hundred and fifty two employees deliver its service for the guests. Deliverables quality depends on the quality of its employees' performance. Employee performance is the results of employee's satisfaction. Knowing individual employee's motivation to work is part of the process how to build employee's satisfaction. Two factors theory stated that individual employee motivation to work is need satisfying. The needs of employee can be classified as hygiene factor and Motivator one. The hygiene factors are aspects that functions to avoid employee dissatisfaction. It comprises of management policy, supervision quality, interpersonal relationship, social environment quality, pay, job security, and job safety (Baah K.D.,2016). When these aspects are not meet individual employee expectation, they will make employees dissatisfied with their job. Hygiene factor satisfaction is not the only factor that self. make organization performance getting higher. The motivator factors are job characteristics The presence of motivators will result in good job performance (Baah K.D.,2016). Motivator aspects include achievement recognition, self development Opportunity, job otonomy, personal growth opportunity and career development Preliminary study which involved five employees of The Royal Beach Seminyak Hotel indicated that there is a number of aspects that are not meet employees exteaction such as fairness of promotion procedure, pay policy, equipment availability, achievement recognition and job design. The objective of present study are to examine the relationship between hygiene aspects and job satisfaction and the relationship between motivator factor and job satisfaction.

### 2. CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

#### 2.1. Job Satisfaction from Two Factor Theory.

Back to the origin of Job Satisfaction definition, Locke (1976) defined Job satisfaction as positive emotional responses toward job and work environment resulting from individual appraisal or individual experiences. Job satisfaction is an integral result of cognition, affection and feeling, individual has toward his job and organization. There should be present in the work environment to avoid employee dissatisfaction such as pay, job security, job safety and positive social relationship at work. Motivator aspects are related to self recognition need and self actualization needs. Organ & Near claimed that job satisfaction measurement is more cognitive and there is limited measurement did on affective aspect. Herzberg (1968) suggested in a Two-Theory of Motivation that there were two factors driving employee satisfaction and avoiding dissatisfaction in the workplace: motivation factors and hygiene factors.

Masum, A.K.M., et al (2016) reported that Nurses' job satisfaction was correlated positively with nurses intended to quit. They also reported a low satisfaction level with contingent reward, fringe benefits, and pay. It is also found that there was a negative relationship between supervisory satisfaction and intention to quit. The concept of intention to quit from the job is considered as a consequence that expresses a "conscious intention to leave the organization because of some reasons. Sanjeev, M. A., & Surya, A. V. (2016) The study is done among pharmaceutical sales and marketing professionals. The findings confirm the existence of two factor structure of motivation and satisfaction. The employees are satisfied in the presence of motivating factors only and hygiene factors do not have any influence on satisfaction levels. The motivating factors however, are not contributed by intrinsic aspects but also extrinsic elements classified by Herzberg. Hyun, S., & Oh, H. (2011) Reexamined Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation in the Korean army foodservice operations in other research. It is tested empirically by using the data obtained from foodservice soldiers and logistics officers serving in the Korean Army foodservice operation. The study attempted to compare general job satisfaction between both sample groups and assess the effect of Herzberg's motivators and hygiene factors on general job satisfaction so as to prioritize the importance of the motivation factors. The results showed there was a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between the foodservice soldiers and logistics officers. Additionally, the results regarding Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory were quite opposite between the two sample groups. Foodservice soldiers showed that hygiene factors were more powerful predictors of general job satisfaction than motivators. On the other hand, motivators had a more significant association with logistics officers' general job satisfaction than hygiene factors. Sahinet *al.*, (2017) found that *hygiene factors and motivator factors* significantly influenced job satisfaction.

