CU Global Management Review
Volume 7, Issue 2, July-December 2018, pp. 45-60

EXAMINING MOTIVATION LEVEL AMONG ACADEMICIANS ACROSS DESIGNATIONS

Anushree Chauhan, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management Studies YMCA University of Science and Technology, Faridabad, Haryana, India

Dr. Manisha Goel, Associate Professor,
Department of Management Studies YMCA University of Science and Technology, Faridabad, Haryana, India.

Dr. Ritu Gandhi Arora, Professor,
Department of Management Studies, DAV Institute of Management, Faridabad, Haryana, India.

Abstract:

Motivated workforce helps an enterprise to grow in the desired path. The education industry aims in the direction of producing future proficient workforce through dedicated and motivated workforce. Keeping this in mind, the present study has been carried out focusing on factors affecting academician's motivation. Further the impact of various demographic variables like Gender, Age, Department, Qualifications at the different Designations of respondents has also been analysed by applying Mean, t test, ANOVA and ANOVA Factorial test has been used to show the interaction between demographic variables, designation and factors of motivation, followed by Post Hoc test. The results clearly indicates that the interaction between, the factors of motivation of academicians and demographic characteristics, differ to a certain extent across different designations.

Key Words: Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Education Industry, Job Analysis, Post Hoc.

1. Introduction

Motivation is to inspire people to work, individually or in groups to produce best results. It is an individual's spirit to act. It is the willingness to exert high levels of effort towards organizational goals, conditioned by the efforts and ability to satisfy individuals' need (Kreitner, 1995). The different aspects of motivation make it a complex and multifaceted process. The concept of motivation has a strong foundation of several researches. These research works have provided several theories of motivation, which are been used by organisations to frame the motivational techniques for the employees.

The motivation of academicians is a subject of major concern since education system of a nation is the base of its manpower. It is a known fact that the strength of an education system lies in its faculty hence

dedicated and motivated manpower means tough youth and strong nation. Academicians are the pillars to this foundation that is why they are entrusted with the responsibility to nurture human capital for betterment of the society. Hence, there is a strong need to keep them motivated thus ensuring quality in teaching and strong futuristic manpower.

The present research aims to study the influence of demographic characteristics on the motivation of higher education academicians working at different designations. The study helps to comprehend the level of motivation amongst higher education academicians through understanding of various intra/inter organisational factors necessary for their growth in desired direction.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1 Motivation

The word "motivation" is taken from the Latin term movere, means "to move" (Baron, Henley, McGibbon & McCarthy, 2002). Tulsee Giri Goswami and Dr. Harsh Dwivedi (2011) in their study presented that motivation may be understood as the set of forces which cause people to behave in definite ways.

Many definitions of the motivation construct have been postulated over the several decades during which this versatile concept has been researched. The literature reviewed by Chauhan A., Goel. M., & Gandhi R. (2014) indicate that motivation influences several key aspects of an organization: job performance, job satisfaction and hence employee turnover and productivity. Employee motivation has direct impact on their productivity and growth (Nupur and Bharati, 2012).

Employee motivation can be deliberated through several wide-ranging approaches like reinforcement theories, process theories and content or need based theories. A brief of these theories is presented in the following section.

2.2 Theories of Motivation

Some of the earlier theories of motivation are mentioned (Chauhan A., Goel M., & Gandhi R.,2015) under as:

(i) Need Hierarchy Theory (1943): Abraham Maslow, the originator concluded its theory in a hierarchy of five human needs: Physiological needs, Safety needs, Social needs, Esteem needs and Self-Actualization needs. With the satisfaction of one need, the next need becomes dominant. So to motivate someone we need to understand at which hierarchy that person is and should focus on need satisfaction at or above level.

(ii) Two-Factor Theory (1959): This theory given by Herzberg considers two factors which affect motivation: (a) Motivators – Factors that really motivate people like achievement, responsibility, recognition, advancement, and growth. (b) Hygiene factors – absence of these factors would de-motivate people, but their presence not necessarily improves the same.

