

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MOTIVATION OF EMPLOYEES IN MINORITY AND NON MINORITY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

(SELECTED INSTITUTIONS IN HYDERABAD)

G.Sai Rekha
Associate Professor
Iarens2000@gmail.com

ACE Engineering College
Ghatkesar.
Hyderabad.

Abstract:

Organizational leaders are finding it increasingly difficult to keep workers motivated to work at their highest potential and to ensure loyalty to the organization. Employees who are not motivated tend to be less productive leading to lower profits for the organization. Organizational leaders must make every effort to implement policies and procedures that promote higher motivation, thus increasing the potential for higher profits. Organizational leaders can utilize intrinsic motivational incentives such as recognition and providing opportunities for interaction or extrinsic motivational incentives such as compensation and benefits to motivate employees; However, research indicates that compensation and benefits can positively affect employee motivation across sectors. Therefore, leaders of all organizations need to be attentive to the factors that influence employee motivation.

Key Words: Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, Employees, Organization, Productivity, Incentives.

INTRODUCTION

To avoid wasting money, leaders need to ensure that they are receiving maximum value for monies spent on motivational incentives. Unfortunately, employees are motivated in vastly different ways. Because employees are motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically finding the most effective incentive package can be difficult for organizational leaders. In one study, monetary incentives increased performance by 23%; however, when monetary incentives were coupled with intrinsic motivational rewards such as social recognition and positive feedback performance was increased by 45%. An abundance of research concerning employee motivation has been conducted; unfortunately little research has been conducted that illuminates the best combination of factors to enhance employee motivation in Educational Institutions.

Increasing employee motivation is an on-going concern for businesses because of the high costs associated with employees who lack motivation to perform at their highest potential. Lack of motivation can be evidenced in a variety of ways that can be both detrimental and costly for organizations. Thirty-five percent of employees in the United States abuse sick leave at least once a year. Additionally, turnover costs in United States businesses can be as high as a billion dollars per year. Business owners want their organizations to operate at peak performance in order to maintain high profitability. recognized that motivation is highly correlated with organizational profitability indicating that an increase in employee motivation could cause an increase in organizational profits.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

1. To Study the different motivational factors that affect employee motivation in the Minority and Non Minority Institutions.
2. To analyse the levels of motivation and job satisfaction in Minority and Non Minority Institutions.
3. To make comparative study with respect to motivation of employees in Minority and Non Minority Institutions.

.SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study is focused on only selected motivating factors which influence employee job satisfaction in Minority and Non minority Institutions. For the purpose of study two Educational institutions of Minority and two Educational institutions of Non-Minority were selected. Due to financial and time constraint for the feasibility of the study Engineering colleges from Hyderabad were selected for the purpose of research. The entire study is based on Hertz Berg Two factor Theory only.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

A population refers to the entire group of people from which data can be sourced and investigated and from which the researcher can make inferences .

In this study the total numbers of respondents were 300, with 150 employees coming from NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions. A non-probability sampling design, namely, convenience sampling was used to draw the sample. Convenience sampling involves collecting information from members of the population who are most easily accessible and conveniently available to provide the required information The rationale for using this method is that it is convenient, quick and cost effective .

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

A quantitative and qualitative method was used to gather data for the research. The measuring instruments includes following Questionnaire.

- 1.Job satisfaction survey (Appendix C)
- 2..Demographic details (Appendix E)
3. Qualitative interview (Appendix F &G)

HYPOTHESIS

H0: There is no significant differences with regard to employee motivation and between the demographic groups

H1: There is significant differences with regard to employee motivation and between the demographic groups .

H0: There is no statistically significant difference in employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is statistically significant difference in employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions

MOTIVATION: A THEORITICAL FRAME WORK.

\Motivation refers to reasons that underlie behavior that is characterized by willingness and volition. Intrinsic motivation is animated by personal enjoyment, interest, or pleasure, whereas extrinsic motivation is governed by reinforcement contingencies. Motivation involves a constellation of closely related beliefs, perceptions, values, interests, and actions. Motivation within individuals tends to vary across subject areas, and this domain specificity increases with age.

Definition of Motivation

Motivation refers to “the reasons underlying behavior” (Guay et al., 2010, p. 712). Paraphrasing Gredler, Broussard and Garrison (2004) broadly define motivation as “the attribute that moves us to do or not to do something” (p. 106).

HERZBERG TWO FACTOR THEORY

To better understand employee attitudes and motivation, Frederick Herzberg performed studies to determine which factors in an employee's work environment caused satisfaction or dissatisfaction. He published his findings in the 1959 book *The Motivation to Work*.

The studies included interviews in which employees were asked what pleased and displeased them about their work. Herzberg found that the factors causing job satisfaction (and presumably motivation) were different from those causing job dissatisfaction. He developed the motivation-hygiene theory to explain these results. He called the satisfiers motivators and the dissatisfiers hygiene factors, using the term "hygiene" in the sense that they are considered maintenance factors that are necessary to avoid dissatisfaction but that by themselves do not provide satisfaction.

The following table presents the top six factors causing dissatisfaction and the top six factors causing satisfaction, listed in the order of higher to lower importance.

Factors Affecting Job Attitudes

Leading Dissatisfaction	to	Leading Satisfaction	to
Company policy		Achievement	
Supervision		Recognition	
Relationship w/Boss		Work itself	
Work conditions		Responsibility	
Salary		Advancement	
Relationship w/Peers		Growth	

Herzberg reasoned that because the factors causing satisfaction are different from those causing dissatisfaction, the two feelings cannot simply be treated as opposites of one another. The

opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction, but rather, no satisfaction. Similarly, the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction.

While at first glance this distinction between the two opposites may sound like a play on words, Herzberg argued that there are two distinct human needs portrayed. First, there are physiological needs that can be fulfilled by money, for example, to purchase food and shelter. Second, there is the psychological need to achieve and grow, and this need is fulfilled by activities that cause one to grow.

From the above table of results, one observes that the factors that determine whether there is dissatisfaction or no dissatisfaction are not part of the work itself, but rather, are external factors. Herzberg often referred to these hygiene factors as "KITA" factors, where KITA is an acronym for Kick In The A..., the process of providing incentives or a threat of punishment to cause someone to do something. Herzberg argues that these provide only short-run success because the motivator factors that determine whether there is satisfaction or no satisfaction are intrinsic to the job itself, and do not result from carrot and stick incentives.

