

## Analyzing the Effect of Teacher's Motivational Techniques on Students' Academic Performance in Pakistan

**Dr. Uzma Munawar**

Assistant Professor, Department of Education  
Govt Sadiq College Women University  
Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan  
[druzmunawar@gmail.com](mailto:druzmunawar@gmail.com)

**Dr. Syed Zubair Haider**

Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Training  
Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan  
[zubairiub@hotmail.com](mailto:zubairiub@hotmail.com)

**Muhammad Sajid Ali**

Researcher, Department of Education  
Islamia University of Bahawalpur  
[goldendovepk@gmail.com](mailto:goldendovepk@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The role of a teacher is very important in the provision of a healthy environment to enhance students' performance. Teachers make use of motivational techniques to inspire students to work in different learning situations to attain the best results. This paper examines the relationship between motivational techniques used by university teachers and students' performance. The study consists of 512 university students enrolled in different programs of three universities of Punjab. The data were collected randomly using one questionnaire, based on 26 items. Eight components emerged from the factor analysis involving "learning opportunities, learning activities, teachers' involvement in students' learning, students' expectations with teachers, competitive environment among students, classroom learning environment, assigning a particular task to students by teachers, teacher and students' individual incentives. Multilevel analyses, EFA, Pearson Correlation, Paired-sample t-test, frequency, and percentages were calculated to measure the beliefs. Results revealed that students appreciate the teachers' efforts in the class room. They were self-motivated and willing to complete challenging tasks assigned by teachers and aware of their responsibilities.

**Keywords:** Motivational Techniques, University Faculty, Students' Performance

### **1. Introduction**

Motivation is one of the essential components upon which the nature of an individual's work depends. It might be a type of gratitude, encouragement, and prizes or punishments (Bigge & Hunt, 1962). It is a craving or drives found inside an individual to attain goals of the life. This is an internal condition that is based upon an individual's recognition and needs (Peters, 2015). In the field of education, motivating students is one of the best ways to improve the educational system. Teachers can facilitate suitable working conditions to students because all students are not equal, so each one should be motivated using different strategies. However, it is difficult to determine an individual's motivation until the behavior and action or performance persist at each moment in time and individual shows intention towards goal-

directed activity (Lepper & Greene, 2015). The improvement of students and institutional capability to a great extent mostly relies upon the way instructor instructs and executes his/her part (Ormrod, 2014).

People are motivated by different things such as psychological needs, survival, urges, feelings, demands, inspiration, fears, dangers, rewards, belonging, wishes, expectations, values, dominance, flexibility, inherent fulfillment, self-fulfillment, interest, delight, aversion, secured propensities, objectives, desire etc. Through motivational process, teachers stimulate, direct and maintain behavior of learners for achieving goals (Arif, 2003). The act of arousing is basically related to the desire, objectives, and strength to produce something better. Human resources are the most important and most expensive assets that an educational organization may hold. Generally, in higher educational institutions, the teacher's work is to determine the level of achievement or failure in the institution to attain its goal towards successful learning (Corno & Anderman, 2015). A teacher is a person who gives institution its credibility and also determines its characteristics. An individual performance is determined by its ability to do the work and his willingness to do it (Qayyum & Saddique, 2003).

Directing is the selection of the behavior whereas maintenance concerns with certain manners and conditions until the desired goals are met. It is a most important challenge for teachers to know about how to motivate students for excellent performance (Reeve, 2014). Different motivational strategies preferred by teachers are influenced by students' nature and institutional behaviors. Teacher and institutional management should choose motivational strategies such as rewards, appreciations, and punishment to motivate students keeping in view the objectives (Riggio, 2015). Teachers often utilize motivation as a tool at a workplace. Teachers make use of motivational techniques to inspire students to work in different learning situations for both individuals and groups to attain the best results for education in the most effective and efficient manners (Singh, 2006). People assumed that the motivation had to generate from the outside. But nowadays, it is understood that each individual has his/her own set of motivational force that can be different from other individuals. It is teachers' duty to carefully identify and address those motivational forces (Ricks, Ginn, & Daughtrey, 1995).

