

The Level of Motivation of the Faculty Members to Teaching at the Hashemite University

Zuhair H. Al-Zo'ibi ¹, Ahmad M. Mahasneh ^{2*}

¹ Department of Fundamentals of Education and Management, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, JORDAN

² Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, JORDAN

* CORRESPONDENCE: ✉ dahmadmahasneh1975@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to identify the level of motivation of the faculty members to teaching at the Hashemite University in the light of gender, college, academic rank, and years of experience variables. The study sample consisted of (232) faculty members. A faculty members motivational scale to teaching was used by the faculty members to collect the data. The study found that the level of motivation of the faculty members to teach was high. There were no statistically significant differences in the level of motivation of teaching due to the gender variable. There were statistically significant differences in the level of motivation of teaching ascribed to the college variable, in favor of the humanitarian faculties. The study also found statistically significant differences in the level of motivation for teaching attributed to the academic rank variable, in favor of the faculty members who are in the rank of professor. There are statistically significant differences in the motivation level of teaching attributed to the years of experience variable, in favor of the faculty members whose experience exceeds 11 years.

Keywords: motivation, motivation to teaching, faculty members

INTRODUCTION

Motivation of the faculty members to teaching in the higher education institutions is one of the indispensable core objectives for the university management. Faculty members play a vital role in the university success and good reputation both with the students and academia. Teachers' motivation contributes to their performance and the transfer of knowledge to the students. Teachers in higher education perform an important role in the educational institution's success and its status with the students and academics (Rasheed, Aslam, & Sarwar, 2010). Yet, there is a widespread belief that most of the faculty members in higher education do not approach high levels of quality in their teaching. The more the teacher's motivation, the more the probability that the teacher will be successful in practicing teaching is. (Stembridge, 1990).

Filak and Sheldon (2003) see that motivation is important for success and performance in any educational, teaching system at the long-run. Porter and Sheers (1973) see that teachers' motivation is important for many different reasons. It is important for the teachers' self-satisfaction, and their motivation may lead to educational reforms and progressive legislations. These researchers also stressed that the teachers' job satisfaction and their motivation are linked with turnovers at the university. Ololube (2004) found that the increasing teachers' motivation leads to increases in productivity that provides support to the educational systems.

Article History: Received 31 January 2019 ♦ Revised 12 February 2019 ♦ Accepted 12 February 2019

© 2019 The Author(s). Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.

Since teachers play a guiding role for their students, the teacher's motivation is associated with the students' learning. The more the student's learning, the more the satisfaction on task accomplishment is, and the more the teachers' occupational engagement will be. Adams and Baily (1989) emphasized that the students' achievement could be an important factor in the teachers' motivation. In other words, if the students are diligent, intelligent and high achievers, their teachers will be more motivated to teaching. The students' achievement will not only work toward raising the teachers' job satisfaction, but also will help and push them to exert the best effort they have in teaching.

It is believed that motivation is able to affect three aspects of work. 1- Selection: Why do people decide to do what they want? 2- Insistence: To what extent they desire the sustainability of the activity? And, 3- Effort: What is the extent of difficulty and diligence required by people to follow up the action? (Sharbyan, 2011; Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004). In this concern, Dornyei and Ushioda (2001) assert that teaching is a type of the human behavior, and the general models of motivation should be applied to describe it. Therefore, one may claim that motivation for teaching determines why teachers decide to teach, the extent of their persistence and the effort they will exert in their educational profession. Owens (1995) stated that motivation is dealing with explaining "Why people do what they do?" This definition may be applied to explain "Why some teachers attend regularly but give the least possible of what they have, meanwhile, others are full of energy and ideas, and perform their job with all enthusiasm? Accordingly, motivation is dealing with the teachers' attitude toward their educational profession.

Theory of cognitive assessment distinguishes between two types of motivation: Internal and external motivation (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999). By the internal motivation, the theory means that the activity subject matter of consideration is made for pleasure or gratification obtained from this activity. On the other hand, the external motivation means that the activity under consideration is done as a "vehicle" for something. The internal motivation consists of three different types of objectives: internal knowledge motivation, internal achievement motivation, and internal activity motivation, which are associated with the performance improvement (Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992). There are many studies about motivation in the education area, with wide types of studies that tackle the students' motivation in the different educational levels, to approach the possible understanding of the way through which performance or its explanation could be improved (Hidi, 2001; Moneta & Spada, 2009). One of the influential factors is the motivation of the students' teachers (Trigwell et al, 2004). Especially, how teachers evaluate and appreciate their own educational abilities, and the effort they want to spend in education, based on this evaluation (Tschannen-Moran & Hay, 2007). In this concern, Macfarlane and Hughes (2009) provide that motivation to teaching in the higher education institutions include three basic components, namely:

