

Retesting Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory among the Housekeeping Staff in the Lodging Industry in the Republic of Korea

- An Exploratory Study -

Herzberg의 two-factor theory 재검증

- 한국 호텔 산업 하우스키퍼 직원들을 대상으로 -

안세화* · 최현석** · Shane C. Blum*** · 유종서****

Ann, Sae-Hya · Choi, Hyun-Suk · Shane C. Blum · Yu, Jong-Seo

Abstract : A housekeeper's work is the most important work that can be done to sell and re-sell rooms, the main product of hotels (Blum, 2011). Preparing rooms for sale is essential to customer satisfaction, the inclination to return, and hotel profitability (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2003). Despite their obvious importance, hotel room attendants and their work remain extremely "unseen" by guests and other hotel employees (Powell & Watson, 2006). The purpose of this study is to test the reliability of the current survey instrument and to determine whether the current study using Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction with a sample of housekeepers in the hotel industry in the Republic of Korea would yield the same results as Herzberg's initial study. The two top-rated hotels in Seoul, the Republic of Korea were selected to administer the survey. Among the 200 surveys distributed, a total of 135 valid surveys was used for the data analysis. By comparing the satisfied and dissatisfied employee groups, the researchers were able to obtain results, which were partially consistent with Herzberg's original

* Texas Tech University Hospitality Administration 박사과정, 주저자. e-mail: sae-hya.ann@ttu.edu

** Texas Tech University Hospitality Administration 박사과정, 2저자. e-mail: Hyunseok.choi@ttu.edu

*** Texas Tech University Hospitality Administration 부교수, 3저자. e-mail: shane.blum@ttu.edu

**** 배재대학교 호텔/컨벤션 경영학과 교수, 교신저자. e-mail: jsyu@pcu.ac.kr

study. Several useful managerial applications that are helpful to increase room attendants' job satisfaction in the lodging industry are anticipated from the findings of this study.

Keywords : Motivation, Job satisfaction, Herzberg's two-factor theory, Housekeeping staff

국문요지 : 하우스 키핑 부서의 일은 호텔의 주요 상품인 방의 판매, 재 판매에 가장 중요한 업무이다. 판매를 위해 방을 준비 하는 것은 고객 만족, 재방문 고객 창출, 그리고 호텔의 수익률에 필수적이다. 이러한 중요성에도 불구하고, 하우스 키퍼들과, 그들이 하는 일은 호텔 직원들이나 고객들에게 “눈에 보이지 않는” 부분으로써, 인정을 받지 못하고 있다. 이 연구의 목적은 개발된 설문지의 신뢰도를 측정하고, 본 연구의 결과가 Herzberg의 two-factor theory의 결과와 일치하는지를 평가 하는 것이다. 대한민국, 서울에 소재한 최고 등급의 2개 호텔에서 설문이 이루어졌다. 총 200개의 설문 중 135개의 유효 설문이 최종 데이터 분석에 사용되었다. 직문 만족 그룹과 불만족 그룹을 비교하여 얻어진 결과는 Herzberg의 연구 결과와 부분적으로 일치하였다. 연구의 결과를 통하여 하우스 키핑 직원들의 동기부여와 직무 만족도에 도움이 되는 결과가 기대되어 진다.

열쇠말 : Housekeeping, Motivation, Job satisfaction, Herzberg's two-factor theory

I. Introduction

Many people have agreed that the housekeeping department is one of the most important departments in any hotel (Blum, 2011). This is because the housekeeping department is the largest department in any hotel in terms of the number of employees and payroll (Blum, 2011). The main duty of housekeepers in the hotel industry is keeping the rooms and hotel clean (Goh, 1989). The clean appearance of a hotel or room has been ranked number one among all other factors that contribute to how a customer selects a hotel, over such factors as location, reputation, service, and price. A housekeeper's work is the most important work that can be done to sell and re-sell rooms, the main product of hotels (Blum, 2011). Preparing rooms for sale is essential to customer satisfaction, the inclination to return, and hotel profitability (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2003). Despite their obvious importance, hotel room attendants and their work remain extremely "unseen" by guests and other hotel employees (Powell & Watson, 2006). Furthermore, there are only a limited number of studies on housekeeping departments and workers compared to studies on food & beverage and hotels in the hospitality industry (Lennon & Wood, 1989).