Reece and Walker (2016) argued that in educative process motivation plays a vital role. One of the most important components of learning is motivation and it is difficult to measure it accurately. It is teacher's job to discover, initiate, sustain and increase students' motivation to learn and engage them in those activities that lead to learning (Corno & Anderman, 2015). Motivation may vary in direction and intensity. Motivational intensity to engage one's activity may depend upon the intensity and direction of motivation to engage in an alternative activity (Singh, 2006). Motivation to engage in one of these activities is strongly affected by the intensity of motivation to engage in the other. The role of a teacher is very important in the provision of a healthy environment to enhance the students' performance. The guidance and supervision of the teacher through the process never be replaced. Hence, it is a good time that special attention should be paid to motivate students and providing them, conducive learning environment.

## **2. Methods and Measures**

The study was descriptive in nature. The descriptive research sets out to describe and interpret what it is (Haider & Qureshi, 2016). In educational research, the most common type of descriptive research is the survey. In survey, researcher measures the individual characteristics such as abilities, behavior, preference, students' achievements, teachers' behavior, the attitude of administrators and parents in the physical environment (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

### 2.1. Population and Sample

The population of the current study comprised of all male and female students of science and arts discipline from public sector universities of Punjab. For selecting the true representative sample from the population of study, two-stage sampling technique was used. At the first stage, 3 public sector universities of Punjab (Punjab University Lahore, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, and Islamia University Bahawalpur) were selected randomly. At the second stage, 600 students [300 males “100 IUB, 100 BZU, 100 PU” (50 from 05 departments of Arts and 50 from 05 departments of science) 10 male students from each department] and 300 females “100 IUB, 100 BZU, 100 PU” (50 from 05 departments of Arts and 50 from 05 departments of science) 10 female students from each department] were purposively selected.

### 2.2. Research Instrument

A questionnaire for students was developed as a research tool on the basis of literature review. In the first part of the questionnaire, personal information related to demographic characteristics (gender, age, location, family structure, and qualification, etc.) were asked while the second part of the questionnaire consisted of 30 close ended questions. In the questionnaire, the questions related to Learning Opportunities (Items = 4,  $\alpha = .79$ ,  $M = 2.85$ ,  $SD = .59$ ), Learning Activities (Items = 3,  $\alpha = .81$ ,  $M = 2.84$ ,  $SD = .62$ ), Teachers' Involvement in Students' Learning (Items = 3,  $\alpha = .69$ ,  $M = 2.85$ ,  $SD = .65$ ), Students' Expectations with Teachers (Items = 3,  $\alpha = .72$ ,  $M = 2.68$ ,  $SD = .66$ ), Competitive Environment in Classroom (Items = 3,  $\alpha = .83$ ,  $M = 2.86$ ,  $SD = .61$ ), Classroom Learning Environment (Items = 3,  $\alpha = .81$ ,  $M = 2.65$ ,  $SD = .54$ ), Assigning Particular Task to Students (Items = 3,  $\alpha = .74$ ,  $M = 2.72$ ,  $SD = .62$ ), and Teacher and Students' Individual Incentives (Items = 4,  $\alpha = .76$ ,  $M = 2.62$ ,  $SD = .58$ ) were included. However, after Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) 26 questions were retained in the questionnaire. It was based on four-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree = 4 to strongly disagree = 1.

### 2.3. Tool Validation and Data Collection

The instrument was developed considering the study objectives after a thorough review of the literature. A panel of six faculty members from the department of education, Islamia University of Bahawalpur recognized the face and content validity of the questionnaire. The questions which have taken an endorsement from more than 80% of the specialists were retained while improper questions were modified according to the specialists' feedback and assessment. The study tool was piloted on a little sample of 30 students. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to assess the reliability of instrument and the value was 0.807.

The researchers personally collected the required data and out of total 600 questionnaires, 512 questionnaires were returned with the response rate of 85%. The collected data were analyzed with SPSS version 20.

### 3. Results

In this study, the process of data analysis took place in two steps. In first step, a factor analysis was conducted on questionnaire. In the second step, descriptive and inferential statistical measures were applied to the data.