Efficacy: motivation is very closely associated with how people see their abilities in certain situations (Baily, 1999; Bandura, 1994). Therefore, failure is interpreted in different ways based on whether people view their abilities as high or low. Individuals who expect high personal abilities see failure as a situation through which they learn and help them in the next times. Generally, these individuals continue to be of strong motivation. Meanwhile, individuals of low personal efficacy see failure an assertion that they are actually unable to achieve the required level, which may cause more decline to their motivation. Bandura (1994) defined the self-efficacy as the beliefs of the individuals about their abilities to realize specific performance levels, which practice influence on the events that affect their life. It is supposed that the self-efficacy concepts are determinants of the individuals' feeling, thought, self-motivation and behavior. Moreover, self-efficacy is a suitable concept from the perspective of the goal orientations theory.

It seems that the perceived efficacy affects the acceptable or selected level of the difficulty of a certain goal, commitment to it, reaction to failure, and strategy selection (Locke, 1996). In addition, theory of the expected value is associated with self-efficacy; and how far teachers are able to motivate themselves to teaching is associated with the anticipated results (Bandura, 1994). The student's perceived efficacy is the specific alternative that determines the self-efficacy, one of the factors that seems closely connected to the teaching behavior and students' results (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk et al, 1990). Accordingly, Bandura made a distinction between the efficacy expectations, in the form of the teacher's efficacy, and the output expectations, in the form of output efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Therefore, the teacher's efficacy focuses on the question, "How far are teachers supposed to possess the required abilities?" Meanwhile, the output efficacy focuses on the question, "How far the effort they expect to put in will lead them to the desired result?" It is assumed that there is an association between these forms of self-efficacy (Soodak & Podell, 1996).

Many researchers attempted to explain both concepts (Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Soodak & Podell, 1996; Woolfolk et al., 1990). They concluded an important result that what was in the past equal to the output

efficacy, based on the work done, is actually connected to the third concept, i.e. teaching efficacy (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Interest: another motivation related aspect is interest. A recent study among mathematics teachers revealed that those mainly interested in teaching showed higher quality in the teaching behavior than their colleagues, whose main interest was the subject area only (Kunter et al, 2006). Interest and pleasure that the individual practices in a certain activity are important indicators of the internal motivation of that activity. The interest concept was developed within the language learning domain, which is one of the important motivation elements that promote the performance (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Hidi, 2001). There is a difference between the individual interest and situational interest. The former is relatively stable and connected with the internal self-value dedicated for a certain issue or activity, which is widely different from one person to another. The latter could be generated from environmental factors, which render it related to external factors (Hidi, 2001; Schiefele, 1999).

Effort: effort plays a role in the various motivation theories. For instance, it is a common factor in both the expectation theory and goal theory. Effort is affected by the clarity and difficulty of the goal and engagement in the assignment goal, and affects the performance (Ambrose & Kulik, 1999). Effort is tightly linked with the self-efficacy concept (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2007). In the attribution theory, which is an extension of the expected value theory, effort is one of the four aspects in which individuals ascribe their success or failure (Graham, 1991). Based on the attribution theory, effort is the main element that could be affected, not only because effort is a thing that is controllable by the individual (ability to control), but also because it is changing (instable), and could be attributed to the individual's control (Vockell, 2001).

Some studies dealt in the factors that influence the faculty members' motivations to teaching in the universities. Abdul Cader (2012), provided six factors that affect the faculty members' motivation to teaching in the Saudi universities. They are: *the internal motivation* (love of teaching, sense of pride in teaching, students' accomplishments and achievements); *external motivation* (salary increase, constraints imposed on the teaching staff by the management, management's support and acknowledgment, and support of professional and personal development); *cultural adaptation* (culture, language, and religious adaptation); *management between the male versus the female officials*; *nepotism*; and *modern technology*.

Bahrami et al (2012) concluded that the more influencing factors in the faculty members' motivation to teaching in Teheran University of Medical Sciences (Iran) were: *job security, physical environment of the work, and professional development*. Kiziltepe (2008) conducted a study to identify the elements affecting the faculty members' motivation to teaching in Turkey. The results showed that the students related factors are the most affecting in the faculty members' motivation to teaching. Students' respect of their teachers and students' academic achievement were the most affecting factors in the faculty members' motivation to teaching.

Rasheed, Aslam, and Sarwar (2010) found that salaries and end-of-service remunerations are the most important factors in the faculty members' motivation to teach. The results further showed other factors, such as: job classification in the university, work environment, feedback, and participation in decision making, which affect the faculty members' motivation to teaching. Aziz, Akhtar, and Rauf (2012) concluded that the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching was high. The results also showed statistically significant differences in the members' motivation ascribed to the gender variable, in favor of the males. Study of Blascova and Blasko (2013) provided that the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching was high. The results further showed that awareness of the objectives and purposes, leadership style, performance evaluation, open contact with the university management, and work environment are the most affecting factors in motivation to teaching. Kim (2013), provided that personal interest in teaching, research works, development of knowledge and skills, helping the students, contribution to the community service, and intense love of teaching are affecting factors in the faculty members' motivation to teaching.

