

## Job Motivation and Performance of Secondary School Teachers

ABD. SHUKOR SHAARI  
NORAN FAUZIAH YAAKUB  
ROSNA AWANG HASHIM

*School of Cognitive Science and Education  
Universiti Utara Malaysia*

### ABSTRACT

*Performance can be regarded as almost any behavior, which is directed toward task or goal accomplishment. Despite extensive research, discussion and debate on how to predict employees' performance, teachers' performance is complex and remains difficult to predict and evaluate. Teachers are still uncertain whether they can rely on some specific characteristics of performance. In view of this practice and in evaluating teachers' performance at the work place, it is therefore the interest of the researcher to conduct a study on secondary school teachers, so as to determine their job motivation and job performance. The second objective of this study is to compare job motivation with job performance and the third one is to compare teaching performance with job performance of secondary school teachers. This correlation study involved a total of 245 secondary school teachers throughout Kedah. Data will be analyzed using the t-test and ANOVA.*

### ABSTRAK

*Prestasi kerja dirujuk sebagai mana-mana tingkah laku yang mengarah ke arah penyelesaian tugas. Di sebalik kajian, perbincangan dan perdebatan yang banyak mengenai pemboleh ubah peramal prestasi kerja para pekerja dalam organisasi, pemboleh ubah peramal prestasi kerja guru masih lagi kompleks dan sukar untuk dinilai dan diramal. Justeru, adalah menjadi minat pengkaji untuk menjalankan kajian untuk mengenal pasti motivasi kerja dan prestasi kerja mereka guru-guru sekolah menengah. Objektif kedua kajian ini ialah untuk membandingkan motivasi kerja mengikut prestasi kerja dan yang ketiga ialah untuk membandingkan pencapaian pengajaran mengikut prestasi kerja. Kajian korelasi ini menggunakan sebanyak 245 guru-guru sekolah menengah di negeri Kedah. Data-data kajian dianalisis dengan menggunakan ujian T dan ANOVA. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa responden mempunyai motivasi kerja yang tinggi terutama dari segi motivasi pencapaian.*

### INTRODUCTION

In organizational psychology, it is frequently expressed that job performance is a function of ability and motivation (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976). Performance can be regarded as almost any behavior, which is directed toward task or goal accomplishment. Good performance among employees in an organization has many implications such as high motivation among employees, out-

standing ability, good organizational climate and infrastructure, excellent leadership that can sustain rapport and productivity and good relationship among staff.

Job motivation is important to the effectiveness of an organization. In an educational organization, Sederberg, Charles & Clark (1990), said that job motivation would produce a teacher with high vitality. This refers the positive quality of producing good products and in this case, it is

good student performance. An individual who is highly achievement motivated would tend to be very conscientious in his or her work and tend to be more responsible.

Noran Fauziah Yaakub and Habibah Elias (1999) studied job motivation and job performance of recipients for excellent service from one of the institutions of higher learning. The objectives of their studies were to determine job motivation and job performance of the recipients and also to compare job motivation according to gender and work category. The results showed that the overall job motivation was moderate, while job performance was high.

Achievement motivation becomes the driving factor for future understanding and can be defined as a predisposition to strive for success. Deci, Connell & Ryan (1989), add that teachers who possess autonomy motivation exhibit less stress and have high job satisfaction compared to teachers who have low autonomy motivation.

Despite extensive research, discussion and debate on how to predict teacher success, teacher performance is considered complex and remains difficult to predict. Not surprisingly, little empirical research has actually been conducted on the area, especially from the perspectives of teachers. Very few studies have focused on teacher performance and the results are inconsistent and inconclusive. Teachers are still uncertain whether they can rely on some specific characteristics of performance (Lavigna, 1992).

In view of this practice and in evaluating teacher performance at the work place, it is therefore the interest of the researchers to conduct a study on secondary school teachers, so as to determine their job motivation, and job performance.

The second objective of this study is to compare job motivation according to job performance of secondary school teachers and the third one is to compare teaching performance according to the job performance of secondary school teachers.

