

## Work motivation of teachers: relationship with job involvement

Louis George<sup>\*1</sup>, Tara Sabapathy<sup>2</sup>, Anitha Varghese<sup>1</sup>.

1.Department of chemistry, Christ University, Bangalore.

2.Department of education, Bangalore University, Bangalore.

---

**Abstract:** In the modern world of competitive higher education the role of motivated teachers is undisputed. This study aims to find the importance of job involvement of teachers in their work motivation. Data was collected from 450 degree college teachers of Bangalore city. Analysis of data and the discussion is included. The results showed a positive relationship between work motivation and the job involvement of teachers. Teachers were more involved in their job were found to be more motivated. Implications of the findings and limitations of the study are given.

**Keywords:** Higher education, Work motivation, job involvement

---

### I. Introduction

The quality of an educational system largely depends upon the quality of its teachers. It is a teacher who helps to transform an individual into a person of imagination, wisdom, human love and enlightenment, and institutions into lighthouses of posterity, and the country into a learning society. The National Policy on Education (1986) has rightly remarked "The status of the teacher reflects the socio-cultural ethos of a society; It is in this context that today a teacher occupies a unique and significant place in any society. It is observed that, with the expansion of higher education over the years in terms of number of universities and colleges and the student strength, its quality and standards have fallen. This issue has engaged the attention of educationists for several years and various committees and commissions have suggested measures for improving the quality of higher education. All the education commissions have recommended several steps for bringing about improvement in the quality of education at this stage. Among all the factors responsible, for the deteriorating standards in higher education, the "teacher" has been identified as the key factor. His characteristics, qualifications, his attitude towards the profession, his competency, his professional skills, his capacity for leadership and motivation to work affect the quality of education. The modern society very badly needs teachers who are not only knowledgeable but also highly motivated and committed to their profession and sincere in their efforts for doing good to the society.

### Concept of work motivation

People can motivate themselves by seeking, finding and carrying out work, which satisfies their needs. There are two types of motivation namely intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation.

**Intrinsic motivation** stems from a direct relationship between the doer and the task and it is usually self-applied. These are the self-generated factors, which influence people to behave in a particular way or to move in a particular direction. These include, responsibility, freedom to act, scope to use and develop skills and abilities, interesting and challenging work and opportunities for advancement. Feelings of achievement, accomplishment and competence-derived from performing one's job are examples of intrinsic motivators. Second, people can be motivated by the management through such methods as pay, promotion, praise etc. This can be termed as "**Extrinsic motivation**" and stems from the work environment external to the task and is usually applied by others or someone other than the person being motivated. Extrinsic motivators can have an immediate and powerful effect but this will not necessarily last for long. The intrinsic motivators, which are concerned with the quality of working life, are likely to have a deeper and long-term effect, because they are inherent in individuals and not imposed from outside.

Work is of special concern to the study of motivation. From a psychological point of view, work is an important source of identity, self-esteem and self-actualization. It provides a sense of fulfillment for an employee by clarifying one's value to the society. However paradoxically it can also be a source of frustration, boredom and feelings of meaninglessness that determine the characteristics of the individual and the nature of work. Individuals evaluate themselves according to what they are able to accomplish. If they see their job as hindering their potential and achievement of the same, it often becomes difficult for them to remain motivated and maintain a sense of purpose at work.

Steers R, Porter L. (1991) defined work motivation as that which drives and sustains human behavior in working life. Pinder (1998) described work motivation as a set of internal and external forces that initiates work

related behavior and determines its form, direction, intensity and duration. Work motivation is an action that stimulates an individual to take a course of action, which will result in attainment of some goal or satisfaction of certain psychological needs of the individual himself. In the present study work motivation is conceptualized in terms of 6 factors namely dependence, organizational orientation, work group relations, psychological work incentives, material incentives and job situation (Agarwal K.G 1988).

