

11

**Applicability of Two – Factors Theory: Perspectives in  
University Academic and Non – Academic Staff**

---

K. V. D. U. M. Wijeyunaratne, A. M. Hewage, S. Nalindu, M. H. G. T. Kumari, S. H.  
T. K. Chandrasekara, K. M. G. P. Gayan, E. W. A. S. Kumara,  
K. A. A. M. P. Sandaruwan

---

**Abstract**

*Employee motivation is a significant psychological aspect of management. To maximize the effort of employees, there should be a mechanism of motivation. Under the motivation theories, there are different theories that can be applied to motivate the employees. Among these theories, two factors theory is introduced by Herzberg are very popular. Two factors theory illustrates the motivational factors and hygiene factors, which behavior to satisfy the employees are different. In the Sri Lankan context, many organizations develop motivational programmes or strategies using two factors theory. However, there are no any research findings to identify the real behavior of employees on two factors theory in Sri Lanka. The problem concerned by the study is: what are the motivational factor and hygiene factors of academic and non – academic staff members of the University of Sri Jayewardenepura. Then, using 00 academic and 000 non – academic staff members from the university of Sri Jayewardenepura, researchers tried to examine the motivational and hygiene factors of academic and non – academic staff members of the University as a main objective of the study. The sample was drawn at random sampling and primary data which were collected using structures questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 00 questions statements under the main 16 factors. Univariate analyses were used to analysis the data. The main finding of the study was that all hygiene factors of original theory became motivational factors for both staff members. In other way, the organizational and personal differences of both staff members such as position, salary, educations were not valued in this situation. Then, it concludes that employees' motivation is depended on contextual factors. Therefore, when developing a motivational programme to the academic and non – academic staff members, contextual factors should be considered.*

*Key words: Two factors theory, Motivational factor, Hygiene factors*

**Introduction**

Generally there are number of factors that directly contribute to the success of an organization. They are included capital, escarpment, machinery, manpower, management, Information system, methods at operation land and buildings etc. Though all these factors are important particularly the human factor is the most vital factors (Kumara, 2005). Also it is the significant resource that controls other factors (Opatha, 2009). In nature, HR carries number of unique features as ability to think, feel, react, animate, active, and living and organize (Opatha, 2009; Arachchige and Kottawatta, online). Thus, without the productive efforts at the workers, other resources would not

be managed. Basically organizations establish with the purposeful fulfillment of specific objectives as maximize the prelist or the market share, increase the growth rate etc (Opatha, 2009). Except them some companies provide services or contribution to well-being of the society without considering profit. However each and every company should direct their employers to accomplish their purposes/ objectives thus. HRM is useful in every organization.

The management of people is not different from the management of other resources of an organization (McNamara, online). The major part of management process that specializes in the management of people in a work organization. People in a work organization are capable with a range of ability, talents and attitudes influence productivity and quality of its products and profitability. People set overall strategies and goals, design, work system, produce good and services, maintain quality, arrange financial resources and market the products and services. Employee motivation is one of the major functions (Shan and Shan, online) of HRM (Encyclopedia of Business, online; Cooper, Metcher, Gilbert and Wanhill, 1998; Nasir, 2007) and it leads to retain an appropriate workforce that gives the maximum contribution to the organization. The knowledge, skills and values of managers and the extent to which these are used will have a major influence on the organization's effectiveness. One of the problems which is faced by organizations is lack of employees' motivation to perform their job well and dissatisfaction with their jobs (Oyedele, 2009). High turnover, more absenteeism, trade union matters and low or no control over employees may arise due to improper motivation systems. To achieve the organization goals efficiency employees need some form of motivation and it becomes an important concept in human resource practice in Sri Lanka.

There is no shortage of motivation theories and tactics that managers use to motivate employees. However we can group the theories in to two general categories: content and process theories. Herzberg's two - factor theories, Need hierarchy theory, ERG theory, Achievement motivation theory, matching content theories are come under the content theories. These are focus on the content of individual's personal needs and motives. Equity Theory, Expectancy Theory and Matching Process Theory are considered under process theories. These are helping us to understand some of the underlying psychological process that generates motivation within individuals. Employees are not motivated to perform their job successfully. Organization has to face so many problems as decrease the productivity; decrease the quality of the product, can occur humanitarian problems, unable to finish the order on time, damage to the organizational goodwill, damage to organizational equipments and properties etc. Motivation is very significant in any organization.

