

Assessing Motivation Among Academicians

Anushree Chauhan, **Dr. Manisha Goel, * Dr. Ritu Gandhi Arora*



* Assistant Prof., Department of Management Studies, YMCA University of Science and Technology, Faridabad, India, Email: anushree27973@gmail.com

** Associate Prof., Department of Management Studies, YMCA University of Science and Technology, Faridabad, India, Email: singla_manisha@rediffmail.com

*** Professor, Department of Management Studies, YMCA University of Science and Technology, Faridabad, India, Email: prof.rituarora@gmail.com

MOTIVATION



Knowledge

Vision

Consulting

ABSTRACT

Changing the work related needs, motives and values of one person in an organization is a daunting challenge. People work in organizations for a varied variety of reasons. Employees want money, safety, security and recognition for the jobs they are performing. Their requirements vary as per their life styles, background, education and type of organizations they are working with. What each unique person in an organization want from work plays an instrumental role in determining that person's motivation to work. Motivation is vital to all organizations and often the difference between highly effective and less effective ones lies in motivation of their members also it is an important determinant of performance. The motivation among academicians is far more important for development of young generation. The present study aims to understand how faculty performance can be improved by focusing on what motivates a faculty at different hierarchical positions. This study attempts to evaluate, analyse and compare the faculty motivation with their respective designations on the basis of the factors ascertained after thorough literature review through structured questionnaire and sample size of 200 academicians working in various universities and affiliated colleges in Delhi and NCR. Delhi and NCR was identified to confine the study to a manageable boundary to ensure effectiveness, validity and reliability on a 5-point Likert scale. The results clearly showed that the motivational factors vary as per the respective designations of the faculty i.e. Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor in spite of working in same institute or university. Results also depicts that it is the management's responsibility to understand the nature of individual motivation, especially as it applies to work situation of an institution.

Key Terms: Academician, Motivation, Commitment, Need for affiliation, Need for achievement.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation is a process through which a person's efforts are energized, directed, and sustained towards attaining a specific goal (Steers et al 2004). The three elements, on which this definition emphasised, are effort, direction and persistence of effort. Motivation is essential for the success of any kind of organisation may it be a production unit, BPO, KPO or a hospital. Academic institutions are one which involved in transmission of knowledge and the development of the students. A poor performance or low morale can influence the knowledge sharing and the ultimate sufferers are the students (Devesh Kapur, 2010) that's why keeping academicians' motivated is extremely important. On top of all, the higher education scenario in India shows emergence of number of central, state, deemed and private universities (AISHE, 2012). In these universities the faculty members are less in numbers than what is mandatory, or the quality of faculty is very poor in terms of communication skills, subject expertise, industry academia interface etc. This requires the severe need for enhancing the attractiveness of teaching as a profession as well as motivation to select this profession by choice not by compulsion. (Deepti and Navneet 2012).

Main purpose of this study is to help academicians to attract and retain talent amongst the teaching fraternity. The present study aims to analyse how the various motivating factors such as Monetary benefits, Nature of Job, Working environment, Job security, Top management support, Responsibility with authority, Growth opportunities, Market reputation of the organisation student feedback and appreciation, Performance management system, Job recognition and Interpersonal relationship, differ amongst the various hierarchical levels of academicians such as assistant professors, associate professors and professors.



LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivation and its influencing factors

The term "motivation" is derived from the Latin term *movere*, which means "to move" (Baron, Henley, McGibbon & McCarthy, 2002). A great many definitions of the motivation construct have been postulated over the several decades during which this multifaceted concept has been researched. Employee motivation can be deliberated through several wide-ranging approaches like reinforcement theories, process theories and content or need based theories. These include Hierarchy of Needs Theory, Theory X and Y, Two Factor Theory, theory of needs, ERG theory, Goal Setting theory, Job Design theory, Equity and Expectancy Theory.

However, the term employee motivation is an intricate and complex term to define; therefore a specific definition of this concept is subtle as the concept comprises the distinctiveness of individual and situation in addition to the perception of that situation by the individual (Ifinedo 2003; Rosenfeld & Wilson 1999).

Different researchers have carried out different employee surveys in order to address the challenge of employee motivation. One of the first surveys was conducted in 1946

(Hersey and Blanchard). The subjects included industrial employees. Similar surveys were administered in 1980 (Kovach 1980), in 1986 (Kovach, 1987), and in 1992 (Wiley 1992). In 1946, industrial employees were asked to rank ten "job reward" factors in terms of personal preference. At the top of the list was appreciation of work done. At the bottom of the list was discipline. In 1980, 200 employees ranked the same ten items presented in the 1946 survey. At the top of the list for employees was interesting work; at the bottom of the list was discipline. In 1986, Kovach (1987) conducted a similar study of 1,000 industrial employees. The list was headed again by interesting work and ended with sympathetic help with personal problems.

Apart from the surveys conducted, different researchers have analyzed the factors of motivation. Carolyn Wiley (1995) research analyzed various factors which motivates employees. The study (1992) highlights the importance of good wages. Main Factors studied were: Full appreciation of work done, Feeling of being in on things, Sympathetic help with personal problems, Job security, Good wages, Interesting work, Promotion and growth in the organization, Personal or company loyalty to employees, Good working conditions.