(iii) **David McClelland Need Theory (1961)**: Mainly focused on drive to excel i.e. Achievement Need, the need to make others behave in a way that they would not have behaved otherwise means Need for Power and last not the least is Affiliation Needs i.e. the desire for interpersonal relationship - friendly and close.

(iv) **Job Design Theory (1976)**: This theory posits that Job features affects outcome of the tasks resultant effects on psychological reactions to the job. The five core job characteristics are: Variety of Skill, Task Identification, Importance of Task, self-sufficiency, and Job Feedback.

(v) **Equity Theory (1965)**: Propounded by Adams this Theory recommends equity between an employee's inputs and outputs. As equity ensure a positive relationship between results and motivation. The theory is built-on the belief that employees become de-motivated, in case their inputs are greater than the outputs.

(vi) **Expectancy Theory (1964)**: Through this theory Victor Vroom introduces three variables, which he calls Valence, Expectancy and Instrumentality. According to Vroom, an outcome is positively valent if the person believes that it holds high instrumentality for the acquisition of positively valent consequences and the avoidance of negatively valent outcomes and expectancy is the strength of a person's belief about whether a particular outcome is possible or not.

(vii) **Porter And Lawler's Extension (1968)**: This model attempted to find out the basis of human beings' valences and expectations and link effort with performance/ job satisfaction. In this model, the effort is viewed as a function of the perceived value of a reward and the perceived effort-reward probability.

3. Literature Review

3.1. Factors influencing motivation

The review of literature shows that the concept of motivation is researched by several researches from various perspectives. The review concludes that the concept of motivation depends upon several factors (Chauhan A., Goel M., & Gandhi R.2014).Some the research studies are discussed in the present section.

Carolyn Wiley (1995), after 40 years of motivation survey (an extension of study carried out by Kovach 1980) concluded that employees at different hierarchical levels with varied earning power, may differ in their motivational values. Hence what motivates individuals at one level of the organization may not motivate those at other level.

An integrative literature review by Rajeswari Devadass (2011) related to employees' motivational practices in organizations documented different motivational concepts in pretext to companies, Job analysis (Job description and person specification), and various environmental factors.

3.2. Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Academicians

S. M Sajid (2014) in his study investigated the job satisfaction levels of university and college teachers and found that there is a significant difference between male and female teachers but no difference was found between university and college teachers. Whereas Minh-Quang Duong (2013) study showed significant difference in job satisfaction level based on gender, qualification, and discipline and the job satisfaction of academicians is significantly affected by demographic and institutional factors.

Kumar, Ravi (2013) analysed the impact of administrative policies and incentives/rewards on teachers' motivation and found that, motivation increases with incentives while poor administrative policies does the reverse. Boran Toker, (2011) investigated the effects of demographics on job satisfaction level of Turkey university's academicians. The results indicated among the demographic variables age and length of service in present university were significantly related to job satisfaction than marital status and gender.

Saif-ud-Din, Khair-uz-Zaman & Allah Nawaz (2010) study reveal that designation, university sector (public or private) and gender have significant impact on the respondents' attitudes towards factors of job satisfaction. And demographic attributes qualification, length of service, department/subject, and marital status were found to have no impact on job satisfaction.

Thomas, Li-Ping, Tang & Mitchell, Chamberlain (2010) showed that service length significantly affects faculty perception towards research and rewards as compare to their rank.

Platsidou, M. & Diamantopoulou, G. (2009) in their study showed that the Greek academicians are moderately satisfied with their job; no statistical significant effects of the demographic factors (such as age, gender, working experience and marital status) were found.

