



## Impact of Demographic Factors on Motivation of University Teachers in North India

**Rajesh Tiwari**

Doctoral Research Scholar, Punjab Technical University, Kapurthala, Punjab

**Dr. Bimal Anjum**

Supervisor, Assistant Professor, DAV College, Chandigarh

### ABSTRACT

The paper evaluates the factors that motivate university teachers and their association with the demographic factors. A descriptive research design is used for the study. The primary data is collected through questionnaire from teachers of private and public universities of North India. The data is analyzed through descriptive tools and analysis of variance.

### KEYWORDS

Teachers, Descriptive Research, Demographic, Universities

### INTRODUCTION

India is on a threshold of an unprecedented opportunities as well as challenges of a young demographic profile. 65% of population is 35 years or below (Virmani 2014). The youth can transform country into an economic superpower if the young students are equipped with necessary skills. But this young population can become a source of law and order problem if they fail to achieve status and financial prosperity in society. According to National Crime Records Bureau 65% of all juvenile crimes are done by 16-18 years old (Tiwary 2013), from 2002 to 2012 rapes by juveniles have increased by 143%, murders 87%, kidnappings by 500% (Bhatt 2013).

The faculty shortage is expected reach 1.38 million by 2020 (Technopak, 2011). Historically teachers have commanded high respect in Indian culture shown by the lines *Guru Brahma, Guru Vishnu, Guru Devo Maheshwarah*. But the current scenario is just the opposite of the respect and position of teachers in Indian society. Now the teaching is regarded as the vocation for those who have no other option (Kesavan, 2012).

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Herzberg et al. in their study in 1959 presented motivation hygiene theory based on study of job satisfaction of 200 engineers and accountants in Pittsburgh. Herzberg argued that satisfiers are motivators and dissatisfiers are hygiene factors (Herzberg et al. 2010).

Chapman and Lowther (1982) studied satisfaction of teachers. It was found that women were more satisfied than men. It was found that accomplishments in leadership had a positive relationship with satisfaction. Recognition was found to positively affect satisfaction.

Castillo and Cano 2004 found that female faculties showed higher level of commitment as compared to male faculties.

Schroder 2008, conducted a study to analyze the job satisfaction of teachers with regard to demographic variables. It was found that administrators were more satisfied with extrinsic factors and teachers were more satisfied with intrinsic factors. It was also found that teachers older than 50 years were more satisfied than the young teachers. Male and female teachers showed similar level of job satisfaction, thus there was no significant difference in satisfaction based on gender. It was found that teachers with PhD were more satisfied than non PhD teachers. No difference was found between satisfaction of teachers with different

length of employment.

Kainth and Kaur 2010 conducted a study on satisfaction of faculties in north India. It was found that male teachers were more satisfied as compared to female faculties. Ololube 2006 concluded in a study that female faculties were more satisfied. However some authors found that there is no difference between satisfaction of male and female faculties (Harash, 2010, Lal and Shergill, 2012, Moore, 2012).

Harash, 2010 studied satisfaction of teachers with regard to teaching experience. It was found that there was no difference between satisfaction of teachers with regard to teaching experience, however it was found that teachers with PhD were less satisfied.

Dhawan 2013 argued that in India teachers have few opportunities for career progression. Author cited examples of Finland, South Korea and Singapore for attracting the best talent for teaching by compensation, prestige and labour-market responsiveness at national level. These countries recruit teachers from the top third of the graduating class in high school.

Ghazi et al. 2013 found that university teacher's motivation is more dependent on fulfillment of hygiene factors.

### OBJECTIVES:

1. Study the factors that motivate university teachers
2. Compare motivating factors for public and private universities with regard to demographic variables

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

A descriptive research design was used for the study. The survey method was used for collecting primary data. The data was collected using a self prepared questionnaire after review of literature. The conceptual framework for the questionnaire was Herzberg hygiene theory. The comparison for public and private university was done through t test and ANOVA using SPSS 21.0.