Implications for Management

If the motivation-hygiene theory holds, management not only must provide hygiene factors to avoid employee dissatisfaction, but also must provide factors intrinsic to the work itself in order for employees to be satisfied with their jobs. Herzberg argued that job enrichment is required for intrinsic motivation, and that it is a continuous management process. According to Herzberg:

- The job should have sufficient challenge to utilize the full ability of the employee.
- Employees who demonstrate increasing levels of ability should be given increasing levels of responsibility.
- If a job cannot be designed to use an employee's full abilities, then the firm should consider automating the task or replacing the employee with one who has a lower level of skill. If a person cannot be fully utilized, then there will be a motivation problem.

Critics of Herzberg's theory argue that the two-factor result is observed because it is natural for people to take credit for satisfaction and to blame dissatisfaction on external factors. Furthermore, job satisfaction does not necessarily imply a high level of motivation or productivity.

Herzberg's theory has been broadly read and despite its weaknesses its enduring value is that it recognizes that true motivation comes from within a person and not from KITA factors.

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis was done in two phase. In the first phase demographic factors are analyzed. In the second phase Relationship between Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction was analyzed in minority and non minority institutions.

I PHASE

The following elements are taken for analysis in both Minority and Non-Minority Institutions (Appendix E). A simple table with percentage calculation is taken into consideration.

1. Gender and Motivation
2. Age and Motivation
3. Job Experience and Motivation
4. Education background and Motivation
5. Designation and Motivation
6. Income distribution and Motivation
7. Job security and Motivation.

II PHASE

Analysis of Motivation and Job Satisfaction Parameters

The following elements are taken for analysis in both Minority and Non-Minority Institutions (Appendix E).

Nature of Research: Descriptive

Statistical Techniques: SPSS package

Statistical Tools: ANOVA and “t” test.

Data collection : Quantative and Qualitative Questionnaire

Appendix C (Quantative Questionnaire)

Appendix F and G (Qualitative Questionnaire)

1. Work content
2. Payment
3. Promotion
4. Recognition
5. Working conditions
6. Benefits
7. Personal
8. Supervision
9. Security and overall satisfaction

4.1. Gender Distribution

Table No 4.1. Gender Distribution

Gender	E.I		T
	NM	M	
Male	106	71	177
	70.7%	47.3%	59.0%
Female	44	79	123
	29.3%	52.7%	41.0%
Total	150	150	300
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

The above analysis shows that 70.7 percent and 29.3 percent of the respondents were male and female in NON-MINORITY Institution. The respondents in MINORITY Institution comprise more of female with 52.7 percent and male 47.3 percent. The study has been administered by considering both the genders to be important.

4.2. Age Distribution

Table No 4.2. Age Distribution

Age of Respondents	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Upto 25 years	15	35	50
	10.0%	23.3%	16.7%
26 to 35 years	38	73	111
	25.3%	48.7%	37.0%
36 to 45 years	52	39	91
	34.7%	26.0%	30.3%

46 Years and above	45	3	48
	30.0%	2.0%	16.0%
Total	150	150	300
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

Mean	35.7967
Mode	29.00
Std. Deviation	9.36059
Minimum	20.00
Maximum	58.00

INTERPRETATION

Findings showed that of all respondents in NON-MINORITY, more than 34.7 percent were aged between 36 – 45yrs followed by the age groups of above 46 yrs and 26 – 35yrs which accounted for 30 percent and 25.3 percent respectively. At MINORITY Institution 48.7 percent respondents were in the age group of 26 – 35yrs followed by 36 – 45yrs and below 25yrs which accounted for 26 percent and 23.3 percent respectively. Interestingly only 2 percent of the respondents were in the age group of above 46yrs, this might be due to issues relating to stress and job security. Whereas at NON-MINORITY above 46yrs accounted for 30 percent this situation might be due to promotions and other benefits of superannuation. The young respondents aged below 25yrs were 10 percent at NON-MINORITY and at MINORITY were 23.3 percent. This can be due to most of the NON-MINORITY Institutions have certain selection formalities which restricts the entry level of the candidates where as at MINORITY Institutions the situation is different.

The mean age of employees is 35.7967 and S.D is 9.36059. Most of the sample employees are in the age of 29 years, the minimum age being 20 yrs and maximum being 58 yrs.

4.3 Job Experience

Table No 4.3. Job Experience

Job Experience	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
1yr--5 yrs	21	58	79

	14.0%	38.7%	26.3%
6yrs--10yrs	13	46	59
	8.7%	30.7%	19.7%
11yrs--15yrs	36	32	68
	24.0%	21.3%	22.7%
16yrs--20yrs	27	10	37
	18.0%	6.7%	12.3%
21yrs--25yrs	20	4	24
	13.3%	2.7%	8.0%
Above 26yrs	33	0	33
	22.0%	.0%	11.0%
Total	150	150	300
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

Mean	12.7400
Mode	12.00
Std. Deviation	8.90290
Minimum	1.00

Maximum	38.00
---------	-------

INTERPRETATION

Experience wise the statistics show that at NON-MINORITY 24 percent of the respondents are having experience between 11—15yrs. At MINORITY Institution 38.7 percent, 30.7 percent and 21.3 percent were the number of respondents having work experience between 1—5yrs, 6 – 10yrs and 11 –15yrs respectively. The study finds that nearly 90 percent of the samples at MINORITY are having experience from 1---15yrs. This trend can be due to quick promotions and performance based incentives which motivate the employees stay in the organization for a longer period. The mean and SD are 12.7400, 8.90290. The mode is 12 which indicate that most of the sample respondents have 12 yrs of job experience. The minimum and maximum job experience is 1 yr and 38 yrs.

4.4. Educational Background

Table No 4.4. Educational Background

Education	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Graduate	90	44	134
	60.0%	29.3%	44.7%
Post Graduate	57	86	143
	38.0%	57.3%	47.7%
Doctorates	3	20	23
	2.0%	13.3%	7.7%
Total	150	150	300
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

Education wise the study finds that 60 percent and 29.3 percent of the respondents are graduates followed by 38 percent and 57.3 percent post graduates at NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions. Professionals account for 2 percent and 13.3 percent respectively.