However, this study is focus on the applicability of two – factor theory on the perspectives in university academic and non academic staff. Further this research attempts to find out the extent of the applicability of both hygiene and motivational factors on the academic and non academic staff in the university premise.

### **Problem of the Study**

Motivation is popular psychological application in the management and it has many theories and models such as acquired needs theory, affect perseverance, attitude-behavior consistency, attribution theory, cognitive dissonance, cognitive evolution theory, consistency theory, control theory, disconfirmation bias, ERG theory, escape theory, expectancy theory, extrinsic motivation, goal-setting theory, intrinsic motivation, investment model, opponent-process theory, positive psychology, reactance theory, self-determination theory, self-discrepancy theory, side bet theory, the transtheoretical model of change (McMlelland, 1975; McMlelland and Burnham, 1976). Among these theories, two - factor theory of motivation is important to study under content theory. Two factors theory examine the motivational factors and hygiene factor that are affecting to motivate employee and remove the dissatisfaction of employee. In the theory of two - factors illustrates the motivational factors such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement & possibility of growth and hygiene factors such as company policy and administration, supervision, relationship with supervisors, work conditions, relationship with peers, salary, personal life, relationship with subordinates, status, job security. However these factors may be differed from context to context. Therefore, the factors affecting to motivation of different kinds of employees may be differed. Then there is a quarry of what are the motivational factor affecting to university academic and non academic staff and what are the hygiene factors affecting to university academic and non – academic staff. Then the problem of the study is: what are the motivational and hygiene factors affecting to university academic and non – academic staff in the university of Sri Jayewardenepura? The main objective of the study is to examine the motivational and hygiene factors affecting to academic and non – academic staff of university of Sri Jayewardenepura. Specific objectives are:

- Identify the motivational and hygiene factors affecting to university academic staff in the University of Sri Jayewardenepura
- Identify the motivational and hygiene factors affecting to university non – academic staff in the University of Sri Jayewardenepura
- Compare the factors affecting to academic and non – academic staff of motivation

### **Literature Review**

At one time, employees were considered just another input into the production of goods and services. What perhaps changed this way of thinking about employees was research, referred to as the Hawthorne Studies conducted by Elton Mayo from 1924 to 1932 (Dickson, 1973). This study found employees are not motivated solely by money and employee behavior is linked to their attitudes (Dickson, 1973). The Hawthorne Studies began the human relations approach to management, whereby the needs and motivation of employees become the primary focus of managers (Bedeian, 1993). According to Ruthankoon and Ogunlana (2003) the word “motivation” was derived from the Latin term mover which means “to move”. The motivation has been defined in different researches in number of ways. Chandran (1987) cited evidence from Viteles (1953) stated that “motivation represents an unsatisfied need which creates a state of tension or disequilibrium causing the individual to move in a goal directed pattern towards restoring a state of equilibrium by satisfying the need”.

Many contemporary authors have also defined the concept of motivation. Motivation has been defined as: the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction (Kreitner, 1995); a predisposition to behave in a purposive manner to achieve specific, unmet needs (Buford, Bedeian, & Lindner, 1995); an internal drive to satisfy an unsatisfied need (Higgins, 1994); and the will to achieve (Bedeian, 1993). For this paper, motivation is operationally defined as the inner force that drives individuals to accomplish personal and organizational goals. Robbins. S.P. (1993) explains that “motivation is the willingness to exert high level of effort toward organizational goals, conditioned by the effort’s ability to satisfy some individual need”.