### FINDINGS & DISCUSSION:

The sample comprised of 52% teachers from private universities and 48% from public universities. Table I shows the satisfaction (on a 5 point likert scale) and significance value of t test for male and female teachers on different factors of motivation.

**Table I: Comparison of Motivation Factors with regard to Gender**

Factors	Universities					
	Private			Public		
	Male	Female	Sig.	Male	Female	Sig.
Enthusiasm	4.28	3.86	0.009	4.3418	4.5385	0.151
Chances for promotion	4.23	3.85	0.016	3.1899	3.4615	0.165
Recognition	2.81	3.66	0.000	3.2278	3.5077	0.166
Responsibilities Allocated	4.20	3.79	0.011	3.227	3.4769	0.198
Rewards for Achievements	3.18	3.62	0.022	3.3038	3.4923	0.328
Salary	3.13	3.70	0.001	3.8987	4.1692	0.091
Boss understands needs of faculties	2.78	3.67	0.000	3.4810	3.5385	0.757
Job related professional relationship	2.83	3.42	0.000	3.5190	3.5077	0.950
Rules & regulations	3.13	3.38	0.104	3.7848	4.1385	0.026
Work load	3.0	3.56	0.000	3.8228	4.1385	0.052

**Source: Survey Data**

In private universities, except rules and regulations, all the P values are less than 0.05, so it is concluded that there is a significant difference (at 5% level of significance) between male and female teachers. Male teachers are more satisfied with regard to enthusiasm, promotion, responsibilities. Whereas female teachers are more satisfied on recognition, rewards, salary, supervision, professional relationship and work load. The public university teachers showed a reverse trend. Except rules and regulations all P values were more than 0.05 thus it is concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female faculties on motivation factors except rules and regulations. There is a significant difference among male and female teachers on satisfaction with rules and regulations. Female teachers are more satisfied with rules and regulations as compared to male teachers in public universities.

**Table II: Anova Test for Motivation with regard to Academic Qualification**

Factors	Private				Public			
	Mean (PG)	Mean (PhD)	F Value	Sig.	Mean (PG)	Mean (PhD)	F Value	Sig.
Enthusiasm	3.98	4.13	0.78	0.38	4.08	4.50	5.37	0.02
Chances for promotion	3.88	4.13	2.25	0.14	2.92	3.39	3.37	0.07
Recognition	3.29	3.17	0.33	0.57	2.92	3.44	3.89	0.05
Responsibilities Allocated	3.94	4.05	0.38	0.54	2.92	3.43	3.96	0.05
Rewards for Achievements	3.53	3.32	1.07	0.30	2.92	3.48	5.02	0.03
Salary	3.61	3.30	2.99	0.09	3.42	4.14	12.40	0.00
Boss understands needs of faculties	3.35	3.13	1.16	0.28	3.29	3.55	1.10	0.30

Job related professional relationship	3.14	3.09	0.08	0.78	3.33	3.55	0.82	0.37
Rules & regulations	3.33	3.21	0.45	0.50	3.42	4.05	9.37	0.00
Work load	3.39	3.21	1.38	0.24	3.29	4.10	15.24	0.00

**Source: Survey Data**

As shown in table II, no significant difference is found in satisfaction of private university teachers based on different categories of academic qualification (PhD and PG). All P values are more than 0.05. On the other hand in case of public universities a significant difference was found in all the factors except professional relationship with regard to academic qualification. PhD qualified faculties were more satisfied on all factors as compared to PG (post graduate) teachers. Both PhD and PG teachers were satisfied with professional relationship.