Many previous researchers have found a correlation between work motivation and job satisfaction (Hancer & George, 2003). Motivation has a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Properly motivated employees tend to be satisfied with their jobs and workers' motivations can improve job satisfaction. Additionally, certain motivational factors contribute to the prediction of job satisfaction (Alam & Md, 2012). Therefore, it is important for management in the hotel industry to understand what essential factors motivate housekeeping staff in order to maximize job satisfaction.

The purpose of this study is to test the reliability of the current survey instrument and to determine whether the current study using Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction with a sample of housekeepers in the hotel industry in the Republic of Korea would yield the same results as Herzberg's initial study.

II. Literature Review

1. The Housekeeping Workforce in the Republic of Korea

Since the International Monetary Fund (IMF) crisis in 1997, most hotels in the Republic of Korea have utilized outsourcing for many departmental positions such as maintenance, parking, security, design and cleaning. This has allowed hotels to increase labor flexibility, promptly respond to the rapidly changing business environment, focus on core competences and reduce risks, labor costs, fixed costs and operating costs (Baek, 2001). “Outsourcing” is defined as contracting portions of work to outside companies, rather than completing it internally, in order to focus on core competences and reduce costs (Choi, 1998). Outsourcing housekeepers is ranked number one among all of the outsourced positions listed since the 1990s (Kang, 2001).

Only a few studies have conducted research on housekeeping departments in the Republic of Korea. Lim (1969) claimed housekeeping departments were important to hotel service. Ahn (2004) used one hotel in Seoul, the capital of the Republic of Korea, to examine what factors affect outsourced housekeepers’ attitudes about their jobs. Ha (2008) examined the relationship among outsourced partnership factors, trust, commitment, and business satisfaction in the housekeeping divisions of the Republic of Korean hotels. The findings showed that partnership factors have a positive effect on trust, and trust has a positive effect on business satisfaction. However, there is a limited number of studies that examine the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction of Korean housekeeping staff.

2. Herzberg’s Two-Factors Theory

Frederick Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959) developed one of the most widely accepted motivation theories, the two-factor theory. Herzberg *et al.* (1959) separated motivational factors into two areas: motivators and hygiene factors. Motivators are the real factors that motivate employees at work and

create true job satisfaction. Hygiene factors are those that create job dissatisfaction if absent. However hygiene factors alone will not create satisfaction, as they only affect dissatisfaction. What makes Herzberg's theory unique is the concept of two different motivational dimensions that explain job satisfaction (Balmer & Baum, 1993).

Job factors about good feelings are related to the job itself or job content (motivators), and these factors are more intrinsic. Achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself (intrinsic interest in the work), responsibility, growth, and advancement are considered job factor motivators and tend to lead to job satisfaction. Job factors about bad feelings that meet a person's need to avoid unpleasantness are related to job context (hygiene factors). Hygiene factors are associated with employee job dissatisfaction and are extrinsic to the job. Hygiene factors include interpersonal relations with peers, subordinates, and supervisors; security; working conditions; salary; status; supervision; company policy and administration; and personal life (Herzberg *et al.*, 1959).