Ruthankoon and Ogunlana (2003) state that many motivation theories have been emerged in the field of organizational behaviour and management since 1950s. He further explained that motivational theories which are categorized in to two groups as content theories and process theories. Process theories focus on understand the thought processes that take place in the minds of the people and that act to motivate their behaviour (Wood J.M. et al, 2001). Content theories assume that all individuals process the same set of needs. Thus, it focuses on the factors which motivate individuals. Herzberg’s two-factor theory is a one of main model under the content theory (George J.M, 2005). However, there are different categorizations of motivational theory. One categorization is acquired needs theory (we seek power, achievement or affiliation), affect perseverance (preference persists after disconfirmation), attitude-behavior consistency (factors that align attitude and behavior), attribution theory (we need to attribute cause, that supports our ego), cognitive dissonance (non-alignment is uncomfortable), cognitive evaluation theory (we select tasks based on how doable they are), consistency theory (we seek the comfort of internal alignment), Control Theory (we seek to control the world around us), disconfirmation bias (agreeing with what supports beliefs and vice versa), ERG theory (we seek to fulfill needs of existence, relatedness and growth), escape theory (we seek to escape uncomfortable realities), expectancy theory (we are motivated by desirable things: we expect, we can achieve), extrinsic motivation (external: tangible rewards), goal-setting theory (different types of goals motivate us differently), intrinsic motivation (internal: value-based rewards), investment model (our commitment depends on what we have invested), opponent-process theory (opposite emotions interact), positive psychology (what makes us happy), reactance theory (discomfort when freedom is threatened), self-determination theory (external and internal motivation), self-discrepancy theory (we need beliefs to be consistent), side bet theory (aligned side-bets increase commitment to a main bet), the transtheoretical model of change (stages in changing oneself) (McMlelland, 1975; McMlelland and Burnham, 1976)

Herzberg began by interviewing approximately two hundred accountants and engineers in Pittsburgh. The findings led Herzberg to conclude that the traditional model of satisfaction and motivation was incorrect (Moorhead and Griffin, 1999). He identified two types of factors affecting employees, which are motivational factor and hygiene factor. Ruthankoon and Ogunlana (2003cited evidence from Herzberg et al. (1959)) stated that, the concept of this theory consists of two groups of factors called motivation factors and hygiene factors. Deshields et al. (2005) cited evidence from

Herzberg et al. (1967) stated that the motivators are typically intrinsic factors: they are part of job content and are largely administered by the employee/ (in this case) academic or non academic staff. The hygiene factors are extrinsic factors and are under the control of the supervisor or someone other than the employee or academic or non academic staff. According to the theory of Two Factors, motivational and hygiene factors can be summaries as table No 01.

Table 01: The motivational and hygiene factors

Hygiene Factors	Motivational Factors
Company Policy and administration	Achievement
Supervision	Recognition
Relationship with supervisors	Work it self
Work conditions	Responsibility
Relationship with peers	Advancement
Salary	Possibility of growth
Personal life	
Relationship with Subordinates	
Status	
Job security	

**Method**

The objective of the study is to examine motivational and hygiene factors affecting to the academic and non academic staff of the University of Sri Jayewardenepura. The type of investigation of this study is descriptive. This is a field study because it examines the factors of motivational and hygiene of academic and non – academic staff. None of the variables are controlled or manipulated. The data for the study are collected within a particular time period and there is no subsequent extension of the research contemplated. The unit of the study is individual the academic and non – academic staff members. This study is purely based on primary data. The non-contrived field-setting environment will be used to collect these primary data. Therefore, the survey method is found to be more suitable to collect required original data because of its comparative advantages position in terms of time and cost. The study needs more reliable and original data. The sampling method is random sampling. The total sample size was 45 academic and non – academic staff members. Then total number of academic staff was 72 and non – academic staff members were 240. The research is purely based on primary data, which are collected from the University of Sri Jayewardenepura. A questionnaire will be used for data collection.

The questionnaires are self prepared by researchers one and the questionnaire method is chosen to collect data for number of reasons particular to this study. The anonymity of the respondents is considered to be very crucial. Then, the questionnaire method is the only possible method of gathering more reliable information while assuming the anonymity of the respondents. The questionnaire consisted of 35 questions to measure the concept of motivational and hygiene factors. All questions were used after assessing the validity and the reliability. The univariate analysis techniques were used to analyses the primary data and SPSS version 16 was used to analysis the data.

