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ABSTRACT

PREFERENCES FOR INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC SPORT MOTIVATORS
OF MISSISSIPPI’S PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

by Jason Hugh Rayborn

May 2015

The purpose of this study was to determine if Mississippi’s teachers teach for the same motivational reasons that athletes practice their sport. Certified teachers (N=380) from Mississippi were asked to complete a modified version of the Sport Motivation Scale-II (SMS-II) survey. This modified version of the instrument, the SMS-II-ED, included 18 questions from 6 different extrinsic, intrinsic, and a-motivational subgroups and one qualitative question for a total of 19 questions. Preliminary demographic items included teacher’s grade level taught (K-5, 6-8, 9-12), years’ experience (1-10, 11-19, 20+), and previous high school or collegiate sport participation (yes or no).

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the variables and a between subjects MANOVA was used to analyze potential differences between each of the independent variables (grade level taught, years’ of experience, previous sport participation) and the dependent variables (six subgroups of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation). Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated for each motivational subgroup to verify reliability.

The results of the study showed that there were no significant differences between the teachers’ grade level taught or years’ experience and the manner in which they were most motivated. Pillai’s Trace test found that there was a significant difference between
the surveyed teachers who previously participated in sport and their peers who did not on the three survey items within the extrinsic motivation integrated subgroup. These three items were question four, because teaching reflects the essence of whom I am, question 11, because teaching is an integral part of my life, and question 14, because through teaching, I am living in line with my deepest principles.

Overall, the teachers of Mississippi placed scores on the 1-7 Likert-type scaled survey in nearly the exact order from most to least autonomous, in line with Deci & Ryan’s (1991) self-determination theory, which the instrument was originally based upon. It seems that the teachers of Mississippi teach for intrinsic reasons, and are not a-motivated towards teaching, which is exceptional news from an administrative standpoint. Motivational ideas that could possibly connect the 180 days that Mississippi school teachers teach with the closely related MLB season are included, as well as recommendations for educational administrative practices and future research.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Major League Baseball (MLB) players spend 8 months each year playing baseball. This sport is demanding (to say the least) due to the fact that once the season begins, baseball players play 162 regular season games in a matter of 180 days (Silva, 2012). With spring training games and sometimes post-season appearances, these players compete at a professional level for approximately 200 games per year (Silva, 2012). Professional MLB athletes are expected to focus and perform at an extremely high level for every game and face the demands of the season in a professional manner (Brodsy & Ekhaus, 2002). There is a need for these athletes to be motivated because motivation has been shown to increase positive outcomes, including performance (Vallerand, 2004). In comparison, teachers are being faced with a plethora of tasks that interfere with actual teaching (Weinstock, 2008). With changing curriculums and tests, evolving technologies, more rigorous evaluations, new salary plans, and problematic parents, it seems teachers are being led in many stressful and challenging directions (Flook, Goldberg, Pinger, Bonus, & Davidson, 2013; Whitaker, Whitaker, & Lumpa, 2009).

Interestingly, the 180 days that MLB players work is the same number of days that public school teachers in Mississippi are required by law (Meador, 2014) to spend on instruction each school year. It seems fitting that one MLB team’s goal of getting better every day and finishing strong (Badenhausen, 2013) could easily carry over to be a school’s goal, as end of the year assessments are so meaningful. As it is vitally important for students and teachers to “finish strong”, MLB teams most important games are usually their final games at the end of the year. What if motivational factors used in sport
were applied to the school environment? Do teachers in Mississippi teach for the same reasons that athletes participate in their sport?

Statement of the Problem

Kocabas (2009) asserted that “low motivation levels in the teacher, who is in a critical position in the education and schooling process, has a negative impact on the achievement of high standards in education” (p. 724) and that motivating teachers was the responsibility of the administrator. Whitaker et al. (2009) noted one difference between high functioning schools and those schools that lack the energy and excitement necessary to be labeled as such lies within the motivation and morale of those who work there. The problem is how can administrators motivate teachers so that they can have the energy and excitement in order to teach as effectively as possible? This study addresses this problem by providing a better understanding of how motivational factors currently used in education and sport effectively motivate teachers to perform at optimal levels.

Justification of the Study

“How can we maintain the energy of the first day of school all year long?” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 3). Cain’s (2012b) ideas on athletic peak performance, focusing on the process over the outcome, seems transferable to the field of education. Those who desire to become a peak performer “must learn to differentiate between what you can control and what you cannot control” (Cain, 2012a, p. 61). Cain (2012a) also wrote of motivation needing to be a regular occurrence for optimal performance, and that “inspiration and motivation should be performed every single day” (p. 292). This “every single day” nearly perfectly equates, with MLB and the school year in Mississippi’s public schools, at 180 days. With MLB teams playing 162 regular season games in
approximately 180 days (Silva, 2012), and the stresses and rigors of cross country travel, nutrition, and being away from family, it is amazing to see how motivated and disciplined these professional players really are (Ortiz, 2014; Surmacz, 2014).

What makes them give their best each day? What motivates them to maintain focus and determination when no one would blame them for taking a day off? Could these same motivational factors be used by administrators in trying to get teachers to give their best every day? Tull (2011) asserted that determining factors that motivate teachers could be “one of the keys to creating a successful educational environment for students” (p. 97). This study aims to determine if sport motivational factors will carry over into the field of education.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical basis of this study derives from the works of several psychologists, philosophers, and researchers and their contributions to the idea of motivation. These include Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs, which includes six levels of individual needs where the lowest level must be met before the person can move to the next level. Teachers must have their lower levels met before they can be motivated at another level (Whitaker et al., 2009). Herzberg’s (1968) two factor theory of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation, hygiene versus motivational factors, or satisfiers versus dissatisfiers is also studied as a vital link towards understanding employee job satisfaction. He attempted to distinguish between motivators that satisfy employees and motivators that produce the opposite effect (de-motivate) (Ellis, 1984; Whitaker et al., 2009). It is important for educational administrators to understand that they do have the
ability to “provide the interpersonal things that most affect morale” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 9).

Deci and Ryan’s (1991) self-determination theory (SDT) is also considered in this study and “it distinguishes between self-determined and controlled types of intentional regulation” of individuals’ behaviors (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991, p. 326). Ryan and Deci (2000) also asserted through SDT that motivation can be mapped from one extreme to another with intrinsic motivation on one end of the continuum to amotivation on the other end. Such distinctions can be instrumental in determining where teachers’ attitudes lie within these extremes. Dweck (2006) wrote directly about teachers in her theory on mindsets: the fixed mindset versus the growth mindset. Fixed mindset teachers “think of themselves as finished products” and the growth mindset teachers see teaching as a “wonderful way to learn” (Dweck, 2006, p. 201). Pink’s (2009) Motivation 3.0 is also a useful, more recent theory that criticizes the old way of motivating employees which was “seek reward and avoid punishment” (p. 16). Instead, Pink suggested cultivating a school environment where teachers are intrinsically motivated through three principles: autonomy, mastery, and purpose (Nordgren, 2013; Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Pink, 2009; Tull, 2011). The theories from these individuals covers several decades of research and a broad spectrum of ideas about the human condition and how motivating / being motivated is connected to the individuals in the fields of education and sport.

Motivation

Motivation is defined as a “hypothetical construct that is used to describe the internal and / or external forces that lead to the initiation, direction, intensity, and
persistence of behavior” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 427). “Definitions of motivation may vary but all agree that almost everyone is motivated in one way or another” (Kocabas, 2009, p. 725). Some are motivated intrinsically, i.e., motivated from within; others are motivated extrinsically, i.e., motivated from an outside source of reward such as money, ribbons, medals, trophies, or praise (Hughes, 2013). Because everyone is unique and has different interests and attitudes, sources of motivation differ from one individual to the next (Kocabas, 2009).

When writing of motivation in the work environment, several authors commented on how unique and intertwined the types of motivation are. Kumar (2011) noted that “total motivation of an employee is a cumulative effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation taken together” (p.41). Hughes (2013) separated the two, as one helps develop the other, stating “extrinsic motivation may be an event(s) which can be used to develop intrinsic motivation” (p. 92). Pink (2009) noted that motivators are not always positive, asserting that extrinsic motivators “often produce the opposite of what they set out to achieve” (p.10). Motivation is a unique construct because “it is not an observable event, nor is it an object that can be examined under a microscope” (Kocabas, 2009, p.726). The purpose of this study is to determine the motivational factors currently used in education and sport and how those factors may effectively motivate teachers to perform at optimal levels.

*Intrinsic Motivation*

Intrinsic motivation is defined as “engaging in an activity for itself and for the pleasure and satisfaction derived from participation” (Vallerand, 2004, p.427), as when an individual plays baseball for “no reason other than because that is what he wants to
It can be more simply defined by an attitude of an individual where “the joy of the task is its own reward” (Pink, 2009, p. 3). There are 3 types of intrinsic motivation: to know, to accomplish things, and to experience stimulation (Pelletier, Fortier, Valierand, Tuson, Briere, & Blais, 1995; Valierand, 2004). “Unfortunately, intrinsic motivation cannot be administered directly” (McAllister & Vandlen, 2010, p.2), which is why understanding it is so important.

For purposes of this study, several intrinsic motivational factors are further discussed in Chapter II. One of the factors involves the autonomy of the employee and its connection to being highly motivated (Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Pink, 2009; Whitaker, 2003). Pink’s (2009) Motivation 3.0 theory that involves autonomy, mastery, and purpose are further reviewed as well. Employee self-efficacy and its connection with increased performance and productivity is another intrinsic motivation factor that is further addressed in Chapter II (Cherian & Jacob, 2013). Another intrinsic factor that merits mention involves the notion that employees want to strive towards something greater than themselves (Glass, 2011; Peters, 2010; Price, 2012; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Several researchers (Diamantes, 2004; Glass, 2011; Price, 2012) wrote of the importance of an employee being in agreement with organizational goals as being an important intrinsic motivating factor. Finally, the workplace’s environment or atmosphere and how that relates to job satisfaction is another intrinsic factor that is further considered in Chapter II (Miller & Swick, 1976; Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Whitaker, 2003).
Extrinsic Motivation

Extrinsic motivation is defined as “engaging in an activity as a means to an end and not for the activity’s own sake” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 427). Extrinsic motivation comes from an “outside source such as external rewards to motivate behavior” (Hughes, 2013, p.92). Researchers concluded that extrinsic motivation can motivate employees or it can provide unintended consequences (Hughes, 2013; Pink, 2009). In other words, “extrinsic can either be helpful or harmful to intrinsic motivation” (Hughes, 2013, p. 93). The literature pointed to 4 types of extrinsic motivation, from least to most autonomous: external regulation, introjection, identification, and integrated regulation (Pelletier et al., 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Herzberg (1968) and Whitaker et al. (2009) asserted that for extrinsic motivating factors to be effective, the superior’s attention should think more about the worker instead of the reward. Because everyone is different, it is important to focus on individuals and how they are motivated individually (Bullough, Jr. & Hall-Kenyon, 2011). Pink (2009) and Hughes (2013) noted that extrinsic motivation has more credibility when it is applied correctly. Since external rewards are often used to motivate, Pink (2009) suggested using the reward after the task is completed, so that it remains unexpected and comes as a surprise. This idea serves as motivation for future endeavors. In writing of the seriousness of extrinsic motivation, Hughes (2013) stated that “individuals in a leadership position who do not understand the art of extrinsic motivation should avoid it” (p. 94).

For purposes of this study, several extrinsic motivating factors are further discussed in Chapter II. One of the extrinsic factors is pay (Diamantes, 2004, Peters &
Although local districts may subsidize pay, the money that a public school teacher in Mississippi can earn is mostly limited, due to the single salary schedule used by the state (Elpus, 2011). However, teacher pay is currently a heavily talked about topic in Mississippi where House Bill 504 was recently passed to include teacher and school performance incentives (merit) that will be implemented in the near future (Dees, 2014). Regardless, it seems as if there is no perfect way to measure teachers’ competence within the idea of merit pay (Green, 2014; Miller & Swick, 1976). Another extrinsic motivating factor that is discussed in Chapter II involves teacher praise (Schwartz, 2009, Whitaker, 2003). Kumar (2011) noted a significantly positive relationship between praise and motivation, as it seems that simple compliments can raise levels of enthusiasm and creativity among teachers. A third extrinsic motivating factor involves shared decision making between administrators and their subordinates (Davis & Wilson, 2000; Price, 2012). The opportunity for advancement (Miller & Swick, 1976; Whitaker et al., 2009) is also an extrinsic factor that is further discussed in Chapter II. The opportunity to professionally collaborate with peers (Glass, 2011; Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Sadri & Bowen, 2011) and full administrative support (Kumar, 2011; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008) are also motivating extrinsic factors that are further discussed in Chapter II.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

R₁ - Are teachers motivated to teach for reasons similar to why athletes practice their sport?

R₂ - Which intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors do teachers perceive to influence the reasons they teach?
Research Hypotheses

H₁ - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ years of experience.

H₂ - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ grade level taught (K-5, 6-8, 9-12).

H₃ - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ previous participation in sport.

Definition of Terms

1. A-motivation - When an extrinsic motivation tactic results in less than optimal overall performance (Pink, 2009) or achieves the opposite of the intended result. “A-motivated individuals do not perceive contingencies between their actions and the outcomes of their actions” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). A synonym of a-motivation is de-motivation.


3. Carrots – sticks motivation - A type of extrinsic motivation in which an individual is enticed to something for a reward or threatened punishment for not (Pink, 2009).

4. Extrinsic motivation - “Engaging in an activity as a means to an end and not for the activity’s own sake” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 427). Four types have been researched on an independent basis. First, external regulation refers to behavior that is controlled by external sources, such as material rewards, praise, constraints
imposed by others, or the avoidance of negative consequences (as cited in Pelletier et al., 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Next, introjection occurs when “the formally external source of motivation has been internalized such that its actual presence is no longer needed to initiate behavior. Instead, these behaviors are reinforced though internal pressures such as guilt or anxiety” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). Identification “reflects a conscious valuing of a behavioral goal or regulation, such that the action is accepted or owned as personally important” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 72). Finally, integrated regulation involves regulations that have been evaluated and made personally important by an individual. Its actions closely resemble intrinsic motivation, but are performed for outcomes rather than enjoyment (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

5. Intrinsic motivation - Motivation that comes from within an individual and is not directed by others (Deci et al., 1991; Hughes, 2013; McAllister & Vandlen, 2010; Nordgren, 2013). Three types have been researched on an independent basis. First, intrinsic motivation to know involves “performing an activity for the pleasure and satisfaction that one experiences while learning, exploring, or trying to understand something new” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 36-37). Next, intrinsic motivation towards accomplishments is defined as “engaging in an activity for the pleasure and satisfaction experienced when one attempts to accomplish or create something” Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37). Lastly, Intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation “occurs when someone engages in an activity in order to experience stimulating sensations (e.g., sensory pleasure, aesthetic experiences, as well as fun
and excitement) derived from one’s engagement in that activity (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37).


7. *Generational differences* - The differences between the ages of employees who work together, as well as “the generational cohort to which the employee belongs” (Dekay, 2013, p. 250).

8. *Growth-mindset* – The thought processes of an individual who has the attitude of continual learning (Dweck, 2006).


10. *Motivation* - “The hypothetical construct that is used to describe the internal and/or external forces that lead to the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 427). This also includes intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

11. *Motivation 2.0* - The belief that “rewarding an activity will get you more of it and punishing an activity will get you less of it” (Pink, 2009, p. 32).

12. *Motivation 3.0* - A theory developed by Daniel Pink (2009) in which an environment is cultivated to recognize that employees are intrinsically motivated through the principles of autonomy, mastery, and purpose.
13. **Professional Learning Community (PLC)** – For purposes of this study, is defined as “a school where people are united by a common purpose, shared vision, collective commitments, and specific, measurable goals” (as cited in Burnette, 2002, p. 51).

14. **School climate** - “The collective personality of a school, the atmosphere as characterized by the social and professional interactions of the individuals in the school” (as cited in Whitaker et al., 2009, p.107).

15. **Self-efficacy** - An individual’s confidence in their own ability (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008).

16. **Self-Determination Theory (SDT)** - A theory conceived by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan (1991) that identifies three needs that must be met for optimal performance to occur: competence, relatedness, and autonomy. When these needs are met, the results are positive; when unmet, the results are negative (Pink, 2009).

17. **Sport Motivation Scale (SMS)** – A survey instrument that consists of 7 subscales that measures 3 types of intrinsic motivation, 3 types of extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation (Pelletier et al., 1995).

18. **Sport motivational factors** - For the purposes of this study, includes intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors that are often used to help understand how athletes are motivated.

19. **Teacher** - For purposes of this study, includes an individual employed by a public school district in Mississippi who has achieved public school certification.
by the state of Mississippi and currently teaches students at the kindergarten through 12th grade level.

20. **Teacher morale** - The overall level of enthusiasm among teachers as a whole at a school (Whitaker et al., 2009).

21. **Team** - “Any group of people who organize in a cooperative effort driven by a shared purpose to achieve a common goal” (Cain, 2012a, p. 311).

22. **Trust** - The confidence that individuals within the school can be counted on to do what they say they will do (as cited in Whitaker et al., 2009).

**Delimitations**

1. Participants will be limited to certified teachers employed in select public schools in Mississippi during the 2014-2015 school year.

2. Schools selected for this study were chosen by convenience sample.

3. Survey methodology will be used to determine whether or not there are statistically significant differences between the independent variables (years of experience, school level taught, and/or previous sport participation) and the dependent variables (six subgroups of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation integrated, external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation).

**Assumptions**

1. It is assumed that the researcher will only have access to certified teachers within the selected schools to complete the survey.