4.5. Designation

Table No 4.5. Designation

Designation	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	within Institution
Assistants	28	39	67
	18.7%	26%	22.3%
Asst. Professor	48	28	76
	32%	18.7%	25.3%
Assoc. Professor	63	63	126
	42%	42%	42%
Professors	3	15	18
	2%	10%	6%
Visiting Professor	2	5	7
	1.3%	3.3%	2.3%
Emeritus professor	6	0	6
	4%	0%	2%
Total	150	150	300
	100%	100%	100

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

The analysis finds that 18.7 percent of the respondents are Assistants at NON-MINORITY Institutions followed by Assistant Professors and Assoc. Professors with 32 and 42 percent respectively 2 percent are Visiting Professors. The study finds that at MINORITY 26 percent and 18.7 percent of the respondents are Lecturers and assistant professors and 42 percent are Assoc. Prof, 10 percent of the sample are Professors The respondent designations are different as career planning is based on the employee performance.

4.6. Income Distribution

Table No 46. Income Distributions

	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	Within Institution
Annual Salary			

Upto Rs 3 lakhs	18	27	45
	12%	18%	15%
Rs 3 lakhs to Rs 6 lakhs	118	40	158
	78.7%	26.6%	52.7%
Rs 6 lakhs to Rs 9 lakhs	14	31	45
	9.3%	20.7%	15%
Rs 9 lakhs to Rs 12 lakhs	0	15	15
	0	10%	5%
Above Rs 12 lakhs	0	37	37
	0	24.7%	12.3%
Total	150	150	300
	100%	100%	100%

Source: Survey

Mean	6.3429
Mode	4.00
Std. Deviation	4.15490
Minimum	1.12
Maximum	20.00

INTERPRETATION

An interesting finding of the study is that NON-MINORITY Institution has no respondent having annual salary above 9 lakhs, whereas 10 percent and 24.6 percent of the respondents of MINORITY Institution have annual salary between 9 –12 lakhs and above 12 lakhs (10 +37 respondents). 78.7 percent of the respondents at NON-MINORITY have annual salary between 3–6 lakhs followed by 12 percent and 9.3 percent drawing salary below 3 lakhs and 6—9 lakhs respectively. Respondents at MINORITY drawing annual salary between 3---6 lakhs and 6---9lakhs is 26.6 percent and 20.7 percent and below 3 lakhs is 18 percent. The reason for drawing more salary might be due to performance and promotions which are based on quantity and quality of work they perform. The mean and SD are 6.3429 and 4.15490. The mode is 4. The minimum and maximum annual salary drawn by sample employee is Rs 112000 and Rs 2000000.

4.7. Job Security

Table No 4.7. Job Security

Job Security	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Uncertain	0	150	150
	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Certain	150	0	150
	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Total	150	150	300
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

The study finds that Job security is certain at NON-MINORITY and uncertain at MINORITY Institutions.

5.1 WORK MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION IN MINORITY AND NON MINORITY INSTITUTIONS**5.2.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Work Satisfaction and Motivation****Table No 5.2.1. Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive Statistics		
Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work Content	1.99	0.081
Payment	1.52	0.5
Promotion	1.81	0.392

Recognition	1.89	0.305
Working Conditions	1.79	0.408
Benefits	1.65	0.477
Personal	1.62	0.486
Leader Supervision	1.92	0.272
General	1.57	0.496

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

As per the dimensions of work motivation assessed by the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire, the above table indicates that the means for the work content, payment, promotion, recognition, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader/supervisor and general ranged from a high of 1.99 to a low of 1.52. It therefore appears that staff in the sample is relatively motivated; however, the mean values for payment, benefits, personal and general were the lowest. These mean values indicate the areas that employees were most likely to be de motivated and dissatisfied.

As per the above table the respondents in the sample are most likely to be motivated due to their work content, working conditions, promotion, recognition and leader supervision. They are least motivated by the remuneration they receive, general, personal and benefits.

Furthermore, the rank order of dimensions of motivation from most motivated to least motivated by the sample respondents is depicted in the following table.

5.2.2. Rank order of motivational factors from most motivating to least motivating

Table No 5.2.2 Rank Order

Descriptive Statistics		
Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work Content	1.99	0.081
Leader Supervision	1.92	0.272
Recognition	1.89	0.305
Promotion	1.81	0.392

Working Conditions	1.79	0.408
Benefits	1.65	0.477
Personal	1.62	0.486
General	1.57	0.496
Payment	1.52	0.5

Source: Survey

5.3 PARAMETERS

5.3.1 Work Content/Work Itself

Table No 5.3.1 Work Content

	Institutions		
Work Content	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	Total
	2	0	2
Low	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	148	150	298
High	49.7%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: survey

INTERPRETATION

As per the above analysis almost all the sample respondents of NON-MINORITY and all the sample respondents MINORITY have high work content. It is interesting to note that almost all the sample respondents view the work to be interesting, creative and challenging.

5.3.2 Payment

Table No 5.3.2 Payment

Payment	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	78	67	145
	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%
High	72	83	155
	46.5%	53.5%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

As per the above table 53.8 percent and 46.2 percent of the sample respondents of NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions considered payment to be low. Which shows that pay or pay related benefits are not motivating employees. 46.5 percent and 53.5 percent of NON-MINORITY and MINORITY have shown a high level.

This trend can be due to MINORITY salaries and incentives are based on performance.

5.3.3 Promotion

Table No 5.3.3 Promotion

Promotion	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	9	48	57
	15.8%	84.2%	100.0%

High	141	102	243
	58.0%	42.0%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

The above table shows that the majority of the sample respondents of both NON-MINORITY and MINORITY are highly satisfied and motivated with promotional opportunities provided at Institutions. Career advancement and hierarchical changes influence employee to perform well as responsibility and power motivates every employee.

5.3.4 Recognition

Table No 5.3.4 Recognition

Recognition	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	12	19	31
	38.7%	61.3%	100.0%
High	138	131	269
	51.3%	48.7%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

As per the above analysis majority of the respondents are highly motivated and satisfied with the recognition they receive from organization, clients, and colleagues.

5.3.5 Working Conditions/ Environment

Table No 5.3.5 Working Conditions

Working Conditions	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	25	38	63
	39.7%	60.3%	100.0%
High	125	112	237
	52.7%	47.3%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

The above table depicts that majority of the sample respondents are satisfied with the working conditions provided at the Institutions. Compared to MINORITY, NON-MINORITY employees are highly satisfied and motivated with the work environment and conditions.

