

## KEY MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS OF UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES

**Sitora Inoyatova Amonovna,**

**Senior Lecturer – Management Development Institute of Singapore in Tashkent,**

*E-mail:* [s.inoyatova@gmail.com](mailto:s.inoyatova@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** *The aim of this research is to find out about the key staff motivational of international Universities in Tashkent’s employees. This research is based on an interpretivistic philosophy and will apply both quantitative and qualitative methods. Both deductive and inductive approach will be used in the research. Findings indicated, that administration staff members are more extrinsically motivated than intrinsically. In addition, the findings revealed that senior management’s view about the motivation factors of their employees does not tally with the administration staff members’ view, which led to a conclusion that senior management does not know what motivates their employees.*

**Аннотация:** *Целью данного исследования является определение основных мотивирующих факторов административных сотрудников, работающих в международных ВУЗах Узбекистана. Исследование включает в себя количественные и качественные методы исследования. Также будут применяться дедуктивные и индуктивные методы исследования. Результаты исследования показали, что сотрудники мотивированы внешне, чем внутренне, и также мнение высшего руководства о мотивирующих факторах их подчиненных, расходится с мнением их подчиненных, что позволило прийти к выводу, что высшее руководство не знает, какие факторы мотивируют их подчиненных.*

**Keywords:** *Motivation, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Herzberg’s two-factor theory, Motivational Theories, MDIS Tashkent, WIUT, TPUT, Human Resources, KPI, Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, Process Theories, Content Theories.*

### Introduction

There have been a number of researches undertaken on motivation of teaching personnel in schools and colleges, however very little research has been conducted on motivation of administration staff members of the colleges and universities; especially in Uzbekistan. This project will be concentrated on International Institutions of Higher Education (IIHE) in Tashkent namely, Westminster International University in Tashkent (WIUT), Management Development Institute of Singapore in Tashkent (MDIST), and Turin Polytechnic University in Tashkent (TPUT).

### Literature review

Chandler and Richardson (2009: 20) suggest that it is impossible for managers to control their employees because motivation comes from employee itself, therefore they

“teach managers how to get people to motivate themselves” which can be achieved by “managing agreements, not people.”

Motivation theories are principally categorized into two main approaches: content and process theories. Since, the content theories are concerned with ‘what’ motivates a person to do something, and the research is seeking to answer question “what motivates administration staff members to work in IIHE”, the focus will be on the two of the content theories, namely Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and Herzberg’s two-factor theory (Wood et al., 2004). Intrinsic and Extrinsic motivators shall be discussed in this research, which are the terms used in psychology (Newstrom, 2007).

When referring to intrinsic motivators, employee is normally self-motivated to work, as a result his performance and job satisfaction increases due to feelings that come from within an individual such as satisfaction, self-esteem; sense of accomplishment (Buchanan and Huczynski, 2004). Whereas extrinsic motivators refers to provision of benefits by others such as “promotion, pay increases, a bigger office desk, praise and recognition” (Buchanan and Huczynski, 2004: 452), which are in fact, being valued by employees but are not efficient motivators (Newstrom, 2007). Which can be interpreted that if an intrinsically motivated employees are self-motivated and enjoy the process of work, then extrinsically motivated employees are motivated by money, rather than by nature of work. Ciotta (2011) in her article describes five common motivational factors, which include compensation, advancement, recognition, security, and personal satisfaction. Employee who is thinking about only monetary compensation is normally self-motivated; otherwise there is no value for him/her to work. In contrast, employees who have the desire to study and grow in the company are motivated by the advancement opportunities such as promotions. The third category of employees is being motivated by being ‘recognized’ in the sense of provision a separate parking lot or plaque, which outweighs the bonuses. Fourth category of employees is the one who value job security, who remain to be motivated by having same responsibilities every day with minimum risks and changes. For the last, fifth category of employees, factors such as money, career advancement, recognition, and/or security do not matter as much as personal satisfaction. This category of employees is ready to commit themselves to activities beyond their job responsibilities and duties in order to achieve their own established goal.

