Factors Increasing Teachers` Motivation: The Case of Vilnius City Municipality

Gintautė Žibėnienė
Mykolas Romeris University
Ateities str. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania

Dangis Gudelis
Mykolas Romeris University
Ateities str. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania

Irena Žemaitaitytė
Mykolas Romeris University
Ateities str. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania

Andrius Stasiukynas
Mykolas Romeris University
Ateities str. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania

Abstract. *The article presents the results of a quantitative study. The aim of the article is to identify the factors motivating teachers of the Vilnius City Municipality to work. The questionnaire survey of Vilnius city teachers was conducted in April-May, 2020, using the electronic survey tool Qualtrics. Employees of the Vilnius City Municipality Administration distributed the link to the questionnaire to all teachers of the Vilnius city schools by e-mail. 1660 respondents started the questionnaire on this electronic platform, but after eliminating the incomplete questionnaires, a database of 873 respondents who answered all the questions of the questionnaire was created. The survey of teachers of Vilnius city educational institutions has shown that teachers are most motivated by the improvement of teachers' working conditions at school and the reduction of direct control as well as by personal recognition and ensuring favourable opportunities for professional development.*

Keywords: *teachers, motivating factors, motivation*
Raktažodžiai: *mokytojai, motyvaciniai faktoriai, motyvacija*

Introduction

In the educational sector, considerable attention is paid to how to make a career in an educational institution attractive to teachers. Demographic and economic changes in Lithuania pose the following challenges: the part of older teachers in the general population of teachers is growing and only a very small part of young people choose to be teachers; less than 15% of graduates of initial teacher education institutions decide to work in the field (Education and Training Monitoring Bulletin Lithuania, 2019). The map of the need for investment in the education system (Map of investment needs in the education system 2021-2023, 2020) indicates that there is an increase in the number of municipalities in Lithuania where there is a shortage of teachers, especially preschool teachers. For example, in 2017. there was a shortage of teachers in half of the municipalities. In 2018, according to the model prepared by MOSTA, 3,077 educated teachers will retire in 2022. Due to the ageing of teachers and the fact that some initial teacher education students do not finish their studies and only a small number of graduates become teachers, teacher shortage may increase significantly in the

future, making it more difficult to implement innovative methods, especially those based on digital technologies (Overview of the state of science, studies and innovations in Lithuania, 2018).

Mitchell (2020; p.1-13) notes that the effectiveness of a school depends on the school community, which should be involving, collaborative, supportive (characterized by good relationships), learning and reflecting. However, the situation in Lithuania, where there is a shortage of teachers and not all young graduates choose a pedagogical career path or withdraw from this career after choosing it, demonstrates the need to examine these factors of school effectiveness in order to understand why teachers are not motivated to work at school and how to motivate them.

The problem of teacher shortage is also growing in Vilnius; therefore, Vilnius City Municipality initiated a research project on measures which could motivate teachers already working in schools in Vilnius and which could incentivize qualified people to choose a pedagogical career. According to the data retrieved from the Education Management Information System in November 2019, 5738 teachers worked in general education institutions of Vilnius City Municipality, of whom 2449 worked in gymnasiums; 815 worked in basic schools; 706 worked in primary schools; 1768 worked in progymnasiums. Vilnius and Vilnius region are growing, therefore the city of Vilnius and the region, as well as some other regions of the country, have been facing a shortage of teachers for a number of years. According to the data of July 1, 2019, Vilnius lacked more than 160 teachers, 44 primary education teachers and 19 pre-school education teachers. It is important to explain what motivates teachers to work, but there is a lack of such research in Lithuania. The purpose of the survey of 873 Vilnius teachers initiated by the Vilnius City Municipality was to find out the factors motivating Vilnius teachers (Stasiukynas et al., 2020). The article which presents results of this research examines motivational and hygienic factors which affect motivation of Vilnius teachers and incentives which could be used by the Vilnius City Municipality to increase the job motivation of Vilnius teachers.