### Conceptualization of the Variables

For the study purpose, motivational and hygiene factors of two factor theory can be conceptualized as table No 02.

Table 02: Conceptualization of the motivational and hygiene factors

Variable	Conceptualization	Source
Company policy and administration.	Satisfaction and dissatisfaction are caused by good or bad organizational policies affecting the employee.	Herzberg, (1987).
Supervision-technical	Statements about supervisors' willingness or unwillingness are to delegate responsibility or to teach, supervisors' competence or incompetence, and fairness or unfairness of supervisors, etc. are classified under supervision.	Herzberg, (1987).
Interpersonal relations with supervisors, peers, and subordinates	These categories are limited to personal and working interactions between the respondent and other people he/she works with. Examples are good or bad experiences involving cooperation, interaction, and discussions at work and during break times.	Herzberg, (1987).
Working conditions	Events in this category relate to physical surroundings on the job, good or bad facilities, and too much or too little work.	Herzberg, (1987).
Salary.	Increase and decrease in salary or wages	Herzberg, (1987).
Status.	Any mention about some signs or appurtenance of stature (e.g. secretary, personal office, cars, etc.) are categorized as stature.	Herzberg, (1987).
Job security.	This includes events related to signs of presence or absence of job security.	Herzberg, (1987).
Achievement	Positive achievement events are stories of success on jobs or solutions to problems. For example, a construction engineer told good stories when he finished a project ahead of the planned schedule and when he was able to solve a difficult technical problem. On the contrary, bad events of achievement involve failure, no progress of work, failure in decision making and schedule delays.	Herzberg, (1987).
Recognition.	Positive recognition occurs when employees are praised or their ideas are accepted. Negative recognition includes blame, criticism or when good ideas are overlooked. Recognition may come from supervisors, peers, and subordinates.	Herzberg, (1987).
Work itself.	Events related to tasks and assignments being too easy or too difficult, interesting or boring tasks are included here. An example of a good event is a construction for an engineer who was assigned to supervise a modified footing and it made him feel challenged. On the contrary, assigning an engineer or foreman to superintend some simple tasks (like masonry) is an example of a bad event.	Herzberg, (1987).
Responsibility.	This factor relates to whether the individual is given the responsibility or freedom to make decisions or not. An example of a good event is the case of a senior foreman who was allowed by his boss to	Herzberg, (1987).

	make decisions on work procedures entirely on his own. An example of a bad event is another foreman who was not allowed to make decisions; he had to ask for approval from the project engineer before doing anything.	
Advancement.	Expected or unexpected is positive advancement, whereas failure to receive expected promotion and demotion are negative advancement.	Herzberg, (1987).
Possibility of growth.	This includes the chance that a person can be promoted. Opportunities to learn new skills or advance construction techniques are also opportunities for growth.	Herzberg, (1987).

### Empirical Data

The empirical data can be given from summary form as below tables. Table No 03 presents the reliability of the research instruments.

Table 03: The reliability of the research instruments

Variable	Internal reliability (Test – retest coefficient)	External reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha)
Company Policy and administration	0.743	0.843
Supervision	0.875	0.959
Relationship with supervisors	0.931	0.836
Work conditions	0.753	0.799
Relationship with peers	0.745	0.742
Salary	0.952	0.721
Personal life	0.756	0.944
Relationship with Subordinates	0.753	0.843
Status	0.901	0.959
Job security	0.840	0.742
Achievement	0.949	0.845
Recognition	0.832	0.951
Work it self	0.749	0.767
Responsibility	0.702	0.744
Advancement	0.761	0.962
Possibility of growth	0.904	0.766

The external reliability of the instruments used to collect data were examined by Test – retest method. This test was carried out using 10 responses (10 staff members) from the University of Sri Jayewardenepura with two weeks time interval between two administrations. As shown in the table No 03, the coefficients of the Test-retest of the instruments indicate that each instrument has a high external reliability (all values of coefficients of test – retest are more than 0.700). The inter item consistency reliability was examined with Cronbach’s Alpha test. The results of Cronbach’s alpha test are given in the table No 03, which suggests that the internal reliability of each instrument is satisfactory (all values of coefficients of Cronbach’s alpha are more then 0.700). The content validity of the instruments was ensured by the conceptualisation and operationalization of the variables, and indirectly by the high internal consistency reliability of the instruments as denoted by Alphas.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the salary is given in table No 04.

