

TEACHERS' NEED SATISFACTION AND THEIR PERFORMANCE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA, PAKISTAN

Safdar Rehman Ghazi¹, Inayat Ullah Khan²

Institute of Education & Research, University of Science & Technology, Bannu,
PAKISTAN.

¹ drsrghazi@yahoo.com, ² inayatullah.stat@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine the satisfaction level of the three basic psychological needs of the secondary school teachers and relationship of the fulfillment of these needs with the academic performance of the teachers. These needs: as identified by self-determination theory are autonomy, competence and relatedness. Objectives of the study were: i). To identify three basic psychological needs satisfaction level of the secondary school teachers. ii). To identify the relationship of these three basic needs satisfaction with the academic performance of the teachers. The study was descriptive in nature and survey method was used to collect the data. The population of the study was teachers who were teaching to 9th class students of secondary schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. A sample of 454 teachers was taken using simple random sampling method. A standardized questionnaire was used to measure the satisfaction level of these needs. The performance of the teachers was measured by percentage of Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education of 9th class result. The teachers' need satisfaction level was analyzed using Median, and Pearson Product Moment Co-efficient correlation was used for relationship between basic needs satisfaction level and academic performance of teachers. It was concluded that the basic needs of the teachers were somewhat satisfied. In addition, there was positive correlation between basic psychological need satisfaction and academic performance of the teachers, there was positive correlation between Autonomy need satisfaction and performance, positive high correlation between competence need satisfaction and very low or negligible correlation between relatedness need satisfaction and performance. It is recommended that for the improvement of the quality of education, teachers may be provided such an environment where their basic needs may be fulfilled.

Keywords: Motivation, Self-determination Theory, Teacher's Motivation, Teacher's Performance, Satisfaction, Need Satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

The term motivation is derived from the Latin word mover, meaning, "to move". Motivation can be broadly defined as the forces acting on or within a person that cause the arousal, direction, and persistence of goal-directed, voluntary effort. Motivation has been defined by various psychologists in quite different ways.

Wlodkowski and Jaynes (1990) explain that in the broadest sense, motivation is "a value and a desire for learning". According to Mangal (2008), Motivation may be regarded as something, which prompts, compels and energizes an individual to act or behave in a particular manner at a particular time for attaining some specific goal or purpose. Motivation refers to "the reasons underlying behavior" (Guay et al., 2010). Paraphrasing Broussard and Garrison (2004) broadly define motivation as "the attribute that moves us to do or not to do something".

However, what exactly is responsible for the motivation of an individual? What are the real activating forces that push and pull an individual to move for achieving a specific goal? Psychologists have tried to provide the answer by identifying these activating forces as needs, drives and motives.

Motivation consists of the following two broad kinds. That is Intrinsic and Extrinsic motivation. The common way of mobilization and motivation is the external rewards, incentives, like good grade, fear of others, assessment etc. Such type of motivation is known as external motivation.

Peoples are also motivated by internal events, such as internal interest, personal pleasure. These motives, which are innate in nature, are known as internal motives, and the motivation of such type is known as internal motivation.

Intrinsic and extrinsic types of motivation have been widely studied, and the distinction between them has shed important light on both developmental and educational practices. Intrinsic motivation is motivation that is animated by personal enjoyment, interest, or pleasure. As Deci et al. (1999) observe, "Intrinsic motivation energizes and sustains activities through the spontaneous satisfactions inherent in effective volitional action. It is manifest in behaviors such as play, exploration, and challenge seeking that people often do for external rewards". Much importance has been placed on intrinsic motivation in social psychology, because it is perceived as a type of motivation leading to highly valued outcomes such as creativity, quality, spontaneity, and vitality (DeCharms, 1968; Kruglanski, Friedman & Zeevi, 1971).

Intrinsic motivation has emerged as an important phenomenon for educators— a natural wellspring of learning and achievement that can be systematically catalyzed or undermined by parent and teacher practices (Ryan & Stiller, 1991). Because intrinsic motivation results in high-quality learning and creativity, it is especially important to detail the factors and forces that engender versus undermine it.