**Table 1. Factor Analysis of students' perspectives regarding motivational techniques used by university teachers**

| Factor                                      | Questions  | Factor Loadings | Variance Explained |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|
| Learning Opportunities                      | Teacher appreciates the good work of students.                                   | 0.504           | 14.69%             |
|   | Students know about teachers' expectations.                                      | 0.412           |                    |
|   | Students are keen to take part in co-curricular activities.                      | 0.688           |                    |
|   | Students appreciate teachers' efforts in the classroom.                          | 0.604           |                    |
| Learning Activities                         | Teacher supplements their lectures with daily life examples.                     | 0.671           | 12.05%             |
|   | Students actively participate in class room activities.                          | 0.590           |                    |
|   | Teacher gives favour to certain students in assigning grades.                    | 0.506           |                    |
| Teachers' Involvement in Students' Learning | Teacher helps the students to become independent learner.                        | 0.565           | 9.18%              |
|   | Academic grades are true reflection of students' achievements.                   | 0.597           |                    |
|   | Teacher gives input for the improvement of students' work.                       | 0.680           |                    |
| Students' Expectations with Teachers        | Teacher comes into the class with full preparation.                              | 0.553           | 8.67%              |
|   | Students hardly meet the expectations of the department.                         | 0.565           |                    |
|   | Teacher treats all the students equally.   | 0.528           |                    |
| Competitive Environment in Classroom        | Teacher encourages students for self-study.                                      | 0.576           | 8.32%              |
|   | Students are not willing to read additional learning material on course content. | 0.649           |                    |
|   | Students ask questions during the lecture.                                       | 0.486           |                    |
| Classroom Learning Environment              | Academic environment of the department is conducive for learning.                | 0.433           | 6.45%              |
|   | Teacher does not answer the students' questions.                                 | 0.755           |                    |
|   | Classroom discussions are not well organized.                                    | 0.696           |                    |
| Assigning Particular Task to Students       | The quality of students' assignment is high.                                     | 0.553           | 6.21%              |
|   | Students like to complete challenging tasks.                                     | 0.623           |                    |
|   | Students are conscious about their responsibilities.                             | 0.658           |                    |
| Teacher & Students' Individual Incentives   | Teacher gives prizes to the extra ordinary students.                             | 0.671           | 5.87%              |
|   | Students hesitate to ask question from their teachers.                           | 0.489           |                    |
|   | Teacher asks questions from students.  | 0.464           |                    |
|   | Teacher uses audio visual aids in their lectures.                                | 0.631           |                    |

Total Variance Explained 71.44%

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to explore the factor structure in the research instruments (Table 1). A Principal Components Analysis (PCA) followed by Varimax rotation was conducted to extract the uncorrelated items of the research instrument. The results of EFA demonstrate that eight-factor solution was observed in the data set with each of their eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounted for 71.44% of the common variance. In the data set 26 items were finally retained after the analysis to measure eight apparent dimensions.

**Table 2. Correlation between teachers' motivational techniques and students' performance**

|                          | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8    | 9 |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|---|
| 1. LO                    | –     |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |   |
| 2. LA                    | .35** | –     |       |       |       |       |       |      |   |
| 3. TISL                  | .31** | .32** | –     |       |       |       |       |      |   |
| 4. SET                   | .37** | .19** | .29** | –     |       |       |       |      |   |
| 5. CEC                   | .32** | .30** | .26** | .25** | –     |       |       |      |   |
| 6. CLE                   | .05   | .05   | .04   | .14** | .04   | –     |       |      |   |
| 7. APTS                  | .32** | .17** | .25** | .29** | .27** | .13** | –     |      |   |
| 8. TSII                  | .19** | .10*  | .27** | .25** | .22** | .15** | .31** | –    |   |
| 9. Students' Performance | -.08  | .06   | -.03  | -.10* | .05   | -.10* | .03   | -.03 | – |

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

Note: LO = Learning Opportunities; LA = Learning Activities; TISL = Teachers' Involvement in Students' Learning; SET = Students' Expectations with Teachers; CEC = Competitive Environment in Classroom; CLE = Classroom Learning Environment; APTS = Assigning Particular Task to Students; TSII = Teacher & Students' Individual Incentives

Pearson's correlation matrix (See Table 2) reveals statistically moderate and low correlation between the dimensions of teachers' motivational techniques and students' performance. The LO has a moderate and low significant correlation with LA  $r = .35$ ,  $p < .01$ , TISL  $r = .31$ ,  $p < .01$ , SET  $r = .37$ ,  $p < .01$ , CEC  $r = .32$ ,  $p < .01$ , APTS  $r = .32$ ,  $p < .01$  and TSII  $r = .19$ ,  $p < .01$ . Moreover, LA has a low relationship with TISL  $r = .32$ ,  $p < .01$ , SET  $r = .19$ ,  $p < .01$ , CEC  $r = .30$ ,  $p < .01$ , APTS  $r = .17$ ,  $p < .01$  and TSII  $r = .10$ ,  $p < .05$ . Similarly, TISL also has a low association with SET  $r = .29$ ,  $p < .01$ , CEC  $r = .26$ ,  $p < .01$ , APTS  $r = .25$ ,  $p < .01$  and TSII  $r = .27$ ,  $p < .01$ . However, with students' performance, a low negative correlation can be seen with SET  $r = -.10$ ,  $p < .05$  and CLE  $r = -.10$ ,  $p < .05$  respectively.