## 2.2 Hygiene Factors, Motivators and Job satisfaction.

The hygiene factors are also explained as the maintenance factors and consist of the physiological, safety and social needs from Maslow's hierarchy of needs. They are factors that are not directly related to the job design but the conditions that surround doing the job. They predicted and the sources of employees dissatisfaction when they are not meet their expectation. However, the presence of such conditions does not enough to build strong motivation (Gibson, 2000). These factors include; company policy and administration, technical supervision, interpersonal relations with supervisor, interpersonal relations with peers and subordinates, salary, job security, personal life, work conditions and status. These factors are necessary to maintain a reasonable level of satisfaction and can also cause dissatisfaction. The hygiene factors are not direct motivators but are necessary to prevent dissatisfaction and at the same time serve as a starting point for motivation. Eventhough, improvements in these conditions do not create motivation. Jansen, A., & Samuel, M. O. (2014) reported that a non-significant statistical relationship between cutting-edge technology, relationship with subordinates, and company policies. Cutting-edge technology showed a slightly non-significant statistical relationship with goal. The result of factor analysis found that extrinsic found that motivation is the strongest factor influence employees to work. Lukwago, G., et al (2014) explained that hygiene factors of policy, relations with peers, supervision, working conditions, and salary; and fringe benefits will impact on employee motivation. Employee characteristics are also expected to influence both intrinsic and extrinsic employee motivation. Singh, B., et al (2015) described that there was a high degree of positive correlation between salary and retention rate of employees. It further explains that salary plays an important role in retaining and motivating the teaching staff in the private universities.

The presence of motivators causes employees to work harder. They are found within the actual job itself and organization environment. Motivating factors include : achievement, recognition of achievement; job identity; job characteristics; responsibility; opportunity for advancement and personal development opportunity. According to the motivation concept, the job have to give the employee a sense of achievement, the job will give the employee proud feeling of having done some difficult but worthwhile. A job is expected provide an employee and recognition of success from superior and peers. Motivating job is a job wich is interesting, varied and provide challenge. Motivating employees should have proud and sense of belonging toward their job. Management have to provide promotion opportunity to their employees. Motivating job should give employees to learn new skills.

Harahap, D. A., et al (2017) showed that there are significant differences on work motivation between employees and staffs PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia based on Two Factors Theory. Furthermore, intrinsic motivation is the strongest factor affects staff to work. It means that extrinsic motivation (hygiene factors) are tend to affect employees to work while intrinsic motivation (motivators) are tend to affect staffs to work.

### 2.3 Model Conceptual and Research Hyphoteses.

Proposed Conceptual model of present research that hyphoteses the relationship between hygiene factor and job satisfaction and the relationship between motivator factor and job satisfaction is presented on figure 1.



Figure. 1 Job Satisfaction Model

#### 2.3.1. Relationship between hygiene factor and job satisfaction .

Clark dan Oswald (2016) stated that *motivator factors*, particularly promotion opportunity was more important than any other motivator to increase job motivation. Souza (2017) supported by evidence that motivators are more strong influenced job satisfaction eventhough in low job security condition. Ali khan and Suhalia(2014) stated that job promotion that has positif correlation with higher pay and job authority. Shields dan Harga (2014) reported that pay, job securityand social job environment juga mengngkapkanbahwaas hygiene factor has positive correlation with job satisfaction of nurse in England. Chadrasekar (2015) also stated that interaction quality with the peer plays positive contribution on job satisfaction. Hyun (2009) found that phisycal environment , pay has positive correlation with job satisfaction of food service employees in South Korea. Schulze (2013) claimed that job security, social relationship, phisycal econdition, company policies has positive relationship with job satisfaction. Onidis (2018) also reported that quality of supervision has positive correlation with job satisfaction of employee of Home IndustryBatik Pasir di Pasuruan. The relationship between hygienfactor and job satisfaction was hyphotezised as :

H1: *Hygiene factor*shas positive correlation with job satisfaction.

#### 2.3.2.Relationship between *Motivators and Job satisfaction*.

Baah& Amoako (2013) uncovered that motivator factorssignifintly influence job satisfaction. Motivator elements such as job promotion is reported increase job satisfaction. Career develoment, self development, also increased job satisfaction (Babic,2013; Winer & Schiff ,2018). Fairness in job promotion, achievement recognition, positively correlated with job satisfaction of sales person. Raziq&Maulabakhsh (2015) supported that motivator positively influenced job satisfaction . Hapsari (2015) and Irmawati (2013) that motivatorhas strong relationship with job satisfaction of Universitas Terbuka employee. Nirmalasari (2018) indicated that achievement recognition has positive relationship with job satisfaction employee of PT KaryaGunaEkatama, relationship of motivator and job satisfaction is hyphoteses as.