Visser-Wijnveen, Stes and Petegem (2014) concluded that the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching was high, and that the teaching subjects variable is the most affecting on their motivation to teaching. Munyengabe et al. (2017) found that the level of faculty members' motivation to teaching was medium; and that the factors that affect their motivation to teaching were: ***social factors, love of the job, classroom environment, ranks, incentives and promotions***. The results also showed a positive, statistically significant relation between the level of motivation and job-satisfaction.

Problem of the Study

The strength of the educational system in higher education institutions widely depends on the teachers' quality. Teachers are one of the basic elements in the higher education institutions. Rowley (1996) found that the teachers' motivation to teaching plays a vital role in the establishment and development of the quality in the higher education institutions. He sees that the teachers' motivation has an effective influence on providing the students high quality teaching experiences. Many studies were carried out in the motivation to teaching area among the elementary and secondary stages teachers, but there is a scarcity in the foreign studies on the faculty members' motivation to teaching. Most of the studies in the teachers' professional development area in the higher education focused on improving the teachers' teaching efficacies, but ignored an important issue, namely, motivation to teaching (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Stes et al, 2010). The current study problem is to identify the level of motivation to teaching among the faculty members in the Hashemite University. More specifically, the current study sought to answer the following questions:

Question One: What is the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching in the Hashemite University?

Question Two: Are there statistically significant differences in the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching in the Hashemite University attributed to gender, college, academic rank and years of experience variables?

Significance of the Study

This study is important due to the following reasons:

1- There are many studies that dealt in the teachers' motivation to teaching in the elementary and secondary schools, but there are few foreign studies that dealt in the faculty members' motivation to teaching in the higher education institutions. Thus, the current study contributes to the provision of knowledge to the literate about faculty members' motivation to teaching.

2- The results of this study may contribute to the enhancement of the faculty members and improvement of their efficacy, which will lead to the improvement of the teaching quality in the higher education institutions.

3- The results may help the academic leaders know the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching, to enable them improve the processes and search for possible solutions to improve the work conditions.

4- Since our age is the science and technology age, the students' future depends on the success in the university stage success, and the students' learning relies on the effective teaching, then we are in need to know the factors that increase the faculty members' motivation to teaching.

5- The current study is an attempt to highlight the factors that affect the teaching quality and assist the teachers and administrative academia in planning and working toward improvement through enhancing the positive elements, which could increase the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching.

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Study Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all the faculty members in the Hashemite University (n=582), as per the statistics of the human resources department in the Hashemite University, in the first semester of the university year 2017/2018. The sample consisted of (232) faculty members (39.8% of the study population), who were chosen by the intentional method, as shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Distribution of the Study Sample Participants According to the Study Variables

Variable	Level	No.	Percentage
Gender	Males	182	78.4%
	Females	50	21.6%
Faculty	Scientific	126	54.3%
	Humanities	106	45.7%
Academic Rank	Assistant Professor	58	25%
	Associate Professor	108	46.6%
	Professor	66	28.4%
Years of Experience	1-5 Years	40	17.2%
	6-10 Years	52	22.4%
	More than 10 Years	140	60.4%
Total		232	100%

Table 2. Values of the Correlation Coefficients between the Scale Dimensions and the Total Degree of the Scale of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching

Dimensions	Personal Efficacy	Teaching Efficacy	Outcomes Efficacy	Interest and Enjoyment	Importance and Effort	Motivation to Teaching
Personal Efficacy	1					
Teaching Efficacy	0.13	1				
Outcomes Efficacy	0.10	*0.15	1			
Interest and Enjoyment	*0.51	*0.26	*0.21	1		
Importance and Effort	*0.26	0.06	*0.14	*0.43	1	
Motivation to Teaching	*0.90	*0.14	*0.19	*0.80	*0.56	1

Instrument

The researchers employed the scale of the faculty members' motivation to teaching, developed by Visser-Wijnveen, Stes, and Petegem (2012). The scale consists of (25) items distributed over three main dimensions. First, efficacy dimensions, which included three sub dimensions, namely: personal efficacy, nine items (1-4-7-12-14-17-19-22-24); teaching efficacy, three items (2-5-8); and outcomes efficacy, three items (3-6-9). Second, interest/enjoyment dimension, 6 items (10-13-15-20-23-25). Third, importance/effort dimension, four items (11-16-18-21). The instrument applied Likert quartet scale as follows: strongly disagree= (1), disagree= (2), agree= (3), and strongly agree= (4), with the highest degree is (100) and the lowest is (20). There are reverse expressions where grading could be inverted, i.e. items (2-5-9-15-21-24).

