

Dissertation Abstract

**Title: The Effectiveness of Achievement Motivation
Training Among High School Teachers in the
Roosevelt College System**

The present study experimented on the enhancement of the motivation of teachers in the hope that performance in teaching will correspondingly improve as a result of an increased level of achievement motivation developed through a motivation enhancement training program.

The main problem of this study was to find out whether training for a specific purpose (as opposed to person-centered group counseling) as a mode of treatment, is effective in enhancing achievement motivation of teachers rated low in performance rating.

The answers to the following specific questions were sought:

1. Will teachers who undergo training in achievement motivation show improvement in their:
 - 1.1 Motivation to achieve, as measured by the Trait Survey.
 - 1.2 Causal attributional style, as measured by the Locus of Control.



DE LA SALLE UNIVERSITY

x

1.3 Teaching performance, as rated by:

1.3.1 school administrators

1.3.2 students

2. Will teachers who experience person-centered group counseling show improvement in their:

2.1 Motivation to achieve as measured by the Trait Survey.

2.2 Causal attributional style as measured by the Locus of Control.

2.3 Teaching performance as rated by:

2.3.1 school administrators

2.3.2 students

3. Will teachers who do not undergo training and do not experience the person-centered group counseling show improvement in their:

3.1 Motivation to achieve as measured by the Trait Survey.

3.2 Causal attributional style as measured by the Locus of Control.

3.3 Teaching performance as rated by:

3.3.1 school administrators

3.3.2 students

4. Will teachers who undergo training in achievement motivation show greater improvement than



(a) those who experienced person-centered group counseling and (b) those who were not exposed to training in achievement motivation or to person-centered group counseling in their:

- 4.1 Motivation to achieve as measured by the Trait Survey
- 4.2 Causal performance as rated by:
Locus of Control
- 4.3 Teaching performance as rated by:
 - 4.3.1 school administrators
 - 4.3.2 students

The subjects of this research were chosen based on their end-of-the-schoolyear (1989-1990) performance rating which ranged from 3.7 to 2.7, interpreted as Fair to Marginal. The thirty teachers were randomly assigned, ten each to three different groups, namely: Experimental, Person-centered and No Treatment. A randomized experimental pretest-posttest control group design was used.

The instruments used for the study were: (a) Trait Survey, which measures the level of achievement motivation, (b) Locus of Control, which measures causal



attributional style (c) Performance Appraisal System, which indicates the teaching performance of a teacher as rated by the school administrators, (d) Teaching Performance Rating, which indicates the rating the students give to their respective teachers.

To determine the significance of difference between pretest and posttest scores of each group on the four measures, the t-test for correlated samples (direct-difference method) was performed with the following outcomes:

1. For the Experimental Group (teachers who underwent training in achievement motivation) the first hypothesis was supported with respect to Motivation to Achieve and Performance Appraisal System but not with respect to Locus of Control and Teaching Performance Rating.

2. For the Person-Centered Group (teachers who underwent person-centered group counseling) the second hypothesis was supported with respect to Trait Survey, Locus of Control, and Teaching Performance Rating (student's rating) but not with respect to Performance Appraisal System.

3. For the No Treatment Group (teachers who did not undergo training in achievement motivation nor



experienced the person-centered group counseling) the third hypothesis was supported with respect to Trait Survey, Locus of Control and Teaching Performance Rating (student's ratings), but not with respect to Performance Appraisal System.

To determine the significance of differences in gain scores (a) between the Experimental and the Person-centered groups and (b) between the Experimental and No Treatment group the t-test for two independent samples was used, with the following results:

1. The Experimental group differed significantly from both the Person-Centered and No Treatment group in their gain scores on the Trait Survey.

2. The experimental Group did not differ significantly from the Person-centered in their gain scores on Locus of Control. Similarly, no significant difference was found between the Experimental and the No Treatment group on this variable. There was no significant difference between the gain scores on Performance Appraisal System and Teaching Performance Rating of the Experimental group and the Person-centered group. There was also no significant difference between the Experimental group and the No Treatment group on the same measures.



Thus, the fourth hypothesis was confirmed only with respect to motivation to achieve, but not with the three other measures.

The following conclusions were arrived at based on the findings of the experiment conducted.

1. Training as a mode of treatment (as opposed to person-centered group counseling and no treatment) is effective in enhancing achievement motivation of teachers, as measured by the Trait Survey.

2. Enhancement of achievement motivation does not necessarily lead to improvement of teaching performance of teachers, as perceived by students.

3. Teachers can obtain increases in teaching performance ratings from their school administrators regardless of their level of achievement motivation and regardless of their attitudes, and beliefs in life.

4. Students' perception of their teachers' performance differs from that of the school administrators.

On the basis of these conclusions the following recommendations are drawn:

1. That follow up observations be made on the teachers of the Experimental group who have shown improvement in teaching performance as perceived by students.



2. That a further study be made to consider the following:

2.1 Stability of increased performance appraisal rating of the teachers of the No Treatment Group.

2.2 Validity and reliability of the rating students give to their respective teachers

2.3 Bigger number of subjects

2.4 Other sources/indicators of teaching performance such as:

2.4.1 willingness of teachers to accept assignments

2.4.2 increment in the grades obtained by the students

2.5 Concept clarification for locus of control appropriate to Philippine setting.

3. That group counseling opportunities be made available in the school for the teachers on a voluntary basis, with a thrust on values clarification to complement the development of intrinsic motivation among teachers.

4. That the results of this study be properly disseminated to the respective schoolheads of the



different teachers involved in this study.

5. That a workshop be conducted on improving teaching performance for the Experimental Group in particular and for other teachers in general.