Theoretical framework

Motivation is a widely researched topic in contemporary disciplines of psychology, management, and education science. It is defined as the totality of interrelated beliefs and emotions which determine and influence behaviour (Martin & Dowson, 2009; p. 79, 327-365); that which initiates, sustains, and focuses behaviour (Sinclair, Dowson & Mcinerney, 2006; p. 1132–1154). The special field of motivation which attracted the utmost research is work motivation, defined as "a set of energetic forces occurring both within and outside the individual to initiate work-related behavior and determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration" (Latham and Locke, 1991; p. 212-247). Since the mid-twentieth century a number of psychological theories have been developed which explained factors motivating human behaviour and their work performance. Classical theories (Maslow, 1954; Herzberg, 2003; McGregor, 1960) developed typologies of factors which could be separated into two broader groups in each of these theories: factors related to intrinsic motivation and those related to extrinsic motivation. This distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation has been further elaborated in the theory of self-determination theory (Ryan, & Deci, 2000; p. 68-78). In parallel, theories which stressed the importance of situational factors to motivate employees' behaviour, such as value of expectations (Vroom, 1964), goal setting (Latham and Locke, 1991; p. 212-247), self-efficacy (Bandura, 2001; p. 1-26), perception of equity (Adams, 1963; p. 67, 422-436), work characteristics (Hackman and Oldham, 1976; p. 16, 250-279), etc., have been developed.

These theories have been tested by empirical studies in different settings. Motivation of teachers also received researchers' attention, a number of studies based on different theoretical premises were conducted with the aim to better understand which factors motivate teachers, working either in secondary schools or universities, and contribute to their job (Toropova, Myrberg and Johansson, 2020; p. 71-97; Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2014; p. 68-77; Guerriero, 2017; p. 171-191; Thoonen, et al., 2011; p. 496-536; Han and Yin, 2016).

Teachers' motivation has also been a subject of education policy and management research, as the proper identification of teachers' needs and factors motivating their behaviour is necessary in

order for educational managers and policy makers to understand which economic or other incentives could contribute to their better work performance. Managers and policy makers can use a variety of motivational tools to keep teachers productive. The main motivating tools which differ depending on motivating factors are salary, bonuses, self-assertion, the opportunity to move up the career ladder, respect, creative atmosphere, positive feedback from management (Canrinus, at al., 2011; p.115–132). Kolbe and Strunk (Kolbe and Strunk, 2012; p. 779–813) presented a typology of economic incentives categorizing incentive policies along two dimensions: their structure and purpose. Incentives were grouped in six categories, according to their structure: salary schedule modifications, salary enhancements, limited duration incentives, tuition subsidies and remission, in-kind incentives and benefits, and retirement benefit waivers. Within each category types of incentive policies were distinguished according to their purpose to address multiple teacher staffing problems (e.g., recruitment, retention, distribution).

Our article presents findings of the teachers' survey based on assumptions derived from the Herzberg's (Herzberg, 1968; p. 87–96) motivation-hygiene theory. According to this theory, the main determinants of job satisfaction (motivational factors) are internal motivators such as recognition, promotion, etc., while job dissatisfaction is caused by external hygiene factors (e.g., salary, working conditions, etc.) if these factors are not adequately ensured. Baughman (1996; p. 19–22) found that important determinants of teacher job satisfaction are managerial support, an orientation toward academic excellence, and morale. Perie and Baker (1997), Arifin, et al., (2017; p.41-46) argued that, among other external factors, teacher job satisfaction was determined by administrative support. According to Brunetti (2001; p. 49–74), the same factors can be a source of both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Young (2003) singled out factors that determine teacher job satisfaction such as excess roles, leadership, teacher autonomy, salary, parental support, student behaviour, and the school climate. The survey also included questions aimed to understand which economic incentives, adapted from Kolbe and Strunck's typology (2012; p.779–813), could contribute to enhancing teachers' motivation.

Research methods

Survey organization and sampling

The questionnaire survey of Vilnius city teachers was conducted in April-May, 2020, using the electronic survey tool Qualtrics.

The research was implemented in accordance with the principles of scientific ethics: participants were allowed to participate in the study at any time, discontinue the study, get access to the purpose of the study, the use of the data, their anonymity was guaranteed; and the researchers undertook measures to adhere to the principle of ethics and protect participants of the study from possible harm (Bitinas, Rupšienė, Žydžiūnaitė, 2008; pp. 112–113).