The two major categories of motivational theories are content theories and process theories. According to Mescon (1985), content theories describe the classification of inner needs, while process theories describe the behavior of the people and its output. The two concepts circulate around needs and rewards. Content theories further classify different types of needs. These are primarily needs and secondary needs. Primarily needs are those which are essential for survival. These needs are naturally and inborn. For example, need for water and food are primarily. Secondary needs are those, which are psychological in nature. For example the need for attainment, power, friendship etc are secondary needs.

It is emphasized that primarily needs are equal for all individual while secondary needs are different and depends upon on person behavior, beliefs, way of thinking etc.

Major content theories of motivation are Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs, Alderfer (1972) ERG theory, Herzberg (1959) motivator-hygiene theory, McClelland (1962) learned needs and Self-determination theory by Deci and Ryan (2000).

Process (or cognitive) theories of motivation focus on conscious human decision processes as an explanation of motivation. The process theories are concerned with determining how an individual behavior is energized, directed, and maintained in the specifically willed and self-directed human cognitive processes. Process theories of motivation are based on early cognitive theories, which posit that behavior is the result of conscious decision-making processes. The major process theories of motivation are Vroom (1960) expectancy theory, Adam (1963) equity theory, and Skinner (1974) reinforcement theory.

Self Determination Theory is presented by Deci and Ryan (2000) in the following words. “Self-determination Theory (SDT) represents a broad framework for the study of human motivation and personality. SDT articulates a meta-theory for framing motivational studies, a formal theory that defines intrinsic and varied extrinsic sources of motivation, and a description of the respective roles of intrinsic and types of extrinsic motivation in cognitive and social development and in individual differences. Perhaps more importantly SDT propositions also focus on how social and cultural factors facilitate or undermine people’s sense of volition and initiative, in addition to their well-being and the quality of their performance. Conditions supporting the individual’s experience of autonomy, competence, and relatedness are argued to foster the most volitional and high quality forms of motivation and engagement for activities, including enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity.”

Furthermore, SDT suggests that if any of the three basic psychological needs are not satisfied or frustrated within a social context, will fall bad affect the wellness of a person.

SDT argues that for healthy development and proper functioning the satisfaction of the basic psychological needs are necessary. These basic needs are Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness.

SDT compare these basic needs concepts with proper development and functioning. For wellbeing of people the satisfaction of these basic needs are very important and necessary (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Furthermore, SDT contradicts with Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1989), and emphasizes that alone competency are not sufficient without Autonomy.

Self-determination theory has many applications in almost all fields, including health and education (Markland, Ryan, Tobn, & Rolnick, 2005). Research concerning Self-determination Theory in the field of health gives us many interesting output. If the psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness of the patients are supported in the procedure of their health care, they have proved to be engaged more volitionally in medication and sustain better outcomes as respect to time (Kasser & Ryan, 1996).

The primary goal of the school is to motivate the students, and by proper motivating them, they are expect to show good performance. Mostly by performance, we mean academic performance. Moreover, evidence proposes that teachers’ support of students’ basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness facilitates students’ autonomous self-regulation for learning, educational performance, and happiness.

\Most of the educators initiate external controls, such as, supervision, monitoring, and evaluations along with incentives or punishment into learning situation to make sure that learning occurs. Such external controls falls effect on teachers as well as students, both undermine, and damage their autonomy need (Ryan & Brown, 2005).

Deci, Niemec and Ryan (2000) explain different factors that show the importance of SDT in classroom in the following words, “We describe several important elements of SDT. First, we examine the concept of intrinsic motivation and those factors that support or undermine it in the classroom. Second, we discuss the innate tendency of people to internalize new knowledge and practices acquired through socialization, and those factors that nurture or thwart the process of internalization. Finally, to link those two topics, we discuss students’ basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, which when supported are associated with academic engagement and better learning outcomes, but when frustrated are associated with academic disengagement and poorer learning outcomes. Intrinsic motivation and learning intrinsic motivation refers to behaviors done in the absence of external impetus that are inherently interesting and enjoyable.” (Niemec et al., in press; Ryan

& Deci, 2000) The discussion summary within one line can be prescribed as, for optimal learning, social adjustment, educational performance the satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs are very necessary both for teachers as well students (Ryan & Brown, 2005).