Testa (2010) argues the notion that money is being an efficient motivator only for routine tasks; whereas creative work has to be rewarded intangibly. When rewarding employees through financial incentives the focus of employee is being shifted to the reward rather than on task. However, this is not to say that creative workers do not want to be rewarded. They do, but it has to be a fair compensation so that the focus remains on the task itself rather than on reward. While, Engle (2011) discusses in his article that regular bonus plans compensating an employee for meeting the company goals may make that employee to feel fairly treated and encourage teamwork.

Carolyn Wiley (1997) in her article “What motivated employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys describes and compared past surveys about the employee

motivation of workers. Findings of which revealed that in the survey conducted in 1946, the employees ranked ‘appreciation’ as most important factor; while in the survey conducted in 1980, the employees ranked ‘interesting work’ as most important factor; whereas in the similar survey conducted in 1986, the most important ranked factor also appeared to be ‘interesting work’. It is also interesting to note, that in the survey conducted in 1988 by Maoch (1988:58-65, cited in N.Malik, 2010:143-149), the most important factor ranked by workers was ‘work conditions’; whereas in the survey conducted in 1990 by Karpaz (1990:75-93 cited in N.Malik, 2010:143-149), findings revealed that workers ranked ‘living in a safe area’ as the most important factor.

However in the study conducted in 1992, the most important factor ranked by the employees was ‘good wages’ (Wiley, 1997). This indicates that employee motivation factors are not consistent with the time. A different study conducted by Malik (2010) on *“Motivational Factors of the Faculty Members at University of Balochistan”* revealed that faculty members ranked ‘living in a safe area’ as a most important factor. *Objective 1* and *Objective 2* of this research will be seeking to identify factors influencing employee motivation in International Institutions of Higher Education (IIHE), and also whether those employees are motivated by financial or nonfinancial factors. Speaking of the views that motivation comes within an individual himself, directors’, managers’, and supervisors’ (senior management’s) role in motivating their employees should not be forgotten and/or underestimated. However, if motivation comes from the person itself, what representatives of the senior management would be able to do to motivate their employees?

Skem (2007) discusses in his article that it is very important for the senior management to know their employees in order to improve job satisfaction and create a good working and supportive environment, which would increase employee self-motivation. Trust, personal regard, communication, provision of feedback, recognition, listening to the subordinates’ view, and make them feel as part of the organization through problem solving and decision making process is essential. Musselwhite (2011) discusses the importance for the managers to create a culture of motivation within the organization. When doing the research, along with the purpose of identifying motivational factors, either financial or nonfinancial of employees it is essential to consider that their responses may mislead the senior management provided they rank nonfinancial factors as most important factors (Rynes et al., 2004).

According to Kenneth Kovach’s (2001) article *“What Motivates Employees? Workers and Supervisors Give Different Answers”*:

“...The supervisors’ ranking show that not only have they not changed over the last forty years their collective perception of factors that motivate employees, but also that they don’t realize the importance of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs of Herzberg’s extrinsic and intrinsic factors in motivation.” (pp. 59-60)

That is why, it is interesting for the researcher to know whether the same would be revealed in the research findings or not. The *Objective 3* of this project will aim to identify the Senior Management’s view about the employee motivation. For instance,

Welch argues, “You have to get rewarded in the soul and the wallet. The money isn’t enough, but a plaque isn’t enough either....you have to give both” (Hymowitz& Murray, 1999: B1, cited in Rynes et al., 2004:392).

### **Research objectives and research questions**

**RQ:** What are key motivational factors of university employees?

**Objective 1:** To determine factors influencing employee motivation in International Institutions of Higher Education (IIHE);

**Objective 2:** To find out whether administration staff members in IIHE are motivated by financial or nonfinancial factors based on the factors identified in Objective 1;

**Objective 3:** To identify the Senior Management’s view about the employee motivation; particularly what motivating factors, are most effective in their organization (if any are used);

**Objective 4:** To find out if Senior Management’s view tallies with employees’ view about motivation factors, based on the results identified in Objective 2 and Objective 3.