Table 04: The factor of salary affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	Academic staff	Non – academic staff
Mean	2.7080	2.4700
Median	2.6600	2.3300
Mode	2.66	2.00
Std. Deviation	1.03996	.73058
Skewness	.405	.784
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	.236	-.080

According to the table No 04, salary is a motivation factor for both categories of staff members. However, comparing to the academic staff members, non - academic staff members are sensitive to the salary.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the relationship with supervisor is given in table No 05.

Table 05: The factor of relationship with supervisor affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	Academic staff	Non – academic staff
Mean	1.5333	2.0833
Median	1.0000	2.0000
Mode	1.00	2.00
Std. Deviation	.89190	1.04477
Skewness	1.676	1.659
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	1.894	2.828

Relationship with supervisor is a motivational factor for both categories of staff members. However, according to the table No 05, academic staff members are sensitive than the non – academic staff for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the security is given in table No 06.

Table 06: The factor of security affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	Academic staff	Non – academic staff
Mean	1.1333	1.2500
Median	1.0000	1.0000
Mode	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation	.34280	.43605
Skewness	2.213	1.179
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	2.996	-.627



The mean value of the both categories of staff members depict that security is a motivational factor. However, academic staff members are sensitive than the non – academic staff for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the status is given in table No 07.

Table 07: The factor of status affecting to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	1.2000	1.7500
Median	1.0000	1.5000
Mode	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation	.40338	1.09737
Skewness	1.539	2.097
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	.379	4.065

According to the table No 07, status is a motivational factor for both categories of staff members. However, academic staff members are more sensitive than the non academic staff members for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the organizational policies, and procedures are given in table No 08.

Table 08: The factor of organizational policies and procedures affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	3.2667	3.4167
Median	4.0000	3.5000
Mode	2.00 <sup>a</sup>	3.00 <sup>a</sup>
Std. Deviation	1.13297	1.12275
Skewness	.027	-.523
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-1.554	-.163

According to the table No 08, the organizational policies and procedures are hygiene factor for both categories of staff members. However, non – academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor than the academic staff members.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the relationship with peers is given in table No 09.

Table 09: The factor of relationship with peers affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	1.6000	1.8333
Median	2.0000	2.0000
Mode	1.00 <sup>a</sup>	2.00
Std. Deviation	.61617	.37529
Skewness	.504	-1.827
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-.593	1.376

Relationship with peer is a motivational factor to both categories of staff members. However, academic staff members are more sensitive than the non – academic staff for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the relationship with boss is given in table No 10.

Table 10: The factor of relationship with boss affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	2.2000	1.9167
Median	2.0000	2.0000
Mode	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation	.98806	.86806
Skewness	1.326	.962
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	2.269	.601

According to the table No 10, relationship with boss is a motivational factor for both categories of staff members. However, non – academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor than the academic staff members.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the supervision is given in table No 11.

Table 11: The factor of supervision affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	1.4000	1.9167
Median	1.0000	1.5000
Mode	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation	.49403	1.19565
Skewness	.419	1.385
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-1.889	1.250

According to the table No 11, supervision is a motivational factor for both categories of staff members. However, academic staff members are more sensitive to supervision than the non – academic staff members.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the personal life is given in table No 12.

Table 12: The factor of personal life affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	1.6667	2.1667
Median	1.0000	2.0000
Mode	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation	1.08404	1.22187
Skewness	1.370	.529
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	.344	-1.331

Personal life is a motivational factor for both categories. However, academic staff members are more sensitive to this than the non – academic staff members.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the recognition is given in table No 13.

Table 13: The factor of recognition affecting to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	1.2667	1.5000
Median	1.0000	1.5000
Mode	1.00	1.00 <sup>a</sup>
Std. Deviation	.44595	.50351
Skewness	1.083	.000
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-.858	-2.058

The mean value of the data illustrates that the recognition is a motivational factor for both categories of staff members. However, academic staff members are more sensitive than the non – academic staff members for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the achievement is given in table No 14.