2. It is assumed that the participants will provide accurate and honest answers to survey questions.
3. It is assumed that each survey participant can be motivated by one or more factors on the survey instrument.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents a thorough review of literature on motivation. It includes the theoretical framework and sections on intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors from the world of sport that could possibly be inserted into the field of education. It also includes reviews of studies on teacher motivation and how the teacher and administrator play roles in this process of motivation / being motivated.

Kocabas (2009) stated that “almost everyone is in some way motivated” (p. 724). Motivation is “the hypothetical construct that is used to describe the internal and/or external forces that lead to the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 427). Sadri and Bowen (2011) agreed with Vallerand (2004), stating that once the initiation of the goal is determined, motivation is described in terms of “direction (the choice of one activity over another), intensity (how hard an employee tries) and persistence (how long an employee continues with a behavior, even in the face of obstacles or adverse circumstances)” (p. 45).

“The concept of human motivation is at the core of any management-related discipline” (Welbourne, Andrews, & Andrews, 2005, p. 55). In society, motivation is highly valued because of the end result it can produce towards mobilizing others to act (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Considering the direct link between educational instruction and student success (DuFour & Mattos, 2013; Kocabas, 2009; Reeves, 2000; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Wallis, Healy, Hylton, & Klarreich, 2008), this desired action is effective, quality teaching. Barkley (2005) stated that “quality can be seen on the faces of teachers and administrators” (p. 10), and Kocabas (2009) contended that “the enthusiasm of the
teacher in daily activities has a significant impact on increasing the students’ motivation levels” (p. 725). With student educational growth and success serving as the ultimate goal of schools (Whitaker et al., 2009), it seems relevant for educational leaders to want highly motivated educators teaching in their schools. DuFour and Mattos (2013), authors and former principals, believed that teachers begin each day with honorable intentions, work tirelessly, and use the best teaching strategies that they possess in the best interest of their students, but questioned if intentions alone were enough. This is why the motivation of teachers by administrators is vital.

“It is a truism that giving people multiple reasons to engage in some activity will increase the chances of that activity” (Schwartz, 2009, p. 391). Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) stated that “a key issue for instructional leadership is whether there are indirect ways of enacting instructional leadership that will also affect classroom practice and, thus, student learning” (p. 460). Schwartz (2009) argued that the above mentioned truism was false and that educational motivation should be handled with “great care” (p. 391). Determining these indirect ways and how they can be carefully but positively effective to the educational setting is a strong task that falls on school administrators. This is of importance because there is evidence that “teacher motivation can be seen as an important factor for an effective educational system” (Muller & Hanfstingl, 2010).

This literature review includes theories from the historical background of motivation as well as more current thoughts on the topic. It also includes factors from the fields of education and sport in an effort to increase the quality of teaching being provided in today’s Mississippi classroom by motivational means. The view from sport serves to provide a fresh, relevant approach to the topic of motivation, which is difficult
to adequately and completely summarize because of its unobservable nature (Vallerand, 2004).

Theoretical Framework

The focus of this study relates to motivation and is therefore grounded in the works of theorists Maslow, Herzberg, Deci, Ryan, and Dweck, authors who have contributed significantly to the topic of motivation.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

In 1943, Abraham Maslow concluded that all individuals had five basic needs that are ranked in hierarchical order from lowest to highest: physiological, safety, love/belonging, esteem, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1943; Sadri & Bowen, 2011; Whitaker et al., 2009). According to Maslow (1943), unmet needs motivate individuals to act and that each need had to be met before the individual could progress to the next level. Once a need had been met, it would no longer serve as a significant motivational force for the individual. Later, Maslow added an additional stage to his hierarchy of needs model, self-transcendence (Koltko-Rivera, 2006).

The first of Maslow’s (1943) basic needs is physiological, which he said is impossible to quantify. These are the most basic needs: food, water, air, shelter, sleep, oxygen, and the like (Whitaker et al., 2009). These initial physiological needs are the most important, as a “person who is lacking food, safety, love, and esteem would most probably hunger for food more strongly than for anything else” (Maslow, 1943, p. 373). In modern societies, these needs could include monetary compensation, since money is used to meet most basic needs. Sadri and Bowen (2011) expressed this assertion by writing that “money is a vital part of employees’ reward packages and helps fulfill the
bulk of their physiological needs” (p. 45). These basic needs could also include a comfortable work environment, fresh air, and a host of other amenities including work–life balance, which has growing importance among the modern workforce (Sadri & Bowen, 2011).

The second stage in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is safety. Maslow (1943) stated that “practically everything looks less important than safety” (p. 376), even, at times, the first stage, the physiological needs of man. The relevance of this second stage to a study on teacher motivation may include a teacher’s need to feel safe in the school environment and the need to feel secure about the provision of retirement plans (Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Whitaker et al. (2009) stated that educational leaders “must realize that the teachers and staff members of their organizations must have their safety needs met” (p. 5). “It’s not enough for staff members just to be safe; they must also feel safe” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 5).

The next stage on Maslow’s hierarchy is the need for love and a sense of belonging. In the work environment, this would include work relationships with co-workers and bosses, and social support mechanisms (Sadri & Bowen, 2011). “The concept of ‘fitting in’ is critical” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 5). Sadri and Bowen (2011) and Whitaker and his colleagues (2009) agreed that an organization can become more efficient when the employees are allowed to collaborate and work in teams. A modern example of schools meeting teachers’ needs at this stage is the use of professional learning communities (PLC’s) which have become common in many schools (Dufour & Mattos, 2013). Maslow (1943) asserted that individual’s whose basic and safety needs
were met would “hunger for affectionate relations with people in general, and will strive with great intensity to achieve this goal” (p. 381).

Maslow’s next level of human motivation is the need of esteem, which includes responsibility, reputation, prestige, recognition, self-respect, and respect from others (Sadri & Bowen, 2011; Whitaker et al., 2009). Maslow (1943) stated that all people have a need or desire for a high evaluation of themselves, for self-respect or self-esteem, and for the esteem of others. He said these motivational characteristics can be broken down into two sections; first, the desire for strength, achievement, adequacy, independence, freedom, and confidence, and second, the desire for reputation or prestige, attention, and importance or appreciation (Maslow, 1943). As it relates to teaching, this could include many things, but praise and recognition from the administration are most important (Sadri & Bowen, 2011; Whitaker et al., 2009).

The fifth tier of Maslow’s original hierarchy is self-actualization. Maslow (1943) defined this trait by stating “what a man can be, he must be” (p. 382). This need for humans to become everything that they are capable of becoming varies from person to person. Employees who have satisfied the lower level needs can focus on bettering themselves and the world around them (Maslow, 1943; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). In education, this could include teachers being encouraged to further their education, being encouraged to raise money for charity, or it could include teachers receiving paid sabbaticals (Sadri & Bowen, 2011). According to Kovach (1995), organizations in the United States have focused more on satisfying the first four basic needs of the worker than they have in satisfying the egotistical or self-fulfillment need.
Maslow later added an additional level to his tier, self-transcendence. The motivational level of self-transcendence involves an individual seeking to further a cause beyond personal potential towards peak experience (Koltko-Rivera, 2006). Maslow found this additional tier through the realization that peak experiences often led individuals to go beyond the very self that was being actualized, becoming relatively egoless in the process (as cited in Koltko-Rivera, 2006). Organized psychology has been resistant to add this top tier of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Koltko-Rivera, 2006), and due to this, no connection to education was found in the literature.

In schools, the obvious leader is the principal (Whitaker et al., 2009). “Understanding where everyone is on the hierarchy can help a leader give people what they need to be more motivated in the workplace” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 5). In this way, the administrator can focus motivation efforts where they are most needed. As research on teachers for the purposes of this study was conducted, several of the factors listed on the survey could fall under Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory

Frederick Herzberg’s (1968) study titled *One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?* is the most reprinted article in the history of the *Harvard Business Review* (DeKay, 2013). The popularity of this article stems from original research in the book *The Motivation To Work* from 1959 in which he and his colleagues distinguished between extrinsic rewards surrounding a job, such as salaries, fringe benefits, and job security, and intrinsic rewards of the job itself, including self-respect, a sense of accomplishment, and personal growth (Ellis, 1984; as cited in Ewen, 1964; Herzberg, 1968; Whitaker et al., 2009). Herzberg wrote that, “while traditional motivators such as salary and quality of
supervision may lead to job satisfaction, only certain feelings—including feelings of achievement and recognition—are true motivators” (DeKay, 2013, p. 249). Herzberg also made clear his thoughts that employee compensation was not necessarily a motivator for improvement, but could be a de-motivator if not addressed (Glass, 2011; Herzberg, 1968; Whitaker et al., 2009). His two-factor theory of intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation (also called satisfiers versus dissatisfiers or hygiene versus motivators) (Ewen, Smith, Hulin, & Locke, 1966; Lidner, 1998; Herzberg, 1968; Whitaker et al., 2009) is a major contributor to this study due to the fact that the literature continually points back to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as the two types of motivation that have been most studied (Vallerand, 2004).

Herzberg’s 1959 study cited the factors of work itself, responsibility, and advancement as the major satisfiers, and company policy and administration, supervision (both technical and interpersonal relationships), working conditions, and pay as the major dissatisfiers (as cited in Ewen, 1964). These findings are in opposition to the traditional notion that when a satisfying motivator leads to worker satisfaction, then the absence of the satisfying motivator will lead to worker dissatisfaction, and vice versa (Ewen, 1964; Ewen et al.; 1966; Herzberg, 1968). Ewen (1964) wrote that it is difficult to compare other motivational aspects with Herzberg’s theory due to the fact that some satisfiers and dissatisfiers can overlap. Ewen (1964) stated “for example, supervision is a dissatisfier in the Herzberg schema. However, the supervisor may be a source of recognition, which is satisfying. Similarly, salary is a dissatisfier, but it may represent achievement and recognition, which are satisfiers” (p. 161).
Whitaker and his colleagues (2009) connected Herzberg’s theory with education, stating that “Herzberg’s theory is an important one for educational leaders because the essential items such as complimenting someone, allowing someone autonomy in their duties, and providing recognition are things that school leaders do have control over” (p. 9). This study aims to find out if these and other factors will work towards motivating teachers towards performing at optimal levels, as athletes often do.

Deci and Ryan’s Self-Determination Theory

Deci and Ryan’s (1991) self-determination theory (SDT) made an important distinction on behaviors that are intentional or motivated. “SDT focuses on the maximization of human potential” (Deal et al., 2013). SDT “distinguishes between self-determined and controlled types of intentional” behavior (Deci et al., 1991, p. 326). Deci and his colleagues (1991) asserted that “when a behavior is self-determined, the regulatory process is choice, but when it is controlled, the regulatory process is compliance (or in some cases defiance)” (p. 327). Deci and his colleagues (1991) also pointed out that most motivational ideas focus on goals or desired outcomes, but not on why certain outcomes are desired. SDT, like Maslow’s ideas, began with a notion of human needs: competence, autonomy, and relatedness, and when those needs are satisfied, individuals are motivated and happy (Pink, 2009).

Ryan and Deci (2000) agreed that motivation can be mapped: on one extreme is intrinsic motivation (most self-determined) and at the other extreme is a-motivation (non-self-determined). In between are four types of extrinsic motivation. From least to most self-determined they are: external regulation, introjection, identification, and integrated regulation.
Instead of attempting to determine motivational levels, Pink (2009) wrote that the focus should be on creating environments for one’s innate psychological needs to flourish. He noted that “SDT is an important part of a broad swirl of new thinking about the human condition” (p. 71). SDT asserts that individuals engage in intrinsically motivated behaviors for the sake of pleasure and satisfaction, without the necessity of rewards or constraints, and extrinsically motivated actions are performed because individuals perceive them to be instrumental to some degree (Deci et al., 1991).

Deci and Ryan (1987) were clear to also point out that SDT was not only intrinsic in nature, but that extrinsically motivated behavior could also be defined as self-determined. Ryan and Deci (2000) noted that an implication of SDT is that if teachers work in supportive environments where the development of a sense of competence and where autonomy is encouraged, then they will be able to focus more on the joys of teaching.

Dweck’s Theory on Mindset

In Dweck’s (2006) book Mindset, the author discussed a theory that is intriguing in terms of motivating employees. She claims that good teaching is about attitude and mindset: the fixed-mindset versus the growth-mindset. In reference to psychological debates about humans innate nature, Dweck (2012) claimed

The hallmark of human nature is how much of who we are-and who we become-is not built in. The hallmark of human nature is each person’s great capacity to adapt, to change, and to grow. In fact, perhaps what is built in is this capacity to learn and change according to the world you find yourself in. (p. 614)
Those who do not adapt to this ever-changing world hold a fixed-mindset. “The fixed-mindset teachers often think of themselves as finished products” (Dweck, 2006, p. 201). These individuals’ attitudes only allow for thinking of themselves as imparters of knowledge, therefore making motivation very difficult (Dweck, 2007; Pink, 2009). Individuals with a fixed-mindset believe that “each person has a fixed amount of intelligence and cannot change” (Dweck, 2012, p. 615).

On the other hand, the growth-mindset teacher thinks that “teaching is a wonderful way to learn” (Dweck, 2006, p. 201) about yourself, about people, and about what you teach, because “all people, no matter who they are, can become substantially more intelligent” (Dweck, 2012, p. 615). There is an assumption that schools are for students’ learning, but Dweck asked why they are not just as much for teacher learning. This emphasis on the growth-mindset teacher is an important concept towards motivation because “a good teacher is one who continues to learn along with the students” (Dweck, 2006, p. 201).

The growth-mindset educator can understand and use motivational tactics in the correct manner, towards increased student achievement, because the “growth mindset creates motivation and resilience-and leads to higher achievement” (Dweck, 2007, p.38). For higher student achievement to be achieved through increased motivation of teachers by school administrators, a growth mindset similar to the one Dweck writes of must be possessed, because her “signature insight is that what people believe shapes what people achieve” (Pink, 2009, p. 118). Dweck (2006) believed that the growth mindset can be changed. This gives hope to educational administrators attempting to motivate teachers.
Motivation

Motivation has been the subject of attention from a host of individuals, including playwrights, philosophers, and psychologists, but defining motivation is difficult because it is not directly observable (Vallerand, 2004). Understanding this difficulty, several researchers attempted to define motivation anyway. Vallerand (2004) defined motivation as “the hypothetical construct that is used to describe the internal and /or external forces that lead to the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior” (p.427). Hughes (2013) stated that motivation was “the degree of mental intensity directed towards the accomplishment of a goal” (p. 299). Davis and Wilson (2000) asserted that the goal of motivation was employees having pride in accomplishments and completing work with confidence. Because there are many different types of motivation and many different types of people, no consensus of a definition among researchers has been achieved (Vallerand, 2004; Imberman, 2012; DeKay, 2013); however, Kovach (1995) stated that motivation was a “key factor in determining employer success levels, and an area overlooked by many organizations” (p.107).

When considering motivators, one must first consider the individual, and no two are alike (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In attempting to motivate employees in the most appropriate way possible, the generational differences of the employees must be considered (Deal et al., 2013; DeKay, 2013; McAllister & Vandlen, 2010; Mousavvi-Bock, 2011). McAllister and Vandlen (2010) concluded that “in order for an organization to build an effective retention plan and keep its employee base highly motivated, strategies and tactics need to be tailored to reflect generational differences” (p. 2). DeKay (2013) stated that it is the problem of managers “to recognize these values
and to develop assignments and projects that will most effectively engage the identified values” (p. 250). DeKay (2013) also wrote that “the age of an employee and the generational cohort to which the employee belongs may illuminate those values most responsible for causing the individual to become emotionally engaged with a job” (p. 250).

These generational groups include

Baby Boomers (1945-1964), Generation X (1965-1981), and Generation Y (1982-2000). Baby Boomers are currently the largest generation in the workforce and tend to value job security and a stable work environment. They expect their hard work to be rewarded. Gen X’s are seen as individualists. Research shows this generation needs immediate, continuous feedback and is more likely to leave a job to see greater challenge and higher salary. The final generation, Gen Y, succeeds with social technology and diversity. Gen Y’s are comfortable with change and value skill development and the challenge of new opportunities. (McAllister & Vandlen, 2010, p. 3)

DeKay (2013) asserted that Herzberg’s ideas on intrinsic factors being genuine motivators may be valid for the baby boomer generation, but that the millennial’s (or Gen Y’s) are more likely to be motivated by extrinsic rewards.

Kovach (1995) also addressed generational differences through the results of workplace surveys conducted in 1946, 1981, and 1995:

The workers surveyed in 1946 came from an environment that is different from that of today’s workers. The United States had just come out of a depression and gone through a war. In 1995, after almost 35 years of relative prosperity and a
rise in the standard of living beyond the imagination of the workers in 1946, it is not surprising that the list of what workers wanted from their work had changed. (p. 94)

Deal and her colleagues (2013) studied generational differences versus managerial level differences and found that “managerial level better explains work motivation than does generation” (p. 1). These ideas on generational differences are worth noting due to the fact that several generations of workers occupy today’s workplaces and classrooms and each generally adheres to slightly differing values and means of motivation (DeKay, 2013). “Understanding what each generation thinks, values, and desires is critical for a more collaborative and successful work environment” (Moussavi-Bock, 2011). Once aspects such as this have been considered, then the superior can move towards motivating the individual in intrinsic and extrinsic manners.

On the opposite spectrum of motivation is a-motivation (or de-motivation) (Deci & Ryan, 1987). Ryan and Deci (2000) believed that “when a-motivated, people either do not act at all or act without intent- they just go through the motions” (p. 72). This is a complete absence of motivation due to a feeling of incompetence or uncontrollability (Vallerand, 2004; Wyatt, 2013). “A-motivated individuals do not perceive contingencies between their actions and the outcomes of their actions. They are neither intrinsically motivated nor extrinsically motivated” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38).