### **Research methodology**

#### **Research Approach**

The research will be carried out using combined research approach, in particular: deductive and inductive. Therefore, data will be generated and theory will be developed as a result of data analysis.

Since the purpose of the research is to find out what motivates administration staff members to work in IIHE, the exploratory research design will be employed, as it is used to study the certain situation with the aim of explaining the relationships between the given variables.

#### **Research Strategy**

The project will apply mixed research strategies: survey and in-depth interviews. Survey strategy, usually used in deductive approach, will assist the researcher to standardize the collected data, and hence, allow making easy comparison (Saunders et al., 2009). While the triangulation approach, will assist in making the research more valid through the usage of interview in addition to the questionnaires, which assist in collecting data.

#### **Sampling Frame**

Employees in IIHE represent the target population. The sampling frame included administration staff members from the IIHE, specifically from the Management Development Institute of Singapore in Tashkent (MDIST), Westminster International University in Tashkent (WIUT), and Turin Polytechnic University in Tashkent (TPUT). The non-probability sampling techniques such as purposive, and quota sampling were used in the project. Purposive also known as judgmental sampling, will allow researcher to choose cases that enable to meet research questions and objectives. Since the aim of the project is to focus on IIHE, other local Higher Educational Institutions shall be excluded. Therefore, since the total number of administration staff working in each of

the IIHE is known, quotas have been assigned for each University and department, which would contribute to the balanced and representative sample.

After contacting the HR departments of the respective universities, the approximate population size revealed to be equal to 120 people. The 95% confidence level has been chosen according to the commonly accepted norms in economic research, with the minimal margin of error equal to 3%, due to small population size. Therefore, the sample size, which was calculated using the Creative Survey website (2010), shall consist of 108 respondents. Minimum response rate is projected for 50%.

### **Data collection**

In an attempt of satisfying the main problem in this dissertation, the researcher designed a questionnaire as a means of data collection instrument, in order to critically analyze the motivation factors of the administration staff members in the IIHE. The Survey questionnaire was produced in two (2) languages: English and Russian, since it had been assumed that not all of the administration staff members in IIHE know English fluently.

The small set of respondents from the targeted population have been selected by the researcher to complete the questionnaire and assist in identifying possible pitfalls such as wording and interpretation of the questions throughout the entire questionnaire with the aim of pilot testing.

Before distribution of the questionnaire, the researcher obtained permission from the Rectors of all of the three (3) Universities to allow the respondents to complete the provided questionnaire. With the aim of granting easier access inside the premises of each of the Universities, an official letter from the WIUT confirming researcher's project title and purpose have been obtained. Survey questionnaires were distributed to all administration staff members in IIHE – below Rectors/Vice Rectors level in hard copy in a separate room with the purpose of allowing an employee to read and answer questions with minimum destructions in one of the Universities; whereas in the remaining two (2), the respective HR representatives insisted on their personal distribution of the questionnaires.

### **Interviews**

The qualitative design methodology applied semi-structured interview format consisting of 10-14 questions scheduled with the representatives of the senior management (Rectors/Vice Rector). Interviews also contributed to the better understanding of the senior management's view based on their experience about the motivational factors in IIHE and compare it against the information received from the survey questionnaires.

### **Triangulation**

As have been noted in the choice of Research Design earlier, triangulation shall be applied which will assist to enhance the validity of the findings. Thus, three perspectives shall be compared namely: the view of administration staff members, senior management representatives (Rectors/Vice-Rectors), and HR Professionals.

### **Response Rate**

Out of the hundred and eight (108) questionnaires handed out, only 57 questionnaires were returned. Two (2) of the Universities had a lowest feedback rate equal to 30% and 40% percent, with the third University's response rate being the highest and equal to 75%. This was justified with the fact that majority of the staff members were on an annual leave, because it was a summer period. Nevertheless, as was initially expected by the researcher, the response rate was equal to 52%.