### **Concept of job involvement**

The concept of job involvement as a stable attitude independent of satisfaction variables emerged from a factor analytic study of interview protocols (Lodahl, 1964). Despite the potential importance as a concept, it has been inadequately defined, poorly measured and subjected to limited number of investigations. The first class of definitions of job involvement can be considered are those which consider it as the extent to which self esteem is affected by the levels of performance. In Allport's (1947) treatment of the psychology of participation, ego involvement is defined as the situation in which the person engages in the status seeking motive, where the person is seeking self-esteem as well as esteem of others. For Faunce (1959), occupational involvement is the commitment to a particular set up task or task area, where successful role performance is regarded as an end in itself and not a means to some other end. With this type of commitment, self esteem will be achieved through performance in a particular occupational role and in terms of an evaluation of intrinsic products of role performance. Vroom (1962) describes a person as ego involved in a job or task, to whatever extent his self-esteem is affected by his perceived level of performance. Lawler (1969) used the term intrinsic motivation in this context which refers to the degree to which a person is motivated to perform well, because of some subjective rewards or words of appreciation as a result of performing well. Thus, Lawler (1969) argued that when esteem and feeling of growth are tied to performance, a person would feel intrinsically motivated. According to these definitions, a job involved person is one for whom work is a very important part of his life and is very much personally affected by his job situation, the work itself, his coworkers, and the organization. Job involvement is also considered as a degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work or the importance of work in his total self image (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965). Maurer (1969) employed the term-work role motivation to describe the degree to which an individual's work role is important in itself as well as the extent to which it forms the basis of self definition, self evaluation and success definition. Maurer described self definition as the degree to which an individual conceptualizes himself as a person in terms of his work role and success definition as the degree to which an individual defines success in terms of work role success and observes that if these two terms are merged they would closely relate to performance esteem definition of job involvement. Lawler and Hall (1970) focused on job involvement as referring to it as psychological identification with ones work as well as the degree to which the job situation is central to the person and his identity. They adapted Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) definition of job involvement as the degree of psychological identification with ones work. The job involved person is highly motivated and feels a sense of pride in his work. This viewpoint would seem to parallel the performance-esteem theme. It is clear that there is a great deal of conceptual confusion and proliferation in terms of our theorizing about the construct labeled job involvement. This confusion does not stop at the theoretical level but continues in the empirical studies of involvement.

A job involved person can be considered as one for whom work is a very important part of life and one who is affected very much personally by the whole job situation, the work itself and co-workers. Job involvement is important from both the employee's and organization's perspective as a component of the quality of working life and as a predictor of individual performance and organizational effectiveness. Vroom (1962) suggested that job factors can influence the degree to which an individual was involved in his job. A person becomes ego involved in his work performance to the extent that performance is perceived to be relevant to certain aptitudes, abilities or to other attributes that are central to his self-conception.

Participative management theorists like Argyris and McGregor on the other hand placed minimal emphasis on job involvement as a personal characteristic and stress involvement as a response to organizational conditions. They view the organization as blocking the gratification of ego and growth needs and leads to the decline or absence of individual involvement in the job. McGregor placed the responsibility on the organization for the behavior of its employees, stating that how people behave is largely dependant on the assumptions managements makes about them.

Managements generally draw assumptions from two theories, theory X and theory Y which are theories of human motivation created and developed by Douglas McGregor at the MIT Sloan School of Management in the 1960s that have been used in human resource management, organizational behavior, and organizational development. They described two very different attitudes toward workforce motivation. McGregor felt that companies followed either one or the other approach. McGregor's work was based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. He grouped Maslow's hierarchy into "lower order" (Theory X) needs and "higher order" (Theory Y) needs. He suggested that management could use either set of needs to motivate employees. According to theory X, people have an inherent dislike for work and must be forced to perform. Also man avoids responsibility,