**Table 3. Students' Attitude towards Learning Opportunities**

| Question  | Agree<br>(f)              | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Teacher appreciates the good work of students.              | 382                       | 74.6         | 130             | 25.4            |
| Students know about teachers' expectations.                 | 337                       | 65.8         | 175             | 34.1            |
| Students are keen to take part in co-curricular activities. | 346                       | 67.5         | 166             | 32.4            |
| Students appreciate teachers' efforts in the classroom.     | 341                       | 66.6         | 171             | 33.4            |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)                                | 68.62 (4.04)              |              | 31.32 (4.01)    |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test  | t (03) = 9.26, Sig = .003 |              |                 |                 |

It is evident from (table 3) that in 74.6% cases teachers motivates the students for learning and appreciates them on their good work. More than 65 % students are willing to learn they not only take part in co-curricular activities but also appreciate the teacher's efforts in classroom and have knowledge about the teacher's expectations from students. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree set of responses in favor of agree side (agree mean = 68.6250, disagree mean = 31.3250, t = 9.26, Sig = 003).

**Table 4. Students' Perspectives on Learning Activities**

| Question  | Agree<br>(f)              | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Teacher supplements their lectures with daily life examples.  | 368                       | 71.9         | 143             | 27.9            |
| Students actively participate in class room activities.       | 357                       | 69.8         | 154             | 30.1            |
| Teacher gives favour to certain students in assigning grades. | 323                       | 63.1         | 189             | 36.9            |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)                                  | 68.26 (4.59)              |              | 31.63 (4.69)    |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test  | t (02) = 6.83, Sig = .021 |              |                 |                 |

Table 4 revealed that in 71.9% cases teachers add example from daily life in their lectures to make them interesting for students. In more than 63% cases students actively participate in classroom activities but teacher give favor to certain students in assigning grades. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree sets of responses in favor of agree side (agree mean = 68.26, disagree mean = 31.63, t = 6.83, Sig = .021).

**Table 5. Teachers' Involvement in Students' Learning**

| Question   | Agree<br>(f)               | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|--|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Teacher helps the students to become independent learner.      | 358                        | 69.9         | 154             | 30.1            |
| Academic grades are true reflection of students' achievements. | 340                        | 66.4         | 172             | 33.6            |
| Teacher gives input for the improvement of students' work.     | 336                        | 65.6         | 176             | 34.4            |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)                                   | 67.30 (2.28)               |              | 32.70 (2.28)    |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test   | t (02) = 13.10, Sig = .006 |              |                 |                 |

It is evident from (table 5) that in 69.9% cases teachers show involvement in making the things learn to the students. In more than 65% cases they give their input for the students' learning, work to make them independent learner and do fair grading of the students. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree sets of responses in favor of agree side (agree mean = 67.30, disagree mean = 32.70,  $t = 13.10$ , Sig = .006).

**Table 6. Students Expectations with Teachers**

| Question   | Agree<br>(f)                | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Teacher comes into the class with full preparation.      | 313                         | 61.1         | 199             | 38.9            |
| Students hardly meet the expectations of the department. | 295                         | 57.6         | 217             | 42.4            |
| Teacher treats all the students equally.                 | 300                         | 58.6         | 210             | 41              |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)                             | 59.10 (1.80)                |              | 40.76 (1.76)    |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test                                     | $t(02) = 8.92$ , Sig = .012 |              |                 |                 |

Table 6 presents that in 61.1% cases teachers get preparation before going to class to make the students learning better. In more than 57% cases students tries to meet the expectation of the department and they all are equally treated by teachers. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree sets of responses in favour of agree side (agree mean = 59.10, disagree mean = 40.76,  $t = 8.92$ , Sig = .012).