Table 14: The factor of achievement affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	1.3333	1.6761
Median	1.0000	2.0000
Mode	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation	.47538	.85815
Skewness	.725	1.524
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.285
Kurtosis	-1.526	2.109

Achievement is a motivational factor to both staff members. According to the table No 14, academic staff members are more sensitive than the non – academic staff for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the responsibility is given in table No 15.

Table 15: The factor of responsibility affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	Academic staff	Non – academic staff
Mean	1.8667	2.0833
Median	2.0000	2.0000
Mode	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation	.62346	.86806
Skewness	.095	.633
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-.397	-.047

The responsibility is a motivational factor to both categories of staff members. However, academic staff members are more sensitive to thon factor than the non – academic staff members.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the growth is given in table No 16.

Table 16: The factor of growth affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	Academic staff	Non – academic staff
Mean	2.4667	2.2500
Median	2.0000	2.0000
Mode	2.00	1.00 <sup>a</sup>
Std. Deviation	1.03280	1.17185
Skewness	.092	.466
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-1.112	-1.267

According to the table no 16, the growth is a motivational factor for both categories of staff members. However, non – academic staff members are more sensitive than the academic staff member for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the work itself is given in table No 17.

Table 17: The factor of work itself affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	Academic staff	Non – academic staff
Mean	2.6000	2.0833
Median	2.0000	2.0000
Mode	2.00 <sup>a</sup>	2.00
Std. Deviation	1.21013	.76453
Skewness	.114	1.024
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-1.637	1.433

Work itself is a motivational factor to the both categories of staff members. However, non – academic staff members are more sensitive than the academic staff members for this factor.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the working environment is given in table No 18.

Table 18: The factor of working environment affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	2.0000	1.8333
Median	2.0000	2.0000
Mode	2.00	2.00
Std. Deviation	.90198	.80491
Skewness	.573	1.315
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-.437	2.121

Working environment is a motivational factor to both categories of staff members. However, non – academic staff members are more sensitive than the academic staff members.

The perception of academic and non academic staff towards the achievement is given in table No 19.

Table 19: The factor of achievement affects to motivation or hygiene factor

	<b>Academic staff</b>	<b>Non – academic staff</b>
Mean	3.0667	2.5833
Median	3.0000	2.5000
Mode	3.00 <sup>a</sup>	2.00
Std. Deviation	1.13297	1.04477
Skewness	-.424	.001
Std. Error of Skewness	.309	.283
Kurtosis	-.570	-1.186

According to the table No 19, the achievement is a motivational factor to non - academic staff members. It is a neutral factor for the academic staff members.

### **Findings of the Study**

The major findings of the study can be summarized as below.

- [1.] Salary is a motivational factor. Non – academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [2.] Relationship is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [3.] Security is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [4.] Status is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [5.] Organizational policies and procedures are a hygiene factor. Non - academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [6.] Relationship with peers is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [7.] Relationship with boss is a motivational factor. Non - academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.

- [8.] Supervision is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [9.] Personal life is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [10.] Recognition is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [11.] Achievement is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [12.] Responsibility is a motivational factor. Academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [13.] Growth is a motivational factor. Non - academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [14.] Work itself is a motivational factor. Non - academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [15.] Working environment is a motivational factor. Non - academic staff members are more sensitive to this factor.
- [16.] Achievement is a motivational factor to non – academic staff members. However, it is neutral to the academic staff members.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

There is a similarity to the theory of two – factor of academic and non – academic staff members of the University of Sri Jayewardenepura. However, degree of sensitivity is divergent in nature. The conclusion of the findings is not equal to the original theory developed by Herzberg. According to the original theory of two – factors, salary, relationship, security, status, organizational policies and procedures, relationship with peers, relationship with boss, supervision, and personal life are the hygiene factors. However, all these factors become motivational factor for both categories of staff members. Therefore, these findings can be used to destroy the original research findings. In other way, achievement is a motivational factor in original theory developed by Herzberg. However, it becomes the neutral factor to the academic staff members.

