

THE IMPACT OF EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION ACADEMIC INSTITUTION IN THEIR PERFORMANCE AT WORK

Ortenca Kotherja

University of Elbasan “Aleksander Xhuvani” Elbasan, Albania,
E mail: kotherja_ortenca@hotmail.com

Abstract

Motivation is defined as the result of the interaction between personal and situational (Decenzo , 2001) . His motivation and factors external and internal have a great importance in labor productivity of employees. Pinder (1998) has defined motivation to work " as a group of energetic forces that start from within the individual and the individual beyond being initiated to show the behavior at work . Staff motivation at work is a combination of meeting the needs of employers and job factors that influence employee motivation and performance at work. School is a very important institution in the education of the young generation and directly affects the performance of teachers to them. School is the institution in which the individual teaches relevant life goals and norms within the social context. Motivational factors have a significant impact on the performance of the work of teachers. Performance is what shows how an institution / organization works and what appears achievement level . The purpose of this study is to show the level of motivation of the base level of education. In this study participants were 40 employees of two 9 - year public school district in Elbasan which was applied a questionnaire designed to measure teachers' motivation and its impact on their performance at work .

Keywords: *motivation, performance, school*

Indroduction:

Motivation process usually begins when someone recognizes a need of his unhappy. Then established a goal to achieve a certain goal in order to satisfy this need. Social context, cultural, environmental directly affects the level of motivation of each individual work. This context consists of organizational values and culture, but it also includes leadership and management, and the impact of group or team in which a person works. Motivating employees in educational institutions is one of the important issues given the responsibilities that they have the knowledge and skills of students. Their performance is a concern for the whole society concerning the serving of knowledge and skills to students, the use of teaching methods, satisfaction they exhibit

at their work etc. Research on motivation revealed that the desire to make an effort may derive from different sources. Scholars and researchers in the early 20th century believed that incentives, penalties and bonuses were needed to motivate, to increase performance and productivity. Academic institution has a great importance on the education of the young generation and the process of learning that directly affects them in solving various problems in the future. Motivation is the process that leads to behavior, and this process cannot be directly measured or observed. Consequently, earlier researchers have identified various factors that can be used in the measurement of motivation. In particular, Herzberg (1966) has empirically identified pleasure / non-factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction / disappointment non-factors as determinants of motivation influencing it in determining the level of motivation of staff redundant and then their level working.

Objectives of the study:

- 📌 To see the level of satisfaction of teaching staff
- 📌 To see the level of motivation of teaching staff
- 📌 To assess the level of employee work performance related to their motivation.

Research questions:

- 📌 How motivated are employees of the institution in their school?
- 📌 How satisfied are employees of the institution in their school?
- 📌 What is the level of performance of academic staff?

1. Concept of motivation.

Motivation comes from the Latin word "*Mover*" which means to move. Motivation is the activation or energization to move or to achieve a certain goal (Wikipidea 2010). Various scholars have given different ideas and definitions. For motivation Nelson and Quick (2003) stated that motivation is a process aimed at achieving a certain behavior. According to Pinder (2000), motivation at work is a set of energetic forces that originate both within and beyond an individual's being, to create work-related behavior and to determine the shape, direction, duration and intensity of these behaviors. Motivation is internal tendency of a person to be positively simulate and to avoid negative simulate. Further, by Deckers (2010), an incentive or reward is expected aversive event environment available. On the other hand, motivation can often be used as a tool to predict behavior, and this varies greatly among individuals, and often must be combined with the ability and environmental factors to influence the work and behavior of employees. According to Jex & Britt (2008), because of the role of motivation in influencing

work performance and behavior, performance is a key factor for any organization and to understand and to structure the work environment to encourage productive behavior and to discourage unproductive employees (Limohamaddi & Neyshabor (2013). Motivation at work is related to a set of factors that determine behavior within the organization, form, direction, intensity and its duration. Understanding what motivates employees is the focus of many studies in the field of organizational psychology. Motivation can often be used as a tool to predict the behavior of individuals in the workplace, varies greatly between individuals and in combination with the capabilities and environmental factors affect the behavior and performance of employees. Motivation in the workplace has an important role to the behavior and performance of employees it is the key institutions / organizations to understand and structure work environments, so as to encourage positive behavior and discourage those that are not positive at work . According to Mitchell (2003), motivation includes "behavioral patterns generated to achieve a certain goal."