5.3.6 Benefits

Table No 5.3.6 Benefits

Benefits	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	27	77	104
	26.0%	74.0%	100.0%
High	123	73	196

	62.8%	37.2%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

As per the above analysis sample employees from NON-MINORITY Institution are showing high motivational levels than employees from MINORITY Institution. This situation might be due to NON-MINORITY Institutions employee benefits and facilities are different from that of a MINORITY Institution. The situation of low motivation in MINORITY Institution reflects this.

5.3.7 Personal

Table No 5.3.7 Personal

Personal	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	39	75	114
	34.2%	65.8%	100.0%
High	111	75	186
	59.7%	40.3%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

As per the analysis the sample respondents of NON-MINORITY are showing high motivational levels compared to MINORITY sample employees. This trend shows that employees of NON-MINORITY are given choice of work preference and departments.

5.3.8 Leader Supervision

Table No 5.3.8 Leader Supervision

Leader supervision	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	12	12	24
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
High	138	138	276
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

As per the analysis the sample respondents showed a high a level of motivation in both the Institutions. This trend shows that the respondents of both NON-MINORITY and MINORITY have a very good relationship with manager. Leader supervision at both the Institutions is encouraging and motivating.

5.3.9 Security (General)/ Overall Satisfaction

Table No 5.3.9 Security (General)

General	Institutions		Total
	NON-MINORITY	MINORITY	
Low	89	40	129
	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%

High	61	110	171
	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
Total	150	150	300
	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%

Source: Survey

INTERPRETATION

The above analysis depicts that compare to NON-MINORITY, MINORITY Institutions motivational levels are high even though there is no job security. Contrarily NON-MINORITY sample showed low motivational levels in spite of high job security. This trend shows that job security is one of the motivational factor and not the only motivational factor which satisfies employees. Challenging jobs, skill variety jobs keep the employees motivated and stay in the Institutions for a longer tenure.

5.4 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

In order to determine whether there were any significant differences with regard to employee motivation and between the demographic groups, the analysis of variance test (Anova) was performed. Differences were considered significant for p-values equal to, or less than 0.05.

5.4.1 Demographic variables and employee motivation

H0: There is no significant differences with regard to employee motivation and between the demographic groups

H1: There is significant differences with regard to employee motivation and between the demographic groups .

Demographic variables and employee motivation

Table No 5.4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Institutions					
Motivational Dimensions	Institutions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean

Work Content	NM	150	1.9866	0.1150	0.0093
	M	150	2	0	0
Payment	NM	150	1.48	0.5012	0.0409
	M	150	1.5533	0.4988	0.0407
Promotion	NM	150	1.94	0.2382	0.0194
	M	150	1.68	0.4680	0.0382
Recognition	NM	150	1.92	0.2722	0.0222
	M	150	1.8733	0.3337	0.0272
Working Conditions	NM	150	1.8333	0.3739	0.0305
	M	150	1.7466	0.4363	0.03563
Benefits	NM	150	1.82	0.3854	0.0314
	M	150	1.4866	0.5014	0.0409
Personal	NM	150	1.74	0.4401	0.0359
	M	150	1.5	0.5016	0.0409
	NM	150	1.92	0.2722	0.0222

Leader Supervision	M	150	1.92	0.2722	0.0222
	NM	150	1.4066	0.4928	0.0402
Security (General)	M	150	1.7333	0.4436	0.0362
	NM	150	1.4066	0.4928	0.0402

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: There are statistically significant differences in motivational levels based on demographic profile such as gender, age, educational level, job experience, annual salary, designation, and job security.

5.4.2 Employee motivational dimension in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions

H0: There is no statistically significant difference in employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is statistically significant difference in employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions

The following table depicts the t test results.

Table No 5.4.2 Independent samples t test of Institutions

Motivational Dimensions		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Work	Equal									

Content	variances assumed	3.307	.070	6.719	298	.000	.2872	.04274	.20307	.37129
	Equal variances not assumed			6.719	279.721	.000	.2872	.04274	.20304	.37132
Payment	Equal variances assumed	25.285	.000	-1.539	298	.125	-.1583	.10285	-.36074	.04408
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.539	273.136	.125	-.1583	.10285	-.36082	.04415
Promotion	Equal variances assumed	2.249	.135	9.148	298	.000	.7868	.08600	.61754	.95604
	Equal variances not assumed			9.148	282.071	.000	.7868	.08600	.61750	.95608
Recognition	Equal variances assumed	1.050	.306	4.949	298	.000	.3483	.07039	.20982	.48685
	Equal									

	variance s not assumed			4.949	295.970	.000	.3483	.07039	.20981	.48685
Working Conditions	Equal variance s assumed	.872	.351	2.950	298	.003	.3111	.10545	.10358	.51864
	Equal variance s not assumed			2.950	297.251	.003	.3111	.10545	.10358	.51864
Benefits	Equal variance s assumed	1.231	.268	6.070	298	.000	.6577	.10836	.44450	.87099
	Equal variance s not assumed			6.070	297.850	.000	.6577	.10836	.44450	.87099
Personal	Equal variance s assumed	.113	.737	3.219	298	.001	.4333	.13460	.16845	.69822
	Equal variance s not assumed			3.219	296.311	.001	.4333	.13460	.16844	.69822

Leader Supervision	Equal variance assumed	.259	.611	3.399	298	.001	.2717	.07994	.11436	.42898
	Equal variance not assumed			3.399	297.903	.001	.2717	.07994	.11436	.42898
Security	Equal variance assumed	13.533	.000	-5.419	298	.000	-.5401	.09967	-.73622	-.34393
	Equal variance not assumed			-5.419	281.506	.000	-.5401	.09967	-.73626	-.34388

Source: Survey

As viewed in the above Table the following relationships are significant at the 95% level

Work motivation, Institutions and work content ($p < 0.05$)

Work motivation, Institutions and promotion ($p < 0.05$)

Work motivation, Institutions and benefits ($p < 0.05$)

Work motivation, Institutions and recognition ($p < 0.05$)

Work motivation, Institutions and working conditions ($p < 0.05$)

Work motivation, Institutions and leader supervision ($p < 0.05$)

Work motivation, Institutions and personal ($p < 0.05$)

Work motivation, Institutions and security ($p < 0.05$)

As viewed in the above Table the following relationships are not significant at the 95% level.

Work motivation, Institutions and payment ($p > 0.05$)

CONCLUSION: As per the t test results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, promotion, benefits, recognition, working conditions and leader supervision, personal and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is statistically significant difference between employee work motivation and Institutions with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions. Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for payment. It can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between these motivational dimensions and Institutions.