H2: *Motivator factor*shas positive corelation with job satisfaction.

### 3.Research Metodology.

#### 3. Research Metodology.

Research design of present study is survey to accumulate data. Research location is at Hotel The Royal Beach Seminyak, Bali, On Jln. Camplung Tanduk, Seminyak, Badung. Research objects are hygiene factors ( $X_1$ ), motivator factors ( $X_2$ ) and job satisfaction ( $Y$ ).

Job satisfaction is defined as perception of respondent on hygiene aspects such as pay satisfaction, social relationship satisfaction etc. While motivators aspect were measured by indicators such as self development opportunity, achievement recognition. Satisfaction data was measured by likert scale with five intervals that reflected respondent opinion (strongly dissatisfied – strongly satisfied). Target population is employee of The Royal Beach Seminyak. The number of target population are 152 employees. The number of respondent that are involved in the study are presented on table.1

A.

**Table.1 The number of unit sample and department**

No.	Departemen	Staff (Orang)
1.	Engineering	26
2.	Front Office	34
3.	F&B Service	43
4.	House Keeping	49
<b>Total</b>		<b>152</b>

source: HRD The Royal Beach Seminyak Bali, 2020.

#### 4.Hasil Analisis Dan Pembahasan.

The Royal Beach Seminyak Bali is Five Star Hotel that operates 128 rooms and kamar dan 17 block Villa. Data were provided by 152 responded. Respondents characteristic is presented on table.2.

**Table.2 Respondent characteristic**

No	Variabel	Klasifikasi	Jumlah (orang)	Persentase (%)
1	Sex	Man	67	44.08
		Female	85	55.92
		<b>total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>
2	Age	18-24 year	38	25.00
		25-34 yaer	74	48.68
		35-40 year	24	15.79
		> 40 year	15	9.87
		<b>total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>
3	Education	SMA	48	31.58
		Diploma	70	46.05
		graduate	33	21.71
		<b>total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>

Source : Primary data , 2020

Female respondent accounted for 55,92 percent, while the rest is male. Most Respondents are between 25-34 years old (48,68 percent). Level education of respondent dominated by those who graduated from Diploma (46,05 percent).

#### 4. Result and Discussion.

Validity test was based on Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Result of Validity test are presented on table 3. Job satisfaction, Hygiene and motivator data are valid. Validity is indicated by value of cumulative Variance that are larger than 0,51

Table 3. Test of Validity and Reliability

No	Variable	Item Pernyataan	Validitas					Eigenvalu e	Validit y
			KMO	Bartlett's Test	MSA	Loading Factor	Cumulative Variance (%)		
1	Job Satisfaction(Y)	Y1	0,50	269,807	0,500	0,957	95,702	1,914	Valid
		Y2			0,500	0,957			Valid
2	Hygiene Factor (X1)	X1.1	0,73	304	0,779	0,923	83,407	7,507	Valid
		X1.2	7	1,37	0,948	0,841			Valid
		X1.3		5	0,660	0,851			Valid
		X1.4			0,684	0,834			Valid
		X1.5			0,697	0,775			Valid
		X1.6			0,723	0,812			Valid
		X1.7			0,808	0,886			Valid
		X1.8			0,709	0,830			Valid
		X1.9			0,687	0,755			Valid
3	Motivator Factor (X2)	X2.1	0,82	115	0,815	0,911	86,966	4,348	Valid
		X2.2	2	5,42	0,792	0,902			Valid
		X2.3		6	0,790	0,900			Valid
		X2.4			0,961	0,715			Valid
		X2.5			0,807	0,920			Valid

Source; Primary data, 2020

Result of reliability analysis indicated that Cronbach's Alpha value of Job satisfaction, Hygiene factor and motivator are larger than 0,70 . These mean that job satisfaction, Hygiene factor and Motivators are reliable. The parameter value are presented in detail on table 4.

Table 4. Result of Reliability Test

Variabel	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability
Hygiene factors (X1)	0,974	Reliabel
Motivator factors (X2)	0,961	Reliabel
Kepuasan karyawan (Y)	0,955	Reliabel

Source : Priary data., 2020

#### 4.1 Variable Score Distribution.

Job satisfaction indicators score distribution are presented on table 5.