seeking only securities. Theory Y assumes that work is natural for people and they will exercise self control without the threat of force. Responsibility is sought, rather than avoided. McGregor argued that predominance of the assumptions of theory X have caused discontentment of the workforce. The more managements apply theory Y assumptions, the more it can expect improved involvement and performance. According to Argyris (1957), although it is normal for individuals as they mature to develop desire for independence, more complex behavior, awareness of self etc., the organization retards their growth by applying controls, demanding passivity, requiring only a few shallow abilities. Thus for an individual to meet the demands of the organization, he must consent to adapt, as a result, he will be under stress. This adaptation may take a form that is detrimental to organizational goals such as becoming less job involved and in lowering work standards. Changes in organizations should therefore center around designing work that will allow the individual to mature normally. Job involvement is generally considered as one factor critical to higher work motivation. When teachers are not involved with the job they find themselves less motivated. If job involvement is a significant motivator for teachers then educationists should be interested in methods to improve job involvement. The significance of having highly motivated and involved teachers, who persevere to build the future for the nation is undeniable. It is in this light that educational administrators are compelled to be concerned with work motivation of teachers and have adequate tools and techniques to motivate teachers to achieve organizational success.

## **II. Objectives**

The present study was undertaken with the following major objectives:

1. To investigate the relationship between work motivation of degree college teachers and their job involvement.
2. To investigate whether differences in job involvement would account for significant differences in work motivation of degree college teachers.
3. To study the main effect of job involvement on work motivation of degree college teachers.

## **Method**

### **Hypotheses**

1. There is no significant relationship between work motivation and its factors of degree college teachers and their job involvement.
2. There is no significant difference in work motivation and its factors of degree college teachers as per difference in their job involvement.
3. Levels of job involvement do not account for significant difference in work motivation of degree college teachers.

### **Tools**

For the purpose of the present study, we have used two tools, as shown in Table 1, namely Work Motivation Questionnaire by K G Agarwal, adapted and standardized by Tara Sabhpathy and Job Involvement Inventory by Lodahl and Kejner, standardized by Dr.Umme Kulsum and adapted by Louis George.

### **Sample**

The population for the study consists of all the degree college teachers in various colleges of Bangalore city, namely 1) Government, 2) Private aided and 3) Private unaided respectively. A sample of 450 teachers, 150 from each of the three categories of colleges were selected by stratified random sampling technique. The sample gave representation to male and female teachers as indicated in Table 2.

### **Data analysis**

From table 3 it can be seen that, the obtained r values 0.375, 0.227, 0.308, 0.307, 0.397, 0.297 and 0.288 are higher than the table value 0.115 at 0.01 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is formulated that there is a significant relationship between work motivation and all its factors of degree college teachers and their job involvement. From table 4 it is observed that the obtained t-values 5.986, 4.254, 4.719, 4.789, 6.302, 4.066, and 4.179 for the total work motivation and its factors are higher than the table value 2.59 at 0.01 level of significance. So the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is formulated. The table further reveals that teachers with high job involvement (M=100.910, 19.663, 20.300, 14.775, 17.408, 16.452 and 12.309) had higher levels of work motivation than teachers with low job involvement (M=92.942, 17.885, 18.682, 13.4846, 16.101, 15.299 and 11.489).

## **III. Results**

From the study we arrived at the following findings.

1. There was a significant positive relationship between work motivation of degree college teachers and their job involvement.
2. There was a significant difference in the work motivation of degree college teachers as per differences in their job involvement. Degree college teachers who had high job involvement were more motivated than teachers who had low job involvement.
3. There was a significant main effect of job involvement on work motivation of degree college teachers.

#### **IV. Discussion**

The study reveals that there is a significant positive correlation between work motivation of degree college teachers and their job involvement. The quality of work life experienced by employees in organizations has been an area of extensive investigation by researchers for a number of years. A frequent focus in several of these studies has been the concept of job involvement which has been described as one of the more important quality of work life indices. Despite the progress in research still a certain amount of confusion surrounds the concept of job involvement which is evident in the abundance of differing perspectives on what job involvement really is.