Employees of the Vilnius City Municipality Administration distributed the link to the questionnaire to all teachers of the Vilnius city schools by e-mail. 1660 respondents started filling in the questionnaire on this electronic platform, but after eliminating the incomplete questionnaires, a database of 873 respondents who answered all the questions of the questionnaire was created. The confidence interval of the survey is 95% with a 3% margin of error. The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 1. **Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents**

	N = 873	Percent
Type of educational institution		
gymnasium	344	39.4
primary school	118	13.5
progymnasium	289	33.1
primary school	122	14.0
Pedagogical work experience (years)		
up to 5 years	88	10.1

	6-10 years	60	6.9
	11-15 years	101	11.6
	16-20 years	97	11.1
	21-25 years	157	18.0
	26 years and more	370	42.4
Position			
	teacher	141	16.2
	senior teacher	399	45.7
	teacher methodologist	278	31.8
	teacher expert	31	3.6
	other	24	2.7
Age			
	26-30 years	49	5.6
	31-35 years	65	7.4
	36-40 years	78	8.9
	41-45 years	140	16.0
	46-50 years	169	19.4
	51 years and older	372	42.6
Gender			
	woman	802	91.9
	man	71	8.1
Distance (km) from the place of residence to the main place of work			
	up to 1 km	91	10.4
	1 - 5 km	241	27.6
	6 - 10 km	293	33.6
	11 km and more	248	28.4
I go to work			
	on foot	149	17.1
	by car	418	47.9
	by public transport	286	32.8
	by taxi	5	.6
	by bicycle	5	.6
	by scooter	1	.1
	by other means	9	1.0

Source: composed by the authors.

The majority of respondents were women (91.9%). Respondents belonged to different age groups, but the predominant age group was 51 years and older (42.6%). Respondents were similarly distributed according to the length of pedagogical work: 42.4% of respondents have been working at school for 26 years and more. The majority of respondents work in gymnasiums and progymnasiums (39.4% and 33.1%, respectively). Among the respondents, the majority are men teachers and teacher methodologists (45.7% and 31.8%, respectively).

Research instruments

The questionnaire consisted of 18 questions formulated on a ranking scale (respondents were asked to mark five options motivating teachers and their motivational measures and rank them from 1 (most preferred) to 5 (least preferred)), and four Likert scale questions (respondents were asked to rate the motivating factors of teachers from 1 (most motivating) to 5 (least motivating). The questionnaire also included a standard block of socio-demographic questions.

When ranking motivational factors and motivational tools, respondents did not have the opportunity to mark several answer options with the same score, while answering Likert scale questions they could evaluate different motivational factors with the same score (i.e. in these questions, unlike ranking scale questions, answer options were not compared). To avoid a large number of missing values, a rule was introduced that respondents had to mark at least one answer option in order to go to the next page of the survey question.

Respondents' answers to the questions about teachers' motivating factors and motivational measures formulated on the ranking scale were analysed by calculating and comparing the sums and averages of the ranking scores assigned to the different answer variants. In the tables, five answer

variants are marked in bold, to which the respondents gave the highest-ranking points. Motivating factors for teachers were also assessed by averaging responses to Likert scale questions[1].

In cases where the mean and ranking values of the fifth and sixth selected options did not differ significantly, non-parametric tests of the related samples were performed to determine whether these differences between the rankings of these options were statistically significant.

The distribution of respondents' answers to the questions in different groups of respondents (gender, length of service, type of educational institution, etc.) was also studied by averaging the values of answers in those groups and performing non-parametric Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests on independent samples to determine whether the differences between the answers in different groups of respondents were statistically significant[2].

A questionnaire was created by distinguishing the relevant blocks of questions (1) demographic, 2) related to the teacher's work environment, salary, etc., 3) motivational factors related to career, recognition, etc.). Herzberg's theory (2003) of external and internal motivational factors (hygienic and motivational factors) was used to form the question blocks, later the structure of the questionnaire was improved considering the research goals and the peculiarities of the respondents.

Hygienic factors related to the work environment of teachers. If the level of hygienic factors is insufficient, the person feels dissatisfied with the job. If it is sufficient, one does not even notice them. Thus, hygienic factors do not motivate people to work better, but only protect them from dissatisfaction. Herzberg (2003) distinguishes the following hygienic factors: 1) administrative policy, 2) working conditions, 3) remuneration for work, 4) mutual relations with managers, subordinates, colleagues, 5) level of direct control.

Motivational factors related to the nature and content of the work itself and motivating people to work better. The absence of motivational factors does not cause dissatisfaction, while their presence causes satisfaction and motivates employees to work more efficiently. These factors are: 1) success, 2) career, professional development, 3) recognition, 4) responsibility, 5) creative and subject development.

Research ethics

The research was guided by ethical principles of research (Bitinas, Rupšienė, Žydžiūnaitė, 2008). The participants were acquainted with the purpose of the research and the use of the obtained domains, adherence to the principles of research ethics, and they were *guaranteed anonymity*.