## METHOD

A sample of 245 secondary school teachers throughout Kedah were given questionnaires on

job motivation and performance by mail. Of the 245 respondents, 82 were males and 162 were females. About 65%(160) have degrees, 13 % possess SPM and 14 % possess STPM. Their range of service in the education field range from one to twenty seven years. They were selected from the list of names provided by Jabatan Pendidikan Kedah (2000). There are 146 secondary schools in Kedah (Jabatan Pendidikan Kedah, 2001). The study adopted simple random sampling.

Performance was assessed by job performance instruments used by principals under the New Remuneration System (SSB). Under the SSB, teachers were given increments of salary according to four categories that is diagonally, vertically, horizontally and static.

Job motivation was measured by using a questionnaire consisting of 10 Likert-response items (7 positive and 3 negative) that have only two dimensions, namely achievement and autonomy motivation. This questionnaire is adapted from Steers & Braunstein (1976) and Sutarto Wijono (1997). Examples of three of the items are given below with their direction (+ or -) indicating parentheses:

1. I do my best work when my job are fairly difficult (+)
2. I try to avoid any added responsibilities on my job (-)
3. I go my own way at work, regardless of the opinions of others (+)

The range of scale is from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scores for all the items were added to make up the total score for the construct. A high score means high job motivation.

The data was analyzed using the SPSS ver.11. ANOVA was used to test the differences in the mean of job motivation scores of the various categories of the respondents.

## VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

A pilot study was carried out to pre-test the instrument. It was conducted on 118 secondary school teachers in May 2001. The objectives of

the pilot study were to: (1) assess the practicality and appropriateness of the questionnaire and provide an indication whether the items need further refinement; (2) obtain teachers suggestions and views on the items; (3) determine the level of difficulty of the items; and (4) assess the reliability of the questionnaire.

The researcher followed the procedure proposed by the American Psychological Association (1985) for instrument validation. First, to assess content validity, the questionnaire was given to an education professor at UUM, two Education lecturers at Institut Perguruan Darulaman and a Bahasa Melayu lecturer at Universiti Utara Malaysia. They gave feedback to improve the questionnaire.

To check for criterion validity, correlation among variables was used. When the researchers correlated commitment with job motivation, the results obtained was  $r = .312$ . To check for reliability, the researcher used Cronbach alpha. It was found that the reliability coefficient obtained for the items was 0.95, a value which suggests very high reliability.

To check for construct validity, factor analysis was used. The results of the pilot study showed that all item of job motivation are deviated into six components and the percentage of variance were between 9.36 to 15.92 %. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test showed that the partial correlation coefficients was .631. Most of the items showed that factor loading was between .65 to .84. This value suggests very high validity.

## RESULTS

### *Overall Job Motivation*

The range of scores for overall job motivation was between 25 and 47, with a mean score of 36.68 (table 1). Using mean score as the criterion to classify respondents into high or low job motivation groups, the results showed almost 85 % of them belong to the high motivation category while the other 15 % belonged to the low motivation category.

**Table 1**  
Descriptive Statistics of Job Motivation and Teaching Performance

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Motivation	241	25.00	47.00	36.6888	3.7725
Achievement Motivation	245	11.00	25.00	19.7755	2.6877
Autonomy Motivation	241	12.00	23.00	16.9170	2.0190
Teaching Performance	232	111.00	171.00	143.6509	11.5141
Valid N (list wise)	229				

### *Achievement Motivation Dimension*

The range of scores for achievement motivation was between 11 and 25, with a mean score of 19.77 (table 1). Based on the mean score as the criterion for categorizing respondents into low and high achievement motivation groups, the results showed that almost 90 % of them belong to the high achievement motivation category while the other 10 % belonged to the low motivation group.

### *Autonomy Motivation Dimension*

The range of scores for autonomy motivation was between 12 and 23, with a mean score of 16.91 (table 1). Using mean score as the criterion to group respondents into high or low job motivation groups, the results showed that almost half of them belonged to the high autonomy motivation category while the remaining 43.2 % to the low autonomy motivation group.

### *Comparing Overall Job Motivation With Job Performance*

Results of the ANOVA of overall job motivation according to job performance gave a F-value of 2.018 (table 2) which was statistically not significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). The results show that there is no significant difference between overall job moti-

vation with different job performance.

