

ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume : 54, Issue 2, No.2, February : 2025

"STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON MOTIVATION AT WORKPLACE IN THE IT SECTOR: A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS AND PREFERENCES"

Akshay Rathore is currently pursuing research in Industrial Engineering and Management (IEM) in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Ujjain Engineering College, Ujjain (M.P.), India. He can be emailed at akshayrathore800@gmail.com.

Dr. Hemant Parmar, a professor in the same department at Ujjain Engineering College, Ujjain (M.P.), India, also offers his expertise in Mechanical Engineering. He is available at hement parmar1@rediffmail.com.

ABSTRACT:

This research explores the influence of demographic factors on employee motivation in the IT sector, analyzing key motivators such as growth and learning opportunities, self-actualization, managerial support and feedback, recognition and incentives, compensation and advancement, flexible work policies, job stability, health and wellbeing benefits, coffee and refreshments, and team bonding and engagement. The analysis identified meaningful differences among demographic groups, with statistical significance (p-value < 0.05), except for Flexible Work Policies in most cases.

Younger employees (18–30) prioritize Growth and Learning Opportunities, Managerial Support, and Recognition & Incentives, while older employees (30–50+) focus on Job Stability, Compensation, Health Benefits, and Team Bonding. Gender-based differences show that males emphasize Growth and Managerial Support, whereas females prioritize Self-Actualization, Compensation, Flexible Work Policies, and Well-being Benefits. Salary also plays a crucial role. Employees earning ₹1–10 lakh report higher satisfaction with growth opportunities and recognition, while those in the ₹21–30 lakh range value job stability, self-actualization, and health benefits.

Work experience influences motivation, with early-career professionals (<1 year) favoring Growth and Recognition, while those with 10+ years focus on Stability and Well-being. Marital status further differentiates preferences, as single employees seek career growth, while married employees prioritize security and interpersonal connections. Work mode also impacts motivation onsite employees report the highest satisfaction with Self-Actualization, Team Bonding, Job Stability, and Well-being, followed closely by hybrid employees, whereas remote employees exhibit lower satisfaction in these areas.

These insights provide a foundation for organizations to develop tailored motivation strategies, enhancing workplace fulfillment, efficiency, and retention within the dynamic IT industry.

Keywords: Employee Motivation, IT Sector, Demographic Factors, Workplace Engagement, Motivational Factors

INTRODUCTION:

Motivating employees is crucial for maintaining high Efficiency and output, particularly in the fast-paced Information Technology (IT) industry. Employee motivation directly influences job satisfaction, commitment, and engagement, all of which drive organizational success. Understanding the factors that affect motivation is essential for IT companies to remain competitive. Employee motivation is influenced by intrinsic elements like personal growth, job satisfaction, and sustaining work-life balance, as well as extrinsic factors such as compensation, recognition, job stability, and opportunities for career advancement. Achieving a balance between these factors is essential for improving both performance and overall satisfaction. This study focuses on analyzing the impact of demographic factors, such as age, gender, income, professional experience, marital status, and work mode, on employee motivation within



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

the IT sector. Motivational factors like growth and learning opportunities, self-actualization, managerial support, recognition and incentives, compensation and advancement, flexible work policies, job stability, health and wellbeing benefits, refreshments, and team bonding and engagement will be examined. By analyzing these factors across various demographic groups, the research will offer insights into how IT organizations can tailor their motivational strategies. Given the diversity of the IT workforce, with varying career stages, salaries, and work modes (remote, onsite, or hybrid), the study will identify how different factors motivate employees. For instance, younger employees may prioritize learning and growth, while older employees may value job stability and team bonding more.