Wiley's study was designed to explore the factors that motivate employees in job, it used similar subcategories as those used by Kovach in 1987. The assumption in Kovach study was that the motivational potency of the factors might vary according to gender, age, income level, job type and organizational level. Organizational level was studied as one of the subcategories influencing motivation. It was concluded that individuals at different organization levels, with different earning power, may have different motivational values. Hence what motivates individuals at one level of the organization may not motivate those at other level. This necessitates differentiating by income level and other demographic factors when analyzing attitudes for motivational purposes. Wiley used occupational category (Clerical, Plant/Service, Sales, Professional, Technical, Managerial) as one of the subgroup and studied that the occupational category has an influence on motivation.

Smrita Sinha et.al (2010) examined impact of work culture on the contextual performance and motivation level of the employees at the middle management level. The results of the study show that various types of culture impact on the motivation level and therefore, the organization needs to nurture and develop the right type of culture in the organization to foster the motivation level of the employees working in the organization. There is a positive correlation between a strong technocratic culture and the level of motivation. Hence, the organization should focus on strengthening the technocratic culture in the organization, if they want to have higher levels of motivation and lower levels of dissatisfaction. Furthermore, there is a negative correlation between the autocratic culture and motivation, hence the organization should reduce its autocratic culture and strengthen the technocratic culture.

Rajeswari Devadass (2011) presented an integrative literature review of employee motivation in organizations which revealed that employee motivation is influenced by different factors. These factors can be divided into four broad categories: Job characteristics, Employee

Characteristics/Experience of outcomes, Management Practices, Broader Environmental Conditions. In each of these broad categories different factors influencing employee motivation were identified.

Motivation and Job satisfaction among academicians

Hill's study (1986) proposed that academicians are extrinsically motivated by organisations through factors such as salary, administrative work and fringe benefits, but job satisfaction of academicians should come from intrinsic work like research and teaching. He proposed this through Herzberg's two-factor theory.

In the research study by Lacy and Sheehan (1997), environment of work, university atmosphere, morale, sense of community and relationship with colleagues were found to be the important predictors for job satisfaction among academics' across eight nations. Furthermore, Leung, Siu & Spector(2000) study shows that recognition, organisational practices and financial inadequacy are the predictor of job satisfaction among academicians.

In another study by Pearson & Seiler (1983) revealed that nationwide sample of academicians in USA get satisfaction through teaching dimensions and research while support and compensation aspects give dissatisfaction.

Flora F. Tien and Robert T. Blackburn (1996) studied the relationship between Faculty Rank System, Research Motivation, and Faculty Research Productivity. The analyses provide insight into the relationships between pro-motion and productivity. The study concluded that motivation toward research productivity is neither purely intrinsic nor purely extrinsic. Rather, both appear to operate depending upon the circumstances of the individuals, their values, and the social situation of the moment.

The research study by Ravi Kumar(2013) on teachers of engineering colleges in Krishna District of Andhra Pradesh, analysed the impact of two factors namely, administrative policies and incentives/rewards on their motivation. The results showed that, incentives increase the motivation whereas the administrative policies decrease the motivation of the teachers. The study concluded that a large amount of the teachers are not happy with the managerial policies of their management which is responsible for their low level of motivation and most of them are not motivated and satisfied with their present salary.

"Job satisfaction among college teachers" a study by S. M Sajid (2014) study aims to investigate the job satisfaction levels in college teachers of a private management institution in Delhi and a college of Delhi University. A total of 40 teachers ranging in teaching experience from 2 to 43 years were selected for study. The data was obtained through Paula Lester's Teachers Job satisfaction questionnaire. Job satisfaction level was compared to institution, and gender. The method of analysis used was Mann Whitney test and Kruskal Wallis test. The study found that job satisfaction levels to be average with significant difference between job satisfaction of male and female college teachers, though no such difference was found in institutions.

Mushtaq A. Sajid¹, Imrab Shaheen (2013) conducted a study to find out what factors increase the motivation level of the faculty members of university academicians. Two factors namely, class room environment, work load stress were analysed. The result showed that class room environment motivates more as compared to workload stress. The main objective of this research study was to assess the impact of factors affecting motivational level. This study was designed to examine those factors which were responsible for high and low motivational level of university academicians.

In his study Jennifer Rowley (1996) has discussed the impact of financial rewards, teaching culture, diversity of roles and experience of staff, autonomy and organisational structure on the motivation of academicians.

The results of the study by Flora F. Tien (2008), Shows that among all rewards, the most important to many faculty is an increase in personal income. Holding one's valence score on promotion constant, faculty with better research performance tends to be those who possess doctoral degrees. The results show that faculty in public institutions perform better than their private-institution counterparts, regardless of promotion valence. Finally, alternative policies to improve faculty research performance are also recommended.

Tulsee Giri Goswami and Harsh Dwivedi (2011) focused their study on factors affecting motivation levels of male and female academicians and have presented that Motivation in simple terms may be understood as the set of forces that cause people to behave in certain ways. A motivated academician generally is more quality oriented. Highly motivated employees are more productive than apathetic employee. Employees join institutions with different needs and expectations. Their values, beliefs, background, lifestyles, perceptions and attitudes are different.

Thomas Li-Ping Tang & Mitchell Chamberlain (2010) in their study, examined the effects of rank, tenure, length of service, and institution on attitude of faculty towards research and teaching. And the Results showed that the length significantly influences the perception of faculty regarding research. The results also showed that the rewards influence teaching, while rank and tenure did not. The faculty members with more than twenty years of experience had the lowest research orientation; those faculty members who are below the rank of professor showed that rewards influence teaching.