The key point to understanding Herzberg's two-factor theory is that motivational and hygiene factors are separated into two different dimensions that affect different aspects of job satisfaction (Tan & Waheed, 2011). Herzberg (1966) claimed that there are two separated parallel continua of job satisfactions: the hygiene factors that affect job dissatisfaction and the motivators that affect job satisfaction. The factors involved in generating job satisfaction (motivation) are separate and distinct from the factors that produce job dissatisfaction. The opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather "no job satisfaction," and the opposite of job dissatisfaction would be "no job dissatisfaction," not job satisfaction. Instead of being opposites, they are two separate unipolar traits. This point of view on job satisfaction is totally distinct from the traditional approach, which views job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as opposite ends of the same continuum (Ewen, Smith, & Hulin, 1966; Herzberg, 1966).

For several decades since its original publication, Herzberg's two-factor theory has been a source of debate, and the theory's findings have been controversial. There has been some support for Herzberg's theory, while many empirical studies

refute the predictions of Herzberg's theory (Wiley, 1997). More than 30 years after the long debate on the methodological and conceptual problems of Herzberg's theory, a new movement demonstrated in the work of Sacheu (2007), and Zhang, Small, Von Dran, and Barcellos (2000) argues the importance of resurrecting and reexamining Herzberg's theory (Sacheu, 2007).

In the hospitality industry, several studies have utilized Herzberg's two-factor theory, and the results indicate differing opinions on Herzberg's theory. Balmer and Baum (1993) also applied Herzberg's theory to the realm of hotel guest satisfaction in Cyprus, as opposed to its normal application to employee motivation. They concluded that motivator factors are the true motivators for customer return, while hygiene factors only support customer satisfaction that are already gained by motivators. Therefore, their findings were consistent with Herzberg's theory. They further stated that Herzberg's theory is more applicable and relevant than Maslow's theory, in view of changes in customers' expectations and the concept of quality.

Baum (2007) also conducted an empirical study using 29 guests who stayed at Eco lodges in Malaysia. His findings revealed that customer satisfaction is a two-dimensional measurement that corresponds well to Herzberg's theory, concluding that Herzberg's theory is capable in explaining service quality dimensions and a good way to address human satisfaction.

Recently, Sledge, Miles, and Coppage (2008) conducted qualitative research using Herzberg's two-factor theory. They focused on the links between motivation, job satisfaction, and the impact of culture in the workplace within the Brazilian hotel industry. Their results partially supported the theory and suggested that culture influences the degree of job satisfaction. Lundberg, Gudmundson, and Andersson (2009) attempted to understand work motivation in a sample of seasonal workers at a tourism destination. Their findings corresponded to Herzberg's theory as the seasonal workers they studied cared more about meeting new people than resident workers, while resident workers were more motivated by wages.

Additionally, Hyun (2009) re-examined Herzberg's two-factor theory in Korean Army Foodservice operations by comparing two groups: the food service soldiers

and the logistics officers. The foodservice soldiers identified hygiene factors as more powerful predictors of job satisfaction while the logistics officers identified motivators as the more significant predictors of job satisfaction. However, not all hygiene factors were more important than motivators for the foodservice soldiers. Likewise, not all motivators appeared to be more important than hygiene factors for logistics officers.

As listed above, several studies in the hospitality industry have utilized Herzberg's two-factor theory in order to examine the motivation and job satisfaction of different groups of employees. However, most importantly, no studies have used Herzberg's two-factor theory to examine the motivation and job satisfaction of the housekeeping staff in the hotel industry in the Republic of Korea.

3. Motivation and job satisfaction

Many previous researchers have consistently found a positive relationship between motivation and job satisfaction; the more workers are motivated, the higher their level of job satisfaction (Alam & Md, 2012; Brown & Shepherd, 1997; Ströh, 2001). Simons and Enz (1995) found that the job satisfaction level of motivated workers was significantly higher than non-motivated people and stated that motivated employees work harder and exert more effort for better performance and productivity than workers who are not motivated. Brown and Shepherd (1997) reported that motivation improves workers' job satisfaction in a positive manner, and some motivational factors do contribute to job satisfaction. Holland (1989) also reported that motivation is closely related to job satisfaction, and a lack of motivation brings a lack of proper job satisfaction among employees of organizations. Therefore, high levels of motivation create high levels of job satisfaction (Eskildsen, Kristensen, & Westlund, 2004; Glisson & Durick, 1988).

3. Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for testing:

Hypothesis 1. Satisfied employees in the housekeeping department value motivator factors significantly more than dissatisfied employees.

Hypothesis 2. Dissatisfied employees in the housekeeping department value hygiene factors significantly more than satisfied employees.

Hypothesis 3. The findings of this study have consistency with the results of Herzberg's studies; motivators rather than hygiene factors are more significantly associated with job satisfaction.

III. Methodology

1. Survey Instruments

The survey instrument was developed based upon previously validated instruments derived from the literature review. All of the questions used in the survey to measure motivators, hygiene factors, and job satisfaction were derived from Carr (2005), Ewen, Smith, and Hulin (1966), Graen (1966), Maidani (1991), Smerek and Peterson (2007), and Tan and Waheed (2011), which have used Herzberg's two-factor theory in their studies. The survey questions used to measure motivators, hygiene factor, and job satisfaction are shown in the Appendix. All of these researchers demonstrated the validity and reliability of the survey instruments in their studies. Specifically, all of the factors showed Cronbach's alpha value between 0.70 and 0.85, indicating that questions in each construct measure a similar concept (Cronbach, 1951). The researchers have included the exact same fifteen factors that Herzberg used in his original study to retest Herzberg's theory (1959). However, one factor, "the relationship with subordinates" was not included because most of the housekeepers hold

entry-level positions and do not have subordinates. A total of 29 motivator questions, 43 hygiene factor questions, and 5 job satisfaction questions were used.

For all items measuring motivators, hygiene factors, and job satisfaction responses were scored on a Likert five-point scale: 1 for "strongly disagree," 2 for "disagree," 3 for "neutral," 4 for "agree," and 5 for "strongly agree."

2. Data collection

The participants of this study were housekeeping staff currently working in top-rated hotels in the Republic of Korea. There were no limitations for participation based on age, ethnicity, gender, work positions, employment status, or education level.

The researchers contacted a total of eight top-rated hotels in Seoul, the Republic of Korea by telephone to receive permission to administer the survey. Only two hotels allowed the researchers to administer the survey at that time. On July 22nd, 2014, the researchers visited the two top-rated hotels in Seoul, the Republic of Korea, to explain the importance of the study, provide detailed instruction and distribute the survey. The survey was administered on site and collected by the director of the housekeeping department at a time and location convenient for the employees. The researchers emphasized that all of the information that the participants provided in the survey would remain confidential and that participation was voluntary. Also, the researchers carefully explained how the survey must be administered and asked the supervisors not to be present during the survey, so their presences would not influence the participants' answers to the survey.

3. Data analysis

Only valid cases were left for the data analysis after missing, invalid, and mis-coded cases were deleted. After data screening, the normality and homogeneity of variance assumption tests were conducted in sequence. After all

of the assumption tests, t-test and correlation were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences between the satisfied and dissatisfied groups and to examine the correlation between surveyed factors and job satisfaction. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 was utilized.

The researchers separated the respondents into two groups of either satisfied or dissatisfied employees. The mean value of job satisfaction was calculated by using the five job satisfaction questions. The mean values were used to separate the job satisfied and dissatisfied groups. The mean values of job satisfaction that were lower than 2.5 (out of 5) were considered part of the job dissatisfied group while the mean values of job satisfaction that were higher than 2.5 (out of 5) were considered part of the job satisfied group.

IV. Results

1. Reliability

A reliability test was performed to check the consistency and accuracy of the measurement scales. Table 1 shows that the results for Cronbach's coefficient α were satisfactory (between 0.69 and 0.96), indicating questions in each construct measure a similar concept (Cronbach, 1951). After running the reliability test, the two items measuring "Personal life" had to be deleted from the survey. The Cronbach's α value of "Personal life" was .088, which is too low to be reliable. The two items were negatively stated on the survey and that might have caused the participants to misunderstand the questions. After deleting the two items, the Cronbach's α value went up to 0.69, which is just high enough to be included.