The results will offer recommendations for IT companies to enhance employee motivation, Improve job satisfaction, and increase retention, thereby boosting overall organizational performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Employee motivation has been studied a lot in organizations. Many studies show that both financial rewards (like salary) and non-financial rewards (like recognition and career growth) are important for motivating employees. Rani et al. (2021) [1], found that good pay, career advancement, and appreciation are key motivators. Pandya (2024) [2], also mentioned that employees are motivated by both types of rewards, with recognition and good work culture being very important. Ghodrati and Ghaffari Tabar (2013) [3], added that personal growth and job satisfaction are also major factors that motivate employees, although financial rewards like salary still play a big role. Le et al. (2021) [4]. found that employees are most motivated when their job has opportunities for career growth, job security, and fair pay. Rakić et al. (2022) [5], agreed that financial rewards, like salary and bonuses, are the most important motivators but highlighted that individual factors like age and gender influence how much these rewards matter to different employees. Barreto et al. (2018) [6], found that companies prioritize salary and stability but are less effective in fostering intrinsic motivation. Kukolj et al. (2023) [7]. identified that a supportive work environment and engaging in team-building activities play an observable role in motivating employees in the IT sector. Mohana & Vasumathi (2024) [8]. found that fairness and security boost job satisfaction, while stress lowers it. Team bonding plays a key role. Aarabi et al. (2013) [9]. added that manager support and feedback also play a big role in motivating employees to do well in their jobs. Shravan & Sivakanni (2024) [10]. identified key motivators in IT, linking recognition, autonomy, and safety to job satisfaction, efficiency, and retention. In a different study, Varma (2017) [11], found that compensation, career development, and organizational culture were the main motivation factors for employees. Similarly, Makki and Abid (2016) [12], said that things like job autonomy and being recognized for work are just as important as money for motivating employees. Maduka and Okafor (2014) [13], found that employees prefer jobs that offer flexibility in terms of hours and work location, especially in busy sectors like manufacturing and service industries. Srivastava and Bhatia (2013) [14]. also emphasized that being recognized for good work is a strong motivator, especially in the banking sector. Dasgupta & Sahai (2024) [15]. found organizational culture and commitment as key drivers of professors' job satisfaction. Baghdadi (2019) [16], and Talukder and Saif (2015) [17], also emphasized that working employees are feel motivated not only by financial rewards but also by opportunities for growth, recognition, and a supportive manager. Nguyen et (2020) [18], also emphasized that leadership, work flexibility, and good company culture help improve employee performance. Agustiar & Hazriyanto (2024) [19]. stressed maintaining motivation and workplace fulfillment for better management, urging further research. Ramlall (2004) [20]. highlighted that combining retention practices can reduce turnover, emphasizing the need for theory-based employee motivation strategies. Yusof et al. (2016) [21], found that both bureaucratic and supportive cultures positively influence employee motivation in the private sector. William (2010) [22].



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

highlighted that while salary impacts motivation, multiple factors influence performance, making money an insufficient sole motivator. Bawa (2017) [23]. found that motivation strategies should change based on how experienced employees are and their personal situation. This indicates that motivation is not a universal concept and should be tailored to various employee groups, considering factors like as age, work experience, and salary. Ibrahim and Brobbey (2015) [24]. highlighted the significance of a positive work environment, well-defined career progression, and social support systems in fostering employee motivation. And emphasized that a blend of intrinsic motivators, such as job recognition, and extrinsic factors, like compensation and feedback, is essential for enhancing job performance. Hosseini (2014) [25]. emphasized that opportunities for career growth and job security are key motivators for employees across all industries. Jain et al. (2019) [26]. mentioned that balancing work demands with health benefits is considerable to keep employees motivated. And discovered that employees are additionally motivated when they have opportunities for both individual and career growth in their roles.

Although many studies talk about the different things that motivate employees, there isn't much research that shows how personal factors like age, gender, work experience, and marital status affect how employees are motivated. Many studies talk about general motivation factors, However, they do not thoroughly examine how these factors vary on behalf of the type of job or the individual's background.

To fill this gap, my research will focus on the impact of different motivational factors, like Growth and Learning Opportunities, Self-Actualization, Managerial Support and Feedback, Recognition and Incentives, Compensation and Advancement, Flexible Work Policies, Job Stability, Health and Wellbeing Benefits, Coffee and Other Refreshments, and Team Bonding and Engagement. I will examine and explore how those factors influence employees on their age, gender, annual salary, total work experience, marital status, and work mode (remote, onsite, or hybrid).