Factors Identified through literature review:

Through the review of literature the following factors were identified:

(I) Motivation among employees is influenced by factors like salary, designation, promotion, working environment and rewards. This is supported by the studies of Carolyn Wiley (1995), Rajeshwari Devadass (2011), Kovach (1980), Smrita Sinha et al(2010).

Carolyn Wiley analysed the various factors which motivates employees. Rajeswari Devadass presented an integrative literature review of employee motivation in organizations which revealed that employee motivation is influenced by

different factors. Kovach (1980) showed that appreciation of work was the most important factor influencing motivation. Smrita Sinha et.al examined impact of work culture on the contextual performance and motivation level of the employees at the middle management level.

(ii) Academicians are motivated by money, promotion, working environment, nature of work. This is concluded from the research studies by:

Jennifer Rowley (1996) study has discussed the impact of financial rewards, teaching culture, diversity of roles and experience of staff, autonomy and organisational structure on the motivation of academicians.

Flora F. Tien (2008), Shows that among all rewards, the most important to many faculty is an increase in personal income.

Mushtaq A. Sajid, Imrab Shaheen (2013) study was designed to examine those factors which were responsible for high and low motivational level of university academicians. Thomas Li-Ping Tang & Mitchell Chamberlain (2010) study, examined the effects of rank, tenure, length of service, and institution on attitude of faculty towards research and teaching. The results also showed that the rewards influence teaching, while rank and tenure did not.

(iii) Amongst the research studies reviewed the researchers have not taken into consideration the comparative analysis of factors affecting academicians' motivation specifically at different designation levels i.e. assistant professor, associate professor and professor. Although some of the researchers have studied impact of designation on motivation of academician as a part of a big study where several other factors are studied simultaneously. Like Thomas Li-Ping Tang & Mitchell Chamberlain (2010) study, examined the effects of rank, tenure, length of service, and institution on attitude of faculty towards research and teaching. Jennifer Rowley (1996) has discussed the impact of financial rewards, teaching culture, diversity of roles and experience of staff, autonomy and organisational structure on the motivation of academicians

(iii) A majority of the researchers have studied the impact of rewards, working environment and Job satisfaction on academician motivation. Some of the studies from which this is concluded are:

Flora F. Tien (2008), study shows that among all rewards, the most important to many faculty is an increase in personal income. Mushtaq A. Sajid, Imrab Shaheen (2013) conducted a study found what factors increase the motivation level of the faculty members of university academicians. Two factors namely, class room environment, work load stress were analysed.

The research study by Ravi Kumar(2013) on teachers of engineering colleges in Krishna District of Andhra Pradesh, analysed the impact of two factors namely, administrative policies and incentives/rewards on their motivation. The study by S. M Sajid (2014) aims to investigate the job satisfaction levels in college teachers of a private management

institution in Delhi and a college of Delhi University. Job satisfaction level was compared to institution, and gender. It was found that job satisfaction levels to be average with significant difference between job satisfaction of male and female college teachers, though no such difference was found in institutions.

(iv) Impact of several other factors like student feedback, performance management system and interpersonal relationships on the motivation of academicians need to be studied. These factors need to be analysed since these are important elements of an academician job. These are also indicators of performance for academicians (UGC guidelines, 2012).



RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Since each designation level differs in different aspects it can be hypothesized that the motivational factors at each level of academicians are different. The differences at the three levels of academicians are mainly in their salary, extent of teaching & research work, administrative work, responsibility and decision making. Hence there is a need to ascertain the factors motivating the academicians working at different hierarchical levels.

The present research work aims at finding out the difference in the motivational factors at different designation levels of academicians. The study will help to analyse academician motivation to a larger extent and help in formulating motivational techniques among academicians.

Hypothesis Formulated:

H1: There is a difference between factors affecting motivational level of academicians working at different hierarchical levels.

H0: There is no difference between factors affecting motivational level of academicians working at different hierarchical levels.



RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data Collection Tools:

The study has been conducted in the form of a survey using questionnaire and interview method that includes the information on different aspects of the research problem. The questionnaire comprises of two sections: first section consists of demographic information and second section explains the various factors affecting motivation among academicians. The related literature studies formed the basis for designing of the questionnaire.

The first section includes questions related to academician's demographic profile like (gender, education, age, income, designation, experience etc.). The second section aims to find out the factors, which motivates the academicians working at various positions. Factors taken into consideration for the purpose of the study are: Monetary benefits, Nature of Job, Working environment, Job security, Top management support, Responsibility with authority, Growth opportunities,

Market reputation of the organisation student feedback and appreciation, Performance management system, Job recognition and Interpersonal relationship. (Table 1)

Sample

The data is collected through a stratified random sampling method from the universities and affiliated colleges of Delhi and NCR region. The sample included assistant professors, associate professors and professors proportionately.

For collecting the data around 200 questionnaires were distributed amongst the faculties working in universities (Private, Government and State Owned Universities), colleges (Aided and Non Aided both). A total of 165 questionnaires were received back, making response rate of around 82%, which is an acceptable percentage (Nulty 2008). Out of the 165 questionnaires received, 158 were found to be useful for analysis.



DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The data so collected have been analyzed by using cross tabulation and Chi Square test. The entire analysis was done using SPSS 19.0 version.

The factors analysed are Monetary benefits, Nature of Job, Working environment, Job security, Top management support, Responsibility with authority, Growth opportunities, Market reputation of the organisation, Student feedback and appreciation, Performance management system, Job recognition and Interpersonal relationship. The responses of the three designations of academicians are analysed on these factors.