Results

The analysis of the survey results revealed that teachers in Vilnius are most motivated by five motivational factors (see Table 2). The main types of motivation are the improvement of the teachers' working conditions at school (3.98), reduction of the level of direct control, creation of more favourable conditions for communication and cooperation with colleagues, additional remuneration for work in the form of non-monetary incentives. All of these motivating factors were rated as important by the respondents (the averages of all response options are higher than 3).

Table 2. **Hygienic factors that motivate teachers the most***

	Average N = 873
Improving teachers' working conditions at school	3.98
Reducing the level of direct control	3.68
Facilitating communication and collaboration with colleagues	3.35

[1] The mean values of the answers to the questions were calculated by recoding the values on the ranking and Likert scales in order to assign the highest values to the answers with the highest motivation (5) and the lowest values to the lowest motivation (1)

[2] As the number of possible groups of respondents according to different socio-demographic characteristics is very large, the distribution of answers in different groups of respondents was assessed and statistical significance was checked for different questions selectively based on preliminary "unwritten" hypotheses and understanding of practical value of such analysis

	Average N = 873
Additional remuneration for work in the form of non-monetary incentives	3.32
Transport benefits for going to work	3.17

Note: * On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 - most motivating and 5 - least motivating), evaluate the motivational factors according to how they motivate you personally as a teacher.
Source: composed by the authors.

In order to find out which motivating factors could help to attract new teachers to schools to receive similar evaluations of personal motivation factors as respondents (as the most motivating factors respondents singled out improvement of teachers' working conditions and reduction of direct control), except that in this case, respondents favoured transport benefits. commuting (the third most important factor) (see Table 3).

Table 3. **Motivational hygienic factors that can attract teachers to work ***

	Average N = 873
Improving teachers' working conditions at school	4.12
Reducing the level of direct control	3.70
Transport benefits for going to work	3.59
Facilitating communication and collaboration with colleagues	3.48
Additional remuneration for work in the form of non-monetary incentives	3.46

Note: * (1 - most motivating and 5 - least motivating), evaluate the motivational factors according to how they could help attract new teachers to schools in Vilnius.
Source: composed by the authors.

In another group of factors (motivational factors), Vilnius teachers consider personal recognition to be the most important personally motivating factor (see Table 5). There has also been much support for favourable opportunities for professional development and personal development. Vilnius teachers singled out career opportunities as a less important factor.

Table 4. **Motivational factors that motivate teachers the most ***

	Average N = 873
Personal recognition	4.13
Favourable opportunities for professional development	3.95
Favourable opportunities for personal development	3.82
Career opportunities	3.37

Note: * On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 - most motivating and 5 - least motivating), evaluate the motivational factors according to how they motivate you personally as a teacher.
Source: composed by the authors.

Responding to the question of which motivating factors could help attract new teachers to work in Vilnius schools (see Table 4), Vilnius teachers also rated personal recognition (average 4.07) and favourable opportunities for professional development the most (3.98). However, unlike personally motivating factors, career opportunities (3.93) were cited by respondents as a more motivating factor than favourable opportunities for personal development (3.78).

Table 5. **Motivational hygienic factors that can attract teachers to work ***

	Average N = 873
Personal recognition	4.07
Favourable opportunities for professional development	3.98
Career opportunities	3.93
Favourable opportunities for personal development	3.78

Note: * On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 - the most motivating, 5 - the least motivating), evaluate the motivational factors in terms of how they could help attract new teachers to schools in Vilnius.
Source: composed by the authors.

In order to determine the peculiarities of motivation of Vilnius teachers' segments, the distribution of evaluation of motivational factors in different groups of respondents was studied. It was investigated whether the assessments of motivational factors differ in the groups of respondents by gender, length of service[3], type of educational institution[4], age[5], salary[6], the distance to work[7], going to work[8]. Table 6 shows the mean values of the motivational factor assessments, which differ statistically significantly in the above groups of respondents (statistical significance at the 0.05 level was checked by nonparametric independent samples Mann Whitney U (two samples; in the case of gender variable) and Kruskal Wallis (more than two samples; and educational institution variables) tests).