#### **Limitations**

The study was limited to a sample of 450 degree college teachers. The total population of male and female degree college teachers at the time of data collection was 7459 working in 267 colleges of Bangalore city. As the city of Bangalore is growing fast the demand for more degree colleges and recruitment of teachers is also on the rise. Therefore the selection of a limited sample of teachers is a limitation in the present study. The sample was limited due to practical constraints such as time, effort and cost. The independent variable selected for the study have been limited to one in order to study that in depth and examine the effect of this on Work motivation of degree college teachers. Degree college teachers in rural colleges were not considered in this study.

#### **Implications**

The correlational analysis of data reveals that there was a significant positive correlation between work motivation of degree college teachers and their job involvement. The 't' test results also clearly indicates that highly job involved teachers have higher levels of work motivation than teachers with low job involvement. The main effect of job involvement on work motivation of degree college teachers is also significant. This further substantiates the earlier results and focuses on the need and importance of enhancing job involvement of teachers to sustain their work motivation..Job involvement can be enhanced through participation in decision making which increases the teachers understanding of the institutions' aims and objectives and this understanding develops a greater appreciation of the common interest and mutual dependence leading to high levels of work motivation. When teachers have a chance to participate in decision making, concerning their own work environment they will be satisfied and this satisfaction will result in improved performance. Principals should see teachers as valued human resources, who can contribute to institutional effectiveness. Involvement at work is not possible without delegation of authority. Delegation means that everyone takes his full share of responsibility. With delegation of responsibility comes delegation of authority which increases job satisfaction and job involvement. Overloading of responsibilities can be as damaging as under-loading. The later results in job apathy and inefficiency, the former produces stresses which leads to anxiety, irritability and even mental of physical breakdown.

Job involvement has typically been related to the satisfaction of intrinsic rather than extrinsic needs. Job involvement is greater when the teachers are given maximum control over their job. College principals can enhance job involvement of teachers by providing opportunities for individual professional growth and development through refresher courses, orientation programs, thereby motivating teachers to give their best to the institution. The intrinsic needs of teachers such as praise, appreciation and recognition should be satisfied by college principals to keep them motivated.

#### **References**

- [1]. Abdel-Halim, Ahmed A; 1980, Effects of higher order need strength on the job performance-job satisfaction relationship: *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 33, Issue 2, p 335.
- [2]. Argyris C. 1957, Personality and organization, the conflict between system and individual, Harper and Collins, New York.
- [3]. August B W; 1978, Teacher involvement in participatory management, *DAI*, 36(8), 4467-A.
- [4]. Carmeli Abraham, 2005, Exploring determinants of job involvement: an empirical test among senior executives, *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 26, Issue 5, p457-472.
- [5]. Donald P. Moynihan and Sanjay K. Pandey , 2007 ,Finding Workable Levers Over Work Motivation: Comparing Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment *Administration & Society* 39: p 803-832.