Demographic analysis:

A total of 165 filled questionnaires were received out of which 158 completely filled were found to be suitable for analysis. The respondents included 39% (62) males and 61% (96) females. There are 66% (104) assistant professors, 21.5% (34) associate professors and 12.7% (20) professors.

The demographic analysis amongst the assistant professors, associate professors and professors are shown in Table 2, 3 & 4. The analysis shows that 80% of professors are males, 64% of associate professors are females and 67% of assistant professors are females. Which clearly shows that at assistant and associate professor level more female employees are working in comparison to professor level.

75% of assistant professors are in the age group 25 to 35 years, 60% of professors are above 45 years and 52% of associate professors are between 35 to 45 years.

Only eight assistant professors have doctorate degree, rest are in process of completing it or are simply post graduates. 60% of Professors are working in Govt. Universities/colleges, 52.9% of associate professors are from self financing institutes or private universities 76% of assistant professors are from self financing institutes.

78% of Assistant professors, 85% of associate professors and

70% of professors are regular while 17.3% of Assistant professors, 8.8% of associate professors and 10% of professors are having contractual appointment.

Majority of the respondent faculty are from engineering and management department. Majority of the respondents have no industry experience. 46% of assistant professors have less than 10 years of experience while 20% are having more than 20 years.

Descriptive Analysis:

A cross tabulation of factors affecting motivation among academicians and Designation of academician is shown in Table 5. The findings are:

(i) Monetary Benefits (Table 5a) motivates assistant professors more in comparison to associate professors whereas professors are not motivated by money. 40% of assistant professors, 44% of associate professors and 35% professors responded that money motivates them high. 45% of professors while only 1.9% of assistant professors and 11.8% of associate professors responded that money motivate low. Results of the Chi-square test shows that there is a significant relationship between monetary benefits and designation (Table 5b). This indicates that money is a motivator for assistant professors and associate professors while this does not play major role in motivating professors. Assistant professors are at the beginning of their career while professors are experienced with good salary.

(ii) Table 6a depicts that nature of appointment (regular, contractual, adhoc) also influence the motivation level. 30% of the professors, 41% of associate professors and 28% of assistant professors are highly motivated. 60% of professors, 35.3% of associate professors and 57% of assistant professors are motivated high. Chi-Square test shows that there is no significant relationship between nature of job and designation (Table 6b). All the three designations have influence of nature of job on their work motivation. It clearly states that an employee with a regular appointment feels more secured as far as his job security and surety is concerned, in comparison to a person who has contractual or ad-hoc appointment. So permanency of job motivates employee at every designation.

(iii) Data shows (Table 7a) that working environment of an institute also influence the motivational level of academicians. Responses given by 50% of assistant professors, 41% of associate professors and 40% of professors clearly depict the same. Total of 46.8% of academicians are motivated high by working environment which clearly shows that cordial environment and work culture motivates an employee more in comparison to any other factor of motivation. Chi-Square results shows that there is a significant relationship between working environment and designation (Table 7b). The working environment motivates the three designations differently. Assistant professors are motivated more by working environment as they are new in the profession and need a proper environment to work. While professors are experienced and are more concerned about the kind of work rather than the working environment.

(iv) The Data shows (Table 8a) 46.8% of total respondent academicians feel very high motivation if they have job security. These 46.8% include 46.2% are assistant professors, 58.8% associate professors and 30% of professors. Results given in Table 8b shows that job security and designation does not have a significant relationship related to motivation. Job security is a source of motivation for all designation.

(v) Responsibility with authority motivates professors (Table 9a). The assistant and associate professors are also motivated by Responsibility with authority but less as compared to professors. 50% of assistant professors, 29.4% of associate professors and 60% of professors are motivated high by responsibility. 26.9% of assistant professors, 23.5% of associate professors and 10% of professors are motivated very high by it. 11.8% of associate professors agree that responsibility motivates them more when it comes with authority. Chi-square test shows that there is a significant difference between influence of responsibility with authority on motivation and designation (Table 9b). Due to seniority and experience, professors feel that when they are provided authority with responsibility they feel more powered. The associate professors are not motivated by responsibility as at their stage they prefer to devote attention towards their research projects etc. Assistant professors are in the initial stage of their career so providing them a responsible task motivates them.

(vi) Image of the institute highly motivates faculty (Table 10a) very high about 50% of assistant professors, 58.8% of associate professors and 30% of professors. 38.5% of assistant professors, 29.4% of associate professors and 70% of professors are motivated high by reputation of the organisation. Professors are motivated very low by reputation of the organisation as compared to 5.9% of associate professors and 1.9% of assistant professors.

The chi-Square test shows that there is no influence of designation on the motivation due to reputation of the organisation. All the three levels are influenced and motivated by reputation of the organisation (Table 10b). Reputation of the organisation is a status symbol for assistant, associate professors and professors.

(vii) Growth opportunities motivates (Table 11a) 48.1% of assistant professors, 47.1% of associate professors and 0% of professors. 3.8% of assistant professors, 11.8% of associate professors and 0% of professors are motivated very low through growth opportunities. Chi-Square test shows that there is a significant difference between designation and motivation due to growth opportunities (Table 11b). As the professors have already attained their qualification and experience, they are no longer motivated by growth opportunities as compared to assistant and associate professors, who are in their growing stage.

(viii) If Top management support assistant professors are motivated highest (38.5%) then associate professors (35.3%) followed by professors (10%). 3.8% of assistant professors, 11.8% of associate professors and 0% of professors are motivated very low by top management support (Table 12a).