A-motivated teachers should not be in the classroom, and administrators should everything possible as to not de-motivate teachers. De-motivation falls right in line with Pink’s (2009) motivation 2.0 theory, that “carrots and sticks can achieve precisely the opposite of their intended aims” (p. 33). Pink (2009) warned that leaders should be
careful of expected rewards, because they tend to have a “substantially negative effect on intrinsic motivation” (p. 37). It seems that when the purpose of an activity changes, the willingness to do it changes, and therefore the quality of the work is affected (Schwartz, 2009).

Collins (2001) believed the real question is “how to manage in such a way as not to de-motivate people” (p. 74). One de-motivating idea is employee goals that are too simple or too difficult (Weiss, 2001). Other de-motivating factors that affect teachers include lack of preparatory time, course load, class size, poor pay, discipline issues, lack of individual teacher influence, and administrators showing unfair favoritism (Wallis et al., 2008; Weiss, 2001).

Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are the two most discussed in the literature, but again, the differences between the two are merely a “teleological aspect; whether the behavior is done for its inherent satisfaction (intrinsic) or is done in order to obtain a separable goal” (Deci & Ryan, 1987, p. 1034). Deci and Ryan (1987) discussed the difficulty in explaining motivational differences in a parable of an individual who loves to have a clean house but despises the process of cleaning it. If the individual willingly chooses to clean the house, that person would be self-determined (intrinsic) in doing it, but the behavior would be extrinsic because it is necessary to having a clean house, and the satisfaction is in the outcome rather than the process. In contrast, if the same individual cleans the house from a feeling of guilt or to satisfy a compulsion, that person would be extrinsically motivated because the behavior was controlled.
Intrinsic Motivation

Ryan and Deci (2000) asserted that “perhaps no single phenomenon reflects the positive potential of human nature as much as intrinsic motivation, the inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one’s capabilities, to explore, and to learn” (p. 70). Researchers agreed that intrinsic motivation comes from within an individual and is not directed by others, although the term can refer to the incentives that attract a person to participate in the work itself (Deci et al., 1991; McAllister & Vandlen, 2010; Nordgren, 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vallerand, 2004). Deci and his colleagues (1991) noted that when individuals are intrinsically motivated, they freely engage in activities that interest them, with a great attitude and without the necessity of material rewards or constraints, Davis and Wilson (2000) asserted that leaders can encourage intrinsic motivational factors at work by being positive, focusing on relationships, and making decisions that focus on employee and organizational growth.

Pelletier et al., (1995) noted that there are three types of intrinsic motivation. The first, intrinsic motivation to know involves “performing an activity for the pleasure and the satisfaction that one experiences while learning, exploring, or trying to understand something new” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 36-37). The second type is intrinsic motivation towards accomplishments. It can be defined as “engaging in an activity for the pleasure and satisfaction experienced when one attempts to accomplish or create something” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37). Intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation is the third type and “occurs when someone engages in an activity in order to experience stimulating sensations (e.g., sensory pleasure, aesthetic experiences, as well as fun and excitement) derived from one’s engagement in the activity” (Pelletier, et al., 1995, p. 37).
The freedom that comes with being intrinsically motivated connects the gap between the employee and a certain amount of creativity; or willingness to take risks, which can lead to more productivity in the workplace (Dweck, 2006; McAllister & Vandlen, 2010; Pink, 2009). One example of intrinsic motivation is termed a “free choice period” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 429), where individuals being studied are given an opportunity to engage again in an activity after the trial period is over, if they so desire. The more time spent on task after the experiment, the higher that participant’s intrinsic motivation level (Vallerand, 2004). Examples of “free choice” intrinsic motivation include completing a jigsaw puzzle or completing a crossword puzzle (Peters, 2010; Pink, 2009), two activities that individuals perform for its own sake.

Pink’s (2009) motivation 3.0 theory is driven by intrinsic motivation. It is an advancement from what he calls motivation 2.0 (carrots and sticks motivation) or the outdated way of motivating: “seek reward and avoid punishment” (Pink, 2009, p. 16). Pink claimed that most schools today are still operating in motivation 2.0 mode: “clearly defined problems, confined to a single discipline, and have one right answer,” (Truby, 2010, p. 42), which is opposite from the economic workplace of today, which is solution oriented.

In order to cultivate a system or school environment of intrinsic motivation 3.0, Pink’s three principles of autonomy, mastery, and purpose must be followed (Nordgren, 2013; Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Pink, 2009; Tull, 2011). Autonomy is the human desire to act with choice (Deci & Ryan, 1987; Tull, 2011) and have some control over the environment in which individuals work. Mastery is the innate desire to become the best at what you do; simply for the joy of doing it well (Tull, 2011). This is in close
connection with intrinsic motivation towards accomplishment (Pelletier et al., 1995). Pink’s (2009) “purpose” is identified as living by a firm set of beliefs and being part of something bigger than yourself.

*Autonomy.* One of the most important aspect of intrinsic motivation deals with the autonomy of employees (Deci & Ryan, 1987; Deci et al., 1991; Pink, 2009). Vallerand (2004) defined autonomy as “the desire to be the origin of one’s behavior” (p. 427). Deci and Ryan (1987) labeled autonomy as one of their three basic needs and stated that “when autonomous, people experience themselves as initiators of their own behavior; they select desired outcomes and choose how to achieve them” (p. 1025). Peters and Passanisi (2012) stated that “our working environment has proven that high teaching standards and autonomy of individual teachers do not have to be mutually exclusive. When teachers feel more control over their work, they will perform better; this can only help student outcomes” (The opportunity section, para 1). Whitaker (2003) agreed, stating that “outstanding faculty members need two things to make them content and motivated: autonomy and recognition” (p. 83). Pink (2009) and others suggested letting teachers and students have more of a say so in what is being taught and learned (Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Truby, 2010; Wallis et al., 2008; Wyatt, 2013). Pink claimed that students who have teachers that understand this outperform their peers because they are “reading and writing about subjects that are relevant to them and that they’re interested in” (Truby, 2010, p. 42).

Peters and Passanisi (2012) stated that “the decline of teacher autonomy in the classroom, combined with near-impossible workloads, can lead to teacher burnout and a feeling of impotence in a career that requires purpose and drive” (para. 4).
of autonomy in education is not necessarily new, as Maeroff asserted in the 1980s that teachers then were being constrained and their autonomy limited (Eller, 1989). Eller (1989) stated that “teachers today are frustrated not so much by their inadequate salaries, but by their lack of autonomy over their jobs” (p. 372). By definition, “intrinsically motivated behaviors are un-alienated authentic” and failing to provide autonomy to individuals “contributes to alienation and ill-being” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 74). Could providing more autonomy to teachers help motivated them to be their best self on a daily basis?

*Supportive school climate.* Another method of increasing intrinsic motivational levels of employees is through the atmosphere of the work environment (climate). Whitaker and his colleagues (2009) defined school climate as “an environment that allows teachers to develop and blossom as leaders” (p. 106). Knowledge and skills are important teaching factors but workplace issues such as teachers’ job satisfaction and employee trust come from a supportive, positive administration and are themes that also effect student learning and school climate (Miller & Swick, 1976; Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Whitaker, 2003).

Kovach (1995) claimed job satisfaction as a definite work motivational factor, but cited it as being difficult to measure as it can change from person to person or day to day. Following Maslow’s third tier of love and belonging, many teachers claim job satisfaction based on the relationships and social aspects that occur at work (Sadri & Bowen, 2011). These types of interactions that promote a positive school climate can occur during teacher lunches, staff meetings, in the teacher lounge or workroom, or at off-campus staff gatherings (Whitaker et al., 2009). Spuck (1974) found that schools
with high levels of social–peer interactions had little trouble keeping or recruiting teachers. These interactions can have the opposite effect as well, as negatively impacting social groups can form within organizations and do more harm than good (Whitaker et al., 2009). Principals and teachers alike should recognize the detrimental effects that negative employees can convey on the overall climate of the school, and rather strive to encourage positive interactions instead (Whitaker et al., 2009; Wong & Wong, 2005).

As stated earlier, trust is a vital piece of the puzzle that significantly affects school climate, as multiple studies determined that supportive principal behavior and faculty trust were significantly correlated (Price, 2012; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). One of these studies also implied “that principals can build trust indirectly through supportive behavior, but they cannot make teachers trust one another through direct action” (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008, p. 462). One expert asserted that the principal’s effect on school climate is stronger than his or her effect on instruction, and the supportive climate that administrators create for teachers is precisely what creates a successful learning environment for students (Price, 2012). Whitaker et al. (2009) stated that “the teacher does not just want to be supported, but wants to feel supported” (p. 6). Clearly, it is the principal’s role to provide such an atmosphere of trust for the teachers (Whitaker, 2003).

Community support and recognition. Ellis (1984) wrote that teachers are motivated more by intrinsic means over extrinsic factors. One of the intrinsic factors that motivate teachers involves community support. Peters and Passanisi (2012) and Miller and Swick (1976) claimed that only with the support of the administration, the parents, and the local community can a teacher sustain the rigors of a long teaching career. Peters and Passanisi (2012) also stated that “by allowing teachers to put their true selves into
their work, by supporting the individuality in style that each teacher can bring to their teaching, school communities can fuel teachers’ sense of purpose in the profession” (Purpose section, para 1). A community teacher of the week award, using local television and radio stations to highlight accomplishments, and teacher appreciation nights are manners of intrinsically motivating deserving, individual teachers (Miller & Swick, 1976; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Whitaker (2003) made it clear by stating that “reinforcing our teachers—especially the ones we value most—makes everyone’s job easier and more satisfying” (p. 84), and helps maintain motivation.

**Self-efficacy.** Community support and recognition leads to self-efficacy (Cherian & Jacob, 2013; Miller & Swick, 1976; Thoonen, Sleegers, Oort, Peetsma, & Geijsel, 2011). For a teacher, this involves believing in themselves and feeling competent in their own ability to correctly address the learning needs of students (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Wyatt (2013) asserted that “one important condition for intrinsic motivation is a feeling of competence” (p. 224). Thoonen and his colleagues (2011) stated that

When teachers have a high sense of self-efficacy, they tend to exhibit greater levels of planning and organization, are more open to new ideas and more willing to experiment with new methods, work longer with students who are struggling, intensify their efforts when their performance falls short of their goals, and persist longer. (p. 504)

This idea of self-efficacy reflects Dweck’s (2006) previously mentioned theory on the growth mindset.

Cherian and Jacob (2013) claimed that the foundation for human motivation begins with self-efficacy and that the high level of perseverance that goes along with this
personal belief will most likely lead to increased performance and productivity. They also stated that “self-efficacy and motivation are both integral part [sic] of performance and both these factors contribute to a good service quality, effectiveness and efficiency in the workplace” (Cherian & Jacob, 2013, p. 81). Varney (2009) added that “motivation theory suggests that increases in self-efficacy lead to persistence and renewed determination, an ‘I think I can’ attitude” (p. 130). Self-efficacy would be labeled under Maslow’s (1943) fifth tier of self-actualization which leads to self-fulfillment or reaching one’s potential, as well as intrinsic motivation toward accomplishment (Pelletier et al., 1995). Due to its positive influences, it seems that administrators should consider ways to affect the efficacy of teachers under their guidance.

*Something greater than themselves.* Once teachers believe in themselves, they can move to something greater. Another intrinsic motivational factor that many scholars mention is the notion that individuals, through their career, want to strive towards something greater than themselves (Glass, 2011; Peters, 2010; Price, 2012; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). This “greater” thing, in education, could be a positive influence on a student’s life (Glass, 2011; Price, 2012). In an interview with Peters (2010), Pink said that teaching is a purpose-driven profession; one in which teachers want to leave a legacy or imprint on the world through their students. Sadri and Bowen (2011) categorized this motivational aspect under Maslow’s fifth tier of self-actualization, stating that “employees who significantly have satisfied the four lower needs now are looking to better themselves, those around them and the world as a whole” (p. 47). This idea could be categorized even beyond self-actualization into Maslow’s sixth tier of self-transcendence, where an individual personally goes beyond and above selfhood (Kolisko-
Superiors who understand this motivational thought can then attempt to inspire employees to perform at their highest level (Sadri & Bowen, 2011).

**Agreement with goals.** Just as believing in something greater can serve to motivate, agreeing with organizational goals is also a very motivating factor (Glass, 2011; Price, 2012; Thoonen et al., 2011). For teachers to be motivated, it helps that they believe in and accept a school’s goals, values, and vision (Thoonen et al., 2011). Glass (2011) noted that school success happens when all the pieces in the organization are pulling in the same direction and toward the same goals. Price (2012) also found that teachers developing, maintaining, and sharing norms and values was vital to improving schools. Garten and Valentine asserted that “effective instructional leadership depends on the principal’s success in involving the faculty members in developing a shared vision of where the school should head” (as cited in Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 60). It seems that when teachers and administrators agree on goals, great things can happen in terms of motivation.

Although the goal of motivation is in the creation of an intrinsic environment (Hughes, 2013) extrinsic factors should also be considered, because “extrinsic motivation may be an event(s) which can be used to develop intrinsic motivation” (Hughes, 2013, p. 92). The following provides the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

**Extrinsic Motivation**

As intrinsic motivation is internal, extrinsic motivation is quite the opposite. Extrinsic motivation is goal-directed and necessitated by some kind of measurable outcome (Reiss, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Wyatt, 2013). Often this outcome is a reward for doing a job, an enticement to do a job, or threatened punishment for not (Deci et al.,
In some cases, extrinsic incentives can really motivate individuals, but in other cases, it can backfire (Deci & Ryan, 1987; Pink, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

“It was originally thought that extrinsic motivation referred to non-self-determined behavior that could only be prompted by external contingencies (e.g., rewards)” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37), but Ryan and Deci (2000) proposed that there were four different types of extrinsic motivation that can be identified along a self-determined continuum. From least to most self-determined they are external regulation, introjection, identification, and integrated regulation. External regulation refers to “behavior that is controlled by external sources, such as material rewards or constraints imposed by others” (as cited in Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37). “With introjection, the formally external source of motivation has been internalized such that its actual presence is no longer needed to initiate behavior. Instead, these behaviors are reinforced through internal pressures such as guilt or anxiety” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). Identification occurs “when the individual comes to value and judge the behavior as important and, therefore, performs it out of choice. The activity is still performed for extrinsic reasons (e.g., to achieve personal goals); however, it is internally regulated and self-determined” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). Lastly, integrated regulation occurs when “identified regulations are fully assimilated to the self. Actions characterized by integrated motivation share many qualities with intrinsic motivation, although they are still considered extrinsic because they are done to attain separable outcomes rather than for their enjoyment” (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 73).

In *Drive*, Pink (2009) wrote of a study performed by several economists attempting to find out if extrinsic rewards boost performance. These researchers offered
several participants differing amounts of money to perform menial tasks. The economists found that higher incentives led to worse performance. It seems that performing tasks for rewards may change or narrow the focus of the employee performing the task (Pink, 2009). Pink explained that extrinsic rewards may be effective for basic tasks, but dangerous for tasks that involve critical thinking.

Herzberg’s two-factor theory points back to inadequate extrinsic factors as being demotivating for people and adequate extrinsic rewards as seldom providing long term motives (Whitaker et al., 2009). Initial studies of human motivation and its impact on success included the Hawthorne studies, which measured the impact lighting had on productivity of workers (Whitaker et al., 2009). At the conclusion of this experiment, both groups showed improvement in production. The Hawthorne studies researchers “concluded that the reason was not the lighting, but the attention paid to the workers” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 11). For extrinsic motivational factors to be effective, it seems that the focus should constantly remain on the workers as people.

The problem with dangling-carrots and wielding-sticks type of motivation (motivation 2.0) is that goals imposed by others can sometimes have dangerous side effects, enticing individuals to perform for the wrong reasons (Deci et al., 1991; Hatch, Thomsen, & Waldron, 2013; Pink, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Reiss (2012) stated that extrinsic incentives can undermine intrinsic motives; for example, if someone is paid for winning a game, then the reward of winning can undermine the enjoyment of the game itself. Pink (2009) stated that “the problem with making an extrinsic reward the only destination that matters is that some people will choose the quickest route there, even if it means taking the low road” (p. 49). Pink also claimed that rewards are addictive and that
once offered, they must be used over and over again to remain effective. He attested “offer too small a reward and the agent won’t comply. But offer a reward that’s enticing enough to get the agent to act the first time, and the principal is doomed to give it again in the second” (Pink, 2009, p. 52). The offer of a reward in and of itself signals to the employee that the task is undesirable, and once the initial buzz wears off, the employer will likely have to increase the reward to get the action to continue (Deci & Ryan, 1987).

Pink (2009) stated that “a few advocates would have you believe in the basic evil of extrinsic incentives, that’s just not empirically true” (p. 47). There is a time and place for extrinsic rewards, but the key involves understanding how the incentive affects the employee’s brain (Pink, 2009). Deci and Ryan (1987) found that “task-noncontingent rewards—those that are given independent of task engagement—were least likely to undermine intrinsic motivation because the reward is not given for doing the activity and thus is not salient as a control” (p. 1026). This involves rewarding individuals for good work but not offering that reward as an incentive beforehand (Pink, 2009). For extrinsic motivational tactics to work, the “reward should be unexpected and offered only after the task is complete” (Pink, 2009, p. 64).

Non-economic and non-verbal types of extrinsic rewards such as preferred parking spaces, service plaques, lunches, and holiday parties offer little motivation to employees, but their absence is resented (Imberman, 2012). Many schools and other employers use attendance rewards, gift cards, hats, caps, educational assistance, technology incentives, and even paid sabbaticals as tactics at sustaining or increasing motivation among employees (Imberman, 2012; Miller & Swick, 1976; Richard, 2007; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Pay, praise, shared decision making, opportunities for
advancement, professional collaboration, and administrative support are other extrinsic motivational factors that are reviewed in the following section.