From the detailed literature survey This research will provide a deeper understanding of how personal factors shape employee motivation. It will also offer insights into how companies can leverage this information to enhance motivation strategies for different employee groups, ultimately improving job satisfaction and performance.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

This research adopts a quantitative approach to investigate how demographic characteristics impact motivation levels among employees in the IT sector. It explores the correlation between various motivational factors, such as growth opportunities, self-actualization, job stability, and others, alongside demographic variables like age, gender, salary, work experience, marital status, work mode, etc. Data on these factors are collected through an online survey, which captures both motivational elements and demographic information.

Objectives of the research:

The primary goal of this research are:

- 1. The aim is to evaluate how various demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, salary, work experience, marital status, and work mode, influence employee motivation.
- 2. To analyze motivational factors like **Growth and Learning Opportunities**, **Self-Actualization**, **Managerial Support**, **Recognition and Incentives**, **Compensation and Advancement**, **Flexible Work Policies**, **Job Stability**, **Health and Wellbeing Benefits**, **Coffee and Other Refreshments**, and **Team Bonding and Engagement** across various demographic groups.
- 3. The goal is to offer insights and recommendations on how IT companies can improve employee motivation by customizing strategies to suit various demographic profiles.

Sample Selection:



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

A total of 122 employees from the IT sector will be chosen through purposive sampling. This sample will include individuals across various demographic categories (age, gender, salary, work experience, marital status, and work mode). These variables are essential for understanding how different motivational factors resonate with employees based on their demographic details.

The demographic variables will be categorized as follows:

- Age Group: 18–30, 30–40, 40–50, 50 and above
- Gender: Male, Female
- Annual Salary: ₹1–10 lakh, ₹11–20 lakh, ₹21–30 lakh or more
- Total Work Experience: > 1 year, > 4 years, > 10 years
- Marital Status: Single, Married
- Work Mode: Remote, Onsite, Hybrid

This diversity ensures that various perspectives are captured and that the study can identify patterns and differences in motivational factors across different employee demographics.

Data Collection:

Data will be gathered using a structured questionnaire, which is divided into two sections:

- **Demographic Information**: This section will gather information on age, gender, salary, total work experience, marital status, and work mode.
- **Motivational Factors**: This portion will assess the importance of various motivational factors using a **Likert scale** (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The factors to be assessed include:
 - Growth and Learning Opportunities
 - Self-Actualization
 - Managerial Support and Feedback
 - Recognition and Incentives
 - Compensation and Advancement
 - Flexible Work Policies
 - Job Stability
 - Health and Wellbeing Benefits
 - Coffee and Other Refreshments
 - Team Bonding and Engagement

The survey data was collected electronically, targeting employees from various IT sectors. Participants were reached through LinkedIn personal references and shared Form links.

Data Analysis Process:

The gathered data will be analyzed using the following statistical techniques:

- **Reliability Analysis**: Cronbach's Alpha will be measured for each factor to evaluate the reliability of responses.
- **Descriptive Statistics**: This will summarize the demographic data and motivational responses using measures like mean, median, standard deviation, and frequency.
- ANOVA (Analysis of Variance): ANOVA will be used to check the differences in motivational factors across various demographic groups (e.g., age, salary, work experience, work mode). It will help identify any significant variations in how different groups perceive motivational factors.
- T-test: A T-test will be employed to compare motivational factors between two demographic groups (e.g., gender, marital status) to assess if there are statistically significant differences in their responses.

Ethical Considerations:

Industrial Engineering Journal ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

This study will follow established ethical standards. Informed consent will be obtained from all participants, ensuring that their participation is voluntary and they can withdraw at any time without any repercussions. Participants' confidentiality will be upheld by keeping personal information anonymous and securely stored. The data will be presented in a summarized form to ensure participant anonymity.