II. Job performance

The performance has a close relation with the level of motivation of each individual. Each individual work appeared in various performance levels which appear from the productive to the level he displays his work. Campbell (1990) describes the performance of "any behavior that is not included under the concept of performance, but only conduct which is relevant to organizational goals:" Performance is what the organization / institution invites such a subject to do something and good "(Campbell et al., 1993, p. 40). Thus, performance is not defined as people move on but is determined by trial and evaluation processes (cf. ILGEN & Schneider, 1991; Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmitt, 1997). In many situations, the behavioral aspects and the results are empirically related. Aspects of the result of performance also depend on factors than the individual's behavior. Herzberg asserts that "having more little resentment can not an employee is motivated to perform better but just to stay in it. "Job performance clearly depends on their level of motivation, which stimulates them to come to work regularly, the work hard, be flexible and be willing to perform the necessary tasks. Performance and quality of an education system depends on the quality and motivation of human resources. Therefore, employees motivation academic institution is likely to have effects on the provision of educational process and outcome of care and performance. Low motivation level and low level of satisfaction have a negative impact on the education sector and this directly affects the performance of the work, and the quality of teaching.

III. Motivation and satisfaction in work

Jex & Britt (2008) stated that the key to finding motivation through one's work is to be able to derive pleasure from the content of the work. Moreover, when employees are motivated, they

will be satisfied with their organization / institution and understand their organization is paying enough attention to them and considers them as important factors. Satisfied employees will engage in positive behavior. Pinder (1998) described the motivation to work as a set of internal forces and external to initiate work related behavior and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration. Pinder (1998) argued that an essential feature of his determination is that the motivation to work is an invisible construct, internal and hypothetical. Du Toit (1990) says that there are three sets of variables that influence motivation at work, which are individual characteristics, values, needs and interests of the people, as varieties of tasks and responsibility as well as the characteristics of the organization, as its political, procedures and clients. Van Niekerk (1987) saw the motivation to work as job creating circumstances that influence employees to perform a required activity of their own, in order to achieve the goals of the organization and also to satisfy their needs. Sempane, Rieger and Rood (2002): "Pleasure in the job relates to people's own assessment of their performance against those issues that are important to them." Job satisfaction in respect of the relevant employee connectivity and organization products, ranking in job performance to the health and life expectancy (Spector, 2003). Megginson, Mosley and Pietri (1982) said that people feel pleasure to work on cases when they felt good about their work, and this feeling is also associated with doing good things at work or being more productive in their professions, or acquaintances for good performance at work. literature suggests that: "A variety of factors motivate people at work, some of which are measurable as money, and others are immeasurable, as a sense of personal achievement (Spector, 2003). Motivating employees in educational institutions and their job satisfaction cannot be isolated but they meet each other and respond to organizational variables such as productivity and working conditions. Employees and job satisfaction depend on workplace behavior which needs addressed by a set of internal or external, and organizational attitudes it directly affects their performance at work.

IV. The relationship between motivation, job satisfaction and performance.

Motivation and performance are two concepts that are related to each other. Many people believe that people who are more motivated in the workplace show a good performance. If employees of institutions reach high level of satisfactions, high level of motivation this will affect their performance at work. Motivation and performance at work are inextricably linked, because each employee should have a degree of motivation just to go to work in the first place. Many people believe that employees that are more motivated will reach the highest level of job performance.

Methodology

This study used quantitative method. The study focused on two public schools in Elbasan as "Sul Harri " and "Qamil Guranjaku". Part of the research were teachers and the 9-year primary. As a measuring instrument used questionnaire and sampling of this study were 42 employees of the school institution, where two of them refused to be part of the study. Measuring instrument that was used in this study is a questionnaire divided into three sections ;the first section measures the level of motivation, the second section measures the level of job satisfaction and measures the performance of third level employees. Questions were measured through Likert scale: (a) completeness agree b) Agree c) neutral d) Not agree e) Completeness not agree).

