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Abstract

The present research is done to establish the relationship of motivational impact of motivational factors with faculty’s demographic characteristics. All faculty members have different level of education, experience and expertise. Therefore the same motivational policies cannot satisfy all faculty categories as Professor, Assistant professor, Lecturer and Instructor. All have different level of education, experience and expertise. This study sought to investigate the influence of various motivational factors on faculty motivation. The research instrument titled “Faculty’ Motivation Questionnaire” (FAMOTQ) was used to gather data for analysis. The results after analysis suggest that the faculty are generally motivated by all factors. However, female faculty members are less satisfied than male faculty members. The factor “work itself” is the most motivating aspect for faculty. The least motivating aspect is “working conditions. Senior faculty is highly satisfied by recognition. Salary factor has great influence on junior faculty & less on senior faculty such as professors & heads.
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Introduction

It is matter of grim affair that level of education is deteriorating day by day in developing countries. Because most of faculty members are dissatisfied with their job. It is crucial that we must determine what motivates faculty. Faculty is the most important resource of an institute. The failures or success of an institute can be summed up to the inputs initiated from its human resource. The factors that initiate the performance of employees are matter of key interest for researchers. It has been truly found out that highly satisfied & motivated employees following a pattern of daily work management have been the core strength of the most successful organizations. The job satisfaction has got tremendous attention in organizational research. Human resource management’s function is to assist the general manager or the top management in keeping the employees satisfied with their jobs. If employees are not satisfied, they will not perform to expected norms. Kalim ullah Khan et al. [1] explored that workplace dissatisfaction and poor performance may lead to high employee turnover in an organization particularly in developing countries where little opportunities are available to people to join other organizations, but it may affect employee’s performance adversely. Education system has different, goals, priorities, values, needs, and motivational instincts as compare to other business organizations. Highly qualified and well motivated faculty members are like brain and blood for any academic institute. They develop the students both personally and professionally. If talented and competent faculty members are not motivated enough by the management, and if they are not happy with their job, institute and management, then they may leave the institute. Teachers are the makers of students. They are those influencing personalities and role models, who refine their students’ skills and polish their personalities and make them responsible citizens and leaders for tomorrow. Therefore, management use various intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors to motivate faculty members, so that they can put their extra efforts to produce bright and successful students, good learning environment, strong culture, and good image of institute. But the same motivational policies without consideration of bibliographic information of faculties are unable to motivate every category of faculty. Thus considering the demographic characteristics of faculty members, sound motivational polices are required to motivate all teachers of the academic institute and for the society as a whole. This study will help to decide valuable motivational policies by institutional management. This paper enlightens
the importance of effective motivational polices that can be useful for the management to retain, attract, and stimulate valuable faculty members.