Bani Kochar (2008), in its study used ten dimensions like working environment, salary, peer group support, allocation of work, growth opportunities, job stress, reward system, entrustment of authority, job safety and security and found that growth opportunities had maximum influence on employee satisfaction. Leung, Siu & Spector (2000) study revealed that acknowledgment, organisational policies and monetary competence are the predictor of job satisfaction among academicians. Whereas, Lacy and Sheehan (1997), stated that workplace atmosphere, workplace environment, self-esteem, sense of belongingness and interpersonal relationship are important for job satisfaction among academicians. Flora F. Tien and Robert T. Blackburn (1996) studied the relationship between Rank, Research and Research Productivity. They concluded that motivation towards research productivity is neither purely intrinsic nor extrinsic.

3.3. Job Analysis of a Higher Education Academician (as mentioned by UGC/AICTE/MHRD)

The education system in India is divided into primary, secondary and tertiary level. The tertiary level is "Higher Education" level. An academician of higher education performs several roles and responsibilities related to the students, organisation, personal development and the society. A brief of the job responsibilities of a higher education academician includes: Teaching and Developing Students, curriculum design, Syllabus designing, Administrative Work (in order to manage the functions of an

institution), Research related activities, Self Developmental Activities, and student related co-curricular, extension & field based activities.

These job responsibilities vary at the different designations i.e. an assistant professor's job responsibilities are different from an associate professor and a professor.

It is concluded that academicians of higher education have to perform variety of tasks, they have varied responsibilities apart from teaching students.

4. Research Gap

The literature review shows that very few researchers have categorized the academicians on the basis of designation and studied its impact on motivation. Research studies clearly stated that motivation of higher education academicians' is influenced by the demographic characteristics to a certain extent.

There is dearth of research in this area where the comparative analysis of factors affecting academician's motivation at different designations has been conducted. Also the influence of demographics at different designations of academicians is explored to a limited extent.

5. Objectives of Study

Through the research gap the present study aims to fulfil the following objectives:

(i) To find out the various factors which have an influence on motivation of higher education academicians at Assistant professor, Associate professor and Professor level;

(ii) To compare the influence of demographic characteristics: Gender, Age, Qualifications, Department and Income of academicians on their motivation across different designations.

6. Hypothesis

The analysis has been done keeping the following hypotheses in mind:

H1: There is a significant relation between the factors influencing motivation of academicians and designations.

H2: There is a significant relation between the gender of academicians at different designations and their factors of motivation.

H3: There is a significant relation between the age of academicians at different designations and their factors of motivation.

H4: There is a significant relation between the qualification of academicians at different designations and their factors of motivation.

H5: There is a significant relation between the department of academicians at different designations and their factors of motivation.

H6: There is a significant relation between the family income of academicians at different designations and their factors of motivation.

7. Research Methodology

7.1 Research Design

The present work is an exploratory as well as empirical. The detailed study of designation and motivation factors of academicians of higher education is performed and relationship between management levels, motivating factors and demographic factors is explored.

7.2 Data Collection Tools and Sampling

The survey was conducted with the help of a structured questionnaire, which was developed based on literature review, existing instruments and expert opinion. The questionnaire was divided into two parts: Demographic and Descriptive. The Demographic part contains questions related to age, gender, qualification, department and family income. The descriptive part contains 60 variables (statements) as questions to assess the motivation level of academicians of higher education.

To collect data, 450 questionnaires were distributed amongst the faculty members of higher education institutions located in and around Delhi/NCR. 340 questionnaires were received back out of which 315 were found to be useful for further analysis. The recommended sample size is 300 participants and the variables that are subjected to factor analysis each should have at least 5 observations (Combrey & Lee, 1992).

7.3 Reliability Tests:

The Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin (KMO) value for these variables were .859 indicating that the sample size was adequate for applying factor analysis. Barlett's test of Sphericity was significant (.000), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix and hence factor analysis is appropriate. The reliability of the data collected with the aid of 60 items schedule was tested with the help of Cronbach Alpha. The coefficient of the Cronbach Alpha is .882 and it is also within the level prescribed (>=0.60).