RESULTS:

This section presents the study's findings, including demographic information, descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, hypothesis testing, and results. The subsections are structured as follows:

Table 1: Participant Demographics

| Demographic Variable | Category | Frequency (N) | Percentage (%) | |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|--|
| Age Group | 18 – 30 | 47 | 38.5 | |
| | 30 – 40 | 42 | 34.4 | |
| | 40 – 50 | 33 | 27 | |
| Gender | Male | 75 | 61.5 | |
| | Female | 47 | 38.5 | |
| Annual Salary | ₹1–10 lakh | 46 | 37.7 | |
| | ₹11–20 lakh | 42 | 34.4 | |
| | ₹21–30 lakh or more | 34 | 27.9 | |
| Work Experience | > 1 year | 52 | 42.6 | |
| | > 4 year | 38 | 31.1 | |
| | > 10 year | 32 | 26.2 | |
| Marital Status | Single | 73 | 59.8 | |
| | Married | 49 | 40.2 | |
| Work Mode | Onsite | 44 | 36.1 | |
| | Hybrid | 40 | 32.8 | |
| | Remote | 38 | 31.1 | |



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

The demographic data of the participants (N=122) show diverse representation. The majority belong to the 18–30 age group (38.5%), with 30–40 (34.4%) and 40–50 (27%) groups following. Males constitute 61.5% of the sample, while 38.5% are females. Most participants earn an annual salary of ₹1–10 lakh (37.7%), followed by ₹11–20 lakh (34.4%) and ₹21–30 lakh or more (27.9%). Regarding work experience, 42.6% have less than 1 year, 31.1% have 4–10 years, and 26.2% have over 10 years of experience. A majority (59.8%) are single, while 40.2% are married. Work mode is nearly balanced, with onsite (36.1%), hybrid (32.8%), and remote (31.1%) arrangements.

Reliability analysis was performed using Cronbach's Alpha to assess the internal consistency of survey items related to different workplace motivation factors. Cronbach's Alpha values range from 0 to 1, with values above 0.70 generally considered acceptable for reliability. The results are presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Reliability Analysis

| Motivation Factors | Count of items (N) | Cronbach's Alpha |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Growth and Learning Opportunities | 3 | 0.862 |
| Self Actualization | 3 | 0.829 |
| Managerial Support and Feedback | 3 | 0.823 |
| Recognition & Incentives | 3 | 0.514 |
| Compensation and Advancement | 3 | 0.707 |
| Flexible Work Policies | 3 | 0.657 |
| Job Stability | 3 | 0.877 |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | 3 | 0.850 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshment | 3 | 0.834 |
| Team Bonding and Engagement | 3 | 0.797 |

In this research, factors namely Growth and Learning Opportunities (0.862), Self-Actualization (0.829), and Managerial Support and Feedback (0.823) demonstrate strong internal consistency. Team Bonding and Engagement (0.797) and Health and Wellbeing Benefits (0.850) also show good reliability. Job Stability (0.884) and Coffee and Other Refreshments (0.834) exhibit sufficient consistency, while Flexible Work Policies (0.657) and Compensation and Advancement (0.707) show moderate reliability. However, Incentives & Recognition (0.514) has lower reliability. Overall, the analysis indicates strong consistency for most factors in the research.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics
Key Drivers of Employee Motivation

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Growth and Learning | 122 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.3033 | 1.00869 | | | | | | |
| Opportunities | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-Actualization | 122 | 1.33 | 5.00 | 3.2350 | .93074 | | | | | | |



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume : 54, Issue 2, No.2, February : 2025

| Managerial Support and Feedback | 122 | 1.33 | 4.67 | 3.3607 | .92570 |
|------------------------------------|-----|------|------|--------|---------|
| Recognition & Incentives | 122 | 2.33 | 5.00 | 3.8552 | .51957 |
| Compensation and | 122 | 1.33 | 4.33 | 3.0792 | .66674 |
| Advancement | | | | | |
| Flexible Work Policies | 122 | 1.33 | 5.00 | 3.7650 | .60710 |
| Job Stability | 122 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.1448 | 1.01503 |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | 122 | 1.33 | 5.00 | 3.0301 | .96210 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshments | 122 | 1.33 | 5.00 | 3.3661 | .94321 |
| Team Bonding and Engagement | 122 | 1.67 | 5.00 | 3.4126 | .81318 |