Table 6. **Distribution of motivational factor assessments among groups of respondents**

Kruskal Wallis test	Work experience		
	16 years and more	6-15 years	Up to 5 years
	Average N = 624	Average N = 161	Average N = 88
Personal motivation			
Improving a teacher's working conditions at school **	4.01	4.10	3.61
Career opportunities***	3.24	3.80	3.56
Kruskal Wallis test	Type of educational institution		
	gymnasium	basic school or progymnasium	primary school
	Average N = 344	Average N = 407	Average N = 122
Attracting new teachers			
Transport allowances for commuting to work ***	3.41	3.66	3.87
Facilitating communication and cooperation with colleagues **	3.34	3.51	3.74
Kruskal Wallis test	Salary		
	1051 and more euros	551 - 1050 euros	up to 550 euros
	Average N = 96	Average N = 682	Average N = 95
Personal motivation			
Additional remuneration for work in the form of non-monetary incentives **	3.51	3.35	2.94
Personal recognition ***	4.40	4.14	3.80
Attracting new teachers			
Additional remuneration for work in the form of non-monetary incentives **	3.39	3.52	3.12
Personal recognition **	4.00	4.12	3.77
Career opportunities**	3.94	3.97	3.62
Kruskal Wallis test	Distance to work		
	Up to 1 km	1 - 10 km	11 km and more

---

[3] The question on the respondents' work experience with six answer options ("up to 5 years", "6-10 years", "11-15 years", "16-20 years", "21-25", "26 years and more") is based on the length of service variable with three values (" up to 5 years "," 6 - 15 years "," 16 years and more ")

[4] The question on the type of educational institution with four answers ("gymnasium", "basic school", "progymnasium", "primary school") consisted of a variable of the educational institution type with three meanings ("gymnasium", "basic school and progymnasium", " primary school")

[5] The question on the age of the respondents with six answers ("26-30 years", "31-35 years", "36-40 years", 41-45 years ", "46-50 years", "51 years and more") is based on an age variable with two values (26-50 years", "51 years and more")

[6] On the basis of the respondents' question on after-tax remuneration ("in the hands") with four answer options ("up to 550 euros", "551-800 euros", "801-1050 euros", "1051 euros and more"), a remuneration variable with three values ('up to 550 euros', '551 - 1050 euros', '1051 euros and more') was generated

[7] Distance to work variable based on the question on the distance (km) from the place of residence to the main place of work with four possible answers ("up to 1 km", "1-5 km", "6-10 km", "11 km and more") with three values ("up to 1 km", "1 - 10 km", "11 km and more")

[8] The commuting variable was compiled on the basis of the question on how the respondents go to work, with seven possible answers ("walking", "own car", "public transport", "taxi", bicycle "," scooter "," other means "). with six meanings ('walking', 'own car', 'public transport', 'taxi', bicycle or scooter ',' other means ')

	Average N = 91	Average N = 534	Average N = 248
Personal motivation			
Transport allowances for commuting to work ***	2.93	3.03	3.57
Attracting new teachers			
Transport allowances for commuting to work ***	3.65	3.46	3.85
Mann Whitney U test	Gender		
	Women	Men	
	Average N = 624	Average N = 88	
Personal motivation			
Personal recognition **	4.17	3.76	
Additional remuneration for work in the form of non-monetary incentives **	3.35	2.96	
Attracting new teachers			
Personal recognition ***	4.10	3.72	
Facilitating communication and cooperation with colleagues **	3.50	3.20	
Career opportunities***	3.97	3.46	
Mann Whitney U test	Age		
	26 - 50 years	51 years and more	
	Average N = 501	Average N = 372	
Personal motivation			
Improving a teacher's working conditions at school **	3.88	4.12	
Facilitating communication and cooperation with colleagues **	3.27	3.45	
Career opportunities***	3.54	3.15	
Attracting new teachers			
Improving a teacher's working conditions at school **	3.99	4.28	
Facilitating communication and cooperation with colleagues **	3.40	3.58	

*Note: *** p <0.005; ** p <0.05.*
Source: composed by the authors.

Examining the distribution of evaluation of motivational factors in the groups of respondents by the length of service, it was found that the attitude towards only two personal motivating factors, i.e., improvement of teachers' working conditions at school and career opportunities, differs statistically significantly among respondents working as teachers. Improving the working conditions of teachers is more important for respondents with a longer length of service (6-15 years and 16 years and more) than for teachers who have recently started working at school. A possible explanation is that the shortcomings of teachers' working conditions at school become apparent after working at school for a longer period of time; therefore, many recent shortcomings are not noticeable or less disruptive to those who have recently started working as teachers. Career opportunities are most important for teachers with 6-15 years work experience, slightly less important for teachers with up to 5 years work experience, and least important for teachers with 16 years and longer work experience. It is likely that teachers with long work experience feel that they have already realized their career opportunities and therefore this motivating factor is less important to them.