7.4 Data Analysis

The Data collected through the structured questionnaire was compiled and analysed through SPSS 19.0 version.

7.4.1 Demographic Analysis

The Demographic profiles of the respondents are shown in the Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Distribution of The Respondents

PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS		Number	Percent
Gender	Male	125	39.7
	Female	190	60.3
Age	less than 25 years	10	3.2
	25 to less than 35 years	151	47.9
	35 to less than 45 years	118	37.5
	Above 45 years	36	11.4
Designation	Research Associate	5	1.6
	Assistant Professor	153	48.6
	Associate professor	103	32.7
	Professor	54	17.1
	Visiting	25	7.9
	Co-terminus with course	3	1.0
Qualification	Post Graduation with NET	154	48.9
	M.Phil	16	5.1
	Ph.D	144	45.7
	Any other professional qualification	1	0.3
Department	Commerce	15	4.8
	Management	39	12.4
	Arts/Humanities	39	12.4
	Engineering	198	62.9
	Any other	24	7.6
Family Income	Less than Rs 600,000 p.a	32	10.2
	Rs 600,000 to Less than Rs 900,000 p.a.	43	13.7
	Rs 900,000 to Less than Rs 12, 00,000p.a.	50	15.9
	More than Rs 12,00,000 p.a.	94	29.8

*Primary Analysis

In teaching profession females (60.3%) have an edge over their male counterparts (30.6%). Majority of the respondents are in the age group of 25 - 35 years, clearly depicts that young generation have started showing interest in this profession also either they are fresher or assistant professors/research associates. 48% of the respondents are post graduates, 45% have doctorate degrees i.e. minimum qualification required for associate professors and professors. The majority of the respondents are from engineering department, being NCR a hub of industries having more of engineering colleges. Data shows that 29.8% of respondents have more than Rs 12, 00,000 annual income, as the sample has around 17% professors. The respondents include 153 assistant professors, 103 associate professors and 54 professors and very few research associates. Reason being the criterion prescribed by the AICTE in its guidelines i.e. ratio of students to faculty.

7.4.2 Findings and Analysis:

Exploratory Factor Analysis

To find out the factors affecting academician's motivation, factor analysis was applied on 60 variables of descriptive part of the questionnaire. 12 factors were obtained as a result of Exploratory Factor Analysis (Chauhan A., Goel M.,& Arora R. 2018).

7.4.3 Comparison of Means, t-test, Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Post Hoc test

To establish the relationship between the factors of motivation and demographic variables ANOVA as well as t-test has been applied. Further the significant relationship between the groups within a demographic characteristic has been tested by applying Post Hoc test. Each group within the demographic characteristic was further tested for their relationship with designation and the particular group of demographic characteristic, through ANOVA factorial.

7.4.3.1 Relationship among Factors of Motivation and Designation of Respondents:

Table 2, depicts that DS 1(Research associate) group is highly motivated by factor F 7(Personal) & F 5 (Responsibility with Authority) (=4.33). The DS 2(Assistant Professor) group is highly motivated by factor F 11 (Student feedback and appreciation) (=4.31) and F 9 (Monetary Benefits) (=4.28). The DS 3(Associate professor) group is highly motivated by factor F5 (Responsibility with Authority) (=4.47). The DS 4 (Professor) group is highly motivated by factor F12 (Research related activities) (=4.66).

The results show that higher designation academicians are motivated more by research related activities as they want to use the knowledge and experience which they have gained. Responsibility with authority motivates the associate professors more as they are in the stage of growing in their career. The monetary benefits and student feedback motivates assistant professors more as they are in the initial stage of their career. In order to grow the monetary benefits and student feedback are a source of motivation for them.

Post hoc Test Results (Table 2):

The results of post hoc test show that the factors F6 (Job security), F7 (Personal related to family), F8 (Performance management system) do not have any relationship with designation. These factors

motivate all the respondents irrespective of designation. The rest of the factors are influenced by designation.