<Table 1> Testing reliability with Cronbach's coefficient alpha

	Number of Items	Cronbach's α
Motivators		
Achievement	3	0.78
Advancement	5	0.86
Work itself	4	0.90
Recognition	7	0.91
Responsibility	5	0.91
Growth	5	0.88
Hygiene factors		
Supervision-technical	8	0.96
Company policy & Administration	3	0.89
Relationship with peers	7	0.93
Job security	3	0.80
Relationship with supervisors	5	0.93
Salary	6	0.88
Working conditions	5	0.85
Status	2	0.77
Personal life	2 (4)	0.69 (0.09)
Job satisfaction	5	0.92

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of gender, age, education, income, years of experience, work positions, and employment status. The majority of the respondents were female (85.9%) which is consistent with the characteristics of most housekeeping staff.

In terms of age, 93.9% of the respondents were in the age range of 40 - 60 and above. More than half of the respondents (57%) were in the age range of 50 - 59. In terms of education, fifth-seven percent of the respondents' highest level of education was a high school degree. In contradiction to the long-standing belief of uneducated housekeeping staff, 36.2% of the respondents had either earned an associates or bachelor's degree or a certificate. In terms of the duration of work experiences, 25.5% of respondents have worked as housekeepers for between 1 - 5 years, while 8.1% worked for more than 20 years. In addition, 75.9% of the respondents were employees of an outsourcing company, indicating that the hotels in the Republic of Korea depend heavily on the housekeeping workforce provided by outsourcing companies.

<Table 2> The characteristics of the respondents

Respondents' characteristics	Number	Percentages
Gender		
Male	16	10.7%
Female	128	85.9%
Age		
20 - 29	4	2.7%
30 - 39	5	3.4%
40 - 49	40	26.8%
50 - 59	85	57%
60 and above	15	10.1%
Education		
Middle school - completed	6	4%
High school degree	85	57%
High school diploma	2	1.3%
Associates' degree	14	9.4%
Associates' certificate	9	6%
Bachelor' degree	20	13.4%
Bachelor' certificate	9	6%
Graduate - Master degree	1	0.7%
Others	1	0.7%
Household Income		
Less than \$10,000	7	4.7%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	72	48.3%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	14	9.4%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	17	11.4%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	15	10.1%
More than \$50,000	20	13.4%
Years of Experience		
Less than 1 year	27	18.1%
1 - 5 years	38	25.5%
5 - 10 years	34	22.8%
10 - 20 years	37	24.8%
More than 20 years	12	8.1%
Work Positions		
Managerial positions	27	18.1%
Line-level positions	116	77.9%
Employment Status		
Hotel employees: Full-time	30	20.1%
Hotel employees: Part-time	6	4%
Outsourcing company employees : Full-time	105	70.5%
Outsourcing company employees: Part-time	8	5.4%

Since housekeeping is manual labor, the inevitable loss of physical health might reflect the relatively small number of respondents who have worked more than 20 years. Krause, Lee, Scherzer, Rugulies, Sinnott, and Baker (2002) have found that 87% of the housekeeping staff in Las Vegas and San Francisco have agreed that their work is physically demanding, which results in high levels of work stress, work-related pain, injury, and disability, and high rates of elevated blood pressure. More importantly, work related pain and injury are the main reasons to take time off from work or quit the job. They found that the average tenure of housekeepers in hotels in Las Vegas and San Francisco is 7.7 years and physically demanding work is one of the reasons for the short tenure of housekeeping staff.

Hypothesis 1.

As seen in Table 3, the mean of motivators for the dissatisfied group was 79.76, and the mean of motivators for the satisfied group was 99.50. In comparing the two means, there is a significant difference in the mean of motivators between dissatisfied and satisfied respondents. Therefore, the satisfied group values motivators more than the dissatisfied respondents. The results support this hypothesis.