5.4.3 Gender and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is statistically no significant difference in gender and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is statistically significant difference in gender and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the t test results.

Table No 5.4.3 Gender and Motivation Descriptive Statistics					
Motivational Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Work Content	Male	177	3.7342	0.39763	0.02989
	Female	123	3.5705	0.37595	0.0339
Payment	Male	177	2.5763	0.97656	0.0734
	Female	123	2.6931	0.75464	0.06804
Promotion	Male	177	3.3089	0.88265	0.06634
	Female	123	3.0704	0.76016	0.06854
Recognition	Male	177	3.459	0.63577	0.04779
	Female	123	3.4106	0.63061	0.05686
	Male	177	3.3164	0.97848	0.07355

Working Conditions	Female	123	3.2656	0.84499	0.07619
	Male	177	3.3333	0.88623	0.06661
Benefits	Female	123	2.8184	1.06128	0.09569
	Male	177	3.0395	1.19949	0.09016
Personal	Female	123	2.9512	1.16368	0.10493
	Male	177	3.6568	0.74796	0.05622
Leader Supervision	Female	123	3.5366	0.63268	0.05705
	Male	177	2.4896	0.8813	0.06624
Security (General)	Female	123	2.9025	0.88163	0.07949
	Male	177	3.6568	0.74796	0.05622

Source: Survey

Table No 5.4.3 Independent samples t test Gender and Motivation

Motivatio nal Dimension s		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differenc e	Std. Error Differenc e	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Work Content	Equal variance s assumed	0.01	0.925	3.586	298	0	0.1637	0.04565	0.0739	0.25354
	Equal variance s Not									

	assumed			3.622	271.625	0	0.1637	0.04519	0.0747	0.25267
Payment	Equal variance s assumed	9.97	0.002	-1.115	298	0.266	-0.1168	0.10476	-0.323	0.08934
	Equal variance s Not assumed			-1.167	294.607	0.244	-0.1168	0.10009	0.3138	0.08016
Promotion	Equal variance s assumed	1.79	0.182	2.434	298	0.016	0.2385	0.09798	0.0456	0.43129
	Equal variance s Not assumed			2.5	284.554	0.013	0.2385	0.09539	0.0507	0.42623
Recognition	Equal variance s assumed	0	0.978	0.652	298	0.515	0.0485	0.07438	0.0979	0.19486
	Equal variance s Not assumed			0.653	263.934	0.515	0.0485	0.07428	0.0978	0.19472
Working Conditions	Equal variance s assumed	3.84	0.051	0.467	298	0.641	0.0508	0.10872	0.1632	0.26475
	Equal variance s Not									

	assumed			0.48	284.226	0.632	0.0508	0.1059	0.1577	0.25923
Benefits	Equal variance s assumed	11	0.001	4.56	298	0	0.5149	0.1129	0.2927	0.73705
	Equal variance s Not assumed			4.416	231.244	0	0.5149	0.11659	0.2852	0.74459
Personal	Equal variance s assumed	0.01	0.919	0.635	298	0.526	0.0883	0.1391	0.1854	0.36207
	Equal variance s Not assumed			0.638	267.556	0.524	0.0883	0.13834	0.1841	0.3607
Leader Supervision	Equal variance s assumed	0.35	0.556	1.456	298	0.146	0.1202	0.08253	0.0422	0.28261
	Equal variance s Not assumed			1.501	286.636	0.135	0.1202	0.08009	0.0375	0.27784
Security (General)	Equal variance s assumed	1.08	0.299	-3.99	298	0	-0.4129	0.10347	0.6165	0.20924
	Equal variance s Not									

	assumed			-3.99	262.517	0	-0.4129	0.10348	0.6166	0.20911
--	---------	--	--	-------	---------	---	---------	---------	--------	---------

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the t test results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, promotion, benefits and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant difference between employee work motivation and gender with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors payment, recognition, working conditions, leader supervision and personal. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference between these motivational dimensions and gender in both the Institutions.

5.4.4 Age and Motivational Dimensions

H0 : There is statistically no significant difference in age and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1 : There is statistically significant difference in age and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4.4 Age and Motivation

Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	7.501	36	0.208	1.387	0.078
	Within Groups	39.515	263	0.15		
	Total	47.016	299			

Payment	Between Groups	42.187	36	1.172	1.571	0.025
	Within Groups	196.125	263	0.746		
	Total	238.312	299			
Promotion	Between Groups	42.977	36	1.194	1.86	0.003
	Within Groups	168.764	263	0.642		
	Total	211.741	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	13.179	36	0.366	0.903	0.632
	Within Groups	106.648	263	0.406		
	Total	119.827	299			
Working Conditions	Between Groups	36.329	36	1.009	1.209	0.202
	Within Groups	219.475	263	0.835		
	Total	255.804	299			
	Between Groups	49.011	36	1.361	1.456	0.052
	Within Groups	245.867	263	0.935		

Benefits	Total	294.879	299			
Personal	Between Groups	68.175	36	1.894	1.42	0.065
	Within Groups	350.822	263	1.334		
	Total	418.997	299			
	Between Groups	23.911	36	0.664	1.404	0.071
Leader Supervision	Within Groups	124.435	263	0.473		
	Total	148.346	299			
	Between Groups	39.957	36	1.11	1.431	0.06
Security (General)	Within Groups	203.937	263	0.775		
	Total	243.895	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION:

As per the ANOVA results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to payment, promotion and benefits as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is statistically significant difference between employee work motivation and age with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions. Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors work content, recognition, working conditions, personal, leader supervision and security. This indicates that the groups have unequal variances. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference between these motivational dimensions and age in both the Institutions.