### **Data analysis and Findings**

#### **Quantitative Study**

#### **Descriptive Analysis**

In order to keep all the collected information at utmost confidentiality, all of the three Universities have been coded as follows: University X, University Y, and University Z, where only the researcher was aware of which code represents the specific University.

**Table 1**

#### **Univariate Analysis: Frequency: Gender**

| Gender                           | Female | Male  | Total  |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|
| Total No. of Respondents         | 26     | 31    | 57     |
| Cumulative % of Respondents (57) | 45.6%  | 54.4% | 100.0% |

Based on the Table 1, gender distribution is fairly represented in the total population of fifty-seven (57) respondents. Male respondents comprise 54.4% of the sample (n=31), whereas female respondents comprise 45.6% (n=26).

**Table 2**

#### **Univariate Analysis: Frequency: Age**

| Age                              | Under 25 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-55 | Total  |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Total No. of Respondents         | 13       | 31    | 8     | 5     | 57     |
| Cumulative % of Respondents (57) | 22.8%    | 54.4% | 14.0% | 8.8%  | 100.0% |

Table 2 indicates, that most of the three (3) Universities' administration staff members are younger, as evidenced by the 54.4% of respondents between the ages 25 and 34 in the given sample. The second biggest age demographic is under age 25 at 22.8%, meaning that 77.2% of the administration staff members participated in the project is under the age of 34 years (n=44).

**Table 3**

#### **Univariate Analysis: Frequency: Marital Status**

| Marital Status                   | Single | Married | Divorced | Total  |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|--------|
| Total No. of Respondents         | 25     | 30      | 2        | 57     |
| Cumulative % of Respondents (57) | 43.9%  | 52.6%   | 3.5%     | 100.0% |

Table 3 above indicates, that 52.6% of the respondents are married (n=30); 43.9% of the respondents are single (n=25), and 3.5% of the respondents are divorced. It can be concluded, that the marital status is fairly distributed.

**Table 4**

## Univariate Analysis: Frequency: Job Position

| Position    | No. of Respondents | % of Total Respondents |
|-------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| HOD         | 26.00              | 45.6%                  |
| Subordinate | 29.00              | 50.9%                  |
| No Response | 2.00               | 3.5%                   |
| Total       | 57.00              | 100.0%                 |

The researcher grouped the job titles into Head of Department (HOD), and Subordinates based on the collected responses. Thus, Table 4 above indicates that 50.9% of the respondents (n=29) are Head of Departments, while 45.6% of the respondents (n=26) are subordinates, which shows that surprisingly, job positions are fairly distributed. Two of the respondents did not answer this question.

### Findings of Objective 1 & 2

The questionnaire distributed to the respondents asked administration staff members to rank the ten motivating factors according to their importance at work. The most important factor was to be ranked starting from 1 and continued to 10 as the least important factor.

**Table 5**

### Motivation Factors Classified as per the Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg's Theory & Their Relation to Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation

| Rank                                                                        | 1           | 2                                        | 3                                                              | 4                                                        | 5                      | 6                                               | 7                                      | 8                                        | 9                                | 10                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Motivation Factor                                                           | Good Salary | Individual Growth and Career Development | Good working conditions (building, equipment, furniture, etc.) | Healthy relationship with senior management & colleagues | Job Security/Stability | Opportunity to do creative and challenging work | Appreciation of work done/ Recognition | Chance for promotion in the organization | Organizational Management styles | Working hours (having flexible work schedule) |
| <b>Lower Order Needs</b><br>(Hygiene Factors/<br>Extrinsic Motivation)      | ✓           |                                          | ✓                                                              | ✓                                                        | ✓                      |                                                 |                                        |                                          |                                  | ✓                                             |
| <b>Upper Order Needs</b><br>(Motivational Factors/<br>Intrinsic Motivation) |             | ✓                                        |                                                                |                                                          |                        | ✓                                               | ✓                                      | ✓                                        | ✓                                |                                               |
| <b>Rank Order Average</b>                                                   | 3.34        | 5.34                                     | 4.92                                                           | 3.72                                                     | 5.92                   | 6.40                                            | 6.58                                   | 6.08                                     | 5.12                             | 7.51                                          |

Source: Individually Prepared by the Researcher

Table 5 above, illustrates motivation factors classified into lower order and upper order needs as per the Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Herzberg's two-factor theory and their relation to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation analysis of which will be discussed in the following section below.

