

## Contemporary issues of motivation for lecturers

Osman Sejfiqaj

osmansejfiqaj@gmail.com

### Abstract

Job satisfaction that employees gain from work has a great impact in their lives. This is the perception of being pleased with the job and the position in the working place. .

How pleased are lecturers in the Public Universities in Kosovo? What are the key factors that contribute to this? How motivated are they? The goal of this paper is to determine of the level, resources and the nature of the lecturer' satisfaction with their work in the Public Universities. This study is developed in Educational institutions, and tried to recognize inner and external factors that are responsible for the behavior of people in a determined way.

Lecturers are the basic factors on developing of a successful education system. One of the development issues is offer of academic services. A great contribution to this is satisfaction in work. By listening to their voice, important results could be achieved for their motivation and their stay in the profession. In addition there are also services and factors that in a unique way determined their work. In terms of methodology and data sources the present study is conducted at the end of Academic year 2013/2014. The questionnaire is administered to professors as a representative sample of academic staff, male, female, experienced, less experienced, part-time, and full-time. Results show a positive correlation between motivation and satisfaction in work. Motivation increases by the increase of satisfaction in work and vice versa. This may be due to the fact that responsible factors for motivation and satisfaction in work should be present in the environment of the organization. Research finds out also the relevance of various factors that contribute to the satisfaction of employees.

**Key words:** education, job satisfaction, motivation, inner and external factors,  
JEL code: J24; J28.

### Introduction

Staff motivation is very crucial in operating any institution or organization. Successfully motivated staff can bring a lot to the institution. A high-quality teaching staff is the cornerstone of the running of a successful educational system. One step in developing a high quality faculty is to understand the factors generally associated with teaching quality and the delivery of academic services. One and foremost of these factors is job satisfaction, which has been studied widely by organizational researchers. In higher education, lecturer satisfaction should be the main objective of the institution to provide quality education for students. Teachers are arguably the most important group of professionals for our nation's future. Many factors have been examined in an attempt to find which ones promote teacher motivation. Professor motivation is based in the freedom to try new ideas, achievement of appropriate responsibility levels and intrinsic work elements(Sylvia & Hutchinson 1985).Less lecturing by professors and more classroom discussions relates positively to lecturer moral further supports the importance of higher-order needs (Greenwood & Soars 1973).

How satisfied are professors? What are the principal factors that contribute to their satisfaction or dissatisfaction? By listening to the voice of professors, we can gain important insights into their motivations for staying in the profession, service and other factor that uniquely define their work.

Such information could help administrators and professors themselves increase the faculty satisfaction and effectiveness, with positive outcomes for the educations of students. The information could also be

of use to perspective faculty members considering teaching at university. Enabling them to more realistic prepare for the rewards and challenges at such anew institution.

The purpose of present study is to examine the level, sources and nature of satisfaction among professors in public universities in Kosovo.

This study is conducted in an educational research type of organization. With regard to employee motivation and job satisfaction, internal and external factors are usually responsible for providing people with a reason to behave in a certain way. Professors are the backbone of the educational systems worldwide, it is imperative that the factors related to their dissatisfaction and demotivation are sought and responded to.

#### Theoretical Framework

Work is an important part of life. These satisfaction that employee get from the job has a great impact on their lives. Job satisfaction is a feeling which describes how content or discontent a person is with the job he/she does. There are different factors that affect a person's level of job satisfaction. These factors include salary, benefits, job security, and working condition, working hours, the work itself, leadership and social relationship

Motivation has been one of the most frequently researched subjects in the field of psychology and education. Therefore, it is only natural to define motivation as a force, one that makes us constantly move, act or do thing. Motivation is defined as some kind of internal drive which pushes someone to do things in order to achieve something .Harmer, (2001) and Robins (1989) defined motivation as "the willingness to exert high levels of effort toward organizational goals, conditioned by the efforts ability to satisfy some individual need". Work motivation has been defined as the process by which behavior is energized, directed and sustained in organizational settings (Steers & Porter, 1991). Job satisfaction which is closely linked with motivation is defined by Schafer (1953) as being one of individuals needs fulfillment: "Overall job satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual's which can be satisfied in a job are actually satisfied "Numerous studies have examined job satisfaction among college and university faculty (August&Waltman, 2004; Hagedorn, 1996; Hagedon & Sax, 2004; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2004; Reybold, 2005) and many others.