Table 5. Job Satisfaction score

No	Indicators	Average score	Interpretation
1	My feeling is positive because company policies are clear	3,43	high
2	My peers make comfortable	3,40	High
Total score		3,415	High

source: Primary data, 2020

Average total score of job satisfaction is 3,415. it indicated that job satisfaction of employee The Royal Seminyak Hotel relatively high. Company policy is perceived as supporting element with higher average score = 3,43 and social environment average score is 3,40.

#### 4.2 Distribusi skor Hygiene factors

Hygiene factors score distribution is presented pada Table.6

Table.6 Score Distribution of Hygiene factors

No	Indicator	Average score	Interpretation
----	-----------	---------------	----------------

1	Team support	3,27	medium
2	Job security	3,35	medium
3	Supervisor support	3,32	medium
4	Pay.	3,37	medium
5	Job safety	3,45	High
6	Achievement recognition	3,31	medium
7	Job promotion	3,32	medium
8	Equipment availability	3,43	High
9	Self development opportunity.	3,39	medium
Average score		3,36	Medium

Source : Primary data, , 2020

Average total score of Hygiene factor indicated that satisfaction level for hygiene factor is medium (Mean = 3,36). The lowest satisfaction score is for team support (Mean = 3,27), achievement recognition (Mean = 3,31), as well as supervisor support (Mean =3,32) and job promotion (Mean =3,32). On the other hand the highest average score is job safety (Mean = 3,45) and equipment availability (Mean =3,43).

#### 4.3 Motivator factors

Distribution score of motivators are presented on table.7.

**Table.7 .Distribution score of Motivator Elements**

No	Item indicator	Average score	Interpretation
1	Fairness for Job Promotion.	3.39	Medium
2	Promotion based on achievement	3.30	Medium
3	Self development opportunity	3.29	Medium
4	Larger scope of responsibility	3.34	Medium
5	Carrerr advancement opportunity	3.49	High
Average score		3,36	Medium

source :Primary data,, 2020

Score distribution of element motivator indicated that respondents perceived there is high career opportunity advancement opportunity (Mean = 3,49) at the same time perception of fairness of job promotion score also higher than toatal average score for motivator element satisfaction ( Mean = 3,39). The lowest score is self development opportunity (Mean = 3,29). It means that respondent perceived that management provided limited opportunity to develop individual employee.

#### 4.6 Hyphoteses testing.

Regression model of the relationship among *hygiene factors* ( $X_1$ ), *motivator factor* ( $X_2$ ) and Job satisfaction employee of Hotel The Royal Beach Seminyak, Bali is pesentedon Table.8.

**Table.8.Regression model of relationship among hygiene factor, motivator and job satisfaction**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1,337	0,391		3,418	0,001
Hygiene factors	0,094	0,016	0,404	5,817	0,000

Motivatod factors	0,147	0,023	0,439	6,309	0,000
-------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Source: Primary data primer, 2020

Functional Equation is :

$$Y = 1,337 + 0,094 X_1 + 0,147 X_2 + e$$

Regression model does comply with classic assumption regarding normality, multicollinearity, as well as heteroskedasticity. The Output of normality verification is presented on table.9.

#### 4.7. Classical Assumption Verification.

Verification on data normality result is presented on table.9.

**Table.9. Test of Normality**

	Unstandardized Residual
N	152
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	1,257
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,085

Source: Primary data, 2020

Kolmogorov-Smirnov parameter value ( $r = 0,085$ ) is larger than 0,05 and it is indicated that data has normal distribution.

Test of multicollinearity indicated that there is no violation on multicollinearity assumption. Result of multi collinearity testing is presented on table 10. Value of Inflation Factor of Hygiene factor and Motivator are between 0,1 – 10,0.

**Table.10. Test of Multicollinearity**

Variabel	Tolerance	VIF
Hygiene factor(X1)	0,572	1,749
Motivator factor (X2)	0,572	1,749

Source: Primary data, 2020

Result of heteroscedasticity testing is depicted on table 11. It is indicated that error of all of three variables in the model errors have similar variance.