All hygiene factors of original theory of two factors were motivational factor for the academic and non – academic staff members of the University of Sri Jayewardenepura. It is not diminishing the value of original work. It explains the impact of contextual factors to the employee motivation. Contractual factors like economical situation, technological situation, socio – cultural situations, natural situations which might be the factors to affect the employee motivations. Therefore, hygiene factors of two factor theory become the motivational factors of academic staff and non – academic staff of this university. In other way, achievement is a motivational factor of original work. Here, it was a neutral factor for academic staff member. It might be happened because of achievement is general behavior for all academics in any university. Therefore, they are not sensitive to the achievement.

The factors affecting to the academic and non – academic staff members are resemblance in nature. The educational background, salary level, position powers or status are not the significant factor to determine the motivation of employees in this

context. It concludes that the behavior of employees is highly oriented to the contextual factors than the organizational factors like position, salary level, work itself etc. Therefore, researchers recommend that when developing a motivational programme for the academic and non – academic staff members of the university, contextual factors should be considered highly. Absence of considering the contextual factors when developing a motivational programme becomes a meaningless effort.

## References

1. Bedeian, A. G. (1993). *Management*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, New York: Dryden Press.
2. Buford, J. A.; Bedeian, A. G. and Lindner, J. R. (1995). *Management in extension*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Columbus, Ohio state University Extension.
3. Cooper, C.; Metcher, J.; Gilbert, D. and Wanhill, S. (1998). *Tourism principles and practices*. Second edition, Addition Wesley Longman Singapore (Pvt) Ltd. Singapore.
4. Dickson, W. J. (1973). Hawthorne experiments. *The Encyclopedia of Management*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 298 – 302, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
5. *Encyclopedia of business*. (online). Human resource management. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, <http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/encyclopedia/Gov-Inc/Human-Resource-Management-HRM.html>. Gov - Inc. [10/02/2010].
6. Higgins, J. M. (1994). *The management challenge*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, New York: Macmillan.
7. Khanka, S. S. (2007). *Pakistan development review*. Zafar Mueen Nasir (ed) Human resource management, Spring, New Delhi: S. Chand & company Ltd.
8. Kreitner, R. (1995). *Management*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
9. Kumara, K. H. H. (2005). Causes of Worker Grievance: a comparative study in the apparel industry in Sri Lanka. *International Conference on Business Management*, Faculty of Management Studies and Commerce, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, pp. 101 – 109.
10. McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington
11. McClelland, D. C., and Burnham, D. H. (1976). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review*, 54(2), 100-110.
12. McNamara, C. (online). Strategic Planning (in nonprofit or for-profit organizations) [http://managementhelp.org/plan\\_dec/str\\_plan/str\\_plan.htm](http://managementhelp.org/plan_dec/str_plan/str_plan.htm). [10/02/2010].
13. Moorhead, G. and Griffin, R. W. (2005). *Organizational Behaviour: Managing people and organizations*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Jaico: Mumbai.
14. Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2009). *Human resource management/personnel management*. Author: Colombo.
15. Oscar, W., Deshields, Jr & Kaynak, E. (2005). Determinants of business student satisfaction and retention in higher education: applying Herzberg's two factor theory. *International journal of educational management* 19, (2). Retrieved March 21, 2010 from [http:// Emeraldinisight.com](http://Emeraldinisight.com)
16. Oyedele, Olufemi (2009). How managers can motivate their employees.
17. Oyedele, Olufemi. (2009). How managers can motivate their employees. [http://www.scitopics.com/How\\_Managers\\_can\\_Motivate\\_their\\_Employees.htm](http://www.scitopics.com/How_Managers_can_Motivate_their_Employees.htm) 1 [10/02/2010].

18. Ruthankoon, R & Ogunlana, S.O. (2003). Testing Herzberg's two factor theory in the Thai construction industry. *Engineering, construction and architectural management* 10, (5). Retrieved March 21, 2010 from <http://Emeraldinsight.com>
19. Shan, Ken and Shan, P. J. (online). Theories of motivation. <http://www.laynetworks.com/Theories-of-Motivation.html>. [10/02/2010].