Table 2: Relationship of Factors of motivation with different designations of respondents along with ANOVA and Post hoc results

Designation	Research associate		Assistant professor		Associate Professor		Professor		F	Sig.	Post Hoc Test Result
	DS1		DS2		DS3		DS4				
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
F1	3.98	.39	3.70	.61	4.40	.67	4.45	.43	35.758	.000	DS2VsDS3 DS2VsDS4
F2	3.80	.70	4.22	.66	3.93	.64	3.81	.44	7.710	.000	DS2VsDS3 DS2VsDS4
F3	3.80	.48	3.31	.81	2.93	.81	2.88	.55	7.879	.000	DS2VsDS3 DS2VsDS4
F4	3.72	.50	4.04	.57	4.08	.78	3.78	.63	2.979	.032	DS3VsDS4
F5	4.33	.40	3.32	.95	4.47	.66	2.99	.89	49.423	.000	DS1VsDS4 DS2VsDS3 DS3VsDS4
F6	4.13	.69	4.05	.79	4.26	.74	4.28	.57	2.22	.085	-
F7	4.33	.47	4.27	.54	4.40	.37	4.28	.35	1.66	.175	-
F8	4.26	.43	4.06	.50	3.99	.41	3.91	.39	2.043	.108	-
F9	3.86	.38	4.28	.71	3.82	.53	3.62	.60	18.888	.000	DS2VsDS3 DS2VsDS4
F10	4.00	.53	4.16	.51	3.97	.35	3.65	.43	17.651	.000	DS2VsDS3 DS2VsDS4 DS3VsDS4
F11	4.26	.64	4.31	.61	4.26	.38	3.86	.56	9.373	.000	DS2VsDS4 DS3VsDS4
F12	3.86	.60	3.80	.88	4.38	.54	4.66	.36	25.448	.000	DS2VsDS3 DS2VsDS4

* Significant at 0.05 percent level. ** Significant at 0 .01 percent level.

F1- Recognition of Seniority, F2- Growth opportunities,F3- Interpersonal relationship, F4- participative management,F5- Authority with responsibility,F6-Job Security, F7- personal related to family, F8- Performance Management system, F9- Monetary Benefits,F10- Top Management support, F11- Student feedback & Appreciation, F12- Research related activities

8. ANOVA Factorial with Post Hoc

Through ANOVA Factorial Design the interaction between designation, demographic characteristics and factors of motivation is analysed. The results are summarised in Table 3.

The results show that Gender and designation together have no influence on the factors of motivation, indicating that a female or male academician on any designation will be affected in the similar manner by all the factors of motivation.

Similarly Designation and Department together does not have influence on any of the factors.

This shows that academicians of different designations belonging to different departments do not differ in the affect of the factors of motivation.

The designation and qualification together influences factors F 1 (Recognition of Seniority), F2 (Growth Opportunities), F3 (Interpersonal Relationships). This shows that difference in designation and qualification both results in differences of factors affecting the academicians' motivation. So an assistant professor with higher qualification will get motivated differently by growth opportunities as compared to assistant professor having only essential qualification.

The age and designation together influences factors F3 (Interpersonal relationship), F5 (Responsibility with Authority) and F8 (Performance Management System). This shows that difference in age and designation both results in differences in the affect of factors of motivation (F3, F5, F8). Like an associate professor in lower age group will be motivated differently through interpersonal relationships as compared to an associate professor in higher age group.

The designation and Family Income together influences only the factor F 1 (Recognition of seniority). Therefore difference in designation and family income both results in difference in the influence of Factor F1.Indicating that an assistant professor in lower income group will be motivated differently by F1 as compared to an assistant professor in higher income group.