5.4 .5 Educational Levels and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in educational levels of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is significant difference in educational levels of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4.5 Education and Motivation						
Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	0.891	2	0.446	2.87	0.058
	Within Groups	46.124	297	0.155		
	Total	47.016	299			
Payment	Between Groups	7.115	2	3.558	4.57	0.011
	Within Groups	231.197	297	0.778		
	Total	238.312	299			
	Between Groups	11.941	2	5.971	8.875	0

Promotion	Within Groups	199.8	297	0.673		
	Total	211.741	299			
	Between Groups	1.461	2	0.73	1.833	0.162
Recognition	Within Groups	118.366	297	0.399		
	Total	119.827	299			
	Between Groups	9.203	2	4.601	5.542	0.004
Working Conditions	Within Groups	246.601	297	0.83		
	Total	255.804	299			
	Between Groups	3.28	2	1.64	1.67	0.19
Benefits	Within Groups	291.599	297	0.982		
	Total	294.879	299			
	Between Groups	29.076	2	14.538	11.073	0
Personal	Within Groups	389.921	297	1.313		
	Total	418.997	299			
	Between Groups					

Leader Supervision	Groups	8.728	2	4.364	9.283	0
	Within Groups	139.618	297	0.47		
	Total	148.346	299			
Security (General)	Between Groups	4.519	2	2.26	2.804	0.062
	Within Groups	239.376	297	0.806		
	Total	243.895	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the ANOVA results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to payment, promotion, working conditions, personal, and leader supervision as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant difference between the mean values of employee work motivation and educational levels with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors work content, recognition, benefit and security. It can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between these motivational dimensions and educational levels of respondents in both the Institutions.

5.4. 6 Job Experience and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in tenure of work / job experience of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is significant difference in tenure of work / job experience of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4.6 Job Experience and Motivation

Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
-------------------------	-------	----------------	----	-------------	---	------

Work Content	Between Groups	9.344	33	0.283	1.999	0.002
	Within Groups	37.672	266	0.142		
	Total	47.016	299			
Payment	Between Groups	47.472	33	1.439	2.005	0.001
	Within Groups	190.841	266	0.717		
	Total	238.312	299			
Promotion	Between Groups	55.466	33	1.681	2.861	0
	Within Groups	156.275	266	0.587		
	Total	211.741	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	17.128	33	0.519	1.344	0.107
	Within Groups	102.699	266	0.386		
	Total	119.827	299			
	Between Groups	41.138	33	1.247	1.545	0.034
	Within Groups	214.666	266	0.807		

Working Conditions						
	Total	255.804	299			
Benefits	Between Groups	52.288	33	1.584	1.737	0.01
	Within Groups	242.591	266	0.912		
	Total	294.879	299			
	Between Groups	73.896	33	2.239	1.726	0.011
Personal	Within Groups	345.1	266	1.297		
	Total	418.997	299			

Leader Supervision	Between Groups	31.622	33	0.958	2.184	0
	Within Groups	116.724	266	0.439		
	Total	148.346	299			
Security (General)	Between Groups	46.353	33	1.405	1.891	0.003
	Within Groups	197.542	266	0.743		
	Total	243.895	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the ANOVA results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, payment, promotion, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader supervision and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is statistically significant difference between employee work motivation and job experience with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions. Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors recognition. The table values indicate that they have unequal variances. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference between employee recognition and job experience of respondents in both the Institutions.

5.4.7 Income levels of respondents and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in income levels of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is significant difference in income levels of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions. The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4. Income Levels and Motivation						
Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	3.792	4	0.948	6.471	.0
	Within Groups	43.224	295	0.147		
	Total	47.016	299			
Payment	Between Groups	4.954	4	1.239	1.566	0.183
	Within Groups	233.358	295	0.791		
	Total	238.312	299			

Promotion	Between Groups	24.854	4	6.214	9.808	0
	Within Groups	186.887	295	0.634		
	Total	211.741	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	11.229	4	2.807	7.626	0
	Within Groups	108.598	295	0.368		
	Total	119.827	299			

Working Conditions	Between Groups	13.008	4	3.252	3.951	0.004
	Within Groups	242.796	295	0.823		
	Total	255.804	299			
Benefits	Between Groups	24.153	4	6.038	6.58	0
	Within Groups	270.725	295	0.918		
	Total	294.879	299			
Personal	Between Groups	25.665	4	6.416	4.812	0.001
	Within Groups	393.332	295	1.333		
	Total	418.997	299			
Leader Supervision	Between Groups	7.296	4	1.824	3.815	0.005
	Within Groups	141.05	295	0.478		
	Total	148.346	299			
	Between Groups	22.138	4	5.535	7.363	0
	Within Groups	221.757	295	0.752		

Security (General)	Total	243.895	299			
--------------------	-------	---------	-----	--	--	--

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the ANOVA results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, promotion, recognition, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader supervision and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant difference between employee work motivation and income levels of respondents with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors and payment. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference in variances between payment and income levels of the respondents in both the Institutions.

5.4.8 Designation of respondents and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in designation of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H0: There is significant difference in designation of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4.8 Designation and Motivation

Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	3.128	5	0.626	4.191	0.001
	Within Groups	43.888	294	0.149		
	Total	47.016	299			
Payment	Between Groups	14.033	5	2.807	3.679	0.003
	Within Groups	224.28	294	0.763		
	Total	238.312	299			

Promotion	Between Groups	5.982	5	1.196	1.709	0.132
	Within Groups	205.759	294	0.7		
	Total	211.741	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	13.287	5	2.657	7.333	0
	Within Groups	106.54	294	0.362		
	Total	119.827	299			
Working Conditions	Between Groups	18.551	5	3.71	4.598	0
	Within Groups	237.253	294	0.807		
	Total	255.804	299			
Benefits	Between Groups	21.267	5	4.253	4.57	0
	Within Groups	273.611	294	0.931		
	Total	294.879	299			
	Between Groups	56.41	5	11.282	9.148	0
	Within Groups	362.587	294	1.233		

Personal						
	Total	418.997	299			
Leader Supervision	Between Groups	11.838	5	2.368	5.099	0
	Within Groups	136.507	294	0.464		
	Total	148.346	299			
	Between Groups	16.958	5	3.392	4.394	0.001
Security (General)	Within Groups	226.937	294	0.772		
	Total	243.895	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the ANOVA results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, payment, recognition, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader supervision and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant difference between employee work motivation dimensions and designation of respondents with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factor promotion. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference between promotion and designation of respondents in both the Institutions.