According to the Table 5 above, average total rank with the lowest mean score represents the most important factor for the staff members. Therefore, the collective total average rank has been placed to ‘good salary’ as the most important motivation factor with the lowest mean score of 3.34. The second highest ranked factor was ‘individual growth and career development’ with the mean score of 3.72, followed by the ‘good working conditions’ with the mean score of 4.92, ‘job security/stability’ with the mean score of 5.34, and ‘opportunity to do creative work’ with the mean score of 5.92 respectively.

### **Analysis of Motivation Factors**

Based on the results, it can be concluded, that staff members of the IIHE are both extrinsically and intrinsically motivated at their workplace, as respondents value ‘good salary’ (rank=1); ‘good working conditions’ (rank=3); ‘relationship with senior management and colleagues’ (rank=4) which represents extrinsic motivation, along with the individual growth and career development (rank=2) which represents intrinsic motivation. However, it is also an indicator that extrinsic motivation amount staff members prevails. It is also interesting to note, that ‘good salary’ across all of the three Universities is being ranked among the top 3 motivational factors, while ‘individual growth and career development’ is being ranked as 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> in Universities X and Y, respectively. Therefore, it is fair to point out that motivation depends on various conditions, as top first ranked factors across all three Universities varied. It is also interesting to compare the obtained ranking results with the related studies. Based on the survey of industrial workers conducted by Maoch (1988:58-65, cited in N.Malik, 2010:143-149), among the top listed motivation factors were: ‘work conditions’ (rank=1); ‘living in safe area’ (rank=2); and ‘good salary’ (rank=3). While, according to Karpaz (1990:75-93 cited in N.Malik, 2010:143-149), the most ranked factors included ‘living in safe area’ (rank=1); ‘good salary’ (rank=2); and ‘interesting work’ (rank=3). However, in the latter surveys the frequency of appearing ‘good salary’ among the top factors have increased, and this what the Table 6 below will represent the comparisons of various researches’ findings:

**Table 6**

### **Comparison of Most Important Rankings With Related Studies**

| <b>Motivation Factor</b>               | <b>Most Important Factors Ranking</b> |                |               |               |                   |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                        | Maoch<br>1988                         | Karpaz<br>1990 | Wiley<br>1992 | Malik<br>2010 | Inoyatova<br>2012 |
| Good Salary                            | 3                                     | 2              | 1             | 2             | 1                 |
| Individual Growth & Career Development |                                       |                |               | 3             | 2                 |
| Good Working Conditions                | 1                                     |                | 4             |               | 3                 |

**Source: Self-prepared by researcher**

Based on the Table 6, it is clear from the previous studies of industrial workers, that ‘good salary’ is being ranked among the top three factors. However, when studies

are being compared to the ones conducted within the education sphere such as ‘A Study on Motivational Factors of the Faculty Members at University of Balochistan’ by Malik (2010), among the list of top ranked factors were: ‘living in safe area’ (rank=1); ‘good salary’ (rank=2); and ‘promotion & growth in the organization’ (rank=3). Based on which it can be concluded, that in the related studies within the education industry ‘good salary’ and ‘growth’ opportunities seem to be valued among the most important ones. However, the study conducted by Wiley (1992) among industrial workers, also found the ranking of ‘growth’, among the top five factors. Administration staff members mainly ranked lower-order needs among the top motivation factors, with the exception to the ‘individual growth and career development’ factor which represents the higher-order needs of Maslow’s theory. Therefore, the analysis of the findings confirmed the Maslow’s theory, where the lower order needs must be fulfilled in order for the employees to start meeting the next ones to become more motivated. That is, what according to Herzberg, illustrates hygiene (extrinsic motivation), which, if not being adequately provided by the Universities can lead to the higher dissatisfaction level.