Table 3: Interaction between Designation, Demographic Characteristic and Factors of Motivation

	Source	Designation * Gender	Designation * Age	Designation * Qualification	Designation * Department	Designation * Family Income
Factor 1	**F**	1.152	.465	3.432	1.187	2.29
	Sig.	.328	.707	**.017**	.303	**.036**
Factor 2	**F**	.498	1.664	6.380	.649	1.609
	Sig.	.684	.175	**.000**	.754	.146
Factor 3	**F**	.195	13.360	3.784	1.323	1.162
	Sig.	.899	**.000**	**.011**	.224	.328
Factor 4	**F**	.470	.880	1.392	1.167	1.111
	Sig.	.703	.452	.245	.316	.357
Factor 5	**F**	.665	2.859	2.183	1.662	1.439
	Sig.	.574	**.037**	.090	.098	.201
Factor 6	**F**	1.516	.751	2.044	.577	1.224
	Sig.	.210	.522	.108	.816	.295
Factor 7	**F**	.470	.880	1.392	1.167	1.111
	Sig.	.703	.452	.245	.316	.357
Factor 8	**F**	.665	2.859	2.183	1.662	1.439
	Sig.	.574	**.037**	.090	.098	.201
Factor 9	**F**	1.516	.751	2.044	.577	1.224
	Sig.	.210	.522	.108	.816	.295
Factor 10	**F**	.174	2.214	1.936	1.218	1.837
	Sig.	.914	.086	.124	.284	.093
Factor 11	**F**	1.917	.913	.760	1.199	.252
	Sig.	.127	.435	.518	.295	.958
Factor 12	**F**	.476	.221	.290	1.577	2.116
	Sig.	.699	.882	.833	.122	**.053**

Source: Primary Data

Table 4 shows the results of Post Hoc tests. The results indicate the differences in specific category of designation and demographic variable, as described below:

Designation and Age:

The results show that Assistant professors and Associate professors of age group 25 to less than 35 years differ significantly with 35 to less than 45 years, in the influence of F3 (Interpersonal relationships). The mean value indicates that 35 to less than 45 years group is more motivated by F3.

The significance value (ANOVA) did not indicated that factor F4 has difference in different designations and age group but in post hoc test this factor showed significant difference between assistant and associate professors of age group less than 25 years from the age group 35 to less than 45 years, in the influence of F4 (Participative Management). The mean values indicate that the assistant professors in age group of 35 to less than 45 years are motivated more by F4 as compared to less than 25 years age. The associate professors of 35 less than 45 years are motivated more by F4 as compared to 25 to less than 35 years of age group.

The assistant professors of age group 25 years to less than 35 years and 35 to less than 45 years differ significantly in the influence of F 5 (Responsibility with authority). The mean values indicate that 35 to less than 45 years age group are motivated high by F5 as compared to 25 years to less than 35 years group.

Designation and Qualification:

The post graduates associate professors and professors differ significantly with associate professors and professors having PhD qualification, in the influence of F 3 (Interpersonal relationships). The mean values indicate that the post graduate associate professors are motivated high by F3 as compared to those having PhD.

Designation and Department:

The assistant professors of management and engineering department are motivated more by F 5 (Responsibility with authority) as compared to assistant professors of "any other" department group.

Designation and Family Income:

The assistant professors who are having family income more than Rs 12, 00,000 p.a. and the assistant professors having family income less than 6, 00,000 p.a. differs significantly in the influence of factor F 1(Recognition of seniority). The assistant professors having family income less than 6, 00,000 p.a. and Rs 6, 00,000 to less than Rs 9, 00,000 p.a. are motivated more by F1.