Discussion

The analysis of the data of the questionnaire survey of teachers in Vilnius city educational institutions provided insights into the factors motivating teachers and their motivation measures. The survey showed that teachers are most motivated to improve their working conditions at school and reduce direct control, as well as to have opportunities for professional development and personal recognition. Research (Abos at al., 2018; p. 21-34; Rezaee, at al., 2018; p. 391-408; Fernet, at al., 2012; p. 514-525) also shows that motivation to work as a teacher depends mostly on autonomous internal reasons, satisfaction with independence, as teachers who are more self-motivated are better protected from burnout and are more involved in their work.

The study of the distribution of the assessment of motivational factors in the groups of respondents according to the type of educational institution did not reveal any significant differences, except that primary school teachers, unlike gymnasium, progymnasium and basic school teachers, found that enabling co-operation and communication with colleagues (Hein, at al., 2012; p. 123-130; Paurienė and Žemaitaitytė, 2020; p. 145-159) and transport facilities for commuting to work (Kruskal Wallis tests showed the statistical significance of differences in the assessments of these motivational factors).

Teachers in the study who received a salary higher than 550 euros favored additional remuneration for non-monetary work, personal recognition, and career opportunities (in terms of attracting new teachers) as motivating factors. It is likely that for those receiving higher salaries, all of these factors are not as important as a direct pay increase. Respondents' attitudes towards motivational factors were examined according to their distance from the workplace. Teachers living 11 km and more away from their place of work were found to rate transport benefits more favorably than respondents living closer to their main place of work. Examining the differences in the assessment of motivational factors between men and women, it was found that personal recognition and additional remuneration for work in the form of non-monetary incentives are considered to be more important as personal motivating factors by women than by men. Women also rated personal recognition, facilitation of communication and collaboration with colleagues, and career opportunities more favorably than men in terms of motivating factors in terms of how they could attract new teachers. Teachers' learning in a collaborative learning environment promotes their job satisfaction, and such teachers are more likely to commit and less likely to change jobs (Butler and Schnellert, 2012; p.1206-1220; Blömeke, at al., 2017; Panganiban, at al., 2017; p. 102-110; Akdemir, 2019; p. 264-270). Older respondents (aged 51 and older) identified factors such as improving teachers' working conditions and facilitating communication and collaboration with colleagues as more important. Meanwhile, career opportunities were a more important factor for younger respondents (26-50 years) than for their older counterparts. Although the circumstances of everyday life have a major impact on teachers' motivation (Blömeke, at al., 2017; Panganiban, at al., 2017; p. 102-110; Akdemir, 2019; p. 264-270), research has shown that key motivational factors such as salary, additional financial bonuses, personal recognition, career advancement, respect, and a creative atmosphere have not changed in recent decades and are particularly important in motivating a teacher (Toropova, Myrberg and Johansson, 2020; p. 71-97; Guerriero, 2017; 171-191; Canrinus, at al., 2011; p. 115-132).

In summary, teachers' satisfaction with their profession and work is influenced by various factors. The needs, expectations and personal characteristics of employees are also very different; therefore, in order to create a system that increases employee satisfaction, it is necessary to constantly analyze the expectations and needs of employees. Teachers' job satisfaction is a factor without which the good performance and progress of an educational organization is impossible (Rezaee, at al., 2018; 391-408).

Limitations of the study and possibilities for further research. A representative number of respondents participated in the study, however, the fact that the study was conducted in only one city can be described as a limitation of the study. The obtained research data revealed the motivational factors of metropolitan teachers. In order to find out more about the motivating factors of teachers working in urban and rural schools of different sizes, it is appropriate to continue the research. It is necessary to mention that the research carried out, in addition to its scientific significance (revealing in-depth factors motivating teachers), also had practical significance. Importantly, since October 1, 2021, Vilnius City Municipality has provided teachers in Vilnius with the opportunity to use public urban transport free of charge.

Conclusions

Although researchers say that hygienic factors do not motivate people to work better, but only protect them from dissatisfaction, research has shown that teachers are most motivated to improve

their working conditions at school, reduce direct control and facilitate communication and collaboration with colleagues (hygienic factors). In the group of motivating factors, teachers consider personal recognition and the creation of favourable opportunities for professional and personal development to be the most important personal motivating factors. Therefore, in order to strengthen the motivation of working teachers and attract new teachers, it is necessary to strengthen teachers' communication and cooperation with colleagues, increase identity with the profession, dissemination of good practices, form and strengthen existing networks of subjects. In order to involve teachers in the solution of issues important for the city's self-government: to form permanent groups of teachers, initiate issues related to the well-being of teachers and form clear mechanisms where teachers can express their reasoned opinion on topical issues.