The Chi-Square test shows that there is significant difference between designation and motivation to work due to support of

top management (Table 12b). As the assistant professors need to grow they require the support of top management more compared to professors. Professors and associate professors require top management support to conduct the work allotted to them.

(ix) Student feedback motivates very high 48% of assistant professors and 20% of professors. 52.9% of associate professors and 80% of professors have a high influence of student feedback on motivation. 0% of professors, 0% of associate professors and 5.8% of assistant professors are motivated very low through student feedback (Table 13a).

The chi-square test shows that there is a significant difference between designation and motivation due to student feedback & appreciation (Table 13b). The professors feel that through their experience and knowledge they should be able to satisfy the students so student feedback is a source of motivation for professors.

(x) 70% of professors, 41% of associate professors and 46% of assistant professors are motivated high by Performance Management System. 10% of professors, 35.3% of associate professors and 36.5% of assistant professors are motivated very high through proper performance management system. (Table 14a).

The chi-square test shows that there is no significant difference between designation and motivation due to performance management system. The test shows that all designations are motivated by performance management system (Table 14b). The teaching faculty requires that a proper performance management system is essential to keep them motivated. The appraisal system and goal setting helps in efficient work delivery.

(xi) Job recognition motivates very high all the three designations (Table 15a). 42.3% of assistant professors, 41.2% of associate professors and 20% of professors are motivated very high through Job recognition. 42.3% of assistant professors, 23.5% of associate professors and 80% of professors have a high influence of it on motivation. 29.4% of associate professors gave a neutral response.

The chi-square test shows that there is no significant difference between designation and motivation due to job recognition. All the three designations are motivated by job recognition (Table 15b). Professors are motivated more when their job is recognized, as it helps in proving their expertise. Assistant and associate professors are also motivated by job recognition.

(xii) Interpersonal relationship motivates very high 29% of associate professors, 28.8% of assistant professors and 30% of professors. High motivation is provided by interpersonal relationship to 60% of professors, 47.1% of associate professors and 59.6% of assistant professors (Table 16a).

The chi-square test shows that there is no significant difference between designation and motivation due to interpersonal relationships (Table 16b). Good interpersonal relationship helps in building peace and harmony amongst the employees and hence helps them to remain motivated. This is required at

all levels.

The findings show that there is a difference in the extent to which each factor of motivation influence at the three designations of academicians.



INDINGS

The findings are discussed according to designation.

Assistant professors are motivated very high by reputation of the organisation, followed by student feedback & growth opportunities, finally after these are job security and job recognition. Demographic data shows that about 76% of assistant professors are belonging to self-financing organisations and 67% are females. Also majority of the assistant professors are in the 25 to 35 age groups. 78% are in regular appointment and 17% in contractual. Majority of them are without Phd degree and are working in either engineering or management department. 46% are having less than 10 years academic experience.

Associate professors are motivated highest by the job security followed by reputation of the organisation. Growth opportunities and student feedback are next in the list. 64% of associate professors are females. 52% are in self-financing institutions. 85% are regular and 8.8% contractual. About 50% are having experience between 10-15 years.

Professors are motivated highest by the nature of the job than by job security. Reputation of the organisation and interpersonal relationship are the next two which motivates the professors. 80% of professors are males. The age of 60% of professors is above 45 years. 60% are working in government university/college. 70% are regular and 10% contractual. The experience of 80% is between 15-20 years and rest 20 % above 20 years.

From the analysis it is further found that amongst the three designations, assistant professors are motivated highest by Monetary Benefits, working environment, responsibility with authority, top management support, student feedback, growth opportunities, performance management system and job recognition. The associate professors are motivated highest by the Nature of job, job security and reputation of the organisation. The professors are motivated highest by interpersonal relationships.

The three designations are motivated by nature of job, job security, reputation of organisations, performance management system and interpersonal relationships. The designation is not influencing motivation for these factors.



CONCLUSION

From the findings it can be concluded that the factors affecting the motivation of academicians are differing in the three designations. Each designation level of academicians varies in several aspects. Due to these differences, there are differences in the factors affecting motivation at the three levels. The influence of gender, qualification, type of organisation, nature of job and experience on the factors of motivation is seen in all the three designations. Due to these differences obtained from cross tabulation and chi-square test conclusion is drawn that assistant professors, associate professors and professors are motivated through a "designation specific" set of factors. This will help in better understanding of motivation amongst the academicians and in designing of motivation techniques for academicians. The study can be further extended by involving a further larger number of academicians and in depth analysis of all the factors(demographic and organisational).