**Literature Review**

Rehman et al. [2] explored that younger and older medical professionals differ significantly in their scores of psychological well-being and work motivation. According to their reports service based industry is going under major changes for the last few years in Pakistan. Due to these changes not only their transactions are increasing but their range of services is also expanding. As a result different sectors of service industry such as banks, educational institutes and telecommunication firms are experiencing swift turnover. Ahmed Imran Hunjra et al. [1] aimed at measuring the effect of human resource management practices like autonomy; leadership behaviour and team work on job satisfaction. It attempts to measure the importance of each factor on level of job satisfaction. It also depicts the difference of level of job satisfaction between male and female employees. Results of the study indicate that there is a positive relationship between autonomy, leadership behaviour and team work environment and job satisfaction. However, leadership and teamwork environment influence more than autonomy on employees’ job satisfaction. The findings also depict a significant difference of level of job satisfaction between male and female employees. “Motivation” describes reason for action to be taken. It stimulates an organism to perform certain action to achieve the desired goal [3]. It also helps to stimulate, express and continue a behavior. That behavior is in creed of achievement of any desired goal, which may results in reward or punishment [4]. According to Tella et al. [3] motivation is like other psychological processes as perception, attitude, learning etc. He further described that motivation speaks for relationship among “need”, “drive” and “incentive”. That is if there will be a felt need or deficiency of anything, then it will stimulate the organism to perform a specific action i.e. drive, and when the organism will perform certain action then he may get desired reward i.e. incentive. Tella et al [3] discussed that well managed organizations value their human resources more than other resources. They consider their employees as an important asset of the organization and employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment is of prime importance for the management of the organization. Management believes to motivate their employees well, so to achieve organizational targets and to make their organization more effective. Rowley [5] sought to identify some of the issues which impact on the motivation of academic staff in higher education. According to Rowley salary, financial or promotion rewards are not of much value for the faculty members because they are hired on a fixed salary scale and promotions occur after long work experience. But few institutes provide several opportunities to their faculty members to earn financial rewards as bonuses and incentives. As higher education institutions become more sophisticated in their approach to quality and move on from the current emphasis on quality assurance to a stronger focus on quality enhancement, motivation will become an even more central issue. Research further explores that faculty members need personal and professional autonomy in their work and decision making. Many researchers believe that faculty members of higher education prefers on intrinsic motivation rather than extrinsic motivation. As fascination of research work, autonomy, recognition, career development, honor and helping others to learn are important factors that can motivate them [6-10]. It does not mean that financial rewards are not important for the teachers. They also need monetary rewards that should be in balance with the non monetary rewards. An effective and successful leader is one who must know the needs of his subordinates and must try to motivate his subordinates in accordance to their needs. Money and titles are of less importance for faculty members, non monetary rewards are rather more valuable for them. According to research conducted by McKeachie [11] teachers feel more satisfied and happy with their job when they have opportunity to learn new skills and knowledge, showing helpfulness, sense of being appreciated by subordinates and colleagues as well, and professional autonomy. All the extrinsic and intrinsic factors must be made available according to individual needs and demands, in order to make them satisfied with their jobs. As discussed about satisfiers and dissatisfies in their study. Satisfiers are intrinsic factors which include work itself, recognition, responsibility, and professional development. Whereas Dissatisfiers are hygiene factors or extrinsic factors that are external to job, which include management policy, salary or wage system, working conditions and working relationships. Absence of extrinsic factors can make employee unhappy as he will become dissatisfied, whereas if proper intrinsic factors or motivators will be present then employee will be satisfied with his job. Thus effective leaders should try to eliminate these dissatisfies. Reed, Bergemann & Olson [12] described that faculty like autonomy in making decisions. If they are free to make their decision and given autonomy, then they feel more
satisfied with their jobs and put more efforts in accomplishing work related goals. Faculty members should be provided with opportunities for personal development, as they should be provided with challenging and novel teaching experiences, they should be motivated to do, seminars, faculty development workshops, conferences, research and publications should be arranged for their knowledge and skill development, proper training and development activities should be performed. Leaders should try to minimize dissatisfiers i.e. absence of extrinsic factors. Leaders should also try to create friendly environment for their faculty members in which they feel accepted and being valued by everyone [5]. Tella et al [3] further explored that training is also one of the important motivating factors that helps staff in polishing their present skills and also helps them to learn new ones. Information availability and communication is also one of the motivating strategy used by management [13]. Financial rewards are significant in such academic institutes where the appraisal policies are wholly dependent on financial rewards [14]. If the faculty members are not compensated fairly then they will become demotivated and dissatisfied with their job. Salary package and working condition stimulates employees to work effectively in an organization [3]. Money has motivating power and leaders can use it wisely to motivate their followers and can shove them towards higher performances [15]. Similarly Sinclair et. al. [16] has demonstrated that money has the motivational power to attract and retain employees and direct them toward higher performance. Therefore management can use monetary rewards to please their employees and their withdrawal as a punishment for them depending upon the power of reward for employees. Motivated faculty can earn good national and international reputation worldwide. By making good reputation and positive image academic institutes can attract brilliant students from all over the world, can attract funds and can create a strong influencing culture, can adapt different useful teaching techniques & styles, can provide superb education to students, can help students to develop professionally and personally. Therefore, management must work to motivate their staff members. As faculty members are at interface in between management and students. They are also important asset of institutes. Management should know the individual differences of their faculty and should try to explore their individual needs and motivate them accordingly, so that teachers could give their best at work and remain well engaged with job and committed with organization as well.