**Table.11. Test of Heteroscedasticity (Glesjer test)**

Variabel	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.896	.260		3.453	.001
Hygiene factor (X1)	-.018	.009	-.198	-2.003	.097
Motivator factor (X2)	.034	.016	.211	2.132	.085

Source : Primary Data, 2020

#### 4.7 Determination analysis.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0,767 <sup>a</sup>	0,588	0,583	1,25917

Source: Primary data , 2020

Determinatin parameter value indicated that variance of hygiene factor and motivator contributes 58,8% for variance of job satisfaction. Relative contribution of motivator ( $\beta = 0,439$ ;  $p < 0,05$ ) is stronger than hygiene factor contribution ( $\beta = 0,404$ ;  $p > 0,05$ ).

Table.12. Partial correlation analysis

Variabel	Unstandardized Coefficients Beta	Sig.
Hygiene factors (X1)	0,404	0,000
Motivator factors (X2)	0,439	0,000

Source; Primary data, 2020

#### 4.8 Discussion.

The effect of either *Hygiene factors* or motivator on Job satisfaction is significant. Variance of Job satisfaction is influenced by variance of hygiene factor and motivator significantly ( $R^2 = 58,8\%$ ). The effect of motivator is significantly stronger than hygiene factor.

The findings recommended in order to increase job satisfaction, management of Hotel The Royal Beach Seminyak Bali need to pay more attention to motivator elements. According to the result of score distribution analysis, the lowest average score is self development opportunity (Mean= 3,29). The results are similar to those reported previously by Raziq&Maulabakhsh (2015) and Winer& Schiff (2018) who uncovered that motivator did significant effects on job satisfaction particularly elements of promotion opportunity and achievement recognition.

Management need to arrange training and development program for its employees and set up decision criteria to select the candidate fairly. The two lowest score of hygiene factor elements is team support (M= 3,27) and achievement recognition (M= 3,31). The findings implication are firstly management need to train the employee how to become a team member and how to work in team. Secondly, management to provide supervisory skill development for its low management level. The program is expected to develop team work quality and enhancing supervisory competence.

The effects of hygiene factor on job satisfaction are reported also by Khalil *et al.*, (2017) and Shields dan Harga (2014). They explained that *hygiene factors* significantly influenced job satisfaction. Schulze (2013) respectively supported the previous findings that social environment has significant correlation with job satisfaction. Management need to address it in company training program. Team building and development is the answer to improve social work environment.

The result of data analysis and hypotheses testing concluded that both *Hygiene factors* and motivators has positive significantly on job satisfaction. Future research is recommended to replicate present study to improve its general validity by involving other hotels employees. It is important to accommodate mandatory requirements of Labour Regulation in Indonesia in the model to enrich job satisfaction dimensions.

#### References

- [1] Alshmemri, M., Shahwan-Akl, L., & Maude, P. (2017). Herzberg's two-factor theory. *Life Science Journal*, 14(5), 12-16.
- [2] Baah, K., & Amoako, G. K. (2013). Application of Frederick Herzberg's two-factor theory in assessing and understanding employee motivation at work: A Ghanaian Perspective. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(9), 1-8.
- [3] Bakotic, D., & Babic, T. B. (2013). Relationship Between Working conditions and Job satisfaction: The Case of Croatian Shipbuilding Company. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 4(206-213).
- [4] Chandrasekar, K. (2015). Workplace environment and its impact organizational performance in public sector organizations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1-19.
- [5] Clark, A. E., Oswald, A., & Warr, P. (2016). Is Job Satisfaction U Shaped in Age. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 69 (1), 57-81.
- [6] Crossman, Abou-Zaki. (2003). Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance of Lebanese Banking Staff. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. Pp: 368-374.
- [7] Dartey-Baah, K., & Amoako, G. K. (2011). Application of Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor theory in assessing and understanding employee motivation at work: a Ghanaian Perspective. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(9), 1-8.
- [8] De Souza, R. (2017). Walking upright here: Countering prevailing discourses through reflexivity and methodological pluralism. *Tesis*. Massey University, Albany, NZ.
- [9] Hyun, S., & Oh, H. (2011). Reexamination of Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation in the Korean army foodservice operations. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 14(2), 100-121.
- [10] Hapsari, Kartika W. (2015) Pengaruh Dua Faktor Motivator dan Higiene (Herzberg) terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan PT. XYZ. *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Bakrie*. 3(1).