**Pay.** One of, if not the (emphasis added), highest priorities for any employee is pay (Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Pay is a motivational factor that falls under Maslow’s (1943) second tier of needs, safety (Sadri & Bowen, 2011). It is a known fact that individuals do not seek the teaching profession for the chance at large salaries, but rather a fair, competitive salary (Glass, 2011; Pink, 2009). At the same time, teachers have to make a living to support the individual needs that they have (Eller, 1989; Pink, 2009). Most people agree that the current educational pay system is outdated; as years of experience and advanced degrees are rewarded with higher pay but have an incredibly poor track record of success in improving teaching (Glass, 2011; Wallis et al., 2008; Whitaker et al., 2009). Pink (2009) claimed that “one reason fair and adequate pay is so essential is that it takes people’s focus off money, which allows them to concentrate on the work itself” (p. 77).

Kovach (1995) noted a situational study that showed the importance of base pay; as the low income group in the study placed “good wages” in the top position of motivational factors. This low pay situation seems to correct itself once pay gets high enough to not be an issue (Kovach, 1995; Pink, 2009). However, it seems that those in superior positions do not recognize this fact, as they attempt to motivate all employees in the same ways (Diamantes, 2004; Kovach, 1995; Pink, 2009). Because individuals are all different, administrators should do the best job possible of recognizing and attempting to meet the needs of each employee (Diamantes, 2004). It may also serve school districts
well to take a solid look at base pay and how it affects the attraction and retention of quality teacher job applicants (Peters & Passanisi, 2012).

Glass (2011) asked the question of whether teachers were motivated for money or something else. The answer to both parts of his question was yes. Glass (2011) found that “teachers were primarily motivated to help kids”, but they “also paid more attention to those things compensation was attached to” (p. 2). Glass continued with the idea that money should be spent on appropriate teacher training, keeping the best teachers in front of the neediest kids, and raising base pay to get better candidates in the teaching field. Glass (2011) stated,

Helping kids and being part of changing the world motivates teachers. But teachers are also rational people who respond to financial incentives. Our work shouldn’t be to blindly protect a near 100 year old industrial era compensation structure, but instead to think about how we build a compensation structure that takes into account teachers’ altruistic motivations and that incents them toward things that help kids and communities. (p. 3)

Merit pay may be the solution to the problem of teacher pay and is gaining momentum in some places, including Mississippi. However, concerns surrounding merit pay open new questions and controversies, as there is no universally accepted, perfect way to measure the competence of teachers (Miller & Swick, 1976; Wallis et al., 2008). Herzberg (1987) even recognized this challenge in writing of the “complexity and difficulty in setting up and administering an incentive system” (p. 5). The challenge of providing better pay for better performances for teachers includes unreliable funding, deciding who gets the extra money (if there is any), and being fair about its distribution
Schools across the nation are dealing with this issue and its challenges while working with reduced budgets (Peters & Passanisi, 2012).

“Employees expect extra rewards for any extra efforts asked of them”; “if the extra is absent, employee cooperation is short-lived” (Imberman, 2012, p. 23). In many cases, this extra cannot be included as a financial reward, so other extrinsic motivational measures should be considered. These “extras” might include free memberships in professional organizations, paid leave for professional development conferences, travel and meal allowances for training, or summer employment (Miller & Swick, 1976; Peters & Passanisi, 2012). Some teachers may want the chance to explore the extra incentives and some may not, but recognizing this area of extrinsic motivation could be vital for school administrators to consider.

Teacher praise. Teacher praise is another motivational extrinsic factor, as it can be administered directly to the teacher from the administrator (McAllister & Vandlen, 2010). This extrinsic factor, when used correctly, can actually influence the teacher intrinsically (Kumar, 2011; Miller & Swick, 1976; Schwartz, 2009). For teachers, and any other employee for that matter, praise and recognition are factors that raise the level of enthusiasm and creativity among workers (McAllister & Vandlen, 2010; Miller & Swick, 1976; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). Schwartz (2009) suggested using praise over material rewards because “praise that is perceived as sincere, that focuses on the performance rather than the person, that promotes attainable standards, and that emphasizes that acceptable performance is within the person’s control may enhance intrinsic motivation” (p. 395). Kumar (2011) also noted a significantly positive relationship between praise and motivation, and Connors (2000) suggested that
administrator praise and recognition are two components that help make outstanding teachers.

Compliments are fantastic, simple motivators for the employee and other workers and “must be capitalized upon and used to facilitate encouragement and support of efforts by teachers to seek better results in the classroom” (Miller & Swick, 1976, p. 235). Receiving compliments is so important that Sadri and Bowen (2011) stated that a “lack of recognition from their direct supervisor is one of the main reasons employees leave their jobs” (p. 47). Announcements in faculty meetings, notices in school newsletters and bulletins, emails, short notes, and just an overall sensitivity to the personal interests of employees are a few of the simplest, cheapest, but yet most effective methods of complimenting teachers that administrators can do (Miller & Swick, 1976; Whitaker, 2003).

Shared decision making. Another non-economical, extrinsic motivating factor in schools today is teacher empowerment through shared decision making with administrators (Davis & Wilson, 2000; Price, 2012; Wallis et al., 2008; Whitaker et al., 2009). Allowing teachers in on some decisions gives teachers a sense of pride and a sense of power, which can increase their work efforts through a heightened sense of self efficacy (Davis & Wilson, 2000). However, it can also have an eventual negative impact on the teacher–principal relationship (Davis & Wilson, 2000). “As teachers are more involved in critical decisions concerning the direction of the school and as they have more autonomy and input, their communication becomes more complex and may be a source of de-motivation and job stress” (Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 349). Wallis and his colleagues (2008) suggested that in order to give teaching the noble ranking it deserves
among professional occupations, leaders should (emphasis added) give teachers a voice in decision making. Whitaker et al. (2009) suggested that effective principals seek out key teacher leaders and do everything possible to involve them in the decision-making process.

Kovach (1995) compared three similar surveys: one from 1946, one from 1981, and one from 1995. Each survey addressed 10 motivational items that were ranked by employees and supervisors in industry. In the 1946 survey, employees ranked “feeling of being in on things” as the number two motivating factor, and in 1995, employees ranked the same trait as the number three factor. Although not listed, it is assumed the 1981 employee survey contained “feeling of being in on things” in a very comparable position to the other two surveys. However, Kovach noted that in all three surveys, supervisors (emphasis added) ranked “feeling of being in on things” as the number 10 or least of all the motivating factors listed. From these studies, it is obvious that employees desire to have a say in decision making. Moreover, these results help shed light on the idea that at times “managers appear to remain out of tune with the wants of their employees” (Kovach, 1995, p. 96).

Advancement. McAllister and Vandlen (2010) claimed that opportunity for advancement is number two on the list of the top three most influential extrinsic motivators. Often times, the opportunity for advancement is just the motivating factor a teacher needs to sustain in such a grueling profession (Kumar, 2011). In many situations in education, the promotion to administrator is viewed as the only opportunity at advancement and the (emphasis added) only way to substantially increase income (Miller & Swick, 1976). Some researchers suggested that schools should look towards creating
societies or prestigious groups of teachers in an effort to maintain motivation (Miller & Swick, 1976; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). No matter the position, “leaders in education need to place great teachers in situations where they can influence others” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 25).

Sadri and Bowen (2011) suggested that “ambitious employees want to feel challenged and have opportunities to advance. They want a defined work role with distinct career possibilities. For these employees, titles and promotions are important” (p. 47). Miller and Swick (1976) and Glass (2011) all noted that promoting a teacher to a master teacher leadership role can serve to increase both personal and professional motivation. Glass (2011) suggested using district money to fund teacher leader roles and stated that this type of motivation would actually be positive for all involved in education.

Providing opportunities for teacher advancement is one of the reasons the Milken Family Foundation founded the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) in 1999. The best teachers in this program can climb the professional ladder in three ways: by remaining in their current position while also serving as a mentor to other teachers, by becoming a master teacher, or by easing into administration (Wallis et al., 2008). Hierarchal steps of advancement in the teaching profession could motivate some teachers to remain in the field of education, despite the negative aspects that plague many schools today including increased class roster sizes, fewer prep periods, low pay, and greater responsibilities (Peters & Passanisi, 2012).

Collaboration with peers. Professional learning communities (PLCs) at school involves a group of teachers who are “united by a common purpose, shared vision,
collective commitments, and specific, measurable goals” (Burnette, 2002, p.51).

Teachers feel invigorated when they have a chance to spend meaningful work time with their peers in a teacher learning/sharing type environment (Burnette, 2002; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Wallis et al., 2008). PLCs are a vital step in teachers being the best they can be through learning, sharing, supporting, observing, and reflecting with other teachers who are knowledgeable about how student learning takes place (Glass, 2011; Peters & Passanisi, 2012; Sadri & Bowen, 2011; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Principals, through allocating meeting time, play a vital role in making sure these motivating interactions take place (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Weinstein (2012) wrote of Seymour’s belief that for productive learning to occur for students, it had to occur for teachers as well, because teachers today are given very few opportunities to work together on improving instruction.

Through an analogy comparing a school to a beach ball, Moussavi-Bock (2011) stated that “real collaboration starts with recognizing that everyone owns a piece of the truth- one stripe on the beach ball- and that no one owns the entire truth” (p. 76). This is an interesting way of thinking because no one in the school, not even the administrator, can see or know everything that goes on at all times. By teachers simply asking and answering real questions in a group format and on a consistent basis, a solid atmosphere where employees feel important, become better at their craft, and are able to impact student achievement can be created (Glass, 2011; Moussavi- Bock, 2011; Peters & Passanisi, 2012). Creating time for the extrinsic motivating factor of PLCs is worthwhile because it is beneficial to the professional educator, who “is on an endless journey of looking for new and better ideas, new information, and improved skills to succeed with
students” (Wong & Wong, 2005, p. 293). This endless journey of improvement is an example of the growth mindset teacher that Dweck (2006) wrote of.

**Administrative support.** As mentioned in the intrinsic motivation section, personal administrative support is vital to maintaining motivated staff members in schools (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Other types of support, such as help with discipline measures and solid administrative feedback, are also critical in letting teachers know that they are supported (Kumar, 2011; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Principals directly affect teacher self-efficacy, either in positive or negative ways, by their willingness to address and handle in school discipline issues and the way in which they respond to problems (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Weiss, 2001). Wallis and his colleagues (2008) wrote of a new teacher leaving a teaching position in a public school and taking a lower paying job in a private school due in part to a lack of administrative disciplinary support.

Solid feedback from administrators is also a heavily discussed topic in education circles today. Kumar (2011) said that workers want feedback to give themselves a chance to better develop the skills of their craft, but DuFour and Mattos (2013) wrote that the evaluation systems in schools today are little more than a joke, because three out of four teachers say the evaluations have no impact on their classroom practice or student achievement. With the current educational trend of making the existing teacher evaluation system more rigorous, DuFour and Mattos (2013) stated that

The premise that more frequent and intensive evaluation of teachers by their principals will lead to higher levels of student learning is only valid if two conditions exist. The first is that educators know how to improve student learning but have not been sufficiently motivated to do so. The second is that principals
have the time and expertise to improve each teacher’s practice by observing that
teacher in the classroom. (p. 35)

Dufour and Mattos (2013) agreed that neither of these conditions exist in today’s
classroom, partly because the teacher’s previous administrators most likely have relayed
nothing but positive messages to the teacher, and because principals are often observing
teachers in content areas out of their expertise. This concept of feedback is another area
of motivation where Dweck’s (2006) growth mindset of a teachable attitude is beneficial.

Motivation in Education

With the constant changes in education and the uncertain economy causing
budget cuts in many schools, Peters and Passanisi (2012) pointed out that schools’
atttempts to motivate are often changing in an effort to improve teacher and student
performance. This “change” could be suggested by Imberman’s (2012) study that
showed changes in the way today’s worker is primarily motivated. Imberman (2012)
found a “growing number of employees now are motivated primarily by basic provisions
of employment-job security and pay” (p. 23) and secondarily influenced by the latest
“employee engagement fad” (p. 23). In reality, motivational matters are more complex
(Schwartz, 2009). “Extrinsic incentives will not alter the motivational structure of all
teachers. People who have intrinsic motivation that is strongly internalized may be
unaffected” (as cited in Schwartz, 2009, p. 395), but “for such people, extrinsic incentives
may be unnecessary” (Schwartz, 2009, p. 395). This shows the complexities involved
with motivation.

Several key terms emerge during research on motivation in education. The
concepts of trust (Conners, 2000; Price, 2012; Whitaker et al., 2009), staff morale
(Whitaker et al., 2009), school climate (Whitaker et al., 2009), teacher empowerment (Davis & Wilson, 2000), and principal-teacher relationships (Price, 2012; Whitaker et al., 2009) all have connections that correspond with the thoughts on motivation. These terms are individually defined by a “feeling” that leaves one “motivated and inspired” (Whitaker et al., 2009, p. 231). Whitaker and his colleagues (2009) stated that “the realization that the effectiveness of our staff will determine the effectiveness of our schools caused us to see the need for a highly motivated, positive group of adults working with students each day” (p. xv).

Administrators in education must take motivation and all the terms that go along with it seriously because there is “evidence that teacher motivation can be seen as an important factor for an effective educational system” (Muller & Hanfstringl, 2010, p. 6), and “as never before, education as a profession is being called upon to reach new and higher standards of excellence, accountability, and effectiveness” (Varney, 2009, p. 131). Is motivation the key to education reaching new heights through the extraordinary work of administrators and teachers?

Principal’s Role

Kocabas (2009) asserted that the responsibility to motivate teachers belonged to the school administrator. That is, the importance of motivation belongs to the building principals who supervise teachers on a daily basis. One manner of motivation that the principal has control over involves the school climate (Whitaker et al., 2009). Price (2012) pointed out that a positive school climate maximizes student learning opportunities and also noted that “principals directly influence informal school processes, such as teacher attitudes and behaviors, while indirectly influencing student outcomes of
achievement and engagement” (p. 45). Researchers Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) agreed that “a principal’s responsibility for the quality of teachers’ work is simply a fact of life” (p. 459). It is for these reasons that it is important for principals to understand their role in providing for teachers a work environment that promotes learning and success (Price, 2012). Bullough, Jr., and Hall-Kenyon (2011) stated that if administrators “lack an intimate understanding of who teachers are and what they most value and find motivating about the work of teaching, even the most well-intentioned of school reform efforts is likely to fail” (p. 128).

Davis and Wilson (2000) wrote of several factors that influence motivation in education. One factor is teacher empowerment, which is used as a technique to increase teacher professionalism and to improve teacher performance in an effort to increase student achievement (Davis & Wilson, 2000). This “empowerment” of teachers involves sharing the power between the administrators and teachers (Davis & Wilson, 2000). Davis and Wilson (2000) also wrote of job satisfaction being linked with motivation in the educational setting. Lawler and Locke defined job satisfaction as “individuals’ affective relation to their work role and the function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceives it is offering” (as cited in Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 350). Davis and Wilson (2000) also wrote of job stress in terms of teacher motivation. Ashton stated that job stress is “linked to low self-efficacy, which then leads to low self-esteem” for teachers (as cited in Davis & Wilson, 2000, p. 350). Davis and Wilson (2000) found a significant relationship between principal empowering behaviors and teacher motivation. They also found that teacher motivation is related to both job satisfaction and job stress in positive manners.
As Wong and Wong (2005) pointed out, this feeling is especially true of new teachers. “The first year of teaching is the most crucial” (Wong & Wong, 2005, p. 13), as new teachers may feel isolated, frightened, humiliated, and essentially alone. Teachers “want someone to give them hope and to tell them when their hardship will end” (Wong & Wong, 2005, p. 13). Great principals understand this and “focus on students – by focusing on teachers” (Whitaker, 2003, p. 35).

One of the key components affecting motivation of teachers is trust. Before motivation can take place, principals should establish a trusting school environment for all school members, including parents, teachers, students, and community members (as cited in Price, 2012). This atmosphere of trust can only be established by the principal and sets the tone for a positive school climate, or environment where the whole of the school community prospers (as cited in Price, 2012). When this atmosphere of trust happens, serious school improvement and student success can occur (Connors, 2000; Price, 2012). It has also been noted that this “‘principal effect’ on their staff and school climate is magnified by the amount of oversight given to the principals from the district or central office” (as cited in Price, 2012).

Price’s study. Price (2012) researched work climates and the effect that principal–teacher relationships had on worker commitment, cohesion, and satisfaction, because “educators prosper when they feel that their efforts are positively affecting students” (p. 41). Her study specifically looked at the direct effect that principals’ attitudes have on teacher outcomes. The second phase of Price’s (2012) study was more useful for the purpose of this study because it tested the “relationship effects from the perspective of the teachers with the principals’ attitudes on teachers’ attitudes” (p. 57).
Price’s demographic identifiers included gender, age, socioeconomic status, years of experience, school characteristics, proximal relationship characteristics, and distal individual outcomes of teachers and principals in this study. The motivational aspects that Price (2012) found included:

The amount of principal autonomy over schooling decisions mildly affects teacher satisfaction and cohesion levels but not commitment. Principal preparations, be they prior assistant principal experience and/or participating in a principal training program, do little to explain variation in the teacher attitudes. The frequency of interactions and degree of power sharing between principals and teachers affect subordinate teacher attitudes much less so than principal attitudes. (p. 61)

These findings suggest that decision sharing is an important piece of the teacher–principal relationship puzzle, but does nothing to affect the overall commitment level of the teacher. Price’s findings also suggested that the route to the administrative position does little to change the teacher’s attitude towards him or her. The study also concluded that the amount of interactions between the teacher and principal has less of an effect on teachers than it does on the administrator. This suggests that principals care about how often they interact with the teachers. Price also found that clear expectations from the principal are among the strongest motivating factors towards teacher attitudes. The impact of the teacher–principal relationship and the consideration of teacher attitude is a vital facet to the study of teacher motivation due to the nature of supervisor–subordinate interactions (Price, 2012).
Key Studies in Teacher Motivation

Kocabas’ study. Kocabas (2009) conducted a study of 225 teachers in an attempt to determine the effects of motivational sources on teachers’ motivation levels, “because everyone has a different background and personality, different interests and attitudes, expectations, desires and needs” (p. 725). Kocabas’ study included gender, area of responsibility, and occupational seniority. His findings were not surprising, as “feeling safe in the school environment” (Kocabas, 2009, p. 729) was overall the most motivating factor and one of the lower needs identified on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.

