



Impact Factor:4.081

WORK MOTIVATION AMONG GOVERNMENT TEACHERS AND PRIVATE TEACHERS

Dr. HIRENKUMAR J. NAYAK

Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Ahmedabad Arts and Commerce College, Ahmedabad, Gujarat

ABSTRACT: The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference in the Work Motivation among Government teachers and Private teachers of Ahmedabad District. The sample consisted of 240 teachers. Out of which 120 were Government teachers and 120 were Private teachers. For this purpose of study "Work motivation Questionnaire" by K. G. Agrawal (1998) was used. The obtained data was analyzed through 't' test to know the mean difference between Government teachers and Private teachers. The results show that there is a significant difference between the mean score of Government teachers and Private teachers in relation to the Dependence, Work group relations, and Job situations. And there is no significant difference between the mean score of Government teachers and Private teachers in relation to the Organizational orientation, Psychological Incentives and Material incentives.

Keywords: Motivation, Organizational, Psychological

INTRODUCTION: Work motivation has been defined "a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond and individual's being to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity & duration (pinder 1998, p.71). This definition recognizes that psychological processes directing behaviour is determined by motive states that could be either conscious or sub-conscious (latham & budworth 2007) most of the work motivation models and theories deal with consciously included motivation in the respect that they focus on how the organization can increase extrinsic motivation (desi & ryan, 2000). Perhaps the most prominent work motivational theory is that on goal setting, which has been proposed as one of the most researched theories and has consistently proven that setting challenging work goals leads to better performance than "do your best" or no goals at all (locke & latham, 2002).

Effects of organizational commitment on outcomes vary across stages. This is especially true for the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover (actual and intended) (cohen,1991).Procedural justice, information sharing and work life policies practices must be considered as complementary means to achieve lower turnover rates (pare & tremblay,2000). Work family conflict is indeed as issue that can affect almost all aspects of people's lives. People's families, their workplaces and even their own mental and physical health can be affected (robbins,2004). It professionals willingly remain in organizations where work is stimulating and challenging ,chances for advancement are high and they feel reasonably well paid (pare & tremblay,2000). Practices and to align configurationally HR strategies to these high commitment work practices (Bhatnagar,2005).

In recent years the role and status of women have been tremendously changed. With the advent of female education and more liberty for their rights and privileges, women's attitude towards their stereotyped role is changing and their participation in education and work place is increasing day by day. The purpose of this study was to measure the Work Motivation among Government teachers and Private teachers.

OBJECTIVES:

- (1) The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference related to the Dependence among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (2) The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference related to the Organizational orientation among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (3) The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference related to the Work Group Relations among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (4) The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference related to the Psychological incentives among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (5) The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference related to the Material incentives among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (6) The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference related to the Job Situations among Government teachers and Private teachers.

HYPOTHESIS:

- (1) There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Dependence among Government teachers and Private teachers.

- (2) There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Organizational orientation among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (3) There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Work Group Relations among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (4) There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Psychological incentives among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (5) There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Material incentives among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (6) There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Job Situations among Government teachers and Private teachers.

METHOD:

(A) **SAMPLE:** In present study sample will be selected randomly. The sample consisted of 240

teachers. Out of which 120 were Government teachers and 120 were Private teachers.

(B) **TOOL:** In order to measure the work motivation of the doctors, teachers and Administrators, we will use a “Work motivation Questionnaire” by K. G. Agrawal was used. Reliability of Work motivation Questionnaire is 0.994 which is very high and Validity of Work motivation Questionnaire is 0.67.

STATISTICAL STRATEGY:

‘t’ test was applied to know the significant differences between Dependence, Organizational orientation, Work Group Relations, Psychological incentives, Material incentives and Job Situations levels of Government teachers and Private teachers.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION:

Table : 1: Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value of the Dependence of Government teachers and Private Teachers

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	‘t’ Value	Level of sig.
Government Teachers	120	28.59	13.89	3.19	0.01
Private Teachers	120	24.73	8.37		

The above table shows the Dependence level of Government teachers and Private teachers for Government teachers mean is 28.59 for Private teachers mean is 24.73 and S.D. is 13.89 and 8.37 for both group ‘t’ level value is 3.19 which is significant at 0.01

level of significant. It means Government teachers have more Dependence in comparison of Private teachers and the hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Dependence among Government teachers and Private teachers” is Rejected.

Table : 2: Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value of the Organizational orientation of Government teachers and Private Teachers

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	‘t’ Value	Level of sig.
Government Teachers	120	67.71	6.48	1.23	NS
Private Teachers	120	68.53	6.08		

The above table shows the Organizational orientation level of Government teachers and Private teachers for Government teachers mean is 67.71 for Private teachers mean is 68.53 and S.D. is 6.48 and 6.08 for both group ‘t’ level value is 1.23 which is not significant. It means Government teachers and Private

teachers are not significantly different with each other in relation to the Organizational orientation and the hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Organizational orientation among Government teachers and Private teachers in relation to their Gender” is accepted.