Motivation plays an important role in the teaching and learning circumstances. Motivation of the teacher and motivation of the students both are essential. Without appropriate motivation, the process of learning becomes unclear and incomplete. For the motivation of the students, the motivation of teachers is basic (Mathews, 1988).

This study is an application of Self- determination theory of motivation. This theory based on the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs. These needs are autonomy, competence and Relatedness.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Teachers are arguably the most important group of professionals for our nation's future. Therefore, the satisfaction of the teacher is very important. This study investigates the level of satisfaction of psychological needs of the secondary school teachers and its relationship with the academic performance of the teachers. Therefore, the significance of this study will be evident from the following points.

- I. The findings of this study will be helpful and beneficial for the head teachers to fulfill the autonomy need of the teachers for better teaching.
- II. The findings of this study will also be helpful for the education department to sustain the autonomy of the teachers so to achieve the required aims and objectives of the department.
- III. This study will inspire the teachers to conduct similar experimentation in the classroom for effective and useful teaching.
- IV. It will provide the new way of job satisfactions. i.e. the satisfaction of the intrinsic motives rather than extrinsic motives.

OBJECTIVES

Following were the objectives of the study:

- a. To identify three basic psychological needs (Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness) satisfaction level of the secondary school teachers serving in the secondary schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.
- b. To identify the relationship of the three basic needs satisfaction with academic performance of the teachers at secondary level.
- c. To give recommendations and suggestions to improve the situations in the schools and for further research.

HYPOTHESES

This study was guided by the following null hypotheses:

Main Hypothesis

H₀: There is no significant relationship between basic psychological needs satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher.

Sub Hypotheses

- H_{0(a)}: There is no significant relationship between Autonomy need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher.
- H_{0(b)}: There is no significant relationship between Competence need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher.
- H_{0(c)}: There is no significant relationship between Relatedness need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was a survey type research.

Population and Sample

All the teachers who were teaching the 9th class students in public secondary schools of the Khyber Paktunkhwa, Pakistan constituted the population of the study. A sample of 454 teachers was drawn by simple random sampling method.

Instrumentation

A standardized questionnaire was used for the satisfaction level of basic psychological needs. This questionnaire was obtained from the website (www.selfdeterminationtheory.org) of the theory. The permission to administer it in the field, was sought from the co-founders (Deci and Ryan) of the theory (Shannon, April 2012). The questionnaire was consisted of 21 items those measured three basic psychological needs. Three points Likert scale was used. These were “Not all true”, “Somewhat true”, and “Very true”.

One of the researchers administered the questionnaires personally. The academic performance of the teachers was measured by the percentage of the Board of Intermediate and Secondary Education result of 9th class.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The collected data were entered in SPSS 16 for analysis. The satisfaction levels of the respondents were measured using Median and Inter Quartile Range (IQR). To see whether there is any relationship exists between basic psychological need satisfaction and teachers’ performance, Pearson Product Moment co-efficient correlation was used. The following weights were given to the scale:

Not all true =1, Somewhat true =2, and Very true = 3

Table 1. The Views of the Teachers about Satisfaction of Three Needs

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Needs</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>I.Q.R</i>
1	Autonomy	2	0.5
2	Competence	2	0.25
3	Relatedness	2	0.75
	<i>Overall</i>	2	0.5

Table 1 shows the views of the teachers about their three basic needs satisfaction. The Median for these needs (Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness) is 2 and Inter Quartile Range (IQR) is 0.5, 0.25 and 0.75 respectively. Furthermore, the Median of overall basic

needs is 2 and IQR is 0.5, which shows that respondents are somewhat satisfied with the basic psychological needs.

Table 2. Relationship between Basic Need Satisfaction and Academic Performance

<i>S.No</i>	<i>Need</i>	<i>Pearson co-efficient (r)</i>	<i>p</i>
1	Autonomy	0.132	0.00
2	Competence	0.193	0.00
3	Relatedness	0.032	0.498
	<i>Overall</i>	0.178	0.00

The last row of the Table 2 indicates that Pearson co-efficient correlation between overall basic psychological needs satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher is 0.178, “p” = 0.00 and the “P” value shows that the hypothesis of no significant relationship between basic needs satisfaction and academic performance is rejected, and a positive correlation exist between basic needs satisfaction and academic performance.