**Table 7. Competitive Environment among Students**

| Question   | Agree<br>(f)                | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Teacher encourages students for self-study.                                      | 351                         | 68.6         | 161             | 31.4            |
| Students are not willing to read additional learning material on course content. | 327                         | 63.8         | 185             | 36.2            |
| Students ask questions during the lecture.                                       | 355                         | 69.4         | 157             | 30.6            |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)   | 67.26 (3.02)                |              | 32.73 (3.02)    |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test   | $t(02) = 9.87$ , Sig = .010 |              |                 |                 |

Table 7 highlights that in 68.6% cases students are motivated by teachers for self-learning. In more than 63% cases students do not show willingness to read additional learning material on course for their better learning but they like to ask questions during the lecture. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree sets of responses in favour of agree side (agree mean = 67.26, disagree mean = 32.73,  $t = 9.87$ , Sig = 010).

**Table 8. Classroom Learning Environment**

| Question  | Agree<br>(f)                | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Academic environment of the department is conducive for learning. | 375                         | 73.2         | 137             | 26.7            |
| Teacher does not answer the students' questions.                  | 233                         | 45.5         | 279             | 54.5            |
| Classroom discussions are not well organized.                     | 268                         | 52.4         | 244             | 47.7            |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)                                      | 57.03 (14.41)               |              | 42.96 (14.49)   |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test  | $t(02) = .843$ , Sig = .047 |              |                 |                 |

It shows from (table 8) that in 73.2% cases academic environment of the department favour the students for their learning. In more than 45% cases teacher dislike to answer the students' questions and do not organized the classroom discussions. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree sets of responses in favor of agree side (agree mean = 57.03, disagree mean = 42.96,  $t = .843$ , Sig = .047).

**Table 9. Assigning Particular Task to Students**

| Question   | Agree<br>(f)                  | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| The quality of students' assignment is high.         | 324                           | 63.3         | 188             | 36.7            |
| Students like to complete challenging tasks.         | 332                           | 64.8         | 180             | 35.1            |
| Students are conscious about their responsibilities. | 317                           | 61.9         | 195             | 38              |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)                         | 63.33 (1.45)                  |              | 36.60 (1.45)    |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test                                 | $t (02) = 15.95$ , Sig = .004 |              |                 |                 |

Table 09 illustrated that in 63.3% cases students complete their assignments with high quality material to learn more. In more than 61% cases students are conscious about their responsibilities and they are willing to complete challenging tasks to make their learning better. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree sets of responses in favor of agree side (agree mean = 63.33, disagree mean = 36.60,  $t = 15.95$ , Sig = .004).

**Table 10. Teacher and Students' Individual Incentives**

| Question   | Agree<br>(f)                 | Agree<br>(%) | Disagree<br>(f) | Disagree<br>(%) |
|--|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Teacher gives prizes to the extra ordinary students.   | 249                          | 48.6         | 263             | 51.4            |
| Students hesitate to ask question from their teachers. | 286                          | 55.9         | 226             | 44.1            |
| Teacher asks questions from students.                  | 342                          | 66.8         | 170             | 33.2            |
| Teacher uses audio visual aids in their lectures.      | 287                          | 56.1         | 225             | 44              |
| Overall response (Mean & SD)                           | 56.85 (7.49)                 |              | 43.17 (7.49)    |                 |
| Paired Sample t-test                                   | $t (03) = 1.82$ , Sig = .048 |              |                 |                 |

It is evident from (table 10) that in 48.6% cases teachers appreciate students for learning by giving them prizes on their extra ordinary work. In more than 55% cases teachers ask questions and also use audio visual aids in their lectures but students feel hesitation to ask the questions from teachers. There is a significant difference between agree and disagree sets of responses in favor of agree side (agree mean = 56.85, disagree mean = 43.17,  $t = 1.82$ , Sig = .048).

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

The thing that distinguished a person from other individuals is the level of his determination and motivation to work. People are motivated by different things like psychological needs, survival, urges, feelings, demands, inspiration, fears, dangers, rewards, belonging, wishes, expectations, values, dominance, self-fulfillment, interest, delight, aversion, and objectives. Teachers often utilize motivation as a tool at workplace. Teachers make use of motivation techniques to inspire students to work in different learning situations for both individuals and groups to attain the best results for education in the most effective and efficient manners. One of the primary tasks of a teacher is to motivate students for learning. This means putting them