REFERENCES

1. AISHE, (2011-12), Government of India Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, New Delhi, 2013.
2. Baron, H., Henley, S., Mc Gibbon, A. & Mc Carthy, T., (2002), *Motivation questionnaire manual and user's guide*. Sussex: Saville and Holdsworth Limited.
3. B. Kumar, Ravi, (2013), *Factors Affecting the Motivation of Teaching Staff (An Empirical Study With Reference To Engineering Colleges, Krishna District, Review of Arts and Humanities, Vol. 2(1)*.
4. Connelly, Lynne, M., (2008), *Pilot Studies, MedSurg Nursing*, 17(6), 411-2.
5. Cronbach, L., J., (1951), *Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests*, *Psychometrika*, Vol.16, 297-334.
6. Devadass, R., (2011), *Employees Motivation in Organizations: An integrative literature Review*, *International Conference on Sociality and Economics Development, IPED Vol.10, IACSIT Press, Singapore*.
7. Duncan, D., Nulty, (2008), *The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done?*, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301-314, ISSN 0260-2938 print/ISSN 1469-297X online © Taylor & Francis .
8. Flora, F Tien, (2008), *What kinds of faculty are motivated to perform research by the desire for promotion?*, *High Education by Springer*, 55, 17-32.
9. Gupta Deepti, Gupta Navneet (2012), *Higher Education in India: Structure, Statistics and Challenges*, *Journal of Education and practice*, 3(2).
10. Hair, J., E, Jr, Black, C.,W., Babin, J., B., Anderson, R., E., and Tatham, L., R., (2010), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th ed., Prentice-Hall.
11. Hill, M., D., (1986), *A Theoretical Analysis of Faculty Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction*, *Educational Research, Quarterly*, 36-44.
12. Ifinedo, P.,(2003), *Employee motivation and job satisfaction in Finnish organizations: a study of employees in the Oulu region, Finland, Master of Business Administration Thesis, University of London*.
13. Jennifer Rowley (1996), *Motivation and academic staff in higher education*, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4(3), 11-16.
14. Kapur Devesh (2010), *Indian Higher Education*, *National Bureau of Economic Research, University of Chicago Press*, 305 - 334, ISBN: 0-226-11044-3; 978-0-226-11044-8.
15. Kovach, K., A., (1987), *What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers*, *Business Horizons*, 30(5), 58-65.
16. Kovach, K., A., (1980), *Why motivational theories don't work*, *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 45(2), 54-90.
17. Lacy, F, J., Sheehan, B., A., (1997), *Job satisfaction among academic staff: an international perspective*, *Higher Education*, 34(3), 305-322.
18. Leung, T,W, Siu, O., L., & Spector, P, E., (2000), *Faculty Stressors, Job Satisfaction, and Psychological Distress among University Teachers in Hong Kong: The Role of Locus of Control*, *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7, 121-138.
19. Mushtaq, A., Sajid, Imrab, Shaheen, (2013), *Factors responsible for High and Low Motivational level of University Academicians*, *International Journal of Science and Research*, ISSN: 2319-7064, 2 (2).

ASSESSING MOTIVATION AMONG ACADEMICIANS

REFERENCES

20. Nunnally, J., (1978), *Psychometric Theory, 2nd edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
 21. Pearson, D., A., and Seiler, R., E., (1983), *Environmental Satisfiers in Academicians, Higher Education*, 12, 35-47.
 22. Rosenfeld, R.H. & Wilson, D.C.(1999), *Managing Organizations : Text, Readings & Case*,
 23. Published by McGraw Hill Publishing Company, Maidenhead, Berkshire, ISBN 10: 0077076435 / ISBN 13: 9780077076436
 24. Sajid, S., M., & Sumbul, Tahir, (2014), *Job satisfaction among college teachers: a comparative analysis, The IUP Journal of organisational behaviour*, 13(1).
 25. Sinha Smrita, Singh Ajay Kr., Gupta Nisha & Dutt Rajul (2010), *Impact of work culture on motivation and performance level of employees in private sector companies, Actao economica pragensia*, Vol.6, 49-62.
 26. Steers, R., M., Mowday, R., T., & Shapiro, D., L., (2004), *The Future of Work Motivation Theory, Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 337-351.
 27. Thomas, Li-Ping, Tang, & Mitchell, Chamberlain, (2010), *Effects of Rank, Tenure, Length of Service, and Institution on Faculty Attitudes towards Research and Teaching: The Case of Regional State Universities*, Taylor and Francis online journal, 103-110.
 28. Tien, Flora, F, and Blackburn, Robert, T., (1996), *Faculty rank system, research motivation, and faculty research productivity: Measure refinement and theory testing, Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 2-11
 29. Tulsee, Giri, Goswami, & Harsh, Dwivedi, (2011). "The motivation level of male and female academicians: a Comparative Study (Special Concern to Professional Academicians)". *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 2(2).
 30. UGC, (2012), *guidelines for minimum academic performance and service requirements for promotion of teachers in universities*.
 31. Van Belle, G.,(2002), *Statistical Rule of Thumb*, New York: John Wiley.
 32. Wiley, Carolyn, (1997), *What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys, International Journal of manpower*, 18(3), 263-280.

TABLE 1: STATE TO WHAT EXTENT FOLLOWING WILL MOTIVATE YOU? KINDLY PROVIDE YOUR ANSWER KEEPING IN MIND YOUR PRESENT DESIGNATION.

S.No	Influences on your motivation	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low
1.	Monetary Benefits					
2.	Nature of Job					
3.	Working Environment					
4.	Job security/safety					
5.	Top management support					
6.	Responsibility with authority					
7.	Growth opportunities					
8.	Reputation of the organisation in the market					
9.	Student feedback and appreciation					
10.	Performance management system					
11.	Job recognition					
12.	Interpersonal Relationship					

TABLE 2

Designation	Gender		Age			Qualification			Organisation Nature		
	Male	Female	25 to less than 35 years	35 to less than 45 years	Above 45 years	Post Graduation	M.Phil	Ph.D	Government	Aided	self-financing
Assistant Professor	34	70	70	26	0	08	8	8	24	0	80
Associate professor	32.7%	67.3%	75.0%	25.0%	.0%	84.6%	7.7%	7.7%	23.1%	.0%	76.9%
Professor	12	22	16	18	0	16	0	18	16	0	18
	35.3%	64.7%	47.1%	52.9%	.0%	47.1%	.0%	52.9%	47.1%	.0%	52.9%
Total	16	4	0	8	12	0	0	20	12	4	4
	80.0%	20.0%	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	62	96	94	52	12	104	8	46	52	4	102
	39.2%	60.8%	59.5%	32.9%	7.6%	65.8%	5.1%	29.1%	32.9%	2.5%	64.6%