**Table III: Anova Test for Motivation with regard to Teaching Experience**

Factors	Private		Public	
	F Value	Sig.	F Value	Sig.
Enthusiasm	.948	.463	1.970	.074
Chances for promotion	.447	.846	1.454	.199
Recognition	1.249	.285	1.756	.113
Responsibilities Allocated	.330	.920	1.116	.356
Rewards for Achievements	1.938	.078	1.502	.182
Salary	2.605	.020	1.046	.399
Boss understands needs of faculties	1.345	.241	1.411	.214
Job related professional relationship	1.000	.428	1.292	.265
Rules & regulations	.823	.554	1.590	.154
Work load	.682	.664	1.437	.205

**Source: Survey Data**

Table III provides results of analysis of variance for teaching experience. In private universities there was no significant difference between the teachers based on teaching experience, except salary. A significant difference was found between satisfaction of teachers of different teaching experience. The faculties with teaching experience more than 15 years were less satisfied (Mean of 2.67) with salary in private universities. On the other hand there was no significant difference between satisfaction of teachers with different teaching experience in case of public universities.

**CONCLUSION:**

Male teachers in private universities are more satisfied on factors promotion and responsibilities representing need for growth. Female teachers were more satisfied with factors that provide stability and recognition. No significant difference was found in satisfaction of male and female teachers in public universities. However female teachers were more satisfied with rules and recognition. In private universities there was no difference in satisfaction of teachers with different qualifications. In public universities PhD qualified faculties were more satisfied. Senior faculties in private universities were less satisfied with salary.

Universities need to transform their role from knowledge dissemination to wealth creation and develop non conventional revenue models to generate the resources to give better sala-

ries to attract talented individual to teaching career. Motivated teachers can equip the young population with necessary skills and attributes to reap the demographic dividend for the country.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

The author acknowledges the support of Punjab Technical University, Kapurthala for research work.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Bhatt M, 2013, Heinous crimes by minors on the rise, shows NCRB data, NDTV dated 6th September 2013, retrieved 20th October 2014 from <http://www.ndtv.com/article/india/heinous-crimes-by-minors-on-the-rise-shows-ncrb-data-415367> | [2] Chapman D, Lowther M, 1982, Teachers Satisfaction with Teaching, The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 75, No. 4 (Mar. - Apr., 1982), pp. 241-247 | [3] Dhawan A, 2013, "Need for plan to restore dignity to teaching", The Times of India dated 5th September 2013, retrieved 6th October 2014 from <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/delhi/Need-for-plan-to-restore-dignity-to-teaching/articleshow/22303345.cms> | [4] Ghazi S, Shahzada G, Khan M, 2013, Resurrecting Herzberg's Two Factor Theory: An Implication to the University Teachers, Journal of Educational and Social Research, Vol. 3 (2) May 2013, pp 445-451 | [5] Herzberg F, Mausner B, Snyderman A, 2010, The Motivation to Work, Transaction Publishers, New Jersey. | [6] Kesavan S. 2012, For a career in mathematics, The Hindu, dated 7th January 2012, retrieved 19th October 2014 from <http://www.thehindu.com/sci-tech/science/for-a-career-in-mathematics/article2747091.ece> | [7] Technopak, 2012, "Private Universities; Creating Opportunities for Quality Higher Education in India", retrieved 15th December 2012 from <http://www.technopak.com/resources/education/Final%20Higher%20Education-Outlook%20July,%202012.pdf> | [8] Schroder R, 2008, Job Satisfaction of Employees at a Christian University, Journal of Research on Christian Education, 17:2, 225-246. | [9] Tiwary D, 2013, Of all juvenile crimes, 64% by 16-18 yr olds, Times of India, dated 6th January 2013, retrieved 25th July 2014 from <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Of-all-juvenile-crimes-64-by-16-18-yr-olds/articleshow/17907886.cms> | [10] University Grants Commission (2011). 'Inclusive and Qualitative Expansion of Higher Education: 12th Five Year Plan (2012-2017)', retrieved 17th October 2014 from [http://www.ugc.ac.in/ugcpdf/740315\\_12FYP.pdf](http://www.ugc.ac.in/ugcpdf/740315_12FYP.pdf) | [11] Virmani P, 2014, Note to India's leaders: your 150m young people are calling for change, The Guardian dated 8th April 2014, retrieved 5th September 2014 from <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/apr/08/india-leaders-young-people-change-2014-elections> |