5.4.9 Job security of respondents and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in job security of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is significant difference in job security of respondents and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4.9 Job Security and Motivation

Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	6.185	1	6.185	45.144	0
	Within Groups	40.83	298	0.137		
	Total	47.016	299			
Payment	Between Groups	1.88	1	1.88	2.37	0.125
	Within Groups	236.432	298	0.793		
	Total	238.312	299			
Promotion	Between Groups	46.427	1	46.427	83.692	0
	Within Groups	165.314	298	0.555		
	Total	211.741	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	9.1	1	9.1	24.491	0
	Within Groups	110.727	298	0.372		
	Total	119.827	299			

Working Conditions	Between Groups	7.259	1	7.259	8.703	0.003
	Within Groups	248.545	298	0.834		
	Total	255.804	299			
Benefits	Between Groups	32.447	1	32.447	36.845	0
	Within Groups	262.431	298	0.881		
	Total	294.879	299			
Personal	Between Groups	14.083	1	14.083	10.365	0.001
	Within Groups	404.913	298	1.359		
	Total	418.997	299			
Leader Supervision	Between Groups	5.535	1	5.535	11.55	0.001
	Within Groups	142.81	298	0.479		
	Total	148.346	299			
	Between Groups	21.876	1	21.876	29.363	0
	Within Groups	222.019	298	0.745		

Security (General)						
	Total	243.895	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the anova results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, promotion, recognition, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader supervision and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant difference in the variances between employee work motivation and job security of respondents with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors payment, and. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference between payment and job security of respondents in both the Institutions.

5.4.10 Working in Shifts and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in shift works and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H0: There is significant difference in shift works and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4.10 Working in Shifts and Motivation						
Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	1.33	2	0.665	4.321	0.014
	Within Groups	45.686	297	0.154		
	Total	47.016	299			
	Between Groups	3.226	2	1.613	2.038	0.132
	Within Groups	235.087	297	0.792		

Payment						
	Total	238.312	299			
Promotion	Between Groups	7.673	2	3.836	5.583	0.004
	Within Groups	204.069	297	0.687		
	Total	211.741	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	5.11	2	2.555	6.615	0.002
	Within Groups	114.717	297	0.386		
	Total	119.827	299			
Working Conditions	Between Groups	10.952	2	5.476	6.642	0.002
	Within Groups	244.852	297	0.824		
	Total	255.804	299			
Benefits	Between Groups	5.377	2	2.689	2.758	0.065
	Within Groups	289.502	297	0.975		
	Total	294.879	299			
	Between Groups	17.657	2	8.829	6.533	0.002

Personal	Within Groups	401.339	297	1.351		
	Total	418.997	299			
Leader Supervision	Between Groups	2.688	2	1.344	2.741	0.066
	Within Groups	145.658	297	0.49		
	Total	148.346	299			
Security (General)	Between Groups	7.223	2	3.611	4.532	0.012
	Within Groups	236.672	297	0.797		
	Total	243.895	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the anova results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, promotion, recognition, working conditions, personal and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant difference between employee work motivation and shift works levels with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions. Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors payment, benefit and leader supervision. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference between these motivational dimensions and working in shifts in both the Institutions by sample respondents.

5.4.11. Working days in a week and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in number of working days in a week and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is significant difference in number of working days in a week and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.4.11 Working Days in a Week and Motivation

Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	.007	1	.007	1.065	.303
	Within Groups	1.980	298	.007		
	Total	1.987	299			
Payment	Between Groups	.076	1	.076	.301	.584
	Within Groups	74.841	298	.251		
	Total	74.917	299			
Promotion	Between Groups	.404	1	.404	2.631	.106
	Within Groups	45.766	298	.154		
	Total	46.170	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	.045	1	.045	.482	.488
	Within Groups	27.752	298	.093		
	Total	27.797	299			

Working Conditions	Between Groups	.069	1	.069	.412	.522
	Within Groups	49.701	298	.167		
	Total	49.770	299			
Benefits	Between Groups	2.863	1	2.863	13.107	.000
	Within Groups	65.084	298	.218		
	Total	67.947	299			
Personal	Between Groups	.295	1	.295	1.251	.264
	Within Groups	70.385	298	.236		
	Total	70.680	299			
Leader Supervision	Between Groups	.162	1	.162	2.206	.139
	Within Groups	21.918	298	.074		
	Total	22.080	299			
	Between Groups	2.022	1	2.022	8.425	.004
	Within	71.508	298	.240		

	Groups					
Security (General)	Total	73.530	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION: As per the ANOVA results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to benefits and security as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant differences between employee work motivation and working days in a week with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors work content, payment, promotion, recognition, working conditions, personal and leader supervision. It can be concluded that there is no significant differences between these motivational dimensions and working days in a week in both the Institutions by sample respondents

5.4.12 Working hours in a day and Motivational Dimensions

H0: There is no significant difference in number of working days in a week and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

H1: There is significant difference in number of working days in a week and employee motivational dimensions in NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions.

The following table depicts the ANOVA results.

Table No 5.35. Working Hours in a Day and Motivation

Motivational Dimensions	ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Content	Between Groups	3.531	4	0.883	5.988	0
	Within Groups	43.485	295	0.147		
	Total	47.016	299			
Payment	Between Groups	39.301	4	9.825	14.564	0
	Within Groups	199.011	295	0.675		
	Total	238.312	299			

Promotion	Between Groups	16.268	4	4.067	6.138	0
	Within Groups	195.473	295	0.663		
	Total	211.741	299			
Recognition	Between Groups	3.115	4	0.779	1.968	0.099
	Within Groups	116.713	295	0.396		
	Total	119.827	299			
Working Conditions	Between Groups	26.212	4	6.553	8.42	0
	Within Groups	229.592	295	0.778		
	Total	255.804	299			

Benefits	Between Groups	33.501	4	8.375	9.453	0
	Within Groups	261.378	295	0.886		
	Total	294.879	299			
	Between Groups	46.963	4	11.741	9.31	0

Personal						
	Within Groups	372.034	295	1.261		
	Total	418.997	299			
Leader Supervision	Between Groups	2.953	4	0.738	1.498	0.203
	Within Groups	145.393	295	0.493		
	Total	148.346	299			
Security (General)	Between Groups	6.434	4	1.609	1.998	0.095
	Within Groups	237.461	295	0.805		
	Total	243.895	299			

Source: Survey

CONCLUSION:As per the anova results the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to work content, payment, promotion, working conditions, benefits and personal as the p value is less than .05. It can be concluded that there is significant differences between employee work motivation and working hours in a day with respect to NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions sample respondents.

Alternatively the null hypothesis is accepted for factors recognition, leader supervision and security. It can be concluded that there is no significant differences between these motivational dimensions and working hours in a day in both the Institutions.