Lawler (1973) was focused on expectations rather than needs. He claim that job satisfaction is determined by the difference between all those things a person feels he should receive from his job and all those things he actually does receive. Nias (1989) interprets job satisfaction as the summary of the total experience in teaching. Rosser (2005) identifies four significant areas in the literature on faculty satisfaction: rewards and salary, work and carrier satisfaction, relationship with student, colleagues, and administrators, and benefits and job security. Ali and Ahmed (2009) confirmed that there is a statistically significant relationship between reward and recognition respectively also motivation and satisfaction.

Another dimension of work motivation relates to the synergy that people experience between their motivational drive system and the characteristic of their work environment. This include the extent to which they are motivated by opportunities for interaction at work, by praise and recognition, by the synergy between their own and organizations values and principles, by their need for job security and by their need for opportunities for continual growth and development. The need for job security is on the most basic needs, job security refers specifically to one's expectations about continuity in a job situation and extends to concern over loss of desirable job features, such as promotion opportunities and working conditions. (Davy, Knicki & Scheck, 1997).

The intrinsic motivation dimension refers to an increase in motivation corresponding with meaningful and stimulating work, flexible structures and procedures, and an adequate level of autonomy. Autonomous activity is an innate need experienced by many people (Beach, 1980; Coster, 1992; Vercueil, 1970). Literature also shows that repetitive jobs lead to lower levels of job satisfaction (Shepard 1973; Stinson & Johnson, 1977).

The extrinsic motivation dimension is represented by aspect such is the need for financial reward, positive promotion prospects, and position and status. A significant positive correlation has been found between the extent to which people are motivated by financial reward and their level of satisfaction with work (Agho et al, 1993; Bellenger et al., 1984, Hoole & Vermeulen, 2003; Mol 1990; Strydom & Meyer, 2002; Thomson, 2003; Visser et al., 1997).

Some support for relationship between job satisfaction and certain dimensions of institutional culture has been found. These dimensions represent organizational aspect that impact on job satisfaction, alongside the personal and job –related aspects.

From the above literature following hypotheses emerge:

**HA0:** The work itself is NOT correlated with work motivation and satisfaction.

**HA1:** The work itself is correlated with work motivation and satisfaction.

**HA2:** The sense of achievement is correlated with work motivation and satisfaction.

**HA3:** The different facets of satisfaction (compensation, relationship with coworkers, security, supervision and growth) are correlated with work motivation.

#### Importance of the Study

It is necessary condition of successful teaching for professors to unceasingly participate in in-service education and increase specialized growth. Many institutes and universities encourage the lecturer to participate in in-service education to obtain a higher degree in order to improve lecturer quality. This study is important for the following reasons:

- Understanding the motivation and job satisfaction of the lecturer may help university administrators to improve lecturer work environment.
- Understanding the lecturer commitment may help the administrators adopt effective policies for motivating and achieving better results in university.

#### Research Methodology

The study is conducted at the end of Academic year 2013/2014. The questionnaire is administrated to 15 professors as a representative sample of academic staff from different public universities in Kosovo, male, female, experienced, less experienced, part-time, and full-time. The study is designed to investigate job satisfaction and motivation levels of professors. More specifically the study tried to examine the factors that positively and negatively affected professor's motivation and job satisfaction. To realize this aim, the following research questions were asked:

1. To what extent are professors satisfied with their work?
2. What are the primary areas of satisfaction that motivate professors to remain in their positions?
3. How important is for professors to provide service to their institution?

The research involved quantitative and qualitative interpretive data in the forms of reports from the three part questionnaire with 15 questions administered with the professors and four open question. The first part of the professor's questionnaire was designed to get the demographic information: age, gender, years experienced, education background. The second part of questionnaire consisted of 15 questions. Using a 4 point Likert scale, the responses ranged from 1(not important) to 4 (very important).In the third part of the questionnaire professors were asked four open –ended questions to give their opinions.

#### Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to determine the central tendency of data and trend of the variables. The outcome explained of intensity of Job satisfaction, Motivation, Reward, and Supervision and Work itself for the point of view of professors. Results showed that professors expressed a moderate to high

level of satisfaction as indicated by mean score 3.07 to 4.0. They are also found adequately satisfied with their job. Table below contains data about tendency for the predicting and criterion variables.

**Professional satisfaction factors.**

In their response the professors identified these factors as e powerful motivators for keeping them in teaching. Professors continually emphasized their work satisfaction in fulfilling a professional commitment and development, serving society (items 1, 2, 3 and 5). Freedom and flexibility is another reason why professors remain in teaching (mean 3.67) academic freedom.

Practical factors such as job security, salary, benefits and advantage teaching in schedule were important to professors, but not important as the Professional satisfaction factors. Job security (mean 2.80.).Several professors discussed some of the practical reason why they remained in the profession: Its beneficial to my family, small children, it give me flexibility to be away when I need to be away. (mean 3.53).

Some of the professors stayed in the profession because it provided them with special benefits opportunity for funding to do the research. Having good relationship with faculty colleges (mean 3.40) appears to be more important than relationship with administrators (mean 3.13).

**Frequencies Table**

		Statistics				
		Satisfaction. in. fulfilling.a. professional. commitment	Satisfaction. in.serving. society	Satisfaction. in. professional. development	Satisfaction. in.being. succesfull.at. some.thing. you.enjoy	The.intelectul. challanges. involved.in. teaching
N	Valid	15	15	15	15	15
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
	Mean	3.87	3.80	3.80	3.93	3.73
	Std. Error of Mean	.091	.107	.107	.067	.118
	Median	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Mode	4	4	4	4	4
	Std. Deviation	.352	.414	.414	.258	.458
	Variance	.124	.171	.171	.067	.210
	Skewness	-2.405	-1.672	-1.672	-3.873	-1.176
	Std. Error of Skewness	.580	.580	.580	.580	.580
	Kurtosis	4.349	.897	.897	15.000	-.734
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	1.121	1.121	1.121	1.121	1.121
	Range	1	1	1	1	1
	Minimum	3	3	3	3	3
	Maximum	4	4	4	4	4
	Sum	58	57	57	59	56

Table.1

According to table which representative the frequencies of variables we can see that the geometric mean is approximate 3, 80 where is the Std Error is approximate .100 where is point of view the professional development. Also the other elements of statistical describes approach is Std Dev. About 0, 4 which show the middle level of acceptance the follows variable.

The coefficient of significant which 0,041 to the question research variables satisfaction of job where is mean of difference – 267 the meaning of this is negative and the employees are not satisfaction with their job.

**HA1:** The work itself is correlated with work motivation and satisfaction.

$\mu \neq \mu_0$ , the work is correlated with motivation and satisfaction, so we can accept this hypothesis the result (sig=0.041).

**HA2:** The sense of achievement is correlated with work motivation and satisfaction(sig=.0.000)

**HA3:** The different facets of satisfaction (compensation, relationship with coworkers, security, supervision and growth) are correlated with work motivation. (Sig=0.003).

According to ANOVA analysis, significant is equal to 0.189, the level is low, is acceptable. The coefficient for the satisfaction of the service to society is acceptable. This indicator confirms the value of teaching as the highest service to society.

The finding are clear in that professors were mainly found similar matters as motivating and demotivating factors as follows:

Motivational Factors	Demotivation Factors
➤ Having a good salary	➤ Having low salary
➤ Progress of students	➤ Unfair salary policy
➤ Being open to professional development	➤ Constant changes of administration
➤ Starting and finishing lesson on time	➤ Inadequate annual leave
➤ Willing to help students in and out of the classroom	➤ Inadequate Stationary
➤ Being hard-working	➤ Inadequate technical equipment's
➤ Being creative in class	

### Conclusions

Overall, the finding of the present study has provided answers to the research questions. The finding suggests that the academic staff of the university have moderate level of general satisfaction. These findings have practical implications for the management of the university. Academic staffs that have different levels of job satisfaction may require different management styles and motivational strategies for optimum organizational effectiveness. At the same time the management of the university needs probe into the causes of low general satisfaction among its academic staff. This is of prime importance because research findings have consistently found that job satisfaction has significant impact on employee commitment to the university, job performance, professional development, satisfaction serving society, relationship between colleagues and motivation.