Table 4: Post Hoc Results

	Designation	Significant categories under significant factors
Designation * Age	Assistant Professor	F3 25 to less than 35 years ($\bar{x}$ =3.21)Vs 35 to less than 45 years($\bar{x}$ =4.03)
	Associate Professor	F3 25 to less than 35 years Vs 35 to less than 45 years F4 25 to less than 35 years ($\bar{x}$ =3.38)Vs 35 to less than 45 years($\bar{x}$ =4.24)
Designation * Qualification	Associate Professor	F1 Post Graduation($\bar{x}$ =3.58) Vs PHD($\bar{x}$ =4.59) F2 Post Graduation($\bar{x}$ =3.50) Vs PHD($\bar{x}$ =4.04) F3 Post Graduation($\bar{x}$ =3.48) Vs PHD($\bar{x}$ =2.81) F6 Post Graduation($\bar{x}$ =3.52)VS PHD($\bar{x}$ =4.43)
	Professor	F3 Post Graduation($\bar{x}$ =4.42) Vs PHD(=2.85)
Designation * Qualification	Assistant Professor	F5 Engineering (=3.29)Vs Any other($\bar{x}$ =3.18) Management(=3.06) Vs. any other($\bar{x}$ =3.18)
Designation * Family Income	Assistant Professor	F1 Less than 6,oo,ooo($\bar{x}$ = (3.79) p.a. Vs. More than Rs 12oo,ooo p.a. (($\bar{x}$ =2.97) Rs 6,00,000 to less than Rs 9,00,000($\bar{x}$ =3.66) Vs. More than Rs 12ooooo ($\bar{x}$ =2.97).

Source: Primary Data

9. Hypotheses Testing Results:

The results of the study show several aspects in which the designation influences motivation.

The influence of factors of motivation (provided by exploratory factor analysis) differs at different designations of academicians. Hence H1 is accepted i.e there is a significant relation between the factors influencing motivation of academicians at different designations.

The influences of Factors F7 and F10 differ in male and female academicians. But when gender is analysed along with designation it is seen that neither these two factors nor the other factors are influenced by it. So H2 is rejected. The influence of age on the factors of motivation reveals that the different age groups differ significantly in the influence of all factors excepting for Factors F7 & F8. But when the interaction of age, factors of motivation and designation is analysed the difference in F3, F4, and F5 factors is found to be significant. Therefore H3 is accepted. The respondents belonging to different qualification group does not have any significant difference in their influence of factors F4, F7, F8 on the motivation. The factors F1, F2, F3 & F6 are found to differ significantly in their influence on respondents belonging to different qualification groups. Hence H4 is accepted i.e. there is a significant

relation between the qualification of academicians at different designations and their factors of motivation.

The respondents belonging to different departments differ in the influence of Factors F3, F4, F 7 & F9. When the interaction of department, designation and factors of motivation is analysed it reveals that only the influence of F5 significantly differs. Therefore H5 is accepted The respondents belonging to different "Family Income" groups does not have any significant difference in the influence of factors F7 & F8. The rest of the factors have difference in the different "family income' groups. But when the interaction of factors of motivation, Family income and designation is analysed, only factor F1 is found to have significant difference in its influence. Hence H6 is accepted So there is a significant relation between the family income of academicians at different designations and their factors of motivation.

10. Conclusion

Through the findings the conclusion can be drawn that designation and demographic characteristics together differ in their impact. When designation is studied separately to analyse its impact on factors of motivation the results are different. But when its compared along with demographic variables then the results show that the demographic variables have an influence on the affect of factors of motivation. Hence designation and demographic characteristics are related to a certain extent.

11. Scope for Further Research

From the present study it can be concluded that designation do impacts the motivation of academicians of higher education. The further studies can be done on school teachers or by taking other organisations as a sample, separate studies can be done for public, private, aided or self financing colleges. The result of the study can be used for designing strategies and policies for academicians'.

References

Bani, Kochar. (2008). Job Satisfaction Among Academics, The ICFAI Journal of Organisational Behavior, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 16-27.

Baron, H., Henley, S., Mc. Gibbon, A. & Mc. Carthy, T. (2002). Motivation Questionnaire Manual And User's Guide. Sussex: Saville and Holdsworth Limited.

Boran Toker (2011), Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff: An Empirical Study On Turkey, Quality Assurance in Education, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp.156-169,

Chaudhary. N & Sharma. B (2012), Impact of Employee Motivation on Performance (Productivity) In Private Organization, International Journal of Business Trends and Technology, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp.45-56.