Results of the ANOVA of achievement motivation with job performance gave a F-value of 4.457 (table 3) which was statistically not significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). The results show that there is no significant difference between achievement motivation with different job performance.

**Table 2**  
ANOVA of Teachers Job Motivation and Job Performance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square-	F	Sig.
Between Groups	113.429	4	28.357	2.018	.093
Within Groups	3288.069	234	14.052		
Total	3401.498	238			

( $p < 0.05$ )

**Table 3**  
ANOVA Teachers Achievement Motivation and Job Performance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	122.397	4	30.599	4.457	.002
Within Groups	1633.899	238	6.865		
Total	1756.296	242			

( $p < 0.05$ )

Result from multiple comparison using Bonferroni in table 4, showed that there is significant different between job motivation and job performance. The difference in mean score in motivation between teachers who obtain diagonally and horizontally good was 2.07. There is also a difference in the mean score in the achievement motivation between teachers who obtained vertically and horizontally good (1.86) in job performance.

Results of the ANOVA of autonomy moti-

vation with job performance gave a F-value of .439 (table 5) which was statistically not significant ( $p < 0.05$ ).

The results from ANOVA in table 5, showed that there is no significant difference in the teachers' autonomy motivation with to different job performance.

Results from multiple comparison using Bonferroni in table 6, show that there are no significant differences between teachers' autonomy motivation with different job performance.

**Table 4**  
Multiple Comparison of Teachers' Achievement Motivation and Job Performance

Bonferroni		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig	95% Confidence Interval	
(I) A8	(J) A8				Lower Bound	UpperBound
diagonally	Vertically	.2051	.5550	1.000	-1.3675	1.7778
	horizontally	1.0098	.4933	.417	-.3879	2.4075
	excellent					
horizontally	diagonally	2.0709	.5675	.003	.4628	3.6790
	good*					
	horizontally	.6667	1.5698	1.000	-3.7814	5.1147
Vertically	diagonally	-.2051	.5550	1.000	-1.7778	1.3675
	horizontally					
	excellent	.8047	.4465	.728	-.4603	2.0697
horizontally	good*	1.8658	.5273	.005	.3716	3.3600
	horizontally	.4615	1.5558	1.000	-3.9466	4.8697
	diagonally	-1.0098	.4933	.417	-2.4075	.3879
excellent	Vertically	-.8047	.4465	.728	-2.0697	.4603
	horizontally	1.0611	.4619	.225	-.2477	2.3699
	good					
horizontally	diagonally	-.3431	1.5348	1.000	-4.6920	4.0057
	diagonally*	-2.0709	.5675	.003	-3.6790	-.4628
	Vertically*	-1.8658	.5273	.005	-3.3600	-.3716
good	horizontally	-1.0611	.4619	.225	-2.3699	.2477
	excellent					
	horizontally	-1.4043	1.5603	1.000	-5.8252	3.0167
horizontally	diagonally	-.6667	1.5698	1.000	-5.1147	3.7814
	Vertically	-.4615	1.5558	1.000	-4.8697	3.9466
	horizontally	.3431	1.5348	1.000	-4.0057	4.6920
excellent	horizontally	1.4043	1.5603	1.000	-3.0167	5.8252
	good					

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

**Table 5**  
ANOVA of Teachers Autonomy Motivation and Job Performance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.247	4	1.812	.439	.781
Within Groups	966.242	234	4.129		
Total	973.490	238			

( $p < 0.05$ )

**Table 6**  
Teachers' Autonomy Motivation and Job Performance

(I) A8	(J) A8	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	.95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
diagonally	Vertically	.3579	.4373	1.000	-.8814	1.5972
	horizontally	.3736	.3862	1.000	-.7209	1.4680
excellent	horizontally r	5.721E-03	.4455	1.000	-1.2567	1.2681
	good	.1579	1.2186	1.000	-3.2956	3.6114
Vertically	diagonally	-.3579	.4373	1.000	-1.5972	.8814
	horizontally	1.569E-02	.3508	1.000	-.9785	1.0098
excellent	horizontally	-.3522	.4152	1.000	-1.5287	.8243
	good	-.2000	1.2079	1.000	-3.6230	3.2230
horizontally	diagonally	-.3736	.3862	1.000	-1.4680	.7209
	excellent					
good	Vertically	-1.5686E-3508	.3508	1.000	-1.0098	.9785
	horizontally	-.3679	.3609	1.000	-1.3906	.6549
good	horizontally	-.2157	1.1903	1.000	-3.5890	3.1576
	diagonally	-5.7208E	.4455	1.000	-1.2681	1.2567
good	horizontally	-.03				
	Vertically	.3522	.4152	1.000	-.8243	1.5287
excellent	horizontally	.3679	.3609	1.000	-.6549	1.3906
	horizontally	.1522	1.2109	1.000	-3.2793	3.5836

