FACULTY MOTIVATORS AT TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

MS. N. MALATI*; DR. PRAKASH SHARMA**

*FACULTY,
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT,
DELHI INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED STUDIES
PLOT NO. 6, SECTOR 25, ROHINI, DELHI (INDIA)

**FACULTY,
DEPARTMENT OF ABST, FACULTY OF COMMERCE
UNIVERSITY OF RAJASTHAN, JAIPUR (INDIA)

ABSTRACT

Experienced and Competent faculty has been increasingly sought after. Institutions ought to find the raison d'être which motivate faculty in joining technical institutions. Prior identification helps the institutions in providing these features to attract the best of faculty.   The current study identifies the faculty motivating factors in joining technical institutions. The study revealed that four factors Institutional Factors, Individual Development Factors, Comfortable Job and Greater Academic Freedom can help the institutions in attracting faculty.

KEY WORDS: Faculty motivators, Technical Institutions, Institutional Factors, Individual Development Factors, Comfortable Job and Greater Academic Freedom.

INTRODUCTION

Education has been documented as the most significant foundation of competitive advantage for a country. The purpose of higher education is to endow students with sufficient information and expertise to function as inspired and dynamic members of the society. India has one of the largest Higher Education (HE) systems in the world and technical education is the integral part of it. The government aims to augment the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in higher education to 21% by the end of the 12th Five year plan period from the existing 13.5% and Ministry of Human Resource Development has devised an action plan to achieve this target. Technical Education is a part of Higher Education and all efforts have been made to provide the necessary fillip to this sector. The All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE) is the statutory body for technical education and defines technical education "as programmes of education, research and training in engineering, technology, architecture, town planning, management, pharmacy, applied arts and crafts and such other programmes or areas as the Central Government may, in consultation with the Council, by notification in the official Gazette, declare". Technical education is being imparted at various levels such as degree, diploma, PG and research in specialized fields catering to various aspects in technological progress and economic advancement.

There has been a surge in the education sector and corresponding approval for private investors in the area of education has resulted in a spurt of technical institutions. The numbers increased

from 4, 491 in 2006-07 to 8, 361 in 2011-12 with a corresponding increase in the annual students intake from   9, 07,822 in 2007-08 to   20,46, 611 in 2011-12. According to **Suneja. K. (2013)** 92% of the total institutions imparting technical education are in the unaided private institutions. This leads to the pertinent issue of possessing quality of the teaching and learning aspects in the technical education with a strong emphasis on the availability of adequate number of well-qualified and experienced teaching faculty at various levels. Matching of faculty demand against its supply has become the most critical issue for institutions as their assessment is largely reliant on the 'Intellectual Capital and Faculty' making it imperative to develop a machinery to reduce, safeguard, retrieve the intellectual capital of the management institutions **(Doctor and Ramachandran, 2008).** Therefore the first step for every institution is to attract suitable faculty and this can be possible if they identify the faculty motivating factors to join the technical institutions. The current study tries to identify the faculty motivator in joining the technical institutions

LITERATURE REVIEW

Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs and Hertzberg's (1968) two-factor theory are the most widely accepted ones with employee motivation being shown to have correlation with factors such as rewards, recognition relationship, advancement and status. The hygiene factors of Hertzberg's theory, job security and pay reward, possessed close relation to the lower ranks of Maslow's hierarchy model. The motivators in Hertzberg's model, such as recognition and challenging work, were closely related to the higher ranks of Maslow's hierarchy model.
Rosenholtz (1989) co-related job performance to employee motivation and suggested three pre conditions for professional satisfaction namely; one, teachers should feel that their efforts have a positive change towards the society and that the results are a direct consequence of their actions, two, teacher's frustration was generally not neutralized by rewards, especially referring to frustration from students , and three, that teacher's wished for ample opportunities for learning, talent grooming and career growth. Holt (1993) classified motivations factors into extrinsic and intrinsic types. External stimulating factors including pay, promotion and job security were put into the extrinsic group, while factors including self-esteem and self actualization were put into the intrinsic group. Amabile et al. (1994) mentioned that motivation is the central element in the learning process with wage equity and financial rewards as key motivators for satisfied employee, further correlated to job satisfaction. Ballou and Podgursky (1995) analyzed data from teachers in the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 and concluded that a 20 percent salary raise for all teachers would be associated with an increased ability of the district to attract new and practicing teachers with higher test scores. According to Stoner, et al. (1995) no matter how automated an organization may be, high productivity depends on the level of motivation and the effectiveness of the workforce. Staff training is an indispensable strategy for motivating employees. The organization must have a good training programme. This will give the employee opportunities for self-improvement and development to meet the challenges and requirements of new equipment and techniques for performing a task. Banjo (1996) states that many managers use money to reward or punish workers. This is done through the process of rewarding employees for higher productivity and instilling fear of loss of job (e.g., premature retirement) due to poor performance. The desire to be promoted and earn enhanced pay motivates employees.