The first row of the table indicates that Pearson co-efficient correlation between autonomy need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher is 0.132 and p = 0.00. The P value shows that the hypothesis of no significant relationship between autonomy need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher is rejected, and a positive correlation exist between autonomy need satisfaction and academic performance.

The second row of the table indicates that Pearson co-efficient correlation between basic psychological need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher is 0.193 and p = 0.00. P value shows that the hypothesis of no significant relationship between competence need satisfaction and academic performance of teacher is rejected, and a positive high correlation exist between Competence need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher.

The third row of the table shows that Pearson co-efficient of correlation between Basic psychological need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher is 0.032 and “p” = 0.498. The P value shows that hypothesis of no significant relationship between relatedness need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher cannot be rejected. It means that there is no significant relationships exist between relatedness need satisfaction and academic performance of the teacher.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of analysis and interpretation of data, it was concluded that secondary school teachers were overall somewhat satisfied with their psychological needs, and they were also somewhat satisfied with all the selected needs: Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness. However, their satisfaction was not high.

Moreover, a positive correlation between overall the selected basic psychological needs satisfaction and academic performance of the teachers were also found. However, this relationship between autonomy need satisfaction and academic performance was moderate positive, between competence need satisfaction and academic performance was high positive, while with the relatedness need satisfaction, and academic performance was negligible.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on research conclusions the following recommendations may be suggested for sympathetic consideration that, for the improvement of the quality of education, the teachers may be provided such an environment where there is a dire need to fulfill all the basic psychological needs of the teachers. To improve the quantity and quality of education, training for the importance of intrinsic motivation may be conducted. Trainings, workshops may be arranged for head teachers and teaching staff for the awareness about intrinsic motivation. To improve the autonomy satisfaction level, there should no extra ordinary interruption in the work of teachers.

REFERENCES

- Adam, J. S. (1963). Toward an Understanding of Equity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, November 422-436.
- Alderfer, C. (1972). *Existence Relatedness and Growth*. New York: Free Press.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory, *American Psychologist*, 44, 1175-84.
- Broussard, S. C. & Garrison, M. E. B. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary school-aged children. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2), 106-120.
- Brown, T. J. (1988). High impact teaching. *Strategies for educating minority youth*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- DeCharms, R. (1968). *Personal Causation*. New York: Academic
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R. & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 627-668.
- Guay, F., Chanal, J., Ratelle, C. F., Marsh, H. W., Larose, S. & Boivin, M. (2010). Intrinsic, identified, and controlled types of motivation for school subjects in young elementary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 711-735.
- Herzberg, M. S. (1959). *Motivation to Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kasser, T. & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 280-287.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Friedman, I. & Zeevi, G. (1971). The Effects of Extrinsic Incentives on Some Qualitative Aspects of Task Performance. *Journal of Personality*, 39, 606-617.
- Mangal S. K. (2008). *Advanced Educational Psychology*, 2nd Ed. Prentice Hall of India Private Limited NewDelhi-110 001, 138.
- Markland, D., Ryan, R. M., Tobin, V. J. & Rollnick, S. (2005). *Motivational interviewing and self-determination theory*.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mathews, J. (1988). *Escalante: The best teacher in America*. New York: Holt.

- McClelland, D. C. (1962). Business Drive and National Achievement. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 99-112.
- Mescon, M. H. (1985). *Management*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Niemiec, C. P., Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (in press) Self-determination theory and the relation of autonomy to self-regulatory processes and personality development, in R. H. Hoyle (ed.), *Handbook of Personality and Self-regulation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- 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.
- Ryan, R. M. & Stiller, J. (1991). The social contexts of internalization: Parent and teacher influences on autonomy, motivation and learning. In P. R. Pintrich & M. L. Maehr (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement: Vol. 7, goals and self-regulatory processes* (pp. 115-149). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ryan, R. M. & Brown, K. W. (2005). Legislating competence: High-stakes testing policies and their relations with psychological theories and research, in A.J. Elliot and C.S. Dweck (eds), *Handbook of Competence and Motivation*, pp. 354–72. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Skinner, B. F. (1974). *About Behaviorism*. New York: Knopf.
- Turner, J. C. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 410–441.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wlodkowski, R. & Jaynes, J. H. (1990). *Eager to Learn: Helping Children Become Motivated and Love Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.