Kocabas (2009) also found high ratings on “my students being successful”, “enjoying my job”, “having a respectable status in society,” and “having high self-esteem”. Kocabas found two areas with significant differences when testing for teacher gender; “my success being recognized” and “being regarded as a role model.” In both areas, these were more effective among females. Statistical significance was found for motivational differences by occupational seniority. Teachers with 11 to 20 years of experience reported “a positive atmosphere in the school motivates me” more than teachers with above 21 years of experience (Kocabas, 2009). Kocabas found that teachers with 11 to 20 years of experience responded that “being part of the decision making process motivates me,” which was significantly different than the other two groups. The teachers with 21 plus years of experience responded significantly higher than the other groups on the idea of “the competitive attitude among teachers is important for my motivation” (Kocabas, 2009).
Overall, Kocabas’ (2009) study found that

The following are among motivation sources that motivate teachers most: feeling safe in school, students being successful, liking their jobs, having high self-esteem, thinking they have a respectable status in society, getting good inspection results, self-realization, a positive climate in school, cooperation, positive relations and solidarity with teaching colleagues, the perception of themselves as competent in their field, self-worth and self-respect, good school ranking in league tables, thinking of their job choice as a career, being happy in their private lives, their successes being recognized and their values respected, convenient working hours, effective communication with school members, finding their pay adequate, and effective administrator governing the school, a ‘we’ culture and an understanding of fair and consistent discipline in the school, emotional and psychological support from family and friends, and feeling secure in the event of accident, illness or retirement. (p. 732)

Kocabas also concluded that “a sense of alienation from friends or society,” “a competitive attitude among teachers,” “being subject to disciplinary measures,” and “inadequate facilities at school for accessing information” have a negative impact on teachers’ motivational levels.

**Bexley’s study.** Bexley (2005) studied factors that motivated public school teachers in south Mississippi public school districts to improve their performance, as well as what their administrators perceived to motivate teachers. She hypothesized that there would be significant differences in the perceptions of teachers and administrators on extrinsic and intrinsic motives, as well as individual motives for improving teaching.
Bexley surveyed 380 public school teachers and 120 public school administrators. Teachers’ responses indicated that “a supportive, open principal” had the greatest motivating effect, and “love of children” had the second. “Easy hours” was found to be the least motivating factor for teachers among survey items. In addition to “a supportive, open principal” the next highest rated extrinsic factors that influenced teachers were “having needed materials” and “atmosphere of the school setting.”

Administrators reported that they thought the least motivating extrinsic factor for teachers was “merit pay.” Administrators rated the following extrinsic motivating factors of teachers: “salary,” “time off / holidays,” “peer recognition,” “supervisor recognition,” “parent recognition,” and “parent involvement” higher than the teachers rated the same factors about themselves. Bexley’s (2005) study concluded that “administrators believed these variables to be more motivating than teachers indicated” (p. 57). Teachers rated the following extrinsic motivating factors: “effective staff development,” “supportive, open principal,” “school–based performance rewards,” “teacher mentoring,” and “having needed materials” higher than administrators rated the same factors about teachers. “Teachers indicated these variables were more motivating than administrators believed them to be to teachers” (Bexley, 2005, p. 57).

Administrators thought that “knowing what was expected” would be the most intrinsically motivating factor of teachers, with “love for children” and “sense of accomplishment” following close behind (Bexley, 2005). The teachers indicated that “love for children” was the most motivating intrinsic factor on the survey for improving their own performance; second was “improving student achievement”, and third was
“knowing what is expected.” Both teachers and administrators agreed that “influence of a former teacher” was the least motivating intrinsic factor for teachers.

Bexley’s (2005) open-ended questions to teachers and administrators began with asking teachers “what inspired them to do their best in the classroom?”; “five of every nine that responded said that the student inspired them to do their best” (p. 58). Twenty percent of the teachers answered that self-motivation was essential to performing their best in the classroom. When principals were asked the same questions of their thoughts about teachers’ inspirations, “seven of every fifteen who responded said that students were prime motivators for teachers to improve teacher performance in the classroom” (Bexley, 2005, p. 58). The next of Bexley’s open-ended questions asked “what motivated teachers to remain in the classroom?,” “five of every seven teachers who responded claimed that students and student progress motivated them to remain in the classroom” (Bexley, 2005, p. 58). The administrators’ thoughts and the teachers’ thoughts were consistent on this question. The third question of the open-ended portion of Bexley’s study asked what teachers found most motivating. “Five of every seven teachers said that student progress was most motivating for them” (Bexley, 2005, p. 59). The administrators and teachers thoughts were consistent on this question as well. In Bexley’s (2005) survey of administrators, the results indicated that

Principals were asked about methods that they used to motivate teachers. A variety of methods were given. The responses most often given was praise and appreciation using notes, small gifts, extra time for planning, duty free times, and verbal recognition of a job well done. (p. 59)
All of the motivating factors associated with the key studies on teacher motivation are relevant and meaningful because they are closely related to the measures of this study. Many of the findings lean favorably towards intrinsic motivation over extrinsic motivation, which was a major portion of Herzberg’s (1968) two factor theory many years ago, as well as Deci and Ryan’s (1987) and Pink’s (2009) thoughts more recently. These researchers found that extrinsic motivators often undermined intrinsic motivators.

Motivation in Sport

Sport is an endeavor that deserves consideration when studying motivation because of the intensity, competitive environment, and personalized training that takes place in order to be successful. Vallerand (2004) stated that motivation matters, as it “represents one of the most important variables in sport” (p. 427). “Motivation is at the heart of many of sport’s most interesting problems, both as a developmental outcome of social environments such as competition and coaches’ behaviors, and as a developmental influence on behavioral variables such as persistence, learning, and performance” (as cited in Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 36).

Pelletier et al., (1995) writes,

Athletes who go to practice because they find it interesting and satisfying to learn more about their sport, or athletes who practice their sport for the pleasure of constantly trying to surpass themselves are considered intrinsically motivated towards their sport. (p.36)

“Athletes are intrinsically motivated to know when they try to discover new training techniques for the sheer pleasure they experience while learning something new” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37). For example, if a pitcher experiments with a new grip for a
pitch simply for the pleasure he feels while learning it, he is operating under intrinsic motivation to know. “Trying to master certain difficult training techniques in order to experience personal satisfaction represents an example of intrinsic motivation to accomplish things” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37). This would include a baseball player wanting to learn bunting techniques in an attempt at mastering the elements of the game. “Athletes who participate in their sport in order to live exciting experiences are intrinsically motivated to experience stimulation” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37). A baseball infielder might incorporate Derek Jeter’s jump throw into his repertoire just for the thrill and excitement he feels when performing it.

On the other side of motivation, athletes participate in sport for extrinsic reasons as well (Andrew, 2004; Pelletier et al., 1995). “Athletes who participate in sport in order to receive praise from their coach or because they feel urged to do so by their parents are motivated by external regulation” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37-38). External regulation can also involve avoiding punishment or constraints (Vallerand, 2004). For example, “an athlete might say “I’m going to today’s practice because I don’t want the coach to make me sit on the bench during the next game!”” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 429).

“Athletes who participate in sports because they feel pressure to be in good shape for aesthetic reasons, and feel embarrassed or ashamed when they are not in best form, represent an example of introjected regulation” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). With this type of extrinsic motivation, the athlete has started to internalize the reasons for his or her actions (Vallerand, 2004). A baseball player who continues to play because he feels embarrassed when not in best form is acting through introjection (Andrew, 2004).
“Athletes who participate in sport because they feel their involvement contributes to a part of their growth and development as a person represent an example of identified motivation” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). An athlete who chooses to go to practice because it will help them perform better in the next game, does so because his extrinsic motives have become regulated through identification (Vallerand, 2004). “Although the activity is internally regulated and self-determined, it is still performed for extrinsic reasons” (Andrew, 2004, p. 26).

A-motivation is also a factor in sport participants, as “a-motivated individuals do not perceive contingencies between their actions and the outcomes of their actions” (Pelletier, 1995, p. 38). Athletes experiencing a-motivation have trouble finding reasons to continue participating in their sport and may cease participation all together (Andrew, 2004).

Specifically, professional baseball is one sport where motivation of athletes becomes very important due to the length of the season (Surmacz, 2014). “Very few people can stay completely focused for 162 games” (Brodsy & Ekhaus, 2002, para. 2), which is the length of the MLB regular season. Brodsy and Ekhaus (2002) and Chass (2001) noted that solid major league managers must motivate their players in such a manner that they are ready to take the field every day. Hal McRae, former manager of the Tampa Bay Rays, asserted that it is the manager’s job “to motivate, to prod, to kick them in the rear in order to maximize their ability” (Chass, 2001, para. 2). In the same manner, school administrators must attempt to motivate their teachers in order to maximize their teaching ability (Whitaker et al., 2009). McRae went on to state that the manager is responsible for everything, “attitude, morale, motivation, style of play, getting
players to understand that we have to play hard, we have to play together, we have to play as a unit” (Chass, 2001, para. 2). This sounds exactly like the effort principals need from their teachers.

In Mississippi, teachers teach 180 days a school year (Meador, 2014), which is very similar to the 162 game MLB regular season (Silva, 2012). Like teaching, professional baseball is a daily mental and physical grind (Brodsy & Ekhaus, 2002; Rose, 2013). The games occur day after day and run seamlessly together, and help is needed to maintain the intensity required to be successful (Rose, 2013). What motivates these professional athletes to perform day after day? Can the sport-derived concepts engrained in intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation carry over to the field of education?

**Competition**

One component of sport that may be enticing for some individuals is the idea of competition. Athletes and coaches often think about competing against an opponent, but like teachers, they should be focusing on competing against themselves (Cain, 2012b). “Too many times, coaches get stuck focusing on the things that they can’t control versus getting into the things they can (control)” (Cain, 2012b, p. 44). Taylor (2009) suggested looking in the mirror and asking this question, “Am I working as hard as him/her?” (Greatest competitor section). “Engaging in the activity for the pleasure of trying to surpass oneself” (Vallerand, 2004, p. 428) would be labeled under intrinsic motivation to accomplish things.

Great coaches turn routine practice situations into competitive drills in order to induce excitement and often reward the winners (Cain, 2012b; Rose, 2013). This
component would be labeled under intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation as “athletes who participate in their sport in order to live exciting experiences are intrinsically motivated to experience stimulation” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 37).

This idea of competition could be carried over to staff meetings or used to excite some teachers into some type of competition with each other, but not all teachers will like this competitive atmosphere (Haslip, 2014; Wallis et al., 2008). Giving employees the opportunity of joining a school sponsored recreation team is another way to help build a positive school climate through competition (Haslip, 2014; Sadri & Bowen, 2011). “When you have this healthy competition amongst your team, good work habits will follow” (Cain, 2012b, p. 47).

Communication

Honest communication is another aspect of sport that may serve as a motivating factor to teachers in schools. This can include coach to player feedback and changes in tone of voice. Athletes motivated extrinsically through external regulation often participate in sport for the praise they might receive from their coach (Pelletier et al., 1995). Just as teachers want honest feedback from their administrators (Dufour & Mattos, 2013; Kumar, 2011), MLB players want the same things from their managers. Justice (2012) stated that MLB managers must “keep the lines of communication open and always be honest with players, regardless of whether the news is good or bad” (para. 5). Sports psychologist Harvey Dorfman stated that

There is not enough time to dance around the issues. You (coaches) need to call a spade a spade and get right to the point. Athletes want and need that. They will respect you as a coach for saving them the time and cutting through the crap. Get
to the point because that is the only time that progress can be made. (as cited in Cain, 2012b, p. 61)

If athletes need that type of honest communication, do teachers?

Communication can also include the tone of voice that coaches use, from positive praise to intense yelling, and all sounds in between, as is commonplace in sport (Fleck, 2013). Voice modulation is a very motivating factor in athletics (Bottom, 2008; Fleck, 2013). This includes coaches yelling words of encouragement to an athlete during tough times as well as being mindful of voice tone during times when the athlete needs positive feedback (Fleck, 2013). Bottom (2008) stated that yelling and screaming can motivate certain athletes, but it is best to have a repertoire of tactics to go through when the athletes are not responding appropriately. Longtime collegiate basketball coach Bobby Knight often motivated his players through fear and intense intimidation. Although his screaming and chair throwing tactics worked with some of his championship teams, this approach is not recommended due to the amount of pressure it puts on those involved (Dweck, 2006; Mazer, 2013).

Giving motivational speeches is another technique that coaches use in an attempt to motivate their players (Rose, 2013). The topics should be personal to those involved, and the presenter should use examples of greatness and success that are interesting to the audience (Rose, 2013). These motivational speeches are used in an attempt to create positive emotions that the athlete can feel and remember (Taylor, 2009).

Super Bowl winning professional football coach Tony Dungy (2007) once motivated his new team by showing them an interview of the great basketball player Michael Jordan early in his professional career. Just after being eliminated from the
playoffs for the second year in a row, Jordan was asked by a reporter a simple question: “do you think you’ll make it to the NBA finals?” (Dungy & Whitaker, 2007, p. 242).

Dungy did this to show his team that there was a time when even Michael Jordan was not the greatest player (of course Dungy’s players knew the rest of the story with Jordan; he would go on to win six NBA championships and be labeled the greatest basketball player of all times). Perhaps these motivational techniques involving communication could be used to enhance teacher effort on any given workday?

*Atmosphere*

Individuals show up with great attitudes to events that they feel are fun. Just as a fun, positive school climate is vital to a great school (Connors, 2000; Whitaker et al., 2009), some athletes respond more positively to fun atmospheres at practice (Bell, 2007). Although most athletes play sports because they enjoy it, the physical and mental strain of the everyday routine of a sport can become monotonous (Taylor, 2009). For this reason, successful coaches make the athletic atmosphere as fun as possible, as often as possible (Bell, 2007). Former MLB manager Tom Trebelhorn said that a baseball season is “a long time to be in agony” (Rose, 2013, Step 1) if the team atmosphere is not fun. Athletes motivated intrinsically towards accomplishments respond more positively when the activity is pleasurable (Pelletier et al., 1995). One way to make the environment fun is by playing music, as music has been shown to make the human body respond as if the work were easier or less stressful than it really is (Fleck, 2013).

Another motivating, fun factor may be the use of motivational video. Motivational videos can be individual or group oriented, and attempt to “motivate, stimulate, and inspire the viewer” (Tracey, 2011, p. 308). Cain (2012a) asserted that
The use of motivational videos, inspirational movies, and highlight reels, are another tremendous tool for peak performers….there is no debating that watching some form of motivational motion picture or video before a practice or a game will inspire your performance on that day. (p. 302)

Since around 2010, the use of motivational video has exploded on the college athletic scene as a means of motivating current and recruited athletes, as well as alumni and donors. Could these exciting, personal videos serve the same capacity in motivating teachers? Cain (2012a) stated that “regardless how you feel when you wake up, the video clips you watch will get you fired up to dominate the day and do the work necessary to advance further up the mountain of excellence” (p. 303).

Team

Many athletic events are team oriented, just as each participant in an educational environment is on a team (Whitaker, 2003). This team concept is displayed through individual and team goals, team captains, and training partners. Cain (2012a) defined a team as “any group of people who organize in a cooperative effort driven by a shared purpose to achieve a common goal” (p. 311). The key for any coach or leader is to get a group of individuals to “come together and sacrifice individual glory and place the success of the whole group first and foremost” (Cain, 2012a, p. 311). One way of doing this is through the creation of team goals. Rose (2013), Taylor (2009), and Cain (2012a) suggested setting goals for individuals as well as the group, focusing on specific things as well as broader subjects.

Many researchers agreed that because there is a tremendous amount of time and energy that goes into preparation for a sport, short-term and long-term goals should be set
for times when an individual is not at his or her best (Bottom, 2008; Fleck, 2013; Taylor, 2009). Taylor (2009) said “imagine exactly what you want to accomplish and tell yourself that the only way you’ll be able to reach your goals is to continue to work hard” (Developing prime motivation). Bell (2007) noted that those athletes who have no goals have no direction. Mental conditioning coach Cain (2012a) stated that goal setting is “important for establishing the routine discipline necessary for peak performance” (p. 24). Cain suggested writing goals on the bathroom mirror as a daily reminder to remain focused. Goal setting can be used effectively by teachers in schools by analyzing student test scores and other measurable data (Burnette, 2002), and is important because “measurement equals motivation” (Cain, 2012a, p. 162).

Another team concept that sport often provides is the selection of team captains. Rose (2013) described a captain in baseball as a teammate who works hard, plays hard, competes at a high level, and overcomes common ailments in an attempt at inspiring others to do the same. Principals would likely be overjoyed to have employees who displayed these same characteristics.

Taylor (2009) suggested the use of a training partner as a motivator; individuals who encourage each other on days when it is needed. Cain (2012a) and Collins (2001) asserted that it is easier to quit on yourself than it is to quit on others, so having that training or accountability partner is a vital component of being at one’s best. Motivation through team concepts is really about helping each other out, as all participants will not have bad days at the same time. Through the course of a 180-day school year, teachers will likely have days where they feel sick, have troubling matters on their minds, or are just having an off day. It is during those tough times that individuals may need
motivating the most, and the teacher teammate can prove to be beneficial at getting their partner through the day effectively. Cain (2012a) summated this by stating

There will be days when you wake up and you do not feel well, but you still have to get the job done. These will be times you are forced to reach within yourself and act differently than you feel in order to accomplish what is necessary. (p. 117)

As influential as motivation is in the world of sport, it may be needed more in the world of education. With teachers being led in so many different directions today and faced with so many things that interfere with actual teaching (Flook et al., 2013; Weinstock, 2008), could the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation sport factors serve to guide administrators towards motivating their teachers towards optimal performance each day?