In addition, Luthans (1998) asserts that motivation is the process that arouses, energizes, directs, and sustains good behavior and performance. That is, it is the process of stimulating people to action to achieve a desired task. One way of stimulating people is to employ effective motivation, which makes employees more satisfied and committed to their jobs. Chiu et al, (2002) highlighted that employee motivation levels are affected by salaries received. Luthans and Sommers (2005) argue that motivation energizes and alters attitudes.

Bhatnagar (2007) further supported the notion that motivation is an internalized drive. Milne (2007) and Rafikul and Ahmad (2008) implied that rewards offered by employers significantly improve an employee's motivation towards their work and subsequently build job satisfaction.

OBJECTIVE

- To identify the employee motivators for joining a technical institution.

RESEARCH DESIGN

A structured questionnaire was designed to collect the data. Different factors were identified through literature review and exploratory study. For this a pool of 12 items was selected on the basis of literature review. Validity of the questionnaire was checked through face validity method and was found to be high. Items were rated on likert scale of five points which is the most popular choice for ordinal scale; the opinion indicated as "critical" has been assigned the weight of 5. To evaluate the motivating factors of the faculty the summated score was calculated for each respondent. The cronbach alpha reliability of the 12 items for 30 respondents was found to be .766, which is an acceptable value of reliability

SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION

The study was conducted in Technical institutions (approved by AICTE) in the Delhi and NCR region. A sample of 250 was drawn using simple random sampling. The data on these items was collected through a sample of faculty members belonging to various technical institutions. Complete filled in questionnaires were received from 141 faculties and further analysis was carried out on them.

DATA ANALYSIS

Principal component analysis was used with varimax rotation. The correlations between factors and the different items expressed by means of the factorial loads were significant. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy came out to be .677 which is above .65 (the acceptable level) (Table 1). This shows that the items selected for the questionnaire are appropriate. The chi- square value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be significant (chi sq= 455.04, p= .000), this means the factor analysis is acceptable. The factor analysis generated four components with eigenvalues above 1. The varimax rotation clubbed the items on four components as shown in Table 2.

Table 1: Showing results of KMO and Bartlett Test for Faculty Motivators Questionnaire

Test		Values
Kaiser- Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy		.677
Bartlett's Test	Chi Sq	455.04
	df	66
	sig	.000

Table 2: Rotated Component Matrix of Motivating Factors

Items		Components			
		1	2	3	4
A1	Salary and other benefits		.653		
A2	Greater Academic Freedom				.900
A3	Relaxed workload			.604	
A4	Status/Prestige of the Institute	.550			
A5	Supportive and approachable management	.721			
A6	Better infrastructure	.811			
A7	Comfortable working conditions	.633			
A8	Research/consulting opportunities		.614		
A9	Greater growth opportunities		.521		
A10	Job security		.731		
A11	Closer to home			.846	
A12	Presence of Work Life Balance			.703	

The items A4, A5, A6, & A7 got clubbed on First component which can be named as **'Institutional Factors'** comprising of prestige of institute, supportive management, better infrastructure and comfortable working conditions. The second component got high factor loadings of item A1, A8, A9, & A10. This can be named as '**Individual Development Factors'** defined by salary and other benefits, growth opportunities, research/consulting opportunities and job security. Three items i.e. A3, A11 &A12 got clubbed on third component which can be named as **'Comfortable Job'** characterized by nearness to home, relaxed workload and presence of work life balance. There is only one item i.e. "**Greater Academic Freedom"** which is loaded on fourth component and has a very high loading of .900, so this can be retained as a factor.
Hence, the analysis brought forth four factors which can be considered important for joining a technical institution.