(continued)

(I)A8	(J)A8	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std.Error	sig	.95% Confidence Interval	
					LowerBound	upperBound
horizontally	diagonally	-.1579	1.2186	1.000	-3.6114	3.2956
	Vertically	.2000	1.2079	1.000	-3.2230	3.6230
	horizontally	.2157	1.1903	1.000	-3.1576	3.5890
	excellent					
	horizontally	-.1522	1.2109	1.000	-3.5836	3.2793
	good					

\*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

## DISCUSSION

The overall job motivation scores suggested that only 85 % of respondents belong to the high category. Of the two dimensions of job motivation, the ranking of the mean scores indicated that achievement motivation dimension to be highest (90%) followed by autonomy (57%). The findings of the research seem to indicate that the teachers reflected such positive characteristics namely high job motivation.

When comparing overall job motivation with job performance, the results show that there are no significant differences between the groups of respondents but when comparing achievement motivation with job performance, the results show that the group of teachers have high achievement motivation.

The results from Bonferroni multiple comparison shows that there are significant differences between group performance of teachers who were in the diagonal and vertical categories with the group of teachers were in the horizontal category.

The findings prove that, job motivation of the majority of the respondents was high. This again suggests that these recipients possess the desired characteristics in a working organization. This findings seem to support Sederberg, Charles

& Clark (1990) that job motivation will produce a teacher with high vitality. Individuals who have highly achievement motivation tend to be very conscientious in his/her work and very responsible.

Further studies on other dimensions of job motivation or teachers' efficacy should be conducted to determine the correlation between teachers' efficacy with their job performance.

## REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association (1985). *Standard for educational and psychological testing*. Washington: APA.
- Amir bin Salleh Mohd Salleh. (1993). *In service training needs assessment for Malaysian secondary school teachers*. University of Michigan. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- Campbell, J.P and Pritchard, R.D. (1976). Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology In. M.D Dunnette, ed. (1976). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

- DeCottis, T.A., & Summers, T.P. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, 40 (7), 445-470.
- Guyton, E., & Farokhi, E. (1987). Relationship among academic performance, basic skill, subject matter knowledge, and teaching skills of teacher education graduates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, sept-okt, 1987.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hunter, J.E., & Hunter, R.F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96 (1), 72-97.
- Lavigna, R.J. (1992). Predicting job performance from background characteristics: More evidence from the public sector. *Public Personnel Management*, Fall 92, Vol. 21, P347.
- Maier, N.R.F. (1958). *Psychology in industry*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin
- Noran Fauziah Yaakub & Habibah Elias (1999). Job motivation and job performance: Case of recipients for excellent service in a higher education institution. *Malaysian Management Review*. June 1999.
- Nottis, K., Feuerstein, A., Murray, J., & Adams, D. (2000). The teacher belief inventory: Measuring the theoretical and practical orientations of preservice teachers. *Education*, Fall 2000, vol. 121, p90.
- Ree, M.J., Earles & J.A., Teachout, M.S. (1994). Predicting job performance. Not much more than g. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 518-524.
- Sederberg, C.H., & Clark, S. (1990). Motivation and organizational incentives for high vitality teachers: A qualitative perspective. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, Vol. 24, No. 1, Fall 1990, p 6-13.
- Steers, R.M., & Braunstein, D. N. (1976). A behaviorally based measure of manifest needs in work settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1976, 9, pp. 251-266.
- Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1984). *Motivation and work behavior*, 3eds. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sutarto Wijono. (1997). *Hubungan antara motivasi kerja dan personaliti dengan prestasi kerja di sebuah organisasi*. Master Thesis, Department of Psychology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.