**Key Studies in Sport Motivation**

Pelletier and his colleagues (1995) originated the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS) in order to “reliably and validly measure the different forms of motivation towards sport” (p. 39), in line with Deci and Ryan’s (1991) self-determination theory (SDT) which identifies intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation. This instrument focuses on 7 subscales of motivation: 3 intrinsic motivation factors, 3 extrinsic motivation factors, and 1 a-motivation factor. On the SMS, each subscale consists of 4 items, for a total of 28 items on the questionnaire. The SMS did not identify the integrated regulation measure of SDT (Pelletier, Rocchi, Vallerand, Deci, & Ryan, 2013).

In recent years, researchers questioned the psychometric properties of the SMS, possibly due to its exclusion of the integrated regulation measure of SDT (Pelletier et al., 2013). Because of this, several of the lead authors of the SMS reviewed it during the
years of 2008-2009 and determined that many of the original items were wrongly classified and unclear, and due to more recent research on SDT, the integrated subscale needed to be included in the instrument. The authors also found that the 12 items measuring the 3 types of intrinsic motivation were not needed and eliminated 2 of those types. The revised, improved scale was named the SMS-II. The SMS-II includes 6 subscales of motivation: 1 intrinsic motivation factor, 4 extrinsic motivation factor, and 1 a-motivation factor. One the SMS-II, each subscale consists of 3 items, for a total of 18 items on the questionnaire. The authors recommended replacing the SMS with the SMS-II “because the newly formulated scale works well and is conceptually cleaner” (Pelletier et al., 2013, p. 338). For purposes of this study, the SMS-II instrument is used, but due to its newness and its very close relationship with the SMS, results of studies from both instruments are considered.

Bean study. Bean (2014) researched relationships between family structure and athletic motivation. He surveyed 114 athletes from various university level sports teams using the SMS-II scale. The extrinsic motivational factor integrated regulation had the highest mean score, followed closely by identified regulation. The next highest score was the intrinsic motivational factor, followed by the extrinsic motivational factors introjection and external regulation. A-motivation had the lowest mean score.

Fortier study. Fortier, Vallerand, Briere, and Provencher (1995) researched the relationships between competitive and recreational athletes and their sport motivation using the original SMS. They surveyed 399 intercollegiate and collegiate recreational athletes from various sports. The researchers found that these athletes were most motivated by the intrinsic-stimulation factor followed by the intrinsic-accomplishment
factor. Next was the extrinsic motivational factor of introjection followed by intrinsic-to-know. Fifth and sixth were the extrinsic factors of identification and external regulation, and last was a-motivation. Four of the subscales showed significant results between the 2 types of athletes. “Results showed that competitive athletes displayed less intrinsic motivation to accomplish things and to experience stimulation than recreational athletes, while demonstrating more identified regulation and more a-motivation than this group” (Fortier et al., 1995, p. 30).

Summary

Collins (2001) stated, “we don’t have great schools, principally because we have good schools” (p. 1) because “good is the enemy of great” (p. 1). Reeves (2004) believed that the failures in educational reform have not been because of a lack of effort on anyone’s part, but rather because the measures have failed at connecting intentions to classroom reality. In an effort to move schools from good to great, new ideas must be considered. Some will work, some will not work, but the effort in the attempt is important to new success. The aforementioned topics regarding motivation, if applied, could be an attempt at providing employees with “the power to improve their work performance” (Weiss, 2001, p. 26). As noted in the first paragraph of this literature review, motivation can be described in terms of direction, intensity, and persistence (Sadri & Bowen, 2011; Vallerand, 2004). Depicting which of these areas to stimulate at a given time can be the difference between successfully motivating or de-motivating an employee; the key lies within the administrator’s ability to decipher each individual. This literature review was written with the intent of further understanding how instrumental intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation aspects of sport
could be connected to the field of education in an effort to motivate teachers towards optimal performance.
CHAPTER III  
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to determine the motivational factors currently used in education and sport and how those factors may effectively motivate teachers to perform at optimal levels. This study determines if there is a statistically significant difference in intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors of teachers in Mississippi’s public schools towards the reasons they teach, based upon teachers’ years of experience, teachers’ grade level taught, and/or teachers’ previous participation in sport. The study also attempts to determine if these same teachers teach for reasons similar to why athletes practice their sport. The study uses survey methodology in order to test the three hypotheses. This chapter presents the research methodology, hypotheses, description of the participants, pilot study, instrumentation, procedures, and the data analysis process used in this study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

R1. Are teachers motivated to teach for reasons similar to why athletes practice their sport?

R2. Which intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors do teachers perceive to positively influence the reasons they teach?

Hypotheses

H1 - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ years of experience.
$H_2$ - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ grade level taught (K-5, 6-8, 9-12).

$H_3$ - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ previous participation in sport.

Participants

For purposes of this study, survey information was gathered from elementary (K-5), middle (6-8), and secondary (9-12) certified, public school teachers from all areas of the state of Mississippi by convenience sample. Approximately 50 superintendents of school districts in Mississippi were contacted via email for permission to conduct the research (Appendix A). These school districts were selected based upon their location within the state of Mississippi as well as by convenience. Once superintendent permission was obtained, the researcher communicated by email and/or phone with building level administrators within each district. The researcher conducted the survey at a time consistent with the wishes of the building level administrator. When feasible, the surveys were conducted personally by the researcher. When uncontrollable issues arose, the researcher mailed all survey material (in a survey packet) to a point person within that specific school district. This point person was chosen by the researcher and followed detailed instructions (Appendix B) in distributing, conducting, collecting, and returning the survey material. At the completion of the survey at each school, one survey respondent was awarded a $20 gift card by random drawing, even if they started but chose not to complete the survey.
Instrumentation

The questionnaire used in this study is a modified version of the Revised Sport Motivation Scale (SMS-II) (Appendix C) (Pelletier et al., 2013). The SMS was originally developed in the French language, but was translated into English for research purposes by Pelletier and his colleagues (1995). The purpose of the SMS was to assess various components of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation towards sport (Andrew, 2004), and the SMS-II serves the same purpose. The SMS-II was created to address criticisms of the original SMS, as research in SDT had evolved substantially since its creation in 1995 (Pelletier et al., 2013). The SMS-II is an 18-item questionnaire containing 6 subscales of 3 items each, which assess the three different types of intrinsic motivation (intrinsic motivation to know, to accomplish things, and to experience stimulation) as 1 subscale, 4 types of extrinsic motivation (external regulation, introjection, identification, and integrated regulation) as 4 subscales, and a-motivation as 1 subscale (Pelletier et al., 2013). Respondents completed the SMS-II by using a 7 point Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from a score of 1, which represents does not correspond at all, to a score of 4, which represents corresponds moderately, to a score of 7, which represents corresponds exactly.

Dr. Pelletier provided permission (Appendix D) to use and modify the instrument that he and his colleagues revised to measure athlete’s perceptions of why they practiced their sport. The internal consistency of the subscales of the SMS-II determined that Cronbach’s alpha values (N=412) varied from .70 to .88 (Table 1).

The researcher reworded each item of the SMS-II in an effort at making the language appropriate for K-12 teachers in Mississippi. The modified instrument was
named by the researcher as The SMS-II-ED (Appendix E). The 6 subscales, their corresponding questionnaire item numbers, reliability data, and descriptive statistics are listed below (Pelletier et al., 2013) (Table 1).

The independent variables considered were the demographics of the teachers from these public schools and consisted of grade level currently taught (K-5, 6-8, 9-12), years of teaching experience (1-10, 11-19, 20+), and previous sport participation (yes or no). The dependent variables considered were the six subgroups of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation. The survey was conducted and the variables collected one time.

Table 1

*Key for SMS-II-ED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability of Numbers Current Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
<td>3,9,17</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation-identified</td>
<td>6,12,18</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation-introjected</td>
<td>1,7,16</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation-external</td>
<td>5,8,15</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation-integrated</td>
<td>4,11,14</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-motivation</td>
<td>2,10,13</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-type Scale 1-7: 1= Does Not Correspond at All. 4= Corresponds Moderately. 7= Corresponds Exactly.
Panel of Experts

Prior to conducting the pilot, a panel of three experts analyzed the survey to establish validity. Panelist one, a White female in her 40’s, has 19 years of experience in Mississippi public education. She has 10 years of experience as a teacher in the primary and elementary classrooms, 2 years of experience as an assistant principal at the high school level, and 7 years of experience as a principal at the elementary level. She was not an athlete. Panelist two, a White male in his 50’s, has 28 years of experience in Mississippi public education. He has 12 years of experience teaching and coaching at the high school level and 4 years of experience teaching at the middle school level. Panelist two has served 12 years in an administrative capacity as an assistant principal at the high school level. He was a high school and collegiate athlete. Panelist three, a White male in his 40’s, has 18 years of experience in Mississippi public education. He has served in the high school classroom for 15 years, while also serving as a head coach. He also has 3 years of experience as a middle school teacher and assistant varsity coach. He was a high school athlete. A copy of the instrument (Appendix E) was hand-delivered to each panelist along with a copy of a validity questionnaire (Appendix F).

Panelists were asked to review the instructions, checked to make sure the language was understandable, and reviewed the instrument, making sure issues and questions were appropriate. After one week, the researcher retrieved the materials and reviewed feedback from the panel. Suggested modifications to the instrument were considered and the instrument was modified as needed to assure its validity.
Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted with 15-20 certified teachers in a single, select public school district in Mississippi. Six or seven teachers were selected from three grade levels: K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. The researcher asked for volunteers who represented various ages and prior participation or non-participation in sport. An attempt was made to provide a sample where at least half the participants previously participated in a sport and at least one participant from each age group: 20’s, 30’s, 40’s, and 50+. The researcher provided each participant a packet that includes written instructions (Appendix G) and a questionnaire (Appendix E). Participants had one week to complete the survey at his or her convenience. Once completed, the surveys were picked up by the researcher at their individual schools and follow-up phone calls were made to discuss suggestions that could improve the instrument. For the purpose of the pilot study, the identities of the participants were known by the researcher.

Procedures

A survey packet, which includes a paper copy of the questionnaire, was hand delivered or conveniently mailed to a point person specifically identified by the researcher, to approximately 18 schools across the state of Mississippi (with IRB and superintendent approval). Through convenience sampling, the schools invited consisted of approximately six elementary schools (K-5), six middle schools (6-8), and six secondary schools (9-12). A minimum of 20 completed surveys per school, or a total of 360 respondents, was needed to conduct this study. The study included at least 100 total respondents from each of the elementary, middle, and secondary schools in order to obtain the statistical power necessary to test for significance.
Data collection began after obtaining permission from the superintendent of education in each participating school district and after obtaining approval from the IRB at The University of Southern Mississippi (Appendix H). The survey packet, which included instructions (Appendix B), paper copies of the survey instrument (Appendix E), conductor assurance form (Appendix I), and a U.S. Postal Service postage paid return envelope, was taken to each school by the researcher or mailed to the specific point person at each school. That individual was tasked with the responsibility of distributing, conducting, and collecting the surveys at his or her individual school (in compliance with the researcher’s instructions and specific school administrative instructions) and returning the completed surveys to the researcher via the postage paid, return addressed manila envelope included in the survey packet. No names were placed on the surveys in order to maintain anonymity, and all respondents were asked to sign a consent form before taking the survey, in order to maintain human subjects’ protection.

Data Analysis

A MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) statistical design was used to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between the independent variables (years of experience, school level taught, and / or previous sport participation) and the dependent variables (six subgroups of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation). Descriptive statistics were analyzed for each of the survey items. The means and standard deviations were examined and reported. Data results are reported in Chapter IV and discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to attempt to answer one main research question: Are teachers motivated to teach for reasons similar to why athletes practice their sport? This chapter reports the results of the study and includes descriptive statistics, results of 3 research hypotheses, and a brief overview of a qualitative question involved in the study. The dependent variables in the study were the six subgroups of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation. The independent variables used in the study were teacher’s years’ of experience, school level taught, and previous sport participation. Hypotheses were tested using Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) tests as well as Pillai’s Trace Multivariate tests and post hoc tests.

In an attempt to answer this research question and others, survey data was collected from certified K-12 teachers across Mississippi. This chapter summarizes the statistical results of this study. The demographics of the teachers surveyed (N=380) are presented as well as frequencies for each independent variable group, including grade level taught, years’ of experience, and previous sport participation. Three research hypotheses were tested using between subjects (MANOVA) tests, conducted through the SPSS computer program. The dependent variables used in these tests were the six subgroups of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation. Post hoc tests were also analyzed to further explore differences.
Approximately 50 superintendents of education throughout Mississippi were contacted via email to obtain permission for their teachers to participate in the study. Eighteen superintendents responded and 17 granted permission which represents 34% of the intended sample.

Once IRB permission was received (Appendix H), a pilot study was conducted in one of the districts in the southern portion of the state to establish reliability of the instrument to be used in this study. Twenty-one surveys were distributed and returned for the pilot study; however, only 20 were analyzed. One survey instrument was discarded, as the teacher responded ‘No’ to the demographic screening question which asked participants to verify they were a ‘certified teacher.’ The instrument’s overall internal reliability was rated by Cronbach’s alpha test at .85, which was consistent with the SMS-II’s (Appendix C) (Pelletier et al., 2013) ratings between .70 and .88 (Table 1).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Once the pilot study was completed, the researcher contacted the principals of the 17 participating schools to schedule the data collection phase of the study. In 13 schools, a contact person was designated to administer the survey. The researcher administered the survey at the other four schools. Each contact person designated to administer surveys received a survey packet via U.S. Postal Service that included a survey conductor assurance letter (Appendix I) and detailed instructions (Appendix B) related to the administration and return of the survey. Each packet also included 50 surveys (Appendix E), 50 double raffle tickets, 1 20$ gift card, and a U.S. Postal Service postage paid return envelope.
Eleven public school districts in Mississippi were represented in the study from among the 17 participating schools. Of the participating schools, six served grades K-5, four served grades 6-8, and six served grades 9-12. One school served grades K-8; surveys conducted at this school included responses from teachers at both the K-5 and 6-8 grade levels. At the time of the study, there were approximately 450 certified teachers employed in the 17 schools and 380 returned useable questionnaires which represents a response rate of 84%. Approximately 16% of the teachers in the sample opted to either not participate in the survey or returned questionnaires that were either incomplete or that self-identified the participant as being non-certified. Incomplete questionnaires or those from self-identified non-certified staff were excluded from the study. Among the 380 useable survey instruments returned and included in this study, 141 were from K-5 schools (37.1%), 134 were from 6-8th grade schools (35.3%), and 105 were from 9-12th grade schools (27.6%). One hundred and seventy eight teachers reportedly had 1-10 years of teaching experience (46.8%), 109 teachers reportedly had from 11-19 years of experience (28.7%), and 93 teachers reportedly had 20 or more years of teaching experience (24.5%). Of the 380 teachers surveyed, 207 responded that they participated in sports at the high school and / or collegiate level (54.5%) and 173 responded that they had not participated in sports (45.5%) (Table 2).
Table 2

*Descriptive Characteristics of Teachers (N=380)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS or College Sports Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SMS-II-ED survey instrument (Appendix E) consists of 19 questions divided into 6 subgroups of motivation: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation. Each of the subgroups consists of 3 questions. The final question on the survey was an open ended question that was included for qualitative purposes. Participants were asked to respond to scaled items using a 7-point Likert-type scale. The following presents the means and standard deviations for each motivational subgroup in order, from highest to lowest mean scores, as well as corresponding
individual survey items. The highest reported mean was in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had an overall mean score of 4.98 (SD 1.37). The second highest reported mean was in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean score of 4.71 (SD 1.39). The categories of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected were reported third and fourth with mean scores of 4.26 (SD 1.61) and 3.36 (SD 1.55) respectively. The a-motivation category was next with a mean score of 2.10 (SD 1.27). The lowest reported mean was in the motivational subgroup of extrinsic motivation external which had a mean score of 1.82 (SD 1.06) (Table 3).

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Motivation Subgroups / Survey Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup / Survey Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Integrated</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q04: Because teaching reflects the essence of whom I am.</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11: Because teaching is an integral part of my life.</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14: Because through teaching, I am living in line with my deepest principles.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03: Because it is very interesting to learn how I can improve.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09: Because I find it enjoyable to discover new teaching strategies.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17: Because it gives me pleasure to learn more about my chosen profession.</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup / Survey Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Identified</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q06: Because I found it is a good way to develop aspects of myself that I value.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12: Because I have chosen teaching as a way of developing myself.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18: Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Introjected</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q01: Because I would feel bad if I was not teaching.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q07: Because I would not feel worthwhile if I did not.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16: Because I feel better about myself when I do.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Motivation</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02: I used to have good reasons for teaching, but now I am asking myself if I should continue doing it.</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10: I don’t know anymore; I have the impression that I am incapable of succeeding in this profession.</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13: It is not clear to me anymore; I don’t really think my place is in teaching.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation External</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q05: Because people I care about would be upset with me if I didn’t.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08: Because I think others would disapprove of me if I did not.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15: Because people around me reward me when I do.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-type Scale 1-7: 1 = Does Not Correspond at All. 4 = Corresponds Moderately. 7 = Corresponds Exactly.
Research Hypotheses

Three hypotheses were tested in this study. Quantitative survey results were entered into SPSS and a between subjects MANOVA and Pillai’s test was used to analyze the data for each Hypothesis. Hypotheses and data analysis results are provided in this section.