Scale Validity and Reliability

The scale, in its original shape, enjoys a high validity degree. Visser-Wijnveen, Stes, and Petegem (2012) verified the validity of the faculty members' motivation to teaching scale. The results showed five main factors that explained (52%) of the total explained variance. These researchers further calculated the correlation coefficients between the scale dimensions and the total scale degree, as shown in **Table 2**.

To verify the scale reliability indicators, Visser-Wijnveen, Stes, and Petegem (2012) calculated the internal consistency coefficients using Cronbach Alpha Equation. The values were (0.90, 0.88, 0.74, 0.83, 0.79 and 0.89) for the personal efficacy, teaching efficacy, outcomes efficacy, interest and enjoyment, importance and effort, and motivation to teaching, respectively. For the purposes of the current study, the researchers verified the construction validity of the scale of the faculty members' motivation to teaching by calculating the correlation coefficients between the scale dimensions and the total degree of the scale, as shown in **Table 3**.

Table 3. Values of the Correlation Coefficients between the Scale Dimensions and the Total Degree of the Scale of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching

Dimensions	Personal Efficacy	Teaching Efficacy	Outcomes Efficacy	Interest and Enjoyment	Importance and Effort	Motivation to Teaching
Personal Efficacy	1					
Teaching Efficacy	*0.24	1				
Outcomes Efficacy	*0.66	*0.59	1			
Interest and Enjoyment	*0.87	*0.36	*0.62	1		
Importance and Effort	*0.86	*0.23	*0.56	*0.87	1	
Motivation to Teaching	*0.90	*0.59	*0.81	*0.91	*0.86	1

*($\alpha=0.01$)**Table 4.** M's and SD's of the Level of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching

Dimension	M	SD	Level of Motivation to Teaching
Personal Efficacy	3.76	0.34	High
Teaching Efficacy	2.86	1.02	Medium
Outcomes Efficacy	3.49	0.45	High
Interest and Enjoyment	3.73	0.36	High
Importance and Effort	3.78	0.35	High
Motivation to Teaching	3.52	0.39	High

Table 3 shows that the correlation coefficients between the scale dimensions (one with the other) and the total scale degree were statistically significant, which are acceptable validity indicators of the current study objectives. To verify the scale reliability indicators, the researchers calculated the internal consistency coefficients using Cronbach Alpha Equation. The values were (0.87, 0.86, 0.72, 0.77, 0.79, 0.87) for the personal efficacy, teaching efficacy, outcomes efficacy, interest and enjoyment, importance and effort, and motivation to teaching, respectively, which are acceptable reliability values for the current study.

Data Collection

The researchers carried out the following procedures to prepare the study and approach the results:

- Revision of the literature and previous studies pertinent to the faculty members' motivation to teaching.
- Translation of the scale of the faculty members' motivation to teaching and asserting its validity and reliability.
- Distribution of the instrument over the sample participants, collecting and assorting them to exclude the incomplete questionnaires.
- Entering the data in the computer, and making the relevant statistical analyses using SPSS, V:17.
- Providing the results, discussion, recommendations and suggestions in the light of the results.

Statistical Analysis

Means (M's) and standard deviations (SDs) were used to answer the first question, and T-Test and the One-Way ANOVA to answer the second question. In addition, the researchers used Scheffe Test for the post hoc comparisons in case of differences among the M's.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of question one: What is the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching in the Hashemite University?

To answer this question, the researchers calculated the M's and SD's of the motivation to teaching scale dimensions and the instrument as a whole, as illustrated in **Table 4**.

Table 5 shows that the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching was high with (M=3.52), and that the level ranged between medium and high. The importance and effort dimension ranked first with

Table 5. M'S and SD's of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching as per the Study Variables