### **QUALITATIVE STUDY Objectives 3 & 4**

For the interviews, four (4) Universities’ representatives of the senior management – Rectors/Vice Rectors, and three (3) HR Professionals were interviewed separately for their view about the motivation level of their employees, results of which can be compared. Below triangulation findings shall be discussed.

#### **Senior Management’s View**

It can be concluded that since the objective 3 of this project seeks to find out about the motivation factors, which, according to the Senior Management’s view, are considered to be among the most effective ones for their employers, the results indicate the following rank order of the motivation factors, by the senior management representatives:

- 1. Good working conditions;**
- 2. Chance for promotion in the organization;**
- 3. Individual growth and career development;**
- 4. Opportunity to do creative and challenging work;**
- 5. Good salary;**
6. Appreciation of work done;
7. Organizational management styles;
8. Job security/stability;
9. Healthy relationship with senior management and colleagues;
10. Working hours.

The objective 4 of this project seeks to find out whether senior management’s view tallies with employees’ view about the motivational factors. Based on the triangulation results, it is interesting to note, that top five ranked factors by the senior management, with exception to ‘good working conditions’ and ‘good salary’, represent upper order needs according to the Maslow, and motivational factors (intrinsic), according to Herzberg,

Whereas, based on the employers' view, out of top five ranked motivation factors, four represent the lower order needs, which represent the extrinsic motivation, as was discussed earlier in the quantitative study.

In the 1946, 1981, and 1986 survey results, discussed by Kovach (2001), supervisors' ranking about their employees' motivation factors have been in the following order:

- 1. Good wages;**
2. Job security;
- 3. Promotion and growth in their organization;**
- 4. Good working condition;**
- 5. Interesting work;**
6. Personal loyalty to employees;
7. Tactful discipline;
8. Full appreciation of work done;
9. Sympathetic help with personal problems;
10. Feeling of being in on things.

When compared to the results where representatives of senior management in this research ranked most important factors to its employees, it can be concluded that, indeed, with one exception to the 'job security', the top five motivational factors are almost the same as the ones ranked by the supervisors in the 1946, 1981, and 1986 studies (Kovach, 2001).

### **HR Professionals' View**

Based on the triangulation findings, it is interesting to note, that HR Professionals' ranking of the motivational factors were almost similar to the ones ranked by the employees themselves (order is different though). The rank order of the factors is as follows:

- 1. Good salary;**
- 2. Healthy relationship with senior management and colleagues;**
- 3. Job security/stability;**
- 4. Good working conditions;**
- 5. Individual Growth and Career Development;**
6. Appreciation of work done;
7. Opportunity to do creative and challenging work;
8. Working hours;
9. Chance for promotion in the organization;
10. Organizational management style.

It is clear, that HR professionals, for sure are aware that employees want the presence of good salary within the Universities, that is why, they match the ranking of their employees with regard to the 'good salary'. The analysis of the findings indicated, that according to the senior management, the Universities' staff members are motivated mostly by the upper-order needs (Maslow's hierarchy), and by motivators (Herzberg's theory), such as 'chance for promotion in the organization'; 'individual growth and

career development’; and ‘opportunity to do creative and challenging work’, which leads to a conclusion, that employees are intrinsically motivated. It also have been revealed that despite the fact, that order of ranking is not identical, all top five factors ranked by the HR professionals match the top five ranked by its employees, four of which represent the lower order needs or hygiene factors. Which gives, a picture of the current situation at the Universities, and confirms the findings that staff members are mostly extrinsically motivated.