TABLE 3

Designation	Job Nature				Department					
	Regular	Adhoc	Contractual	Visiting	Commerce	Management	Arts/Humanities	Engg	Any other	
Assistant Professor	82	4	18	0	2	8	4	88	2	
	78.8%	3.8%	17.3%	.0%	1.9%	7.7%	3.8%	84.6%	1.9%	
Associate professor	29	0	3	2	0	1	2	30	1	
	85.3%	.0%	8.8%	5.9%	.0%	2.9%	5.9%	88.2%	2.9%	
Professor	14	4	2	0	2	2	2	14	0	
	70.0%	20.0%	10.0%	.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	70.0%	.0%	
Total	125	8	23	2	4	11	8	132	3	
	79.1%	5.1%	14.6%	1.3%	2.5%	7.0%	5.1%	83.5%	1.9%	

TABLE 4

Designation	Industry Experience					Academic Experience					
	0	less than 1 year	1 year to less than 3 years	3 years to less than 5 years	5 years to less than 8 years	1 year to less than 5 years	5 years to less than 10 years	10 years to less than 15 years	15 years to less than 20 years	20 years to less than 25 years	25 years to less than 30 years
Assistant Professor	78	4	16	6	0	20	48	30	6	0	0
	75.0%	3.8%	15.4%	5.8%	.0%	19.2%	46.2%	28.8%	5.8%	.0%	.0%
Associate professor	26	4	2	2	0	0	10	17	5	0	2
	76.5%	11.8%	5.9%	5.9%	.0%	.0%	29.4%	50.0%	14.7%	.0%	5.9%
Professor	12	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	16	4	0
	60.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	30.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	80.0%	20.0%	.0%
Total	116	10	18	8	6	20	58	47	27	4	2
	73.1%	6.3%	11.1%	5.1%	3.8%	12.7%	36.7%	29.7%	17.1%	2.5%	1.3%

TABLE 5A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION*MONETARY BENEFITS

Designation	Monetary Benefits					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	28	42	26	2	6	104
	26.9%	40.4%	25.0%	1.9%	5.8%	100.0%
Associate professor	9	15	6	4	0	34
	26.5%	44.1%	17.6%	11.8%	.0%	100.0%
Professor	4	7	0	9	0	20
	20.0%	35.0%	.0%	45.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	41	64	32	15	6	158
	25.9%	40.5%	20.3%	9.5%	3.8%	100.0%

TABLE 5B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(MONETARY BENEFITS AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.355 ^a	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	38.651	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.292	1	.130
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 6 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .76.

TABLE 6A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION*NATURE OF JOB

Designation	Nature of Job					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	30	60	12	2	0	104
	28.8%	57.7%	11.5%	1.9%	.0%	100.0%
Associate professor	14	12	8	0	0	34
	41.2%	35.3%	23.5%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Professor	6	12	2	0	0	20
	30.0%	60.0%	10.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	50	84	22	2	0	158
	31.6%	53.2%	13.9%	1.3%	.0%	100.0%

TABLE 6B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(NATURE OF JOB AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.675 ^a	6	.193
Likelihood Ratio	9.154	6	.163
Linear-by-Linear Association	.209	1	.648
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 5 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .25.

TABLE 7A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION*WORKING ENVIRONMENT

Designation	Working Environment					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	40	52	12	0	0	104
	38.5%	50.0%	11.5%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Associate professor	12	14	4	0	4	34
	35.3%	41.2%	11.8%	.0%	11.8%	100.0%
Professor	4	8	7	6	0	20
	20.0%	40.0%	10.0%	30.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	56	74	18	6	4	158
	35.4%	46.8%	11.4%	3.8%	2.5%	100.0%

TABLE 7B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(WORKING ENVIRONMENT AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	58.444 ^a	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	39.793	8	.000
Linear by Linear Association	13.475	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .51.

TABLE 8A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION*JOB SECURITY

Designation	Job Security/Safety					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	48	30	16	6	4	104
	46.2%	28.8%	15.4%	5.8%	3.8%	100.0%
Associate professor	20	6	6	0	2	34
	58.8%	17.6%	17.6%	.0%	5.9%	100.0%
Professor	6	10	2	2	0	20
	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	74	46	24	8	6	158
	46.8%	29.1%	15.2%	5.1%	3.8%	100.0%

TABLE 8B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(JOB SECURITY AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.117 ^a	8	.195
Likelihood Ratio	13.104	8	.108
Linear-by-Linear Association	.013	1	.909
N of Valid Cases	157		

TABLE9B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(RESPONSIBILITY WITH AUTHORITY AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.042 ^a	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	31.856	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.835	1	.009
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .51.