Table : 3: Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value of the Work Group Relations of Government teachers and Private Teachers

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	‘t’ Value	Level of sig.
Government Teachers	120	71.21	13.91	2.33	0.05
Private Teachers	120	67.96	12.57		

The above table shows the Work Group Relations level of Government teachers and Private teachers for Government teachers mean is 71.21 for Private teachers mean is 67.96 and S.D. is 13.91 and 12.57 for both group ‘t’ level value is 2.33 which is significant at 0.05 level of significant. It means

Government teachers have more Work Group Relations in comparison of Private teachers and the hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Work Group Relations among Government teachers and Private teachers in relation to their Gender” is Rejected.

Table : 4: Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value of the Psychological incentives of Government teachers and Private Teachers

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	‘t’ Value	Level of sig.
Government Teachers	120	68.37	7.25	1.86	NS
Private Teachers	120	69.03	7.84		

The above table shows the Psychological incentives level of Government teachers and Private teachers for Government teachers mean is 68.37 for Private teachers mean is 69.03 and S.D. is 7.25 and 7.84 for both group ‘t’ level value is 1.86 which is not significant. It means Government teachers and Private

teachers are not significantly different with each other in relation to the Psychological incentives and the hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Psychological incentives among Government teachers and Private teachers in relation to their Gender” is Accepted.

Table : 5: Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value of the Material incentives of Government teachers and Private Teachers

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	‘t’ Value	Level of sig.
Government Teachers	120	27.26	13.85	0.97	NS
Private Teachers	120	26.07	8.82		

The above table shows the Material incentives level of Government teachers and Private teachers for Government teachers mean is 27.26 for Private teachers mean is 26.07 and S.D. is 13.85 and 8.82 for both group ‘t’ level value is 0.97 which is not significant. It means Government teachers and Private teachers are not

significantly different with each other in relation to the Material incentives and the hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Material incentives among Government teachers and Private teachers in relation to their Gender” is accepted.

Table : 6: Mean, S.D. and ‘t’ value of the Job Situations of Government teachers and Private Teachers

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	‘t’ Value	Level of sig.
Government Teachers	120	71.21	13.91	2.33	0.05
Private Teachers	120	67.96	12.57		

The above table shows the Job Situations level of Government teachers and Private teachers for Government teachers mean is 71.21 for Private teachers mean is 67.96 and S.D. is 13.91 and 12.57 for both group ‘t’ level value is 2.33 which is significant at 0.05 level of significant. It means Government teachers have more Job Situations in comparison of Private teachers and the hypothesis, “There is no significant difference between the mean score of the Job Situations among Government teachers and Private teachers in relation to their Gender” is Rejected.

- (5) There was no significant difference between the mean score of the Material incentives among Government teachers and Private.
- (6) There was a significant difference between the mean score of the Job Situations among Government teachers and Private.

CONCLUSION:

- (1) There was a significant difference between the mean score of the Dependence among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (2) There was no significant difference between the mean score of the Organizational orientation among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (3) There was a significant difference between the mean score of the Work Group Relations among Government teachers and Private teachers.
- (4) There was no significant difference between the mean score of the Psychological incentives among Government teachers and Private teachers.

REFERENCES:

Argyle, M. (1987). *The Psychology of Happiness*. London: Routledge Press.

Best, J.W. & Khan J.V. (1992). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.

Dave, C.B. and others (1986), “*Statistics in psychology*”, Viral Prakashan, A’ bad Ch.1 and 2 page.1 to 30.

Eby, Lillian T, Freeman Deena M,(1999), “*Motivation bases of affective organization commitment*”, Journal of occupational & organizational psychology, vol.72 issue 4, p463, 21p.

Garet, and R.S woodworth (1981), “*Statistics in Psychology in education*”, 10th Indian reprint, vakils, seffer and Simonds Ltd. Bombay. Ch- 6, 8,14 Page 122-125, 97-201 and 371-374.

Latham, G. P.& Locke,E.A (1990), “*Work motivation and satisfaction: The Light at the end of the tunnel*”, Psychological science, 1, 240-246.

Locke, E.A (1968), “*A theory of task motivation incentives*”, Organizational behaviour and human performance, 3, 157- 189.

Molden,D.C, Lee,A.Y,& Higgins, T.E (2008), “*Motivation for promotion and prevention*”, Handbook of Motivational science (PP 169-187) London: Guilford Press.

Nolen, Teris P., Clawson, Barbara N., (1992), “*Human values: issues for home economics*”, International Journal of Cultural Property (2005), 12:2:275-280 Cambridge University.