- [6]. Elloy David F, Everett James E, Flynn W Randolph; 1995, Multidimensional mapping of the correlates of job involvement, *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*.
- [7]. Eskildsen, Kristensen and Anders, 2004, Work Motivation and Job satisfaction in the Nordic countries, *Employee relations*, Vol. 26, 2, p 122-136.
- [8]. Gorn and Kanungo, 1980, Job Involvement and Motivation: Are intrinsically motivated managers more job involved? *Organization Behavior and Human Performance*, 26, p 265-277.
- [9]. Henry E Garrett, Woodworth R S, 1967, Statistics in psychology and education, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Vakils, Feffer and Simmons (P) Ltd, p 201, 461.
- [10]. James M Dieffendorff, Douglas J Brown, Allen M Kamin and Robert G Lord; 2002, Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, p 93-108
- [11]. Knoop, Robert; 1980, Job Involvement of Teachers; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Toledo, OH.
- [12]. Lawler and Hall, 1970, Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction and intrinsic motivation; *Journal of applied psychology*, 54, p 305-312.
- [13]. Lee-Ross, Darren, 2005, Perceived job characteristics and internal work motivation: *Journal of Management Development*; Vol. 24, 3, p 253- 266.
- [14]. Latham, Gary P.; Ernst, Christopher T, 2006, Keys to motivating tomorrow's workforce, *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, p181-198.
- [15]. Mittal J.P; Teachers motivation to work, 1995, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, Mittal Publications, p 25- 33.
- [16]. Paul F Rotenberry and Philip J Moberg; 2007, Assessing the impact of job involvement on performance, *Management Research News*, Vol. 30, Issue 3, p 203-215.
- [17]. Patric Low Kim Cheng, Motivation, 2006, the Chinese leadership way in Singapore's small and medium companies, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 5, p.80-87.
- [18]. Pathak R. D.; 1990, 1<sup>st</sup> edn, Job involvement among bank managers, National institute of bank management, p.1-22.
- [19]. Rama Mohan Babu V, 1992, Job satisfaction, attitude towards teaching, job involvement, efficiency of teaching and perceptions of organizational climate of teachers of residential and non-residential schools. Ph. D Edu., Sri Venkateshwara University.
- [20]. Venkatachalam J, Sivasankara Reddy K; 1996, Impact of job level and job tenure on work involvement, job involvement and job satisfaction in different organizations, *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 33, No. 2, p 78-85.

**Table 1** Showing Variables, Tools and Authors

Sl.No	Variables	Tools of the study
1	Work Motivation	Work Motivation Questionnaire by K.G.Agarwal, adapted and standardized by Dr.Tara Sabapathy.
2	Job Involvement	Lodahl and Kejner's Job Involvement Inventory standardized by Dr.Umme Kulsum was adapted by Dr.Louis George

**Table 2:** Showing the distribution of sample according to type of Management and Gender

Gender	Type of Management			Total
	Government	Aided	Unaided	
Male	71	85	75	231
Female	79	65	75	219
Total	150	150	150	450

**Table 3:** Table showing the variables, size (N) ,df, and coefficient of correlation 'r' and its significance at 0.05 and 0.01 levels between Work Motivation scores and its factors of degree college teachers and their Job Involvement

Variables	N	df	r-value	Level of Significance
Work Motivation and Job Involvement				
Work Motivation	450	448	0.375	**
Dependence	450	448	0.227	**
Organizational Orientation	450	448	0.308	**
Work Group Relations	450	448	0.307	**
Psychological Incentives	450	448	0.397	**
Material Incentives	450	448	0.297	**
Job Situation	450	448	0.288	**

**\*\*Significant at 0.01 level**

**Table 4:** Table showing the 'N', Mean, SD and t values of the Work Motivation scores and its factors of degree college teachers as per differences in their Job Involvement

Sl. No	Variables	N	Mean	SD	't' value	Level of significance
1	Work Motivation	223	100.910	15.082	5.986	**
	High Job Involvement	227	92.942	13.100		
	Low Job Involvement					
2	Dependence	223	19.663	4.908	4.254	**
	High Job Involvement	227	17.885	3.911		
	Low Job Involvement					
3	Organizational Orientation					
	High Job Involvement	223	20.300	3.705		

*Work motivation of teachers: relationship with job involvement*

	Low Job Involvement	227	18.682	3.453	4.791	**
4	Work Group Relations High Job Involvement	223	14.775	3.098		
	Low Job Involvement	227	13.484	2.604	4.789	**
5	Psychological Incentives High Job Involvement	223	17.408	2.092	6.302	
	Low Job Involvement	227	16.101	2.299		**
6	Material Incentives High Job Involvement	223	16.452	2.954	4.066	**
	Low Job Involvement	227	15.299	3.061		
7	Job Situation High Job Involvement	223	12.309	2.015	4.179	**
	Low Job Involvement	227	11.489	2.145		

**\*\*Significant at 0.01 level**