TABLE 9A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION* RESPONSIBILITY WITH AUTHORITY

Designation	Responsibility with authority					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	28	52	22	2	0	104
	26.9%	50.0%	21.2%	1.9%	.0%	100.0%
Associate professor	8	10	12	0	4	34
	23.5%	29.4%	35.3%	.0%	11.8%	100.0%
Professor	2	12	2	1	0	20
	10.0%	60.0%	10.0%	20.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	38	74	36	6	4	158
	24.1%	46.8%	22.8%	3.8%	2.5%	100.0%

TABLE 10A

Designation	Reputation of the organisation in the market					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	52	40	8	2	2	104
	50.0%	38.5%	7.7%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0%
Associate professor	20	10	2	0	2	34
	58.8%	29.4%	5.9%	.0%	5.9%	100.0%
Professor	6	14	0	0	0	20
	30.0%	70.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	78	64	10	2	4	158
	49.4%	40.5%	6.3%	1.3%	2.5%	100.0%

TABLE 10B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(REPUTATION OF THE ORGANISATION AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.084 ^a	8	.109
Likelihood Ratio	14.608	8	.067
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.981
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .25.

TABLE 11A: CROSS TABULATION (DESIGNATION* GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES)

Designation * Growth Opportunities Crosstabulation			Growth Opportunities					Total
Designation			Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	Count		46	40	10	2	6	104
	% within Designation		44.2%	38.5%	9.6%	1.9%	5.8%	100.0%
Associate professor	Count		18	6	1	2	1	31
	% within Designation		52.9%	17.6%	11.8%	5.9%	11.8%	100.0%
Professor	Count		2	14	2	2	0	20
	% within Designation		10.0%	70.0%	10.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Count		66	60	16	6	10	158
	% within Designation		41.8%	38.0%	10.1%	3.8%	6.3%	100.0%

TABLE 11B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi Square	53.310 ^a	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	53.948	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.846	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 6 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.02.

TABLE 12A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION* TOP MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Designation	Top management support					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	40	42	12	6	4	104
	38.5%	40.4%	11.5%	5.8%	3.8%	100.0%
Associate professor	12	12	4	2	4	34
	35.3%	35.3%	11.8%	5.9%	11.8%	100.0%
Professor	2	6	8	1	0	20
	10.0%	30.0%	40.0%	20.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	54	60	24	12	8	158
	34.2%	38.0%	15.2%	7.6%	5.1%	100.0%

TABLE 12B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(TOP MANAGEMENT SUPPORT AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.958 ^a	8	.003
Likelihood Ratio	20.898	8	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.689	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 5 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.02.

TABLE 13A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION* STUDENT FEEDBACK AND APPRECIATION

Designation	Student feedback and appreciation				Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	
Assistant Professor	50	42	6	6	104
	48.1%	40.4%	5.8%	5.8%	100.0%
Associate professor	16	18	0	0	34
	47.1%	52.9%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Professor	4	16	0	0	20
	20.0%	80.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	70	76	6	6	158
	44.3%	48.1%	3.8%	3.8%	100.0%

TABLE 13B CHI-SQUARE TESTS(DESIGNATION AND STUDENT FEEDBACK AND APPRECIATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.857 ^a	6	.021
Likelihood Ratio	18.648	6	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.978
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .76.

TABLE 14A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION* PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Designation	Performance Management System				
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Total
Assistant Professor	38 36.5%	48 46.2%	16 15.4%	2 1.9%	104 100.0%
Associate professor	12 35.3%	14 41.2%	8 23.5%	0 .0%	34 100.0%
Professor	2 10.0%	14 70.0%	4 20.0%	0 .0%	20 100.0%
Total	52 32.9%	76 48.1%	28 17.7%	2 1.3%	158 100.0%

TABLE 14B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.598 ^a	6	.269
Likelihood Ratio	9.198	6	.163
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.800	1	.180
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .25.

TABLE 15A: CROSS TABULATION DESIGNATION* JOB RECOGNITION

Designation	Job recognition				Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	
Assistant Professor	44 42.3%	44 42.3%	12 11.5%	4 3.8%	104 100.0%
Associate professor	14 41.2%	8 23.5%	10 29.4%	2 5.9%	34 100.0%
Professor	4 20.0%	16 80.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	20 100.0%
Total	62 39.2%	68 43.0%	22 13.9%	6 3.8%	158 100.0%

TABLE 15B: CHI-SQUARE TESTS(JOB RECOGNITION AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.111 ^a	6	.003
Likelihood Ratio	22.086	6	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.390	1	.532
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 5 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .76.

TABLE 16A: CROSS TABULATION(DESIGNATION & INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP)

Designation	Interpersonal relationship					Total
	Very High	High	Neutral	Low	Very Low	
Assistant Professor	30 28.8%	62 59.6%	10 9.6%	2 1.9%	0 .0%	104 100.0%
Associate professor	10 29.4%	16 47.1%	6 17.6%	0 .0%	2 5.9%	34 100.0%
Professor	6 30.0%	12 60.0%	2 10.0%	0 .0%	0 .0%	20 100.0%
Total	46 29.1%	90 57.0%	18 11.4%	2 1.3%	2 1.3%	158 100.0%

TABLE 16B: CHI-SQUARE TEST (INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP AND DESIGNATION)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.850 ^a	8	.276
Likelihood Ratio	9.168	8	.328
Linear by Linear Association	.077	1	.782
N of Valid Cases	157		

a. 8 cells (58.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .25.

DIAS TIMES ADVERTISEMENT RATES*

Particulars	Per Insertion	Per Annum
Full Back Cover	15,000	50,000
Inside Front	13,000	45,000
Inside Back	12,000	40,000
Full Page	8,000	30,000
Half Page	6,000	20,000
Quarter Page	4,000	15,000
Annual Subscription :	₹ 500/-	Quarterly: ₹ 150/-

*Subject to change without prior notice.