Phase 1: Adaptation of instruments, sampling and procedures at this stage.

The degree of motivation, job satisfaction rate and degree of Performance - To adjust the scales measuring procedure is followed a few step approaches. First is a translation of questionnaires, measuring scales. The translation is performed twice by the method English-Albanian-English-Albanian.

Subsequently conducted a small pilot with 20 people, in order to obtain information on the degree of understanding of the allegations and also deal ideas for how to best fit a particular term. 20 persons were students of the Faculty of Social Sciences.

Each of the students are delivered to the stairs, and each was asked about the allegations. Students are asked to understand what some specific allegations, in order to assess whether the allegations of scale somewhat properly understood and measured really what we want to measure. Also asked for the use of some concepts, what can be more connected and more understandable for employees in Albania.

Phase 2: Sampling methods and instruments during the study.

a. Administration of measuring scales - measuring scales were awarded to employees at two public schools in Albania. Casual sampling was conducted according to the sample simple formula casual. Are taking full lists of employees in each school and a selection of sample Hourly a certain ratio, 1 to 2 or 1 to 3. Upon ending list, and I'm back with the same report selected persons remained until the number that shows the formula.

The distribution of the selected participants in the study were:

School 1	School 2

The measuring scales are distributed employees in their work environment and are completed individually, without being influenced by each other's presence. During the time scales are met physically, I was present to explain how and why the concepts beginning of the study but also for any questions or concerns you may have respondent. Completion of stairs takes on average 10 minutes.

Phase 3: Data Analysis

Qualitative analysis was conducted and quantitative analysis of data. In the first phase, the adaptation of instruments, before the stairs changes have come as a result of qualitative analysis is made suggestions of persons sampled. While in the last stage adaptation is performed a quantitative analysis. Data were thrown into SPSS, which is calculated through the relations stairs validity of each claim, and reliability through Alpha Crombach.

Even during the study, was conducted quantitative analysis of the data obtained by measuring rates are calculated correlations between variables.

The limitations of the study:

- 1 - Instruments are not standardized for Albania.
- 2 - Albanian context - are not accustomed to and may risk studies for lack of seriousness on the part of respondents.
- 3 - Unable to calculate or to consider other factors that may affect the variables obtained in the study.

Ethical issues:

Participants who completed the scales were announced before they meet for the purposes of the study, the use of information and maintaining privacy and their anonymity in the publication of the final results. Their approval to fill the questionnaires will be considered as a written consent to the use of data by conditions (conditions are written at the beginning of each instrument).

All data collected during the study will be kept confidential and anonymity and privacy of participants and all participants in the study were unaware.

Results:

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Motivation in work	40	22	30	27.05	2.075
Satisfaction in work	40	23	37	30.78	3.662
Job performance	40	33	40	37.98	1.915
Valid N (listwise)	40				

Question 1. Which is the level of motivation on employees of educational institutions?

The average value obtained in the degree of school employees Motivation is the key value that comes from the results. Value is 27.05 (with a minimum of 22 and maximum of 30), with a standard deviation 2075, which means that values are more concentrated around the average.

Must say that the value 27.05 indicates a very high level of the average, since this value can vary between 6-30 points on extent of Motivation. Shows the average value of a motivation almost maximum level of school employees. Being that it was a casual sampling and stairs are in a satisfactory fitness and confidence, the results obtained from this study can be generalized and are considered representative. However, you should always consider the tendency of respondents to give answers they think are right answers and not really think (it even mentions that reason can not be taken for granted because it cannot prejudice the sample).

Question 2: What is the level of satisfaction from the work of employees of educational institutions?

The average value obtained from the norm of school employees is the core value that comes from the results. Value is 30.78 (with a minimum of 23 and maximum of 37), with a standard deviation 3662, which means that values are relatively concentrated around mesatares. Kjo value indicates a moderate level of job satisfaction among employees of schools, as level of points that

can be taken to scale 8-40. Megjithatë varies, it can be said that the overall level of satisfaction tends to go towards positive values.

The same reasoning applies in the case of Motivation in terms of generalization and representation of results.