<Table 3> Comparison of means for motivator factors between the dissatisfied and satisfied employees

Groups	N	Mean	SD*	T-value	Probability
Dissatisfied	55	79.76	10.13	-7.55	.000**
Satisfied	70	99.50	18.67		

Note. * Standard Deviation; ** Significant at .05 level

Hypothesis 2.

As seen in Table 4, the mean of hygiene factors for the dissatisfied employees was 114.59, and the mean of hygiene factors for the satisfied employees was 140.51. In comparing the two means, the satisfied group values hygiene factors more significantly. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is not supported.

<Table 4> Comparison of means for hygiene factors between the dissatisfied and satisfied employees

Groups	N	Mean	SD*	T-value	Probability
Dissatisfied	55	114.59	18.97	-6.98	.000**
Satisfied	70	140.51	21.21		

Note. * Standard Deviation; ** Significant at .05 level

Hypothesis 3.

Table 5 presents the correlation matrix of motivator, hygiene factors, and job satisfaction. All six motivators were significantly correlated to job satisfaction at the 0.01 level. All of the hygiene factors were significantly associated with job satisfaction. All of the correlation coefficient values in the matrix had a positive value, meaning hygiene factors and job satisfaction were positively correlated. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

<Table 5> Correlation analysis of the motivators and hygiene factors and job satisfaction

	JS	AC	AD	WI	RC	RE	GR	SP	CA	RP	JC	RS	SL	WC	ST	PL
JS	1.00															
AC	.599*	1.00														
AD	.553*	.662*	1.00													
WI	.610*	.740*	.641*	1.00												
RC	.656*	.610*	.627*	.561*	1.00											
RE	.601*	.528*	.634*	.520*	.622*	1.00										
GR	.648*	.536*	.603*	.463*	.714*	.635*	1.00									
SP	.438*	.341*	.402*	.200*	.417*	.412*	.583*	1.00								
CA	.662*	.512*	.631*	.418*	.609*	.590*	.725*	.587*	1.00							
RP	.620*	.554*	.597*	.464*	.674*	.648*	.733*	.502*	.736*	1.00						
JC	.651*	.537*	.512*	.454*	.587*	.543*	.573*	.509*	.631*	.619*	1.00					
RS	.552*	.460*	.482*	.369*	.577*	.532*	.623*	.701*	.646*	.570*	.566*	1.00				
SL	.678*	.511*	.530*	.381*	.515*	.521*	.552*	.383*	.652*	.560*	.577*	.469*	1.00			
WC	.725*	.556*	.598*	.456*	.587*	.611*	.602*	.490*	.702*	.633*	.670*	.516*	.766*	1.00		
ST	.549*	.434*	.476*	.409*	.529*	.420*	.537*	.416*	.620*	.525*	.473*	.499*	.544*	.586*	1.00	
PL	.636*	.388*	.489*	.339*	.471*	.569*	.492*	.264*	.538*	.467*	.483*	.382*	.647*	.672*	.488*	1.00

Note. JS = Job satisfaction /

Motivators: 1) AC = Achievement / 2) AD = Advancement / 3) WI = Work itself / 4) RC = Recognition / 5) RE = Responsibility / 6) GR = Growth /

Hygiene factors: 1) SP = Supervision – technical / 2) CA = Company policy and administration / 3) RP = Relationship with peers / 4) JC = Job security / 5) RS = Relationship with supervisors / 6) SL = Salary / 7) WC = Working condition / 8) ST = Status / 9) PL = Personal life

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

V. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to test the reliability of the current survey instrument and to determine whether the current study would yield the same results as Herzberg's original study. From this exploratory study, the researchers were able to determine how to develop a reliable survey instrument for a main study. The researchers found that all of the items were reliable, except for one factor - personal life. Since the personal life factor contained only two reliable items, the researchers will add at least one more item for the main study. Also, the status factor currently has only two items. Even though the Cronbach's coefficient alpha level is 0.77 with these two items, the researcher will also add at least one more item to conduct factor analysis for the main study.