Variable	Level	Personal Efficacy		Teaching Efficacy		Outcomes Efficacy		Interest & Enjoyment		Importance & Effort		Teaching Motivation	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Gender	Male	3.73	0.35	2.97	0.99	3.49	0.48	3.69	0.38	3.73	0.38	3.52	0.42
	Female	3.89	0.22	2.45	1.02	3.46	0.31	3.90	0.15	3.94	0.12	3.53	0.24
College	Scientific	3.72	0.38	2.48	1.01	3.40	0.44	3.62	0.41	3.68	0.41	3.38	0.41
	Humanities	3.81	0.27	3.22	0.84	3.59	0.43	3.86	0.22	3.89	0.20	3.69	0.30
Academic rank	Assistant Professor	3.56	0.51	2.71	0.88	3.31	0.55	3.53	0.51	3.62	0.53	3.34	0.50
	Associate Professor	3.86	0.21	2.83	1.03	3.56	0.39	3.83	0.26	3.85	0.26	3.58	0.33
	Professor	3.78	0.23	3.04	1.11	3.53	0.39	3.75	0.23	3.81	0.21	3.58	0.34
Years of Experience	5 years and less	3.64	0.49	2.31	0.96	3.31	0.46	3.61	0.48	3.67	0.47	3.31	0.43
	6-10 years	3.67	0.43	3.19	0.83	3.47	0.54	3.68	0.43	3.73	0.43	3.55	0.46
	More than 11 Years	3.83	0.21	2.90	1.05	3.54	0.39	3.79	0.26	3.83	0.26	3.58	0.33

(M=3.78), followed by: personal efficacy (M=3.76), interest and enjoyment (M=3.73), outcomes efficacy (M=3.49), respectively; and the teaching efficacy ranked last with (M=2.86). This result may be explained in the light of the relation between teaching motivation and job satisfaction, which could be realized through engaging the faculty members in decision-taking about many affairs in the university; providing various enhancements by the university; finding the suitable teaching environment, and attention to the faculty members. These steps could assist the faculty members to develop and improve their performance, develop the academic work, and increase their motivation to teaching.

When the faculty members find attention to their individual needs and moral support and interesting their psychological stability in the university community, they will be encouraged to devote themselves to work and be capable of creativity, innovation and improvement, and will increase the level of their motivation to teaching. These results are in line with those of Blaskova and Blasko (2013); Visser-Wijnveen, Stes, and Petegem (2014) and Aziz, Akhtar, and Rauf (2012), which showed that the level of the faculty members' motivation was high.

Results of question two: Are there statistically significant differences in the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching in the Hashemite University attributed to gender, college, academic rank and years of experience variables?

To answer this section, the M's and SDs of the study sample evaluation degree of the motivation to teaching level as per the gender, college, academic rank and years of experience variables were calculated, as shown in **Table 5**.

Table 5 shows apparent differences in the means of the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching as per gender, college, academic rank and years of experience variables. To identify the difference significance in the means of the faculty members' motivation to teaching, as per gender and college variables, the researchers employed the T-Test. And, to identify the difference significance in the means of the faculty members' motivation to teaching, as per the academic rank and years of experience variables, they employed the One-Way ANOVA analysis, as shown in **Tables 7-12**.

First: Gender Variable

Table 6 shows statistically significant differences in the personal efficacy, interest and enjoyment and importance and effort dimensions as per the gender variable, where T values were statistically significant, in favor of the female faculty members. The table also shows statistically significant differences in the teaching efficacy as per the gender variable, where T values were statistically significant, in favor of the males. There were no statistically significant differences in motivation to teaching and outcomes efficacy dimensions among the sample participants as per the gender, as T value was not statistically significant. Finally, the results did not show differences in motivation to teaching ascribed to the gender variable. This result may be interpreted by that both the male and female faculty members live the same conditions and are entrusted the same academic and teaching assignments. Therefore, this reflects that the motivation to teaching of both the male

Table 6. T-Test Results of the Level of the Faculty Members' Motivation as per the Gender Variable

Dimensions	Gender	Number	M	Freedom Degree	T Value	Sign.
Personal Efficacy	Male	182	3.73	230	-3.088	*0.00
	Female	50	3.89			
Teaching Efficacy	Male	182	2.97	230	3.267	*0.00
	Female	50	2.45			
Outcomes Efficacy	Male	182	3.49	230	0.437	*0.00
	Female	50	3.46			
Interest and Enjoyment	Male	182	3.69	230	-3.692	*0.00
	Female	50	3.90			
Importance and Effort	Male	182	3.73	230	-3.654	*0.00
	Female	50	3.94			
Motivation to Teaching	Male	182	3.52	230	-0.058	0.95
	Female	50	3.53			

and female faculty members is equal. As for the differences in the motivation to teaching dimensions, the results showed that they were in favor of the female faculty members, which reflects more effect of the social conditions on the female faculty members than the males. Furthermore, the personal factors of the females are more evident than those of the males, as the females are more sensitive and influenced than the males. This, in turn, leads to increase the females' personal efficacy, teaching efficacy, interest and enjoyment, and importance and effort. The result could be further explained by that the females are more interested in teaching, more willing to teach and more willing to prove and realize their selves than the males. Still, it could be explained in the light of the fear of negative evaluation, as the female faculty members are more afraid of the negative evaluation than the males. The results of the current study are not in line with those of the study of Aziza, Akhtar, and Rauf (2012), which showed statistically significant differences in the faculty members' motivation to teaching as per the gender variable, in favor of the males.