References

1. Abos, A., Haerens, L, Sevil, J., Aelterman, N., García-Gonzalez, L. (2018). Teachers' motivation in relation to their psychological functioning andinterpersonal style: A variable- and person-centered approach, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74, pp. 21-34.
2. Adams, J. S. (2019). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
3. Akdemir, O. A. Teachers organizational communication and their job motivation. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8 (2), 264-270.
4. Arifin S., Md Nazirul I., Sarker, Azm Shafiullah P. (2017). Job Satisfaction of Public and Private Primary School Teachers of Bogra District in Bangladesh. *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*; 1(1):41-46. doi: 10.12691/jsa-1-1-6.
5. Bandura, A. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. *Annual Review Psychology*, 52, 1-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
6. Baughman, K. S. (1996). Increasing Teacher Job Satisfaction: A Study of the Changing Role of the Secondary Principal. *American Secondary Education*, 24(3), 19-22. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41064155
7. Bitinas, B., Rupšienė, L., Žydžiūnaitė, V. (2008). *Qualitative Research Methodology*, Part I. Klaipeda. 2008.
8. Blömeke, S., Houang, R., Hsieh, F. J., Wang, T. Y. (2017). Effects of job motives, teacher knowledge and school context on beginning teachers' commitment to stay in the profession: A longitudinal study in Germany, Taiwan and the United States. In G. K. LeTendre & M. Akiba (Eds.), *International handbook of teacher quality and policy* London: Routledge.
9. Brunetti, Gerald J. (2001). Why Do They Teach? A Study of Job Satisfaction among Long-Term High School Teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28, no. 3: pp. 49–74. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478304.
10. Butler, D. L., & Schnellert, L.(2012). Collaborative inquiry in teacher professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, pp.1206-1220
11. Canrinus, E. T., Helms-Lorenz, M., Beijaard, D., Buitink, J. and Hofman, A. (2011). Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment: Exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity. *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 27(1): pp.115-132.
12. Education and Training Monitoring Bulletin Lithuania. 2019; Internet access: https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/default/files/document-library-docs/et-monitor-report-2019-lithuania_en.pdf
13. Fernet, C., Guay, F., Senécal, C., & Austin, S. (2012). Predicting intraindividual changes in teacher burnout: the role of perceived school environment and motivational factors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, pp. 514-525
14. Guerriero, S. (2017). Teacher motivation, responsibility, pedagogical knowledge and professionalism: A new era for research. *In Pedagogical knowledge and the changing nature of the teaching profession*, 171-191.
15. Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
16. Han, J., and H. Yin. (2016). Teacher motivation: Definition, research development and implications for teachers. Ed. M. Boylan. *Cogent Education*, 3(1):1217819, 1-18.
17. Hein, V., Ries, F., Pires, F., Caune, A., Emeljanovas, A., Ekler, J. H., (2012). The relationship between teaching styles and motivation to teach among physical education teachers. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 11, pp. 123-130.
18. Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Revivew* 81(1): pp.87-96.
19. Kolbe, T., and Strunk, K. O. (2012). Economic incentives as a strategy for responding to teacher staffing problems. Educational Administration Quarterly, 48(5): pp.779-813.
20. Latham, G.P. and Locke, E. (1991). Self-Regulation through Goal Setting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Performances*, 50, pp.212-247. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90021-K
21. Map of investment needs in the education system 2021-2023. (2020). Access through internet:http://socioline.ru/pages/vipaniotto-vsmaksimenko-kolichestvennye-metody-v-sotsiologicheskih