### Limitations of this study

Limitations of this study are highlighted as under:

- This study is applicable to the public University only. The sampling frame was limited to public educational institution therefore the results cannot be generalized to the entire educational institutions.
- The results of this study must be qualified in term of the sample that were used.
- Questionnaire sampling method was used which may be supported with focus group discussion, interviews and panel discussion to come at more concrete results

### Reference:

1. Agho, A.O., Mueller, C.W. & Price, J.L. (1993). Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. *Human Relations*, 46(8), 1007 – 1027.

2. Ali, R., & Ahmed, M.S. (2009). The impact of reward and recognition programs on employee's motivation and satisfaction: An empirical study. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(4), 270-279.
3. August, L. & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(2), m-192.
4. Beach, D. S. (1980). *Personnel: The management of people at work* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.
5. Bellenger, D.N., Wilcox, J.B. & Ingram, T.N. (1984). An examination of reward preferences for sales managers: *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 4(2), 1 – 6.
6. Davy, J.A., Kinicki, A.J. & Scheck, C.L. (1997). A test of job security's direct and mediated effects on withdrawal cognitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 323 – 349.
7. Greenwood, G. E., and Soars, R.S. (1973). Teacher morale and behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 64: 105-8.
8. Hagedorn, L. & Sax, L. (2004). Marriage, children, and aging parents: Thereof family-related factors in faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 19(2), 65-76.
9. Hagedorn, L. (1996). Wage equity and female faculty job satisfaction: The role of wage. Differentials in a job satisfaction causal model. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(5), 569-598.
10. Harmer, Jeremy. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Longman Press.
11. Hoole, C. & Vermeulen, L.P. (2003). Job satisfaction among South African pilots. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(1), 52 – 57.
12. Johnsrud, L.J. & Rosser, V.J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518-542.
13. Lawler, E.E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
14. Mol, A. (1990). *Help! Ek is 'n bestuurder. (Help! I am a manager)*. Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers.
15. *Monographs: General Applied*, 67(14), 1-29.
16. Nias, J. (1989). *Primary teacher talking. A study of teaching as work*. London: Tout ledge.
17. Reybold, L. E. (2005). Surrendering the Dream: Early career conflict and faculty satisfaction threshold. *Journal of Career Development*, 32(2), 107-121.
18. Richard M. Steers and Lyman W. Porter. *Motivation and Work Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill; 1991.
19. Robbins, Stephens P. (1989). *Organizational behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
20. Rosser, V. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 81-107.
21. Schaffer, R.H. (1953). Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work, *Psychological*
22. Shepard, J.M. (1973). Specialization, autonomy, and job satisfaction. *Industrial Relations* 12(3):274-281.
23. Stinson, J.E. & Johnson, T.W. (1977). Tasks, individual differences and job satisfaction. *Industrial relations*, 16(3):315-325.
24. Strydom, S.C. & Meyer, J.C. (2002). 'nOndersoekna die bronne van werkstevredenheid en werkstres onder middlevlak bestuurders in die Wes-Kaap. (An investigation of the sources of job satisfaction and work stress among middle level managers in the Western Cape). *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 15 – 22.
25. Sylvia, R. D., and T. Hutchinson. 1985. "What makes Ms. Johnson teach? A study of teacher motivation." *Human Relations*, 38: 841-856.
26. Thomson, D. (2003). Incentive schemes have to work! *Management Today*, 18(10), 46 – 47.
27. Visser, P.J., Breed, M. & Van Breda, R. (1997). Employee satisfaction: A triangular approach. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 23(2), 19 – 24.