H\textsubscript{1} - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ years of experience.

Hypothesis I was not accepted. Pillai’s Trace test found that there was no statistically significant difference between the participants’ years’ of experience and the six categories of motivation listed in the survey, $F(12, 746) = 1.559$, $p = .099$. The participants’ mean scores separated by their years’ of experience (1-10, 11-19, 20+) was distributed among the six motivational categories, as each of the 3 experience groups reported highest scores in at least 1 of the motivational subgroups.

The 1-10 years’ of experience group reported highest scores in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had a mean of 4.85 ($SD$ 1.38). This same group of teachers reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.70 ($SD$ 1.38). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.18 ($SD$ 1.62) and 3.330 ($SD$ 1.51) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 2.10 ($SD$ 1.32) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 1.84 ($SD$ 1.08).
The 11-19 years’ of experience group reported mean scores in the exact same manner as their less experienced peers, with highest scores in the area of extrinsc motivation integrated which had a mean of 5.08 (SD 1.30). This same group of teachers reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.77 (SD 1.43). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.39 (SD 1.60) and 3.42 (SD 1.62) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 1.85 (SD 1.08) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 1.79 (SD 1.11).

The 20 or more years’ of experience group reported mean scores in the exact same manner as the other two groups of their less experienced peers, with highest scores in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had a mean of 5.14 (SD 1.40). This same group of teachers reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.66 (SD 1.38). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.27 (SD 1.60) and 3.333 (SD 1.55) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 2.39 (SD 1.34) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 1.81 (SD 0.97). Reported means of teachers by years’ experience ranged from a high of 5.14 (extrinsic motivation integrated, 20+ years’ experience) to a low of 1.79 (extrinsic motivation external, 11-19 years’ experience). The following presents the means and standard deviations of the
years’ experience demographic and the six motivational subgroups in order from highest
to lowest reported means (Table 4).

Table 4

*Between Subjects Factors – Years’ Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Years’ Experience (N=380)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Integrated</td>
<td>1-10 (n=178)</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-19 (n=109)</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+ (n=93)</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>1-10 (n=178)</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-19 (n=109)</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+ (n=93)</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Identified</td>
<td>1-10 (n=178)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-19 (n=109)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+ (n=93)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Introjected</td>
<td>1-10 (n=178)</td>
<td>3.330</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-19 (n=109)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+ (n=93)</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Motivation</td>
<td>1-10 (n=178)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-19 (n=109)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+ (n=93)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation External</td>
<td>1-10 (n=178)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-19 (n=109)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+ (n=93)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-type Scale 1-7: 1= Does Not Correspond at All. 4= Corresponds Moderately. 7= Corresponds Exactly.
H₂ - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ grade level taught (K-5, 6-8, 9-12).

Hypothesis II was not accepted. Pillai’s Trace test found that there was no statistically significant difference between the participants grade level taught and the six categories of motivation listed in the survey, $F (12, 746) = 1.247, p = .246$. The participants’ mean scores separated by grade level taught (K-5, 6-8, 9-12) was distributed among the six motivational categories, as each of the 3 grade level groups reported highest scores in at least 1 of the motivational subgroups.

The K-5 grade level group of participants reported highest scores in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had a mean of 4.99 ($SD\ 1.36$). This same group of teachers reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.81 ($SD\ 1.33$). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.27 ($SD\ 1.53$) and 3.38 ($SD\ 1.46$) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 2.09 ($SD\ 1.32$) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 1.69 ($SD\ 0.91$).

The 6-8 grade level group of participants reported mean scores in the exact same manner as their K-5 peers, with highest scores in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had a mean of 4.87 ($SD\ 1.39$). This same group of teachers reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.62 ($SD\ 1.38$). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected
contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.09 (SD 1.70) and 3.24 (SD 1.54) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 2.15 (SD 1.22) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 1.79 (SD 1.06).

The 9-12 grade level group of participants reported mean scores in the exact same manner as the other two groups of their peers, with highest scores in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had a mean of 5.11 (SD 1.40). This same group of teachers reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.69 (SD 1.49). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.47 (SD 1.58) and 3.48 (SD 1.67) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 2.05 (SD 1.28) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 2.03 (SD 1.21). Reported means of teachers grade level taught ranged from a high of 5.11 (extrinsic motivation integrated, 9-12 grade level) to a low of 1.69 (extrinsic motivation external, K-5 grade level). The following presents the means and standard deviations of the grade levels taught demographic and the six motivational subgroups in order from highest to lowest reported means (Table 5).
Table 5

*Between Subjects Factors – Grade Level Taught*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Grade Level Taught (N=380)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Integrated</td>
<td>K-5 (n=141)</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 (n=134)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 (n=105)</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>K-5 (n=141)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 (n=134)</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 (n=105)</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Identified</td>
<td>K-5 (n=141)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 (n=134)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 (n=105)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Introjected</td>
<td>K-5 (n=141)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 (n=134)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 (n=105)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Motivation</td>
<td>K-5 (n=141)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 (n=134)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 (n=105)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation External</td>
<td>K-5 (n=141)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 (n=134)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12 (n=105)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-type Scale 1-7: 1= Does Not Correspond at All. 4= Corresponds Moderately. 7= Corresponds Exactly.

H₃ - There is a significant difference in the intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a-motivation factors by teachers’ previous participation in sport.
Hypothesis III was accepted. Pillai’s Trace test found that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants who answered ‘yes’ to the sport participation demographic question and the extrinsic motivation integrated subgroup, $F(6, 373) = 2.141, p = .048$. The tests of between subjects effects reported a significance as well, $F(1, 378) = 4.458, p = .035$. This was the only significance found from the between subjects MANOVA (Table 6).

Table 6

*Between Subjects Effects – Sport Participation, Yes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>(Sport Participation, Yes)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>3.064</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Identified</td>
<td>3.546</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Introjected</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation External</td>
<td>2.057</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Integrated</td>
<td>4.458</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Motivation</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group of participants who previously participated in sport (yes) reported highest scores in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had a mean of 4.85 ($SD 1.43$). This same group of participants reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.60 ($SD 1.46$). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.12 ($SD 1.67$) and 3.30 ($SD 1.65$) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in
the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 2.07 (SD 1.28) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 1.89 (SD 1.14).

The group of participants who had not previously participated in sport (no) reported mean scores in the exact same motivational subgroup order as their sport participant peers, only their mean scores were higher in five of the six subgroups. These non-sport participant participants responded with highest scores in the area of extrinsic motivation integrated which had a mean of 5.14 (SD 1.28). This same group of teachers reported second highest scores in the area of intrinsic motivation which had a mean of 4.85 (SD 1.30). The areas of extrinsic motivation identified and extrinsic motivation introjected contained the third and fourth highest reported scores for this demographic group, with mean scores of 4.43 (SD 1.51) and 3.43 (SD 1.41) respectively. This group of teachers reported fifth highest scores in the area of a-motivation which had a mean of 2.13 (SD 1.26) and reported the lowest scores in the extrinsic motivation external area which had a mean of 1.73 (SD 0.95).

The participants who had previously participated in sport reported lower mean scores on the survey in the statistically significant difference area of extrinsic motivation integrated than their peers who had not participated in sport. The participants who previously participated in sport also reported lower mean scores to survey questions in 5 of the 6 motivational subgroups in comparison to their peers who had not previously participated in sport, including extrinsic motivation integrated, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, and a-motivation. Only in the subgroup of extrinsic motivation external did the respondents who previously participated in sport report higher mean scores than their peers who did not participate in
sport. The following presents the means and standard deviations of the sport participation demographic and the six motivational subgroups in order from highest to lowest reported means (Table 7).

**Table 7**  
*Between Subject Factors – Sport Participation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Sport Participation (N=380)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (n=207)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (n=173)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Integrated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation Introjected</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Motivation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation External</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Likert-type Scale 1-7: 1= Does Not Correspond at All. 4= Corresponds Moderately. 7= Corresponds Exactly.
Qualitative Question

The final aspect of the SMS-II-ED survey involved an open-ended question of a qualitative nature. The participants were asked to reply to the question “What are the main reasons you teach?”. Approximately 75% of the surveyed teachers ($n = 285$) provided a written response to this question. The other 25% ($n = 95$) left the question blank. When analyzing the responses, several themes emerged. The most commonly reported theme was answers related to the participants’ desire ‘to influence / inspire young people to learn new things.’ Of the approximately 285 responses to question 19, this, or a closely related response, was given 76 times (26.7%). The next most frequently reported theme was the desire ‘to make a difference in young peoples’ lives.’ This theme was identified 59 times (20.7%) within the responses. Fifty-three teachers (18.6%) wrote that they teach because they ‘love children / students.’ Other themes that were found among the responses to “What are the main reasons you teach?” were ‘God’s calling on their life’ ($n = 34; 11.9$%), and a desire to ‘help produce responsible or successful adults’ ($n = 32; 11.2$%). The remaining responses to this qualitative question can be found below (Table 8).
Table 8

*Qualitative Responses to ‘What are the main reasons you teach?’ (N=285)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To influence / inspire young people to learn</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make a difference in young lives</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love for children / students</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s calling on my life</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help produce responsible or successful adults</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love it. I couldn’t imagine doing anything else</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>09.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To expose others to the joy of my subject area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>07.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure anymore. Too much outside influence, loss of autonomy etc.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>07.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for family, good hours, time off, benefits etc.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>06.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced by others, former teachers, etc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>02.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

In this study, three (3) hypotheses were tested. Quantitative survey results were entered into SPSS and a between subjects MANOVA and Pillai’s test was used to analyze the data for each Hypothesis. Only one of the hypotheses was found to be statistically significant. Pillai’s Trace test found that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants who answered ‘yes’ to the sport participation demographic question and the extrinsic motivation integrated subgroup, $F (6, 373) = 2.141, p = .048$. Qualitative responses were analyzed and the most frequently reported
theme that emerged to the question “What are the main reasons you teach?” included the
desire for teachers ‘to inspire or teach young people to learn new things’ and the desire
‘to make a difference in young lives’. Further conclusions, discussions, and practical
implications for educational administrative practice are included in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if teachers are motivated to teach for reasons similar to why athletes practice their sport? This chapter discusses the findings of the study and implications for the field. This chapter begins with an introduction and includes sections on discussions, the six subgroups of motivation, and limitations. Also included are recommendations for practice, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.

With the similarities between the length of the MLB season and the 180-day teaching schedule that Mississippi school teachers face each year (Meador, 2014; Silva, 2012), there seems to be value in understanding if teachers and athletes are motivated by similar factors (Kocabas, 2009; Vallerand, 2004). Not only is it important for teachers to be motivated to perform well each school day, it is also instrumental for this motivation to begin day one (Whitaker et al., 2009) and to be a daily occurrence all year long (Cain, 2012a). Since Kocabas (2009) noted that it was the administrator’s job to motivate teachers, and that motivating teachers was key to having a successful educational environment (Tull, 2011), the role of the administrator can be compared to the role of a coach. Using this analogy can be helpful in gaining a better understanding of how the factors found in sports can be used to help educational administrators motivate teachers in the classroom. This study aimed to investigate the possible connections between motivational tactics used in the fields of sport and education.
Vallerand (2004) defined motivation as external or internal factors that lead to the “initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior” (p. 427). Since most everyone is motivated in some way or another (Kocabas, 2009), it is important to understand how each individual is motivated. For purposes of this study, motivation was measured by the SMS-II-ED and its 19 questions which divided motivation into six subgroups: intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, extrinsic motivation integrated, and a-motivation. Although each subgroup is unique, nearly all motivational tactics can be categorized into one of these six categories.

Conclusions

Of the 380 K-12 teachers that completed the SMS-II-ED survey, it was interesting to note that almost half of them (46.1%) were within their first 10 years in the teaching profession. This finding is consistent with data from across the United States, as the National Center for Education Statistics (2013) reports 42.3% of teachers currently within their first 10 years of teaching.

It was also interesting to note that over half (54.5%) of the teachers had participated in athletics at the high school or collegiate level. This places emphasis on the purpose of the study, that the connection between athletic motivators and the educational environment should be considered, especially considering the high percentage of sport participant teachers. The researcher found no data in the literature related to the number of teachers with prior experience in sports.

Another interesting finding was that the teachers who responded ‘yes’ to the sport participation demographic question reported lower mean scores on five of the six
motivational subgroups of this study, with the only exception being in the area of extrinsic motivation external. There was also a statistically significant difference between the teachers who responded ‘yes’ to the sport participation demographic question and the teachers who responded ‘no’ to the same question on the survey items involving the extrinsic motivation integrated subgroup, which involves teaching being in line with individual’s deepest principles and reflecting who they are. It seems that the sport participant teachers were consistently less motivated by the motivational questions than their non-sport participant peers, except for the extrinsic motivation external subgroup which involves the feelings and perceptions of others toward them.

Although several authors (Deal et al., 2013; DeKay, 2013; McAllister & Vandlen, 2010; Mousavvi-Bock, 2011) pointed to generational differences being an important motivational factor to consider, this study did not find a difference in the motivational reasons why teachers teach, as reported by teachers with 1-10, 11-20, or 20+ years’ experience. Although the study did not specifically ask for participants’ age, there is an obvious relationship between years of teaching experience and age. The researcher used a 10 year span to measure years’ of teaching experience and this large span could be a reason why no statistically significant differences were found.

Ryan and Deci (2000) agreed that motivation can be mapped on a continuum. At one end is intrinsic motivation (most self-determined) and at the other is a-motivation (non-self-determined). In between are four types of extrinsic motivation. Listed from least to most self-determined they are: external regulation, introjection, identification, and integrated regulation. These six types of motivation are the same measured by the SMS-II-ED. Each are discussed individually and explained in connection with the results of
the current study. It is interesting to note that when the means of these motivational factors are ranked in this study, they are in almost the exact same order as Ryan and Deci’s (2000) mapping of the motivation of human beings, from most self-determined to least self-determined. The only exception was in the order of intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation integrated on the self-determined end and a-motivation and extrinsic motivation external on the non-self-determined end, both of which came in reverse order when compared to Ryan and Deci’s observations.

The lead authors of the SMS-II, Pelletier and his colleagues (2013), studied 290 younger athletes with a mean age of 17.41 years old. Their findings were slightly different than the researcher’s study of teachers. In Pelletier’s study, the subgroups were reported in the following order, from highest to lowest mean scores: extrinsic motivation identified, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation integrated, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, and a-motivation. Although the current researcher’s study and Pelletier’s study’s results were similar, the reported results of Pelletier’s study were more consistent with the findings from the following studies of strictly athletes.

Bean’s (2014) also used the SMS-II in his study. His survey involved 114 college athletes from various sports. The results of Bean’s study were very similar to the results of Pelletier’s study and this study. Bean’s reported results listed the subgroups in the following order, from highest to lowest mean scores: extrinsic motivation integrated, extrinsic motivation identified, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation introjected, extrinsic motivation external, and a-motivation.
Although the subgroups were slightly different in the Fortier et al., (1995) study of 399 college recreational and competitive athletes using the original SMS instrument (not the SMS-II), the results between the athletes and the teachers of this researcher’s study were similar. The Fortier study involved three subgroups of intrinsic motivation, three subgroups of extrinsic motivation, and one a-motivation subgroup for a total of seven subgroups. The Fortier study reported the mean scores of the seven motivational subgroups in the following order, from highest to lowest mean score: intrinsic motivation stimulation, intrinsic motivation accomplishment, extrinsic motivation introjection, intrinsic motivation to know, extrinsic motivation identified, extrinsic motivation external, and a-motivation. This order was somewhat different than the results of Pelletier’s updated version of the SMS (the SMS-II). In the sport studies of athletes using similar sport motivation scales, the subgroup of a-motivation consistently received the lowest mean scores. The following motivational subgroups from the SMS-II-ED are listed in order from the highest to lowest overall reported mean scores.

Extrinsic Motivation Integrated

The SMS-II-ED includes three questions from each of the six subgroups of motivation as well as one open-ended qualitative question, for a total of 19 questions. Overall, the motivational subgroup of extrinsic motivation integrated received the highest scores on the 7-point Likert-type scale. The mean score on this item was nearly 5 (4.98) which is defined by the Likert-type scale as falling between ‘corresponds moderately’ and ‘corresponds a lot’. The individual questions within this subgroup ‘because teaching reflects the essence of whom I am’ (Q04, \( M =5.31 \)), and ‘because teaching is an integral part of my life’ (Q11, \( M =5.21 \)) received the highest reported scores of any questions on
the entire survey. It is interesting to note that the sports participants in this study posted lower scores on the extrinsic motivation integrated subgroup than their non-sports participant peers. This was the only difference found among the subgroups versus any of the independent variables of this study, as there was a statistically significant difference between the teachers who responded ‘yes’ to the sport participation demographic question and the teachers who responded ‘no’ to the same question on the survey items involving the extrinsic motivation integrated subgroup. It is unclear why this difference existed and the researcher recommends further research on this motivational subgroup and specific demographic group.

This highest scoring subgroup of extrinsic motivation integrated is closely related to the fifth tier of Maslow’s original hierarchy, self-actualization, and the sixth tier, self-transcendence. Maslow (1943) defined self-actualization by stating “what a man can be, he must be” (p. 382). Self-transcendence involves an individual going beyond self-actualization and becoming egoless in the process (as cited in Koltko-Rivera, 2006). Extrinsic motivation integrated is also closely connected to Pink’s (2009) ideas on purpose, which is living by a firm set of beliefs and being part of something bigger than yourself. This need for humans to become everything that they are capable of becoming, and more (Maslow, 1943), varies from person to person, but it seems that teachers in this sample teach because it reflects who they are, is an integral part of their life, and falls in line with their deepest principles. Thirty-four of the qualitative respondents of this survey (11.9%) noted that they teach because it is ‘God’s calling on their life’ and 26 respondents (9.1%) mentioned ‘I couldn’t imagine doing anything else’. Both of these qualitative responses coincide with the ideas behind this motivational subgroup. The
following subgroup of intrinsic motivation is so closely related to the extrinsic motivation integrated subgroup that Pelletier et al., (2013) noted that more research was needed to determine how the two groups could be distinguished from each other.