The descriptive statistics reveal the relevance of different motivation factors among 122 participants. Recognition & Incentives had the highest mean score (3.86, SD = 0.52), followed by Flexible Work Policies (3.77, SD = 0.61) and Team Bonding and Engagement (3.41, SD = 0.81), indicating their high importance. Moderate scores were observed for Managerial Support and Feedback (3.36, SD = 0.93), Coffee and Other Refreshments (3.37, SD = 0.94), and Growth and Learning Opportunities (3.30, SD = 1.01). Factors like Self-Actualization (3.23, SD = 0.93), Job Stability (3.14, SD = 1.02), and Compensation and Advancement (3.08, SD = 0.67) had lower means, while Health and Wellbeing Benefits received the lowest mean score (3.03, SD = 0.96). This highlights varying priorities in workplace motivation factors.

Hypothesis Testing:

This subsection presents the results of statistical tests (ANOVA and t-tests) performed to identify notable variations in motivational factors based on demographic variables. Regular ANOVA was applied to factors where the assumption of homogeneity of variance was satisfied. For factors where this assumption was not met, Welch's ANOVA was used. Post-hoc tests, such as Tukey's HSD, were employed for factors with equal variances, while Games-Howell was used for factors with unequal variances, ensuring precise pairwise comparisons.

Results of One-Way ANOVA Test on Motivation Factors Based on Age: Table 4: Regular Anova

| Tuble 1. Regular Entova | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | | | | | |
| Self-Actualization | Between Groups | 68.481 | 2 | 34.241 | 112.130 | <.001 | | | | | |
| | Within Groups | 36.339 | 119 | .305 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 104.820 | 121 | | | | | | | | |
| Managerial Support and Feedback | Between Groups | 81.328 | 2 | 40.664 | 216.424 | <.001 | | | | | |
| | Within Groups | 22.359 | 119 | .188 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 103.687 | 121 | | | | | | | | |
| Recognition & Incentives | Between Groups | 5.962 | 2 | 2.981 | 13.285 | <.001 | | | | | |



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

| | Within Groups | 26.702 | 119 | .224 | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---------|-----|--------|---------|-------|
| | Total | 32.664 | 121 | | | |
| Compensation and Advancement | Between Groups | 17.725 | 2 | 8.863 | 29.243 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 36.065 | 119 | .303 | | |
| | Total | 53.790 | 121 | | | |
| Job Stability | Between Groups | 92.975 | 2 | 46.488 | 174.576 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 31.689 | 119 | .266 | | |
| | Total | 124.664 | 121 | | | |
| Team Bonding and Engagement | Between Groups | 55.440 | 2 | 27.720 | 134.249 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 24.572 | 119 | .206 | | |
| | Total | 80.012 | 121 | | | |

Table 5: Welch Anova

| | | Statistic ^a | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-----|--------|-------|
| Growth and Learning Opportunities | Welch | 143.844 | 2 | 75.163 | <.001 |
| Flexible Work Policies | Welch | .179 | 2 | 68.580 | .836 |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | Welch | 108.449 | 2 | 71.370 | <.001 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshments | Welch | 4.996 | 2 | 79.264 | .009 |

The table indicates that, with the exception of flexible work policies, all other factors have p-value of less than 0.05, signifying notable variations in motivational factors based on the age of employees. Post-hoc analysis reveals distinct preferences across age groups. Employees aged 18–30 are more inclined toward Growth and Learning Opportunities, Managerial Support and Feedback, Recognition & Incentives. Apart from this individuals in the 30–40 and 40–50+ age groups prioritize Self-Actualization, Compensation and Advancement, Job Stability, Health and Well-being Benefits, and Team Bonding and Engagement. Additionally, the Refreshment and Coffee factor is particularly favored by employees in the 30–40 age group.