Hypothesis 1 was supported since the satisfied group valued motivators more than the dissatisfied group. Hypothesis 2 was not supported because the satisfied group valued hygiene factors more than the dissatisfied group. Hypothesis 3 was also not supported because both motivators and hygiene factors positively and statistically correlate with job satisfaction. This study indicated that the satisfied employees stress both motivators and hygiene factors more than the dissatisfied employees, and hygiene factors were also sources of job satisfaction.

The findings show that motivators and hygiene factors were both sources of job satisfaction rather than dissatisfaction. These findings are the opposite of Herzberg's original study, which concluded that hygiene factors only affect job dissatisfaction. However, this study did support Herzberg's theory that motivators are the most significant factors that create job satisfaction. This inconsistency might be caused due to the different samples between Herzberg's study and this study, a great number of outsourced employees, or the different nationalities of the samples participants. The sample of Herzberg's original study (1959) was American engineers and accountants, but the sample for this study is Korean housekeeping staff. The inconsistency might be due to the different samples and their occupations. Another reason might be based on gender differences since females (85.9%) were the majority of the participants for this study and Herzberg's were predominantly males. It is also possible that

employees' values on motivation and job satisfaction have changed since Herzberg conducted the study in 1959. The main study, with more participants, can better determine the reasons for these inconsistencies.

In conclusion, management of hotels in the Republic of Korea can benefit from the findings of this study - both motivators and hygiene factors were important to increase job satisfaction of employees in housekeeping departments. The good news for management is that many motivators and hygiene factors are not costly to execute in the work place to increase employees' job satisfaction. Job satisfaction related to advancement, achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth, relationships with peers, subordinates, and supervisors, working conditions, status and personal life can be increased without tremendous monetary investment. Management can try to meet the employees' needs for motivators and hygiene factors and finally increase job satisfaction.

VI. Limitation and Future Study

There are only two items measuring each of the factors, personal life and status. A factor analysis is planned to retest Herzberg's theory. As the required number of items measuring each factor must be three, the researchers will add several more items for these factors to create a more reliable survey instrument.

In addition, the findings of this study can be applied only to housekeeping departments in the Republic of Korea, as the results obtained may not be generalized to other countries. Therefore, further research could be conducted as a comparison between the Republic of Korea and other countries to examine the magnitude of differences in motivation and job satisfaction.

■ References

- Ahn, S. G. (2004). An Empirical Study on the Job Satisfaction of Housekeeping Outsourcing Employees. *Journal of Travel Study*, 21, 205-221.
- Alam, T., & Md, S. (2012). Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction, Motivation and Turnover Rate of Medical Promotion Officer (MPO) in Pharmaceutical Industry: A Study Based in Khulna City.
- Baek, N. S. (2001). *Analysis on improving international competitiveness of hotels in South Korea: focused on outsourcing*(Unpublished master's thesis). Kyung Hee University, Gyeonggi-Do.
- Balmer, S., & Baum, T. (1993). Applying Herzberg's hygiene factors to the Changing accommodation environment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 5(2).
- Baum, T. (2007). Researching consumer satisfaction: an extension of Herzberg's Motivator and Hygiene Factor Theory. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 23(1), 71-83.
- Blum, S. C. (2011). *Hotel Operations: Theories and Applications* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA:Kendall/Hunt.
- Brown, C. M. & Shepherd, N. (1997). *"Job satisfaction factors"*, New Delhi, Griffin Books.
- Carr, G. G. (2005). *Investigating the motivation of retail managers at a retail organisation in the Western Cape* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Western Cape).
- Choi, W. Y., (1998). Corporate restructuring, outsourcing is the key!. *LG Weekly Economy*, 490, 50.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- Eskildsen, J. K., Kristensen, K., & Westlund, A. H. (2004). Work motivation and job satisfaction in the Nordic countries. *Employee relations*, 26(2), 122-136.
- Ewen, R. B., Smith, P. C., & Hulin, C. L. (1966). An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(6), 544-550.
- Goh, S. H. (1989). Job satisfaction of hotel room attendants (Unpublished master's thesis). Texas Tech University, Lubbock.
- Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational

- commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61-81.
- Graen, G. B. (1966). Addendum to "An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory.". *Journal of applied psychology*, 50(6), 551.
- Ha, C. H. (2008). The relationship among outsourcing partnership factors, trust, commitment, and business satisfaction in the housekeeping division of delux hotels. *Tourism & Leisure Research*, 20(2), 87-103.
- Hancer, M. & George, R. T. (2003). Job satisfaction of restaurant employees: an empirical investigation using the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 27(1). 85-100.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work (2nd ed.)*. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Holland, B. K. (1989). Motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Property Management*, 54(5), 32-36.
- Hunter Powell, P., & Watson, D. (2006). Service unseen: The hotel room attendant at work. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 25(2), 297-312.
- Hyun, S. (2009). Re-examination of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation in the Korean Army Foodservice Operation (Master thesis). Iowa State University.
- Kandampully, J., & Suhartanto, D. (2003). The role of customer satisfaction and image in gaining customer loyalty in the hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 10(112), 3-25.
- Kang, S. M. (2001). *Critical success factors for outsourcing in hotel industry: focused on the house keeping department of first-rate hotel* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kyonggi University, Gyeonggi-Do.
- Krause, N., Lee, P. T., Scherzer, T., Rugulies, R., Sinnott, P. L., & Baker, R. L. (2002). Health and working conditions of hotel guest room attendants in Las Vegas. *An epidemiological investigation*.
- Lim, S. B. (1969). The importance of housekeeping in terms of hotel service. *Journal of Kyonggi University*, 3, 60-68.
- Lennon, J. & Wood, R. (1989). The sociological analysis of hospitality labour and the neglect of accommodation workers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 8(3), 227-235.
- Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A., & Andersson, T. D. (2009). Herzberg's Two-Factor

- Theory of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management*, 30(6), 890-899.
- Maidani, E. A. (1991). Comparative study of Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of job satisfaction among public and private sectors. *Public Personnel Management*.
- Powell, P. H. & Watson, D. (2006). Service unseen: The hotel room attendant at work. *Hospitality Management*, 25, 297-312.
- Sachau, D. A. (2007). Resurrecting the motivation-hygiene theory: Herzberg and the positive psychology movement. *Human Resource Development Review*, 6(4), 377-393.
- Simons, T. & Enz, C. A. (1995). Motivating hotel employees. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 20-27.
- Sledge, S., Miles, K. A., & Coppage, S. (2008). What role does culture play? A look at motivation and job satisfaction among hotel workers in Brazil. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(9), 1667-1692.
- Smerek, R. E., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 229-250.
- Ströh, E.C.(2001). Personnel motivation: Strategies to stimulate employees to increase performance. *Politeia*, 20(2), 59-74.
- Tan, TH. & Waheed, A. (2011). Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and job satisfaction in the Malaysian retail sector: the mediating effect of love of money. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 16(1), 73-94.
- Wiley, C. (1997). What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys. *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(3), 263-280.
- Zhang, P., Small, R. V., Von Dran, G. M., & Barcellos, S. (2000, January). A two factor theory for website design. *In System Sciences, 2000. Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Hawaii International Conference on* (pp. 10-pp). IEEE.

2014년 10월 10일 최초투고논문 접수
2014년 10월 31일 최종심사완료일 및 게재확정일 통보
2014년 11월 9일 최종 논문 도착
3인 익명 심사 료