Second: College Variable

Table 7 shows statistically significant differences in the teaching efficacy, outcomes efficacy, interest and enjoyment, importance and effort, and motivation to teaching dimensions among the study sample participants, as per the college variable. All T values were statistically significant and the differences were in favor of the humanities colleges faculty members, while there were no statistically significant differences in the personal efficacy among the faculty members as per the college variable, where T value was not statistically significant. This result seems logical because the courses the faculty members teach in the humanities colleges are different in nature from those taught in the scientific colleges. In the humanities colleges, the faculty members most often provide opportunities for dialogues, discussions, and opinion expression about the course topics during teaching. This leads to effective interaction between the faculty members and their students, and subsequently, may increase their motivation to teaching. The faculty members of the scientific colleges may not employ such strategies during teaching, as the nature of the scientific courses is characterized by rigidity and proven facts. The results of the current study are in line with those of Visser-Wijnveen, Stes, and Petegem, (2014), which provided that the teaching topics variable is the most affecting on the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching.

Table 7. T-Test Results of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching as per the College Variable

Dimensions	College	Number	M	Freedom Degree	T Value	Sign.
Personal Efficacy	Scientific	126	3.72	230	-1.962	0.06
	Humanities	106	3.81			
Teaching Efficacy	Scientific	126	2.48	230	-6.778	*0.00
	Humanities	106	3.32			
Outcomes Efficacy	Scientific	126	3.40	230	-3.155	*0.00
	Humanities	106	3.59			
Interest and Enjoyment	Scientific	126	3.62	230	-5.202	*0.00
	Humanities	106	3.86			
Importance and Effort	Scientific	126	3.68	230	-4.701	*0.00
	Humanities	106	3.89			
Motivation to Teaching	Scientific	126	3.38	230	-6.444	*0.00
	Humanities	106	3.69			

Table 8. Results of the One-Way ANOVA Analysis of the level of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching as per the Academic rank Variable

Dimensions	Source of Variance	Total Squares	Freedom Degrees	Squares Mean	F Value	Sign.
Personal Efficacy	Between groups	3.346	2	1.673	16.147	*0.00
	Within groups	23.729	229	1.104		
	Total	27.075	231			
Teaching Efficacy	Between groups	3.447	2	1.724	1.644	*0.19
	Within groups	240.099	229			
	Total	243.546	231			
Outcomes Efficacy	Between groups	2.563	2	1.281	6.623	*0.00
	Within groups	44.309	229	0.193		
	Total	46.872	231			
Interest and Enjoyment	Between groups	3.409	2	1.704	14.548	*0.00
	Within groups	26.830	229	0.117		
	Total	30.239	231			
Importance and Effort	Between groups	2.090	2	1.045	8.933	*0.00
	Within groups	26.792	229	0.117		
	Total	28.883	231			
Motivation to Teaching	Between groups	2.496	2	1.248	8416	*0.00
	Within groups	33.960	229	0.148		
	Total	36.457	231			

Third: Academic Rank Variable

Table 8 shows statistically significant differences in the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching, as a whole, on the personal efficacy, outcomes efficacy, interest and enjoyment, and importance and effort dimensions, as per the academic rank variable, as all F values were statistically significant. On the other hand, there were no statistically significant differences in the teaching efficacy dimension attributed to the academic rank, as F value was not statistically significant. To identify the differences in the means, the researchers used Scheffe post hoc comparison test as shown in **Table 9**.

Table 9 shows that the differences in the level of motivation to teaching, on the four motivation dimensions among the study sample participants, were within the faculty members of the assistant professor rank as compared with those of the associate professor and professor ranks, in favor of the faculty members of associate professor and professor ranks. This result may be explained by the heavy workloads and research works the assistant professors are burdened, which lead them to distribute their efforts over multiple assignments, and, therefore, their motivation to teaching declines. As for the increase of motivation to teaching among the faculty members of the associate professor and professor ranks, the reason may be that they feel capable to share in the decision making and other works and assignments entrusted to them, based on the rank and experience in teaching and scientific research fields. Furthermore, it could be interpreted by that they feel the job security, which leads to an increase in their motivation to teaching. The material aspect might also have a role in their

Table 9. Results of Scheffe Post Hoc Comparison Test of the level of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching as per the Academic rank Variable