Lawler [17] reported that different theories questioning why people prefer certain careers, why they seek particular rewards and feel satisfied or dissatisfied with their work and rewards. These are some of the resonating questions that create so many assumptions and hypothesis to be researched. Patel and Cardon [18] explored that having a group culture is a key factor in the extent to which leadership behaviour is adopted, as well as how effective adopting HRM practices are for increasing productivity and job satisfaction. Gogoi [19] found that the importance of work spiritually is consistently growing as the spiritual cause leads to strategic benefits to the business unit and due to the significant contribution of team work spiritually

**Problem Statement**

The management of faculty in institutes is an integral part of management process. To raise the level of education in the colleges, sound & balanced motivational policies are required to develop under the consideration of demographic characteristics of faculty. Because of the prevailing situation is North India, where the supply of faculty is greater than its demand. Most institutes don’t believe much in effective employee’s satisfaction and motivation to ensure higher performance. There has been no attempt to validate the relationship between motivational policies & faculty’s demographic characteristics in the educational organizations of India.

**Purpose of Study**

The research of relevance of job satisfaction and motivational factors with faculty’s demographic characteristics is very crucial to institutional management. All faculty members have different level of education, experience and expertise. Therefore the same motivational policies cannot satisfy all faculty categories as Professor, Assistant professor, Lecturer and Supervisor. All have different level of education, experience and expertise. This study concerns at investigating the influence of various motivational factors on faculty motivation.

**Research Methodology**

**Sample**

The research design was descriptive survey method and data was collected through a questionnaire. The sample of the study is comprised of teachers from 7 randomly selected institutes of Punjab, India. A convenient sample size of 227 faculty members who were also randomly selected was chosen amongst the respondents. Before handover Motivation Questionnaire” (FAMOTQ) was used to gather data for the study. Section “A” of the research questionnaire describes respondents’
background information, categories include: gender, age, marital status, education level academic rank & experience. Section B, on the other hand describes possible motivational factors. The questionnaire was made up of 6 items in section ‘A’ and 4 items in section ‘B’. Respondents were asked to rank some possible items on job related sources of satisfaction and motivation from the most important 1, 2, 3... to the least important 8, 9 and 10.

**Data Analysis**

To arrive at the intended analyses, the participants’ responses were keyed into SPSS version 17.0 software and several sets of statistical analyses were performed: mean point value and standard deviation.

**Findings & Results**

Out of the total number of respondents, 179 (78.9%) were male while 48 (21.1%) were female. And 15 (6.6%), 119 (52.4%), 52 (22.9%), 41 (18.1%) are heads, professors, lecturers and instructor respectively. Further information on the demographic characteristics is as displayed in Table 1. Results of the table 2 shows that females reported lower level (i.e. 1.73) of motivation with motivational factor recognition and higher level of motivation with salary increment. On the other hand male are highly motivated by promotion and recognition. The influence of work conditions on both male and female is almost same. Table 3 depicts that persons of age group (21-30) are more influenced by salary increments and promotion, whereas group of age 51+ are motivated by other two factors i.e recognition & work conditions. The other age groups are almost influenced in same proportion by all motivational factors. As shown in table 4, married and singles both are more inclined towards salary increments and promotion and less motivated by work conditions and recognition. But salary increment has major influence on married and promotion has on single. Results of the table 5 shows that diploma holders reported lower level (i.e. 1.18) of motivation with motivational factor recognition and higher level of motivation with salary increment Doctorates are factors is almost same on persons having master degree. Graduate are more motivated by salary increment and have same influence of other three factors. Highly motivated by work conditions and recognition. The influence of all motivational The results of table 6 demonstrate that The other age groups are almost influenced in same proportion by all motivational factors. Good working conditions & recognition have great motivational impact on heads. Lectures are less motivated (i.e. 2.27 & 3.37) by conditions & recognition. Table 7 shows that top experienced persons (i.e. 16-20 & 21+) are more influenced by recognition & work conditions, whereas persons having experience (1-5 ,6-10 and 11-15 ) are highly motivated by other two factors i.e. salary & promotion.