SUMMARY

Since motivation influences productivity, organizations need to understand what motivates employees to reach peak performance. It is not an easy task to increase employee motivation because employees respond in different ways to their jobs and their organization's practices. As per the findings almost all the sample respondents of NON-MINORITY and all the sample respondents of MINORITY have high work content. It is interesting to note that almost all the sample respondents view the work to be interesting, creative and challenging. It is found that pay or pay related benefits are not highly motivating employees. Though both NON-MINORITY and MINORITY Institutions have shown a high level of motivation comparatively MINORITY Institution employees are more motivated. This trend can be due to MINORITY Institutions salaries and incentives are based on performance.

FINDINGS

Motivational Practices : The findings of the study show that institutions follow a performance linked incentive schemes as motivators. The basic purpose of this type of system is to motivate the employees to work more effectively and efficiently in order to attain the organizational goals. As it is known that success of any institution depends upon how strong it is in managing its employees and retaining them over the period of time to have much better customer and employee relationship. The study finds that Non-Minority institutions follows motivational practices such as training programs, incentives based on targets and branch turnovers. Employee recognition programs and employee involvement in decision making process are continuously implemented to sustain the interests of employees

. CONCLUSIONS

Today's work environment is undergoing a major shift; factors such as globalization, growing economies, and improved technology are constantly presenting new challenges and creating new opportunities for people. With these changes, people's perceptions regarding their jobs are also changing. In this grow-or-die marketplace, the success of any organization relies on its workforce. Satisfied and committed employees are the most significant assets of any organization, including Institutions. As Institutioning institutions are the backbone of a nation's economy, the efficient management of human resources and the maintenance of higher job satisfaction levels affect the growth and performance of an entire economy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- De Beer, M.J. (1987). 'Unpublished master's dissertation, Bloemfontein, University of the Free State.
- Frey, B., & Osterloch, M. (2002). *Successful Management by Motivation - Balancing Intrinsic and Extrinsic Incentives*. Zurich: Springer.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1988). *Management of organisational behaviour*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Hinkle, D.E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (1982). *Basic behavioural statistics*. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioural research* (3rd ed.). Japan: CBS Publishing Japan Ltd.
- Kruger, S.J., Smit, E., & Le Roux, W.L. (1996). *Basic Psychology for human resource practitioners*. Kenwyn: Juta & Co.
- Luthans, F. (1989). *Organisational behavior* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Neuman, W.L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Oosthuizen, T.F.J. (2001). *Motivation influencing worker performance in a technical division of Telkom SA*, *Acta Commercii*, 1, 19-30.
- Paynter, J.L. (2004). *The motivational profiles of teachers: Teachers' preferences for extrinsic, intrinsic, and moral motivators*. Dissertation, The John Hopkins University.
- Pearson, R. (1991). *The human resource: Managing people and work in the 1990s*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill.
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). *Motivational beliefs, values, and goals*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109–132.

- Gottfried, A. E. (1990). Academic intrinsic motivation in young elementary school children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(3), 525–538.
- Gottfried, A. E., Fleming, J. S., & Gottfried, A. W. (2001). Continuity of academic intrinsic motivation from childhood through late adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 3–13.
- Pintrich, P. R., & DeGroot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 33–40.
- Ryan, R. M., Connell, J. P., & Plant, R. W. (1990). Emotions in nondirected text learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 2(1), 1–17.
- Steers, R. M., Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 22, Pp. 46-56, 1977.
- Schunk, D. H. (1983). Ability versus effort attributional feedback: Differential effects on self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 848–856.
- Stipek, D. J. (1996). Motivation and instruction. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 85–113). New York: Macmillan.
- Stipek, D., Feiler, R., Daniels, D., & Milburn, S. (1995). Effects of different instructional approaches on young children's achievement and motivation. *Child Development*, 66(1), 209–223.

APPENDIX C

Job Satisfaction Survey

Job Satisfaction Survey							
Please Circle one number for Each Question							
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6

10	Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

1	DISAGREE VERY MUCH
2	DISAGREE MODERATELY
3	DISAGREE SLIGHTLY
4	AGREE SLIGHTLY

5	AGREE MODERATELY
6	AGREE VERY MUCH

Appendix – E

Demographic Details

Please check the appropriate blank

1. Please select your age range

20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	over 60 years
-------	-------	-------	-------	---------------

2. Please indicate your gender

Male	Female
------	--------

3. Please indicate your current designation

Lecturer	Asst Prof	Assoc. Prof	Prof.	Visiting Prof	E. Prof
----------	-----------	-------------	-------	---------------	---------

4. Please select the length of service in the institution

1 Yr	1-3 yrs	4-7 yrs	8-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	16-20 yrs	more than 20 yrs
------	---------	---------	----------	-----------	-----------	------------------

5. Select your educational qualification

Degree	Masters	Doctorate	Post-Doc
--------	---------	-----------	----------

6. Please select your salary range per annum

1 Lac	1-3 Lacs	4-7 Lacs	8-10 Lacs	11-15 Lacs	more than 15lacs
-------	----------	----------	-----------	------------	------------------

7. Please select job security status in your institution.

certain uncertain

Appendix F

QUALITATIVE INTERVIEW

1. Selection of participants. A directory of employees will be used to determine the exact number of employees within each department. Face-to-face interviews will be conducted
2. Initial contact will be made with the selected participants via email or telephonic stating the desire for a face-to-face interview, as well as the time and place for the interview.
3. A letter of introduction will be provided stating the purpose of the interview, assuring anonymity, confidentiality, and assuring no punitive measures for non participation.
4. Once the face-to-face meeting occurs, a consent form will be signed again reiterating anonymity, confidentiality, and assuring no punitive measures for non participation.
5. Unless specified otherwise, each conversation will be taped and transcribed verbatim.

Appendix G

What are the factors have the greatest relationship, either positive or negative, to employee motivation in Educational Institutions in Hyderabad.

1. How many months/years have you employed in the organisation?
2. How many months/years have you been working in the present position?
3. How do you define workplace motivation?
4. What incentives would motivate you, personally, to perform?
5. Describe when you felt motivated on your job?
6. Discuss motivation policies and procedures at your organization?
7. What the organization does to motivate employees?
8. In your opinion, what should organization do to motivate employees?

What are the actions management take for employee motivation in Educational Institutions in Hyderabad.

9. Discuss the methods followed by your department heads to increase motivation?
10. Discuss the additional methods could be followed by your department heads to increase motivation?