Dimensions	Academic rank	M	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Personal Efficacy	Assistant Professor	3.56		-0.30	-0.22
	Associate Professor	3.86	0.30		
	Professor	3.78	0.22		
Outcomes Efficacy	Assistant Professor	3.31		-0.25	-0.22
	Associate Professor	3.56	0.25		
	Professor	3.53	0.22		
Interest and Enjoyment	Assistant Professor	3.53		-0.30	-0.22
	Associate Professor	3.83	0.30		
	Professor	3.75	0.22		
Importance and Effort	Assistant Professor	3.62		-0.23	-0.19
	Associate Professor	3.85	0.23		
	Professor	3.81	0.19		
Motivation to Teaching	Assistant Professor	3.34		-0.24	-0.24
	Associate Professor	3.58	0.24		
	Professor	3.58	0.24		

Table 10. Results of the One-Way ANOVA of the Level of the Faculty Members' Motivation as per the Years of Experience Variable

Dimensions	Source of Variance	Total Squares	Freedom Degrees	Squares Mean	F Value	Sign.
Personal Efficacy	Between groups	1.767	2	0.884	7.994	*0.00
	Within groups	25.308	229	0.111		
	Total	27.075	231			
Teaching Efficacy	Between groups	17.769	2	8.885	9.011	*0.00
	Within groups	255.777	229	0.986		
	Total	243.456	231			
Outcomes Efficacy	Between groups	1.679	2	0.839	4.254	*0.01
	Within groups	45.193	229	0.197		
	Total	46.872	231			
Interest and Enjoyment	Between groups	1.210	2	0.605	4.773	*0.00
	Within groups	29.029	229	0.127		
	Total	30.230	231			
Importance and Effort	Between groups	0.897	2	0.449	3.672	*0.02
	Within groups	27.985	229	0.122		
	Total	28.883	231			
Motivation to Teaching	Between groups	2.282	2	1.141	7.645	*0.00
	Within groups	34.175	229	0.149		
	Total	36.457	231			

motivation to teaching, as the holders of these academic ranks enjoy more financial privileges than those of assistant professor rank.

Fourth: Years of Experience Variable

Table 10 shows statistically significant differences in the level of the faculty members' motivation to teaching, as a whole, and the five dimensions of the motivation to teaching, as per the years of experience level, as F values were statistically significant. To obtain the difference significant among the means, Scheffe post hoc comparison test was applied as shown in **Table 11**.

Table 11 shows that the differences in the means of the level of motivation to teaching and the teaching efficacy dimensions of the sample participants were among the members whose teaching experience is less than five years, as compared with those whose experience is between six and ten years, and those whose experience is more than eleven years, in favor of the faculty members whose experience is between six and ten years, and those whose experience is more than eleven years. The table further shows that the differences in

Table 11. Results of Scheffe Post Hoc Comparison Test of the Level of the Faculty Members' Motivation to Teaching as per the Years of Experience Variable

Dimensions	Years of Experience	M	5 Years and Less	6-10 Years	More than 11 Years
Personal Efficacy	5 years and less	3.64			-0.19
	6-10 Years	3.67			
	More than 11 Years	3.83	0.19		
Teaching Efficacy	5 years and less	2.31		-0.88	-0.59
	6-10 Years	3.19	0.88		
	More than 11 Years	2.90	0.59		
Outcomes Efficacy	5 years and less	3.31			-0.23
	6-10 Years	3.47			
	More than 11 Years	3.54	0.23		
Interest and Enjoyment	5 years and less	3.61			-0/18
	6-10 Years	3.68			
	More than 11 Years	3.79	0.18		
Importance and Effort	5 years and less	3.67			-0.16
	6-10 Years	3.73			
	More than 11 Years	3.83	0.16		
Motivation to Teaching	5 years and less	3.31		-0.24	-0.27
	6-10 Years	3.55	0.24		
	More than 11 Years	3.58	0.27		

the means of the personal efficacy dimension, the outcomes efficacy dimension, the interest and enjoyment dimension, and the importance and effort dimensions among the faculty members, were within those whose experience is more than eleven years, and in their favor. The result seems logical, as the more the years of experience, the more the motivation to teaching level is, due the accumulation of their experiences and teaching multiple and various courses. And, the more the faculty members' teaching experience, the more their motivation to teaching is, because experience reflects on the teacher's personality in terms of the knowledge accumulation, and because they know that their role is not confined to teaching but extends to prepare generations for different fields. This result could be interpreted based on that the productivity of the faculty members, who have more diversified experiences, will increase in the teaching field, and subsequently, this will be reflected on their motivation to teaching. They continuously feel that their different needs are satisfied, and thus their behavior is directed to increase their productivity to approach the sufficient level of gratification.

In the light of the results the researchers concluded, they recommend the following: Attention to provide material and moral support to the faculty members, especially the distinguished. Highlighting the faculty members' abilities and skills in various areas and encouraging their creativity and innovation through activities inside and outside the university. Interest in introducing the faculty members' problems inside the university and making attempts to overcome them as far as possible. Carrying out further studies that deal in the faculty members' motivation and job satisfaction level.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Zuhair H. Al-Zo'ibi – Department of Fundamentals of Education and Management, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan.