Overall the research indicates the following results in terms of motivation of faculty members based on motivational factors and the biographical variables of the sample:

- The most experienced faculty such as heads are less motivated by salary increments. They are mainly influenced by recognition & good work conditions.
- Instructors & Lecturers are highly motivated by salary increments.
- Overall, female employees are less motivated. They are mainly influenced by salary increments.
- Married and single both reported more motivation by salary increments and promotion.
- Highly educated faculty having doctorate degree are more motivated recognition & good work conditions. On the other hand faulty with low education are more influenced by salary increments and promotion.
- Faculty in all age groups except group (51+) showed lower level of motivation with recognition & good work condition.

**Conclusion**

The research highlights that management can make use of different tactics strategies and policies to influence the motivational level of faculty in work settings, but different tactics, strategies and policies would have a different motivational impact on diverse people. A motivation strategy may possibly have the power
of enhancing motivation in one way and diminishing it in others. To make sure the success of motivational tools, it is important to consider the uniqueness of the situation and the diversity of the concerned group. It is the job of management to consider different alternatives according to situation. The four motivational factors (Salary increment, work conditions, recognition and promotion) in this study are very important to research on by researchers and management to consider well if effective productivity is to be enhanced from the faculty. From this research, it is observed that among all factors, salary and promotion are the most influential factors for motivation for all faculties except most qualified and experienced faculty such as heads.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of faculty

| Independent variables | Frequency | % Percentage |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Gender                |           |             |
| Male                  | 179       | 78.9        |
| Female                | 48        | 21.1        |
| Marital Status        |           |             |
| Single                | 63        | 27.8        |
| Married               | 164       | 72.2        |
| Age                   |           |             |
| 20-30                 | 34        | 15.0        |
| 31-40                 | 135       | 59.5        |
| 41-50                 | 40        | 17.6        |
| 51-60                 | 18        | 7.9         |
| Academic Rank         |           |             |
| Head                  |           |             |
| Professor             | 15        | 6.6         |
| Lecturer              | 119       | 52.4        |
| Instructor            | 52        | 22.9        |
| Doctorate             | 41        | 18.1        |
| Master                | 22        | 9.7         |
| Bachelor              | 122       | 53.7        |
| Diploma               | 47        | 20.7        |
| 1-5 years             | 66        | 29.1        |
| 6-10 years            | 119       | 39.2        |
| 11-15 years           | 29        | 12.8        |
| 16-20 years           | 25        | 11.8        |
| 21+years              | 18        | 7.9         |

Table 2: Impact of motivational factors based on gender

| Gender | Recognition | Promotion | Work conditions | Salary increment |
|--------|-------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Female | 1.73        | 2.42      | 2.35            | 2.54            |
| N      | 48          | 48        | 48              | 48              |
| Std. Deviation | .869 | .895 | .758 | .922 |
| Male   | 2.54        | 2.69      | 2.22            | 2.03            |
| N      | 179         | 179       | 179             | 179             |
| Std. Deviation | .984 | .781 | .842 | .780 |