on the way to work hard, make efforts to work regularly and contribute positively to the achievement of the desired goals. But students' contribution and performance depend on individual's ability, environment and his level of motivation (Arif, 2003). A teacher should ensure the level of motivation in an individual and his willingness to do something. It is a teacher's responsibility that he/she should accommodate students equally, push them and give a fair chance to everyone to participate in classroom activities. In other words, try to motivate all of them by using motivational techniques (Qayyum & Saddique, 2003). The teacher should arouse their desire and direct them to meet their short term and long-term goals. He should prepare them for a self-directive and lifelong learning. A highly self-motivated teacher can contribute a lot to the intellectual and personality development of a student. From the analysis of data, it appeared that students appreciate the teachers' efforts for using motivation techniques to make the students' learning better. The results of the study revealed that teachers used a variety of motivational techniques to increase the performance of students. These motivation techniques have a positive impact on the achievement of students (Henaky, 2013).

The current study also highlights that majority of the teachers assign a challenging task to the students, appreciate the good work of the students and supplement their lectures with daily life examples (Massey & Heafner, 2004). The findings of the present study also in line with Yusoff (2012) revealed that teachers equally treat all the students, encourage them for self-study, helps the students to become independent learner, give input for the improvement of the students' work, give prizes to the extraordinary students, ask questions from students and use audiovisual aids in their lectures. Singh (2006) is also in the favor of this idea that good teamwork and equal treatment of all students encourage them for self-study and they become independent learners.

The majority of the students are self-motivated for their learning. They are aware of teachers' expectations and actively participate in classroom activities. They take part in co-curricular activities and conscious about their responsibilities and accept the constructive criticism from the teacher. Students try to meet the deadline for the completion of their assignments. They like to complete challenging tasks and ask questions from their teachers. Alderfer (1969) need theory supported that growth needs are concerned with the individual's intrinsic desire of professional. A number of respondents agreed that teachers perform the extraordinary work for students. They argued that the academic grades are a true reflection of students' achievements (Sugita McEown & Takeuchi, 2014). The overall results showed that teachers used motivation strategies in a variety of ways. These motivation strategies showed a significant relationship with students' performance. In addition, the effectiveness of motivational strategies varied according to students' proficiency level.

## References

- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 4(2), 142-175. doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90004-X
- Arif, M. H. (2003). *Human Development and Learning*. Lahore: Majeed book Depot.
- Bigge, M. L., & Hunt, M. P. (1962). *Psychological foundations of education: An introduction to human development and learning*: Harper & Row.
- Corno, L., & Anderman, E. M. (2015). *Handbook of educational psychology*: Routledge.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

- Haider, S. Z., & Qureshi, A. (2016). Are All Children Equal? Causative Factors of Child Labour in Selected Districts of South Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 5(1), 3-10. doi.org/10.7821/naer.2016.1.132
- Henaky, O. S. S. A. (2013). *A comparative and evaluative study of motivational techniques used in the second intermediate level EFL classroom in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*. Unpublished Master of TESOL Thesis, College of Education, Curriculum and Instruction, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.
- Lepper, M. R., & Greene, D. (2015). *The hidden costs of reward: New perspectives on the psychology of human motivation*: Psychology Press.
- Massey, D. D., & Heafner, T. L. (2004). Promoting Reading Comprehension in Social Studies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(1), 26-40. doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.48.1.3
- Ormrod, J. E. (2014). *Essentials of educational psychology: Big ideas to guide effective teaching*: Pearson Higher Ed.
- Peters, R. S. (2015). *The concept of motivation*: Routledge.
- Qayyum, A., & Saddique, M. (2003). Let's Enhance the Performance of the Teachers: A Study of Motivational Techniques used by School Heads. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 13, 28-33.
- Reece, I., & Walker, S. (2016). *Teaching, training and learning: A practical guide*: Business Education Publishers Ltd.
- Reeve, J. (2014). *Understanding motivation and emotion*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ricks, B. R., Ginn, M. L., & Daughtrey, A. S. (1995). *Contemporary supervision : managing people and technology*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Riggio, R. (2015). *Introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*: Routledge.
- Singh, Y. K. (2006). *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistics*. New Delhi: New AGE International (Ptv) Limited.
- Sugita McEown, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2014). Motivational strategies in EFL classrooms: how do teachers impact students' motivation? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 20-38. doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2012.741133
- Yusoff, W. M. W. (2012). The Impact of Prophet Muhammad Motivation Techniques on Students' Performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 1700-1708. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.12.117