*Intrinsic Motivation*

The subgroup of motivational factors that had the second highest reported mean was intrinsic motivation. Teachers responded slightly lower to the intrinsic motivational questions than to extrinsic motivation integrated questions but the mean of 4.71 was still in the range between ‘corresponds moderately’ and ‘corresponds a lot’. The fact that the means of both these subgroups are similar is not surprising considering the close relationship between the two subgroups. Deci and his colleagues (1991) stated that intrinsic motivation is driven by individuals doing things for reasons that they choose, without reward or constraint from others, and teacher’s reported through this study that those words are consistent with their feelings about why they teach.

Herzberg asserted that “while traditional motivators such as salary and quality of supervision may lead to job satisfaction, only certain feelings–including feelings of achievement and recognition–are true motivators” (DeKay, 2013, p. 249). These ‘certain feelings’ are intrinsic in nature and the two highest mean scored subgroups in this study show consistencies with what Herzberg taught then and what teachers feel today.

The highly scored questions in this subgroup, ‘because I find it enjoyable to discover new teaching strategies’ ($M = 4.95$) and ‘because it gives me pleasure to learn more about my chosen profession’ ($M = 4.74$), reflect what Dweck (2006) wrote about mindset, that “teaching is a wonderful way to learn” (p. 201) about yourself, about people, and about what you teach. The questions in this subgroup and the teacher’s high
scores on them also connect the teachers thoughts to Pink’s (2009) ideas on mastery, which is the innate desire to become the best at what you do; simply for the joy of doing it well (Tull, 2011). Each of the survey items listed in the intrinsic motivation subgroup bring these truths to the forefront, and their mean scores fall between ‘corresponds moderately’ and ‘corresponds a lot’ on the Likert-type scale as to why teachers feel they teach.

*Extrinsic Motivation Identified*

Another highly scored mean group of questions as reported in the study come from the subgroup of extrinsic motivation identified ($M = 4.26$). Extrinsic motivation identified (or identification) occurs “when the individual comes to value and judge the behavior as important and, therefore, performs it out of choice. The activity is still performed for extrinsic reasons (e.g., to achieve personal goals); however, it is internally regulated and self-determined” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). Questions in this subgroup included ‘because I found it is a good way to develop aspects of myself that I value’ ($Q06, M = 4.37$), ‘because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself’ ($Q18, M = 4.25$), and ‘because I have chosen teaching as a way of developing myself’ ($Q12, M = 4.17$). Each of these questions involve teachers developing themselves through teaching, and their individual mean scores were very consistent with each other and very close to the Likert-type scale score of ‘corresponds moderately’ with reasons why teachers teach.

*Extrinsic Motivation Introjected*

The next motivational subgroup in the descending order of this study’s reported teacher mean scores is extrinsic motivation introjected (or introjection) ($M = 3.36$).
“With introjection, the formally external source of motivation has been internalized such that its actual presence is no longer needed to initiate behavior. Instead, these behaviors are reinforced through internal pressures such as guilt or anxiety” (Pelletier et al., 1995, p. 38). The difference between the question ‘because I feel better about myself when I do’ (Q16, $M = 4.09$) and ‘because I would feel bad if I was not teaching’ (Q01, $M = 2.85$) is quite different, as the scores move from ‘corresponds moderately’ towards ‘corresponds a little’ respectively. It seems that teachers think more along the lines of teaching making them feel good about themselves, but not enough to make them feel bad about not teaching.

A-motivation

The next to lowest mean scores of this study involved a-motivation. When an extrinsic motivation tactic results in less than optimal overall performance (Pink, 2009) or achieves the opposite of the intended result, a-motivation occurs. The survey items in this subgroup include ‘I used to have good reasons for teaching, but now I am asking myself if I should continue doing it’ (Q02, $M = 2.62$), ‘I don’t know anymore; I have the impression that I am incapable of succeeding in this profession’ (Q10, $M = 1.91$), and ‘it is not clear to me anymore; I don’t really think my place is in teaching’ (Q13, $M = 1.77$). The teachers reported low scores on the items in this motivational subgroup, as each fell between the labels of ‘corresponds a little’ and ‘does not correspond at all’. This is good news for educational administrators as well as anyone who cares about the profession of teaching, as an a-motivated individual is never a positive asset to any organization (Collins, 2001).
Extrinsic Motivation External

The motivational subgroup of extrinsic motivation external had the lowest mean scores amongst the responding teachers ($M = 1.82$). It is the least autonomous and least self-determined of the group of extrinsic motivators (Pelletier et al., 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Extrinsic motivation external (or external regulation) refers to behavior that is controlled by external sources, such as material rewards, praise, constraints imposed by others, or the avoidance of negative consequences (as cited in Pelletier et al., 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2000). This is the most obvious, well known category of extrinsic motivation and includes the question ‘because people around me reward me when I do’ (Q15, $M = 2.23$). The items in this subgroup focus on the constraints imposed by others or upon doing things for rewards. Teachers responded with low mean scores to each of these items. Question 15 on the survey did not perform well and reliability ratings were raised significantly when this item was removed from the survey.

Limitations

The ability to generalize the results of this study beyond the present sample is limited by several variables. The sample included 380 responses from teachers representing 11 school districts in Mississippi. There were approximately 32,007 certified K-12 teachers and 152 public school districts in Mississippi at the time of the study (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013, State Profile, Mississippi). Therefore, the sample represented 1.2% of the state’s teachers and 7.2 % of the state’s school districts. Other limitations include:

1. Unequal subgroups of teachers by grade level
2. The use of convenience sampling of school districts
3. Survey response rate

4. The reliability rating of the extrinsic motivation external subgroup; specifically question 15

**Recommendations for Practice**

Bullough, Jr., and Hall-Kenyon (2011) stated that if administrators “lack an intimate understanding of who teachers are and what they most value and find motivating about the work of teaching, even the most well-intentioned of school reform efforts is likely to fail” (p. 128). The findings of this study suggest that the following items should be considered by educational administrators for possible use in schools:

1. The highest subgroups as reported by teachers were also the most self-determined, or most autonomous. The study shows that teachers teach due to principles and beliefs within them, to continue to learn new things, and to further develop themselves. Administrators should give teachers the opportunity and freedom to further explore these areas of their profession.

2. Since over 50% of the responding teachers of this study were involved in sport at some point in their lives, administrator should confirm if sport is still of interest to them. If so, the administrator could plan towards involving some athletic type motivators for those teachers.

3. Overall, the teachers of this study were not a-motivated towards teaching. The administrator should attempt to make sure that this remains that case by focusing on the motivational subgroups that the teachers were most motivated by.
4. Overall, the teachers of this study reported that they did not care what others thought. The administrator should make every effort not to make decisions based upon perceptions of others, as this could lead to a-motivation.

5. The study concluded that teachers are teachers and teaching is teaching. There was very little difference in responses based upon teachers’ grade level taught or years’ of experience, and teachers should all be treated and viewed in the same manner.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. More than 50% of the sample included teachers who previously participated in sports. Future research is recommended to investigate if this is unique to the sample or if perhaps there is a relationship between prior participation in sports and a desire to teach.

2. In five of the six motivational subgroups (all except extrinsic motivation integrated), teachers that responded ‘yes’ to the previous sport participation demographic question reported lower mean scores than their non-sport participant peers. It is unclear why this occurred and further research is recommended by the researcher.

3. Changing the sport participant demographic question (yes or no) to a more definitive question of level of previous sport participation (high school, college, or professional) could identify possible relationships between motivation and the level of previous sport participation.

4. Adding a sex demographic question (male or female) could provide further clarity to motivational differences within the study.
5. Adding an age group type demographic question could provide additional clarity to generational differences that might exist.

6. Changing the years’ experience demographic question from ten year ranges to smaller ranges could possibly provide clarity to generational differences that might exist.

7. Increasing the reliability rating of the SMS-II-ED from .647 to .767 by eliminating question 15.

Conclusion

Although only one significant difference was found from the results of this study, the study provides meaningful information. Educational leaders can learn from the motivation required to participate in sports at a high level, especially baseball, and attempt to utilize some of those motivational traits towards getting teachers to be at their best daily. This point becomes even more valid considering the study revealed that over 50% of the respondents participated in sport at the high school or collegiate level. There is no doubt that some of the greatest leaders come from the field of sport (Hughes, 2013), and many of those former sport participants are now in the classrooms of Mississippi. It is the administrator’s responsibility to motivate these individuals (Kocabas, 2009) and one that should not be taken lightly.
APPENDIX A

SUPERINTENDENT PERMISSION TO SURVEY TEACHERS

(Date)

Dr. ________,

I am currently in the final stages of a Ph.D. in Educational Administration from The University of Southern Mississippi and need your help! I will be distributing an anonymous, confidential survey on “teacher motivation” and need feedback from your teachers. If you allow, I will either mail or hand deliver a survey to a point person at a school(s) in your district to be distributed and collected. I will also include a $20 gift card to be raffled off to survey respondents. The survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete.

Please respond with permission on district letterhead by mail or attached email as soon as possible. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to call or email me.

Thank You,

Jay Rayborn
Columbia School District
1401 Church St.
Columbia, MS 39429
601-695-6075 cell
jrayborn@columbiaschools.org
APPENDIX B
SURVEY PACKET INSTRUCTIONS

Survey Conductor,

Thank you so much for agreeing to help me conduct this survey within your district! Once you have read and signed the assurance form, please read the following information carefully and follow the instructions. Should you have any questions, please call me before proceeding.

Jay Rayborn
601-695-6075 (cell)

Survey Packet:

Contents:

1. This cover letter / instructions (1 copy).
2. Assurance form for person conducting the survey (1 copy).
4. Dual tickets for $20 gift card raffle (50 tickets).
5. $20 gift card (1).
6. Large self-addressed, stamped manila envelope for survey return (1).

Instructions:

1. Please sign the assurance form for conducting the survey.
2. Read the following statement aloud to the teachers:

    This is a survey on reasons that you teach. It is from doctoral student Jay Rayborn of Columbia, MS. Your participation is voluntary and your responses are anonymous and confidential. By taking a survey, you are giving your consent for your data to be used in his study on teacher motivation. Do not write your name on the survey. Once you are finished, please put your survey in this manila envelope. You will then be eligible for a $20 Visa gift card that will be raffled off following the completion of this survey. Thank you for your consideration.

3. Distribute the survey instrument –THE SMS-II-ED to willing teachers.
4. Place the return manila envelope in a centralized location.
5. Once all surveys are placed back in manila envelope, please seal shut.
6. Distribute raffle tickets (You keep one end of ticket stub, the teacher keeps the other end).

(The teacher must have turned in a survey to be eligible to win).

7. Draw a winning raffle ticket and call out the winning number.
8. Distribute gift card to winner.
9. Place all survey materials in the provided large manila, postage paid return envelope and place in outgoing U.S.P.S. mail the next working day.
APPENDIX C
THE SPORT MOTIVATION SCALE (SMS-II)

**SMS-II**

**Why do you practice your sport?**

*Please think about why you practice your primary sport and respond to the questions below. Using the following scale, please indicate to what extent each of the following items corresponds to one of the reasons for which you are presently practicing your sport.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not correspond at all</th>
<th>Corresponds very little</th>
<th>Corresponds a little</th>
<th>Corresponds moderately</th>
<th>Corresponds quite a bit</th>
<th>Corresponds quite a lot</th>
<th>Corresponds completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Because I would feel bad about myself if I did not take the time to do it.
   
2. I used to have good reasons for doing sports, but now I am asking myself if I should continue.
   
3. Because it is very interesting to learn how I can improve.
   
4. Because practicing sports reflects the essence of whom I am.
   
5. Because people I care about would be upset with me if I didn’t.
   
6. Because I found it is a good way to develop aspects of myself that I value.
   
7. Because I would not feel worthwhile if I did not.
   
8. Because I think others would disapprove of me if I did not.
   
9. Because I find it enjoyable to discover new performance strategies.
   
10. I don’t know anymore; I have the impression that I am incapable of succeeding in this sport.

11. Because participating in sport is an integral part of my life.

12. Because I have chosen this sport as a way to develop myself.

13. It is not clear to me anymore; I don’t really think my place is in sport.

14. Because through sport, I am living in line with my deepest principles.

15. Because people around me reward me when I do.

16. Because I feel better about myself when I do.

17. Because it gives me pleasure to learn more about my sport.

18. Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself.

**THE SPORT MOTIVATION SCALE (SMS-II)**

APPENDIX D

PERMISSION TO USE / MODIFY SMS-II INSTRUMENT

From: Luc Pelletier [social@uottawa.ca]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 11:08 AM
To: Thelma J Roberson
Subject: Re: Revised Survey Instrument (Take a quick look)

Dear Dr. Robertson,

For your information the SMS has been revised recently and we don’t use the old version anymore. I have attached the SMS-II and an article on it validation. I have also attached another scale that you may find more appropriate for your study, the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale.

Yes, you have my permission.

Regards,

Luc G. Pelletier, Ph.D.
Ecole de Psychologie / School of Psychology
Université d'Ottawa / University of Ottawa
136 Jean Jacques Lussier (5027)
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5 Canada
(613) 562-5890 ext. 7503
Site Web/Website: http://www.socialescience.uottawa.ca/pelletiermotlab/
Courriel/Email: Luc.Pelletier@uOttawa.ca
SMS-II-ED: THE SPORT MOTIVATION SCALE

Demographic Information: (Circle one for each item)

Certified Teacher? Yes or No

School Level? K-5 6-8 9-12

Years of Experience including this year? 1-10 11-19 20+

Did you participate as an athlete in organized sports
during high school or college? Yes or No

WHY DO YOU TEACH?

Please think about why you teach and respond to the questions below. Using the scale below, please indicate to what extent each of the following items corresponds to one of the reasons for which you are presently teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not correspond at all</th>
<th>Correlates a little</th>
<th>Correlates moderately</th>
<th>Correlates a lot</th>
<th>Correlates exactly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY DO YOU TEACH?
1. Because I would feel bad if I was not teaching. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I used to have good reasons for teaching, but now I am asking myself if I should continue doing it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Because it is very interesting to learn how I can improve. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Because teaching reflects the essence of whom I am. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Because people I care about would be upset with me if I didn’t. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Because I found it is a good way to develop aspects of myself that I value. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Because I would not feel worthwhile if I did not. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Because I think others would disapprove of me if I did not. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Because I find it enjoyable to discover new teaching strategies. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I don’t know anymore; I have the impression that I am incapable of succeeding in this profession. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Because teaching is an integral part of my life. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Because I have chosen teaching as a way of developing myself. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. It is not clear to me anymore; I don’t really think my place is in teaching. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Because through teaching, I am living in line with my deepest principles. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Because people around me reward me when I do. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. Because I feel better about myself when I do. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. Because it gives me pleasure to learn more about my chosen profession. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. What are the main reasons you teach?

APPENDIX F

VALIDITY QUESTIONNAIRE

The SMS-II-ED, developed by Jay Rayborn, is a modified version of THE SPORT MOTIVATION SCALE (SMS-II)

Validity Questionnaire

Thank you for volunteering your time to assist me in the development of this survey. Your input is very important with respect to the survey itself and the development of my dissertation overall. Your willingness and consideration to participate in this study is greatly appreciated.

Please provide feedback of the included survey based on the following questions:

1. Does the survey contain language that can be understood by certified K-12 teachers in Mississippi’s schools?

2. Does the survey address specific and appropriate issues in the statements as they relate to intrinsic, extrinsic, and a-motivational factors that could possibly motivate teachers?

3. Do you find any of the questions offensive or obtrusive? Explain-

4. Are there any questions that you would exclude from the survey? Explain-

5. Are there any other motivational factors that you would include that are not a part of the survey?

6. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about the survey?
Enclosed is a survey instrument on teacher motivation. This is in connection with a research project by Jay Rayborn, through The University of Southern Mississippi. If you are reading this, you have volunteered to help pilot this study. Please read every question carefully and submit your most honest answer. If you have suggestions or thoughts about the instrument, please write those in the margins or on the back of the survey. I may then call you for clarification in order to make this instrument as reliable as possible.

Thanks for your help,

Jay Rayborn
1401 Church St.
Columbia, MS 39429
601-695-6075 (cell)
APPENDIX H

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.

Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 14121002
PROJECT TITLE: Preferences for Intrinsic and Extrinsic Sport Motivators of Mississippi Public School Teachers
PROJECT TYPE: New Project
RESEARCHER(S): Jay Rayborn
COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education and Psychology
DEPARTMENT: Educational Leadership and School Counseling
FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 01/15/2015 to 01/14/2016
Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board
APPENDIX I

SURVEY CONDUCTOR ASSURANCE FORM

Survey Conductor Assurance

This is a research project on teacher motivation being conducted by Jay Rayborn through The University of Southern Mississippi, and has been reviewed by university IRB members. You are invited to participate in this research project because you have been identified as a responsible employee within your school district.

Your participation in helping conduct this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in the research study, you may withdraw at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized.

The procedure involves reading instructions aloud, distributing survey instruments, and having the teachers place the completed surveys in a folder. It also involves distributing raffle tickets and drawing for a winner. Your name will not be used in this study.

If you have any questions about the research study, please contact me before you begin. If you agree to help me conduct this study, please print and sign your name below.

Thank You,

Jay Rayborn
1401 Church St.
Columbia, MS 39429
601-695-6075 (cell)

I agree to help conduct this survey on Teacher Motivation.

Name: ________________________________

Signature: ______________________________

School District: ______________________________
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