- [11] Harahap, D. A., Agustini, F., Amanah, D., & Riza, S. (2017). The Comparison of Work Motivation between Employees and Staffs Based On Two Factor Theory of Motivation in PT PP London Sumatra Indonesia At Bah Lias Research Perdagangan North Sumatera Indonesia. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Invention*, 2(1), 187-192.
- [12] Hasibuan, M. S. (2005). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Edisi Revisi. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- [13] Hasibuan, Malayu S.P. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Edisi Revisi. Jakarta: Penerbit PT Bumi Aksara.
- [14] Herzberg. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Willey and Sons.
- [15] Hutagalung, P. Sondang. (2004). Analisis pengaruh Kompensasi dan Promosi terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Pegawai pada PT Asuransi Dharma Bangsa. *Tesis*. Universitas Sumatera Utara Medan.
- [16] Hyun, Sungmin. (2009). Re-examination of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation in the Korean Army foodservice operations. *ProQuest Dissertations*. 1464349.
- [17] Irmawati. (2013). Pengaruh Herzberg Two Factors Theory Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan di Universitas Terbuka (UT). *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*. 16 (1). pp: 28-36. ISSN 1979-2239
- [18] Jansen, A., & Samuel, M. O. (2014). Achievement of organisational goals and motivation of middle level managers within the context of the two-factor theory. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(16), 53-53.
- [19] Jange, Suresh., & Vandana Gavali. (2014). Job Satisfaction of Library Professionals in Maharashtra State, India Vs ASHA Job Satisfaction Scale: An Evaluative Study. *Journal of Library and Information Science*. 4(4)
- [20] Khalil, Ur Rahman, Waheed, Saad Ullah Khan. (2017). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction: A comparative study of conventional and Islamic insurance. *Cogent Business & Management*. 4 (1)
- [21] Kreitner Robert, Kinicki Angelo. (2005). *Organizational Behavior* (terjemahan buku 1). Cetakan Kelima. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- [22] Lukwago, G., Picho, E. O., & Basheka, C. B. (2014). Using Herzberg's two factor theory to develop a construct validity for motivation of employees in Uganda's National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO): A preliminary analysis.
- [23] Naveed, Asvir., Ahmad Usman & Fatima Bushra. (2015). Promotion: A Predictor of Job Satisfaction A Study of Glass Industry of Lahore Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 2(16): pp:301-305.
- [24] Noori, Zaahid., Aman Ullah Khan., & Imran Naseem. (2015). Impact Of Job Promotion And Job Progress On Work Satisfaction in The University Of KPK Povistan Province. *Science International Journal*. 27(2).
- [25] Onidis, Nicky. (2018). Pengaruh Faktor Motivator dan Faktor Hygiene Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan Home Industri Batik Pasir Semeru di Pasirian. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*. 6(1).
- [26] Rehman, K., Rehman, Z., Saif, N., Khan, A. S., Nawaz, A., & Rehman, S. (2013). Impacts of job satisfaction on organizational commitment: a theoretical model for academicians in HEI of developing countries like Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 3(1), 80-89.
- [27] Schulze. (2013). Job satisfaction, work environment, and rewards: Motivational theory revisited. *LABOUR*. 25(1).
- [28] Shields, M. A., & Price, S. W. (2014). Racial harassment, job satisfaction and intentions to quit: Evidence from the British nursing profession. *Economica*. (62) 295-326.
- [29] Shahin, Mehdi. (2016). Effects of Mixed Procedures on Governmental Employee Promotion Organization Job Satisfaction (Case Study: Employees and Lorestan University Faculty Members). *Asian Social Science*. 12(5)
- [30] Singh, B., Meet, M., & Choubey, S. (2015). Applicability of Two Factor Theory of Motivation on Private University Teachers: An Empirical Study. *The Indian Journal Of Commerce*, 68(4)..