Table 3: Impact of motivational factors based on age

| Age     | Work conditions | Promotion | Salary increment | Recognition |
|---------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|
| 21-30   | 2.12            | 2.62      | 3.29             | 1.97        |
| N       | 34              | 34        | 34               | 34          |
| Std. Deviation | .844 | .830 | .739 | 1.001 |
| 31-40   | 2.19            | 2.68      | 2.16             | 2.18        |
| N       | 135             | 135       | 135              | 135         |
| Std. Deviation | .790 | .785 | .774 | .791 |
### Table 4: Impact of motivational factors based on marital status

| Martial Status | Work conditions | Salary increment | Promotion | Recognition |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Married        | Mean 2.13       | 3.04             | 2.74      | 2.15        |
|                | N 164           | 164              | 164       | 164         |
|                | Std. Deviation 1.012 | 0.724        | .747      | 1.128       |
| Single         | Mean 2.19       | 2.59             | 3.02      | 2.13        |
|                | N 63            | 63               | 63        | 63          |
|                | Std. Deviation .895 | .835          | .684      | 1.039       |

### Table 5: Impact of motivational factors based on education

| Education     | Work conditions | Salary increment | Promotion | Recognition |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Diploma       | Mean 2.13       | 3.12             | 2.11      | 1.18        |
|                | N 41            | 41               | 41        | 41          |
|                | Std. Deviation .853 | .805         | .820      | 1.119       |
| Graduation    | Mean 2.21       | 3.11             | 2.28      | 2.31        |
|                | N 52            | 52               | 52        | 52          |
|                | Std. Deviation 1.237 | .795          | .957      | .861        |
| Masters       | Mean 2.52       | 2.51             | 2.70      | 2.51        |
|                | N 119           | 119              | 119       | 119         |
|                | Std. Deviation 1.047 | .966          | .819      | 1.071       |
| Doctorate     | Mean 3.14       | 2.88             | 2.53      | 3.15        |
|                | N 15            | 15               | 15        | 15          |
|                | Std. Deviation .990 | 1.506         | 1.454     | .941        |

### Table 6: Impact of motivational factors based on rank

| Rank          | Work conditions | Salary increment | Promotion | Recognition |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Instructor    | Mean 2.15       | 3.27             | 2.41      | 1.68        |
|                | N 41            | 41               | 41        | 41          |
|                | Std. Deviation .853 | .789         | .805      | .820        |
| Lecturer      | Mean 2.27       | 3.13             | 2.58      | 2.37        |
|                | N 52            | 52               | 52        | 52          |
|                | Std. Deviation .957 | .787          | .795      | .961        |
| Professor     | Mean 2.56       | 2.51             | 2.80      | 2.56        |
|                | N 119           | 119              | 119       | 119         |
|                | Std. Deviation .998 | .966          | .819      | .977        |
| Head          | Mean 3.40       | 2.80             | 2.53      | 3.53        |
|                | N 15            | 15               | 15        | 15          |
|                | Std. Deviation .941 | .972          | .990      | .873        |
### Table 7: Impact of motivational factors based on experience

| Experience | Work conditions | Promotion | Salary increment | Recognition |
|------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 – 5      | Mean 2.02      | 2.52      | 3.39             | 1.87        |
|            | N 34           | 34        | 34               | 34          |
|            | Std. Deviation .874 | .739 | .840             | 1.870       |
| 6 - 10     | Mean 2.27      | 2.68      | 2.76             | 2.16        |
|            | N 135          | 135       | 135              | 135         |
|            | Std. Deviation .895 | .774 | .771             | .790        |
| 11 - 15    | Mean 2.30      | 3.23      | 2.55             | 2.36        |
|            | N 40           | 40        | 40               | 40          |
|            | Std. Deviation 1.085 | .853 | .905             | .927        |
| 16+20      | Mean 3.17      | 2.44      | 1.54             | 3.54        |
|            | N 25           | 25        | 25               | 25          |
|            | Std. Deviation .984 | 1.227 | 1.056            | .872        |
| 21+        | Mean 3.62      | 2.22      | 1.51             | 3.94        |
|            | N 18           | 18        | 18               | 18          |
|            | Std. Deviation .984 | 1.227 | 1.056            | .873        |
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