CONCLUSION
With increasing demand for faculty, identifying the motivators will help the institutions in making the right move to attract the best of faculty. Institutions which offer conducive environment and also provide ample opportunities for growth to the faculty including good salary and greater academic freedom are in a better position to attract quality faculty. Sinclair, et al. (2005) demonstrates the motivational power of money through the process of job choice. They explain that money has the power to attract, retain, and motivate individuals towards higher performance. Furham et al. (2009) entailed that organizations and managers recognized rewards as an important element in motivating employees to act willingly, exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and exhibit strong desire to maintain membership. Further the institutional policies like the status and prestige and supportive management is considered

equally important motivating factor. Institutions providing these benefits would certainly be in a position to get the best of faculty and also retain them for future.

REFERENCES

- **Amabile, T. M. Hill, K. G Hennessey, B. A. Tighe. E. M. (1994)** "The Work Preferences Inventory: Assessing Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivational Orientations" *.Journal of Personal and Social Psychology. ,* 66 (5): 950-967.

- *All India Council for Technical Education Approval Process Handbook (2011-2012)*

- **Ballou, D.& Podgursky, M. (1995).** "Recruiting Smart Teachers". *Journal of Human Resources*, 30(2), 326-338.

- **Banjo, S.A. (1996)**. *Human Resource Management? An Expository Approach.* Lagos: Saban Publishers.

- **Bhatnagar, J. (2007),** "Talent Management Strategy of Employee Engagement in Indian ITES Employees: Key to Retention", *Employee Relations*, 29 (6):640-63.

- **Chiu, R. K,.Luk, V. W & Tang. T. L(2002),** "Retaining and Motivating Employee: Compensation Preferences in Hong Kong and China", *Personnel Review,* 31 (4): 402-431.

- **Doctor, G. and Ramachandran, S. (2008).** "DSpace @ IBSA: Knowledge Sharing in a Management Institute". *VINE: The Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 38 (1), 42-52

- **Furham, A. Eracleous, T. Chamorro-Premusiz.(2009)** "Personality, Motivation and Job Satisfaction: Herzberg meets the Big Five". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24 (8): 765-779.

- **Herzberg, F. (1968).** "One more Time: How do you Motivate Employees?" *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), 33-62.

- **Holt, D. , (1993),** *Management Principles and Practices*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

- **Luthans , . F. , (1998),** *Organization Behaviour.* Boston: Mc Graw- Hill Companies, Inc.

- **Luthans, K.W. and Sommers, S.M. (2005).** '*Impact of High Performance Work on Industry –level Outcomes', Journal of Managerial Issues ,* 17(3):327-345

- **Maslow, A. H. (1954).** *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers

- **Milne P. (2007).** "Motivation, Incentives and Organizational Culture", *.Journal of Knowledge Management.* 11 (6): 28- 38.

- **Rafikul, I. & Ahmad Z.I (2008).** "Employee Motivation: A Malaysian perspective". *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 18 (4): 344-362.

- *Report on "Inclusive and Qualitative Expansion of Higher Education", 12th Five Year Plan 2012-17, UGC, Delhi*

- **Rosenholtz, S.J. (1989)**, *Teacher's Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*. New York: Longman

- **Sinclair, R.R., Tucker, J.S., Cullen, J.C., & Wright, C. (2005)**."Performance differences among four organizational commitment Profiles" *.Journal of Applied Psychology 90 (6)*, 1280-1287.

- **Stoner, J. et. al**. (1995).*Management*, Pearson Educational Publisher, India:

- **Suneja. K (2013),** "Unaided Institutes Constitute 92% of Technical Education". *Financial Express* , March, 18, 2013