## **CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Summary of Findings**

Based on the findings in Objective 1, it has also been revealed that employees are more motivated by financial factors because they ranked ‘good salary’ as the 1<sup>st</sup> important factor. This assisted to meet the Objective 2 of this research, which sought to find out whether staff members are motivated by financial or non-financial factors. Findings of Objectives 1 and 2 of the research, also confirmed that staff members are rather extrinsically motivated, as four out of five important factors represent extrinsic motivation. Moreover, when exploring the objectives 3 and 4 of the research, despite the different rank order and factors, three of the top five ranked factors represent the intrinsic motivation, which means that staff members, according to the senior management, are motivated by the intrinsic motivation. Which led to a conclusion that senior management’s view about motivation factors of their staff members did not tally with their employees’ view. Furthermore, triangulation comparisons assisted to reveal the current situation at the Universities, which confirmed that the view of HR Professionals was almost similar to the view of the staff members. Based on the findings of motivation level among the administration staff me the following has been revealed:

- Financial incentives motivated them more than non-financial ones;
- They were mainly neutral with regards to their current salary satisfaction level;
- Majority agreed that trainings, promotion, and growth opportunities were provided by the Universities;
- Majority liked an opportunity to have creating and interesting job;
- Agreed about an open communication with the senior management;
- Generally were satisfied with the provided benefits;
- Satisfied with the support provided by senior management/HR.

Furthermore, it has been revealed that employees are rather dissatisfied with their salary, which have been confirmed by the HR professionals, and more importantly, that senior management was aware about this fact. Only one of the Universities have been working on increase of the base salary though, others seemed to ignore its importance to the employees. In addition, based on the triangulation findings, it can be concluded that even though senior management agreed with the importance of employee motivation in Universities, only half of the staff members agreed that top management was interested in motivating their employees; which led to an interpretation, that the factors that senior

management was using to motivate staff members were not being considered important for the employees themselves.

### **Recommendations for Universities**

This research has been undertaken with the purpose of exploring factors that motivate administration staff members to work in IIHE. Therefore, based on the findings, general recommendations shall be provided for the Universities to consider. Since ‘good salary’ has been ranked as 1<sup>st</sup> important motivation factor and it also has been ranked among the list of factors, which could be improved within the Universities, possible suggestions shall be outlined to address the main area of concern among the staff members as follows. Salary, based on the findings and theories discussed in this research, are one of the hygiene factors, absence of which may lead to employee dissatisfaction. Therefore, it is highly recommended to the Universities to adequately provide such hygiene factors. Good working conditions, job security and stability, and healthy relationship with the supervisors are considered as hygiene factors, similar to the salary, and findings revealed that these hygiene are being adequately provided by the Universities. University administration staff members have ranked ‘individual growth and career development’ as the 2<sup>nd</sup> most important factor. According to the findings and support of the relevant theory, this factor is being classified as a motivator factor. Therefore, Universities can take this into consideration when designing the motivation scheme for their administration staff members, since, the majority of the staff members are younger, it has been confirmed that they value growth and development opportunities.

### **REFERENCE LIST**

[1] *HRMagazine*(2010) ‘Nonfinancial Factors Improve Motivation and Engagement’.56(12) December.p77-77, 1p, 1 Chart, [Online Business Source Premier PDF Full Text]. EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 4 March, 2012]

[2] Avakyan, T. (2007) *Perfect Teacher: Worth of Striving for or Just Dreaming of? Applying HR concepts in University Project* (BA). Westminster International University in Tashkent.

[3] Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2007) *Business research methods*.2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[4] Buchanan, D. & Huczynski, A. (2004) *Organizational Behaviour An Introductory Text*.5<sup>th</sup>edition.Spain: Pearson Education.

[5] Carolyn Wiley, (1997) "What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 18 Iss: 3, pp.263 – 280

Chandler, S. & Richardson, S. (2009) *100 Ways To Motivate Others: How Great Leaders Can Produce Insane Results Without Driving People Crazy*. International Edition. Singapore: The Career Press. p.20.

[6] Ciotta, D. (2011) 'Improve Productivity: Identify Your Staff's Motivating Factors'. *American Salesman*, 56(11) November.p.25-28, 4p, [Online Business Source Premier PDF Full Text].EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 10 March, 2012].