22. Martin, A. J., & Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal relationships, motivation, engagement, and achievement: Yields for theory, current issues, and educational practice. Review of Educational Research, 79, 327-365.
23. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality* ([1st ed.].). New York: Harper. Maslow, Abraham H.
24. McGregor, Douglas M. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
25. Mitchell, T. (2020). School and Community Relations in the Kansans Can School Redesign Project. *Educational Considerations*, 46 (2), article 8, pp.1-13.
26. Overview of the state of science, studies and innovations in Lithuania. (2018). Vilnius: Science and Studies Monitoring and Analysis Center.
27. Panganiban, R., Lani F., Garcia J. C., Miramontes, G., Madjidi, F. (2017). Public Sector eLearning Nationwide: Enhancing Professional Development. *Journal of Global Leadership*, Volume V, pp.102-110.
28. Paurienė, G., Žemaitaitytė, I. (2020). Mokytojų pašaukimo vaidmuo efektyvinant švietimo sistemą. *Acta Pedagogica Vilnensia, 45*, pp. 145-159.
29. Perie, M., Baker, D. P. (1997). Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED412 1810).
30. Rezaee, A., Khoshsima, H., Bahtash, E. Z., Sarani, A. (2018). A Mixed Method Study of the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Job Performance in Iran. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(4), 391-408.
31. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
32. Sinclair, C., Dowson, M., & Mcinerney, D. (2006). Motivations to teach: psychometric perspectives across the first semester of teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 108, pp.1132-1154
33. Skaalvik, E. M., and Skaalvik, S. (2014). Teacher self-efficacy and perceived autonomy: Relations with teacher engagement, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. 114(1):68-77.
34. Stasiukynas, A., Zemaitaityte, I., Gudelis, D., Zibeniene, G. (2020). Vilnius city teacher's motivation research report.
35. Thoonen, E. E. J., P. J. C. Sleegers, F. J. Oort, T. T. D. Peetsma, and F. P. Geijsel. (2011). How to improve teaching practices: The role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 47(3): pp.496-536.
36. Toropova, A., Myrberg, E. and Johansson, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. <u>Educational Review</u>, 73(1):71-97.
37. Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation.* Wiley and Sons, New York.Tüzemen, D. 2019. "Job polarization and the natural rate of unemployment in the United States". *Economics Letters*, 175: 97-100.

Gintautė Žibėnienė, Dangis Gudelis, Irena Žemaitaitytė, Andrius Stasiukynas

Mokytojų motyvaciją didinantys veiksniai: Vilniaus miesto savivaldybės atvejis

Anotacija

Mokytojų senėjimas ir trūkumas Vilniaus miesto savivaldybėje skatina ieškoti šio reiškinio priežasčių. Straipsnyje nagrinėjami mokytojų motyvacijos veiksniai ir pristatomi Vilniaus miesto mokytojų motyvacijos tyrimo (873 respondentų anketinės apklausos) rezultatai. Tyrimas parodė, kad mokytojus labiausiai motyvuoja mokytojų darbo sąlygų mokykloje gerinimas ir tiesioginės kontrolės mažinimas bei asmens pripažinimas ir profesinio tobulėjimo galimybių užtikrinimas. Tyrimas taip pat parodė, kad pagrindiniai motyvaciniai veiksniai, tokie kaip atlyginimas, papildomi finansiniai priedai, pagarba, kūrybinė atmosfera, per pastaruosius dešimtmečius nepasikeitė ir yra ypač svarbūs motyvuojant mokytojus jų karjeroje. Vilniaus miesto ugdymo įstaigų mokytojų apklausa atskleidė, kad mokytojus labiausiai motyvuoja mokytojų darbo sąlygų mokykloje gerinimas ir tiesioginės kontrolės mažinimas bei asmens pripažinimas ir palankių profesinio tobulėjimo galimybių užtikrinimas.

Gintautė Žibėnienė, Doctor of Social Sciences, Assoc. Professor at Institute of Education and Social Work, Faculty of Human and Social Studies, Mykolas Romeris University.
E-mail: <u>zibeniene@mruni.eu</u>

Dangis Gudelis, Doctor of Social Sciences, Professor at the Institute of Public Administration, Faculty of Public Governance and Business, Mykolas Romeris University.
E-mail: dgudel@mruni.eu

Irena Žemaitaitytė, Doctor of Social Sciences, Professor at Institute of Education and Social Work, Faculty of Human and Social Studies, Mykolas Romeris University.
E-mail: irene@mruni.eu

Andrius Stasiukynas, Doctor of Social Sciences, Professor at the Institute of Public Administration, Faculty of Public Governance and Business, Mykolas Romeris University.
E-mail: stasiukynas@mruni.eu

Gintautė Žibėnienė, socialinių mokslų daktarė, docentė Mykolo Romerio universiteto Socialinių mokslų fakulteto Švietimo ir socialinio darbo institute.
E-mail: zibeniene@mruni.eu

Dangis Gudelis, socialinių mokslų daktaras, profesorius Mykolo Romerio universiteto Viešosios politikos ir verslo fakulteto Viešojo administravimo institute.
E-mail: dgudel@mruni.eu

Irena Žemaitaitytė, socialinių mokslų daktarė, profesorė Mykolo Romerio universiteto Socialinių mokslų fakulteto Švietimo ir socialinio darbo institute.
E-mail: irene@mruni.eu

Andrius Stasiukynas, socialinių mokslų daktaras, profesorius Mykolo Romerio universiteto Viešosios politikos ir verslo fakulteto Viešojo administravimo institute.
E-mail: stasiukynas@mruni.eu