Question 3. Which is the level of performance on academic staff?

The value that comes to average level of performance is an expected value for each individual is keen to see the positives of his performance at work and sometimes overestimate in all. Average tasks and work in the performance level of 40 employees is 37.98 (with a minimum of 33 and maximum of 40), with standard deviation 1.915 which means that all values are more concentrated around the average (scale limits stand at 8-40 points). Shows the average value for a maximum performance level school employees, without any value that falls below the high / positive.

Being that it was a casual sampling and stairs are in a satisfactory fitness and confidence, the results obtained from this study can be generalized and are considered representative. However, you should always consider the tendency of respondents.

We forced to show how well they do their job, especially when you perceive that they are valued by an outsider (even mentioned that it therefore can not be taken for granted because it can not prejudice the sample).

Correlation Table

		Nivel of Performance.	Nivel of Motivation	Nivel of Satisfaction
Nivel of Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.129	-.125
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.426	.442
	N	40	40	40
Nivel of Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.129	1	.234
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.426		.145
	N	40	40	40

Nivel of Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	-.125	.234	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.442	.145	
	N	40	40	40

For analysis of the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction and performance, is mostly utilized correlational analysis and principal value that comes from the results is the relationship $r = 0.129$ motivation - performance, correlation is not statistically significant, and $r = -0.125$, that is also not statistically significant and negative correlation indicates more.

All studies mentioned in the literature review have predicted job satisfaction and motivation as the main factors affecting a good performance to employees of public education institutions. The results obtained from this study refute the hypothesis of a positive correlation relationship between the variables job satisfaction and motivation on the one hand and performance on the other. We should do in this case is to think the reasons and factors that lead to laying following hypotheses. First, it must be said that Albania is not yet accustomed to studies and research, and often these searches can be hampered by the tendency to answer questions or to assess allegations of instruments in the way that they think should be the answer and no real answer. This is observed more significantly in meeting the Performance Scale of 40 employees sampled. If we see these result showing that the answer always have high performance level without touching any violation or deviation of duty. In this case, given that the sample results in a high level of performance in every case, there is little significance level of motivation and job satisfaction. If this low or high, performance remains high, if not maximum and therefore the correlation coefficients were not statistically significant.

However, in the case of the relationship of Motivation and Performance, despite not have a statistically significant relationship, the data provide a positive correlation coefficient, which means that are consistent with the hypothesis regarding direction.

What comes in this particular study, the data are coming to the relationship between job satisfaction and performance, indicating a negative direction of the relationship.

References:

Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 687–732). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press

C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational*

The 2nd International Conference on Research and Education – “Challenges Toward the Future” (ICRAE2014), 30-31 May 2014,

University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Shkodra, Albania

- psychology (Vol. 6, pp. 71–108). Chichester: Wiley.
- Deckers, L. (2010). *Motivation: Biological, psychological, and environmental* (3rd.ed.).
- Du Toit, M.A. (1990). *Motivering (Motivation)*. In J. Kroon (ed.). *Algemene bestuur (General management)* (2nd ed.). (pp. 83– 92). Pretoria: HAUM
- Nelson, D.L. and Quick, J.C. (2003), *Organizational Behaviour: Foundation, Realities and Challenges* (4th ed.), Australia: Thomson South-Western.
- Pinder .C.C(2000,October). *Work motivation theory at the start of the new millennium*. Presented to American Board of Vocational Experts, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Ilgel, D. R., & Schneider, J. (1991). *Performance measurement: A multi-discipline view*.
- Jex, S., and Britt, T., (2008), *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*, 2nd Ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, NJ
- Limohamaddi & Neyshabor (2013). *International Journal of Research in Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management*, Vol. 1, No.3, pp. 1-12
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, **10**, 71–83.
- Meggison, L.C., Mosley, D.C. & Pietri, P.H. (1982). *Management concepts and applications* (4th ed.) New York: Harper Collins.
- Sempene, Rieger dhe Roodt (2002): *Job Satisfaction in relation to organizational Culture*; SA *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 2002, 28(2), 23-30
- Van Niekerk, W.P. (1987). *Eietydse bestuur (Contemporary management)*. Durban: Butterworth.