[7] Creative Research Systems (2010) *Sample Size Calculator*. Available at: <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm> [Accessed: 16 March, 2012].

[8] Engle, P. (2011) 'Incentive Compensation'. *Industrial Engineer*, 43(10) October.p22-22, 11p, [Online PDF Full Text].EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 4 March, 2012].

[9] Holloway, A. (2009) '3 steps to...motivate employees'. *Canadian Business*, 82(12/13) 21 July. p84-84, 1/3p, [Online Academic Search Premier HTML Full Text]. EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 4 March, 2012].

[10] Kaye, B. & Jordan-Evans, S. (2003) "How to retain high-performance employees". John Wiley & Sons, Inc, Vol. 2, pp. 291-298.

[11] Kovach, K.A. (1987) "What motivates Employees? Workers and Supervisors give different answers", *Business Horizons*, Sept/Oct, Vol. 30, No. 6,pp. 58-65

Musselwhite, C. (2011) 'Creating a Culture of Motivation'. *T+D*, 65(9) September.p46-49, 4p, [Online Academic Search Premier PDF Full Text].EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 7 March, 2012].

[12] Malik N. *Serbian Journal of Management* 5 (1) (2010) 143-149 "A STUDY ON MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS OF THE FACULTY MEMBERS AT UNIVERSITY OF BALOCHISTAN" [Accessed 25 Aug, 2012].

[13] Newstrom, J. (2007) *Organizational Behavior: Human behavior at work*. 12<sup>th</sup> edition. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

[14] Robinson, C. (2010) 'The keys to Turbo-Charging Intrinsic motivation'. *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 33(3) October.p4-8, 5p, [Online Academic Search Premier PDF Full Text].EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 28 February, 2012].

[15] Rynes, S., Gerhart, B., Minette, K. (2004) 'THE IMPORTANCE OF PAY IN EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION: DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN WHAT PEOPLE SAY AND WHAT THEY DO'. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4) December.pp.381-394, 14p, [Online Business Source Premier PDFFull Text].EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 7 March, 2012].

[16] Hymowitz, C., & Murray, M. (1999, June 21). Boss talk: Raises and praise or out the door – How GE's chief rates and spurs his employees. *Wall Street Journal*, p. B1.cited in Rynes, S., Gerhart, B., Minette, K. (2004) 'THE IMPORTANCE OF PAY IN EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION: DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN WHAT PEOPLE SAY AND WHAT THEY DO'. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4) December.pp. 381-394, 14p, [Online Business Source Premier PDFFull Text]. EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 7 March, 2012].

[17] Sadri, G. & Bowen, C. (2011) 'Meeting Requirements: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is Still a Reliable Guide to Motivating Staff'. *Industrial Engineer*, 43(10) October.p44-48, 5p, [Online Academic Search Premier PDF Full Text].EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 4 March, 2012].

[18] Saunders, M., Lewis, P., Thornhill, A., (2009) *Research methods for business students*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Italy: Pearson Education. pp.116,

[19] Simplicio, J. (2010) ‘Portrait of the College Employee: Worked ‘em’ to death, or just leave ‘em’ alone’. *Education*. 131(1), p135-138, 4p, [Online Academic Search Premier PDF Full Text]. EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 15 February, 2012].

[20] Skemp-Arlt, K. & Toupence, R. (2007) ‘The Administrator’s Role in Employee Motivation’. *Coach & Athletic Director*, 76(7) February. p28-34, 4p, [Online Academic Search Premier PDF Full Text]. EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 28 February, 2012].

[21] Testa, B. (2010) ‘Post-recession incentives: Kudos VS Cash’. *Workforce Management*, 89(8) August. p8-10, 2p, [Online Academic Source Premier HTML Full Text]. EBSCOhost. [Accessed: 10 March, 2012].

[22] Wood, J., Wallace, J., Zeffane, R., Chapman, J., Fromholtz, M., Morrison, V. (2004) *Organisational Behaviour: A global perspective*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Milton: John Wiley & Sons Australia.