Comrey, A. L. & Lee, H. B. (1992). A First Course in Factor Analysis. Hillsdale, NJ:Erlbaum.

Chauhan A., Goel M., & Gandhi R. (2018). Motivation Among Higher Education Academicians' Factors Analytical Approach, Anveshak: An International Journal of Management , Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 159-76.

Chauhan A., Goel M., & Gandhi R. (2015). Analyzing Complexities of Employee Motivation, Aatambodh, Vol.11, No. 2, pp. 64-73.

Chauhan A., Goel M., & Gandhi R. (2017). Assessing Motivation among Academicians, DIAS Technology Review, Vol.13, No. 2, pp. 40-54.

Chauhan A., Goel M., & Gandhi R. (2014). A Review of Factors Influencing Employee Motivation, Excel International Journal Of Multidisciplinary Management Studies, Vol.4, No. 2, pp. 128-143.

Devadass, Rajeswari (2011), Employees Motivation in Organizations: An integrative literature Review, International Conference on Sociality and Economics Development, IPED Vol.10, IACSIT Press, Singapore.

Field, A.P. (2005), Discovering statistics using SPSS (2nd edition), London; Sage.

Gandhi, Arora. Ritu (2015), Comparative Study of Factors affecting Talent Retention and Strategic Remedies, Anvesha: The Journal of Management, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 10-20

Kovach, K., A., (1987), What Motivates Employees? Workers And Supervisors Give Different Answers, Business Horizons, Vol. 30, No.5, pp 58-65.

Kovach, K., A., (1980), 'Why Motivational Theories Don't Work?', SAM Advanced Management Journal, Vol.45, No.2, pp 54-90.

Kreitner, R. (1995). Management (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company

Kumar, Ravi, B., (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 No1, pp. 56-68.

Lacy, F., J. and Sheehan, B., A., (1997) 'Job Satisfaction Among Academic Staff: An International Perspective', Higher Education, Vol.34, No.3, pp 305-322.

Leung, T., Siu, O. and Spector, (2000), Faculty Stressors, Job Satisfaction, And Psychological Distress Among University Teachers In Hongkong: The Role Of Locus Of Control, International Journal of Stress Management, Vol. 7 No.2, pp 121–138.

Minh-Quang Duong (2013), The Effects of Demographic and Institutional Characteristics on Job Satisfaction of University Faculty in Vietnam, International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 67-75.

Nupur Chaudhary, Bharti Sharma(2012), Impact of Employee Motivation on Performance (Productivity) In Private Organization, International Journal of Business Trends and Technology, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 43-58.

Platsidou, M. & Diamantopoulou, G. (2009), Job Satisfaction Of Greek University Professors: Is It Affected By Demographic Factors, Academic Rank And Problems of Higher Education? Educating the Adult Educator: Quality Provision and Assessment in Europe, Conference Proceedings, ESREA-ReNAdET. Thessaloniki: Grafima Publications, pp. 535-45.

Saif-ud-Din, Khair-uz-Zaman, & Nawaz, A. (2010), Impact of Demographic Variables on Job Satisfaction of the Academicians in Universities of NWFP, Pakistan. Bulletin of Education and Research, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 53-68.

Sajid, S., M.,and Sumbul, Tahir, (2014) 'Job satisfaction among college teachers: a comparative analysis', The IUP Journal of organisational behaviour, Vol.13 No.1, pp. 89-101.

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, Vol. 67, pp 2-11.

Tulsee, Giri, Goswami, and 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, Vol.2, No.2, pp. 78-92.

UGC Guidelines (2012), Minimum Academic Performance And Service Requirements For Promotion Of Teachers In Universities Of India.

Wiley, Carolyn, (1997) 'What Motivates Employees: Over 40 Years Of Motivation Surveys, International Journal of manpower, Vol.8, No.3, pp 263-80.