Ahmad M. Mahasneh – Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Cader, A. (2012). *Motivational issues of faculty in Saudi Arabia* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). Walden University, United States.
- Adams, B., & Bailey, G. D. (1989). School is for teachers: Enhancing the school environment. *NASSP Bulletin*, 73, 44-48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263658907351310>
- Ambrose, M. L., & Kulik, C. T. (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25, 231–292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500302>
- Aziz, F., Akhtar, M. S., & Rauf, M. (2012). The motivation level of trained male and female teachers at higher education level in Pakistan: A comparative study. *The Dialogue*, 7(2), 138- 151.
- Bahrami, M. A., Ezzatabadi, M. R., Jamali, E., Tafti, A. D., Tehrani, G. A., & Ardakani, S. E. (2012). Job motivation factors: a case study of an Iranian Medical University. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 1(10), 345-352.
- Bailey, J. G. (1999). Academics' motivation and self-efficacy for teaching and research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 18, 343–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436990180305>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 71–81). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Blaskova, M., & Blasko, R. (2013). Motivation of university teachers and its connections. *International Scientific Journal Human Resources Management and Ergonomic*, 2, 6-21.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109–132. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153>
- Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). A proposal for an international collaborative research programmers to identify the impact of initial training on university teachers. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5, 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787404040463>
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569–582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569>
- Graham, S. (1991). A review of attribution theory in achievement contexts. *Educational Psychology Review*, 3, 5–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01323661>
- Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Education Research Journal*, 31, 627–643. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312031003627>
- Hidi, S. (2001). Interest, reading, and learning: theoretical and practical considerations. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13, 191–209. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016667621114>
- Kim, D. (2013). *Tertiary teachers motivation for choosing and remaining in teaching in a public university in Cambodia* (Unpublished Master dissertation), Victoria University of Wellington, Cambodia.
- Kunter, M., Tsai, Y.-M., Klusmann, U., Brunner, M., Krauss, S., & Baumert, J. (2008). Students' and mathematics teachers' perceptions of teacher enthusiasm and instruction. *Learning and Instruction*, 18(5), 468–482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.06.008>
- Locke, E. A. (1996). Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 5, 117–124. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849\(96\)80005-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(96)80005-9)
- Macfarlane, B., & Hughes, G. (2009). Turning teachers into academics? The role of educational development in fostering synergy between teaching and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46, 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290802646214>
- Munyengabe, S., Haiyan, H., Yiyi, Z., & Jiefei, S. (2017). Factors and Levels Associated with Lecturers' Motivation and Job Satisfaction in a Chinese University. *EURASIA: Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education*, 13(10), 6415-6430. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/77946>
- Ololube, N. P. (2004). Professionalism: An Institutional Approach to Teachers' Job Effectiveness in Nigerian Schools. *Seventh International LL in E Conference*.
- Owens, R. G. (1995). *Organizational behavior in education*. 5th edition. Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1973). Organizational work and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 76-151. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034829>

- Rasheed, M. I., Aslam, H. D., & Sarwar, S. (2010). Motivational issues for teachers in higher education: A critical case of IUB. *Journal of Management Research*, 2(2), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v2i2.349>
- Rowley, J. (1996). Motivation and academic staff in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4(3), 11-16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684889610125814>
- Sharabyan, S. K. (2011). An investigation into Iranian language teachers' motivation with respect to their job satisfaction and second language pedagogy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 1071-1075. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.209>
- Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1996). Teacher efficacy: Toward the understanding of a multi-faceted construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12, 401-411. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(95\)00047-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00047-N)
- Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Shapiro, D. L. (2004). The future of work motivation theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(3), 379-387.
- Stembridge, A. F. (1990). Teacher motivation: An essential requirement in the integration of faith and learning in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges. *Christ in the Classroom*, 4, 169-189.
- Trigwell, K., Ashwin, P., Lindblom-Ylance, S., & Nevgi, A. (2004). *Variation in approaches to university teaching: the role of regulation and motivation*. Paper presented at the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI) Higher Education Special Interest Group conference, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 944-956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003>
- Vallerand, R. J., & Bissonnette, R. (1992). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and a motivational styles as predictors of behavior: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 599-620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00922.x>
- Visser-Wijnveen, G. J., Stes, A., & Van Petegem, P. (2012). "Development and Validation of a Questionnaire Measuring Teachers' Motivations for Teaching in Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 64(3), 421-436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9502-3>
- Vockell, E. L. (2001). *Educational psychology. A practical approach* (Online Ed.), <http://education.calumet.purdue.edu/vockell/EdPsyBook/>
- Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6, 137-148. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(90\)90031-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(90)90031-Y)