Results of Independent sample T - Test on Motivation Factors Based on Gender: Table 6: Results of T - Test

| Levene's | |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| Test for | |
| Equality of | |
| Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |



ISSN: 0970-2555

| | | | | | | Signit | ficanc | | Std. | Interva | onfidence al of the erence |
|---|------------------------------|-------|---------|-------|-----------------|----------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------------------|
| | | F | F Sign. | | df | One-Side | Two - Side d p | Mean Differ ence | Error Diffe renc e | Lower | Upper |
| Growth and Learning Opportunit ies | Equal variance s assumed | 13.34 | <.00 | 2.696 | 120 | .004 | .008 | .4933 | .182 97 | .13106 | .85561 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 2.548 | 80. 487 | .006 | .013 | .4933 | .193 60 | .10810 | .87857 |
| Self- Actualizati on | Equal variance s assumed | .162 | .688 | 2.726 | 120 | .004 | .007 | .4599 5 | .168 73 | 79402 | 12589 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 2.669 | 91. 128 | .005 | .009 | .4599 | .172 | 80224 | 11766 |
| Manageria 1 Support and Feedback | Equal variance s assumed | 13.71 | <.00 | 2.237 | 120 | .014 | .027 | .3790 1 | .169 43 | .04354 | .71447 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 2.095 | 78. 003 | .020 | .039 | .3790 | .180 87 | .01892 | .73909 |
| Recognitio n and Incentives | Equal variance s assumed | .036 | .851 | 1.388 | 120 | .084 | .168 | .1336 | .096 29 | 05703 | .32427 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 1.409 | 102 .57 5 | .081 | .162 | .1336 | .094 86 | 05453 | .32177 |



ISSN: 0970-2555

| Compensa tion and Advancem ent | Equal variance s assumed | .322 | .572 | 3.061 | 120 | .001 | .003 | .3671 | .119 96 | 60470 | 12968 |
|---|------------------------------|-------|------|------------|-----------------|------|------|------------|------------|-------------|--------|
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 3.043 | 95. 921 | .002 | .003 | .3671 9 | .120 68 | 60674 | 12764 |
| Flexible Work Policies | Equal variance s assumed | 1.592 | .210 | 4.147 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | .4399 1 | .106 07 | 64991 | 22990 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 4.429 | 116 .20 2 | <.00 | <.00 | .4399 1 | .099 | 63664 | 24317 |
| Job Stability | Equal variance s assumed | .559 | .456 | - 1.761 | 120 | .040 | .081 | .3297 4 | .187 21 | 70041 | .04093 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | - 1.774 | 100 .04 0 | .040 | .079 | .3297 | .185 92 | 69861 | .03913 |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | Equal variance s assumed | .171 | .680 | - 4.991 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | .8163 6 | .163 55 | 1.1401 | 49254 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 5.011 | 99. 085 | <.00 | <.00 | .8163 | .162 91 | 1.1396 | 49311 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshme nts | Equal variance s assumed | 13.12 | <.00 | 4.158 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | .6850 1 | .164 73 | 1.0111 7 | 35885 |
| | Equal variance s not assumed | | | 4.439 | 116 .12 0 | <.00 | <.00 | .6850 1 | .154 | 99069 | 37934 |



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume : 54, Issue 2, No.2, February : 2025

| Team | Equal | .557 | .457 | - | 120 | .114 | .229 | - | .150 | 48156 | .11635 |
|----------|----------|------|------|-------|-----|------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|
| Bonding | variance | | | 1.209 | | | | .1826 | 99 | | |
| and | S | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| Engageme | assumed | | | | | | | | | | |
| nt | Equal | | | _ | 101 | .112 | .224 | - | .149 | 47854 | .11333 |
| | variance | | | 1.224 | .65 | | | .1826 | 19 | | |
| | s not | | | | 1 | | | 0 | | | |
| | assumed | | | | | | | | | | |

The t-test results show several gender-based differences in employee motivation factors. Male employees tend to place higher importance on Growth and Learning Opportunities and Managerial Support and Feedback. In contrast, female employees demonstrate a stronger preference for Self-Actualization, Compensation and Advancement, Flexible Work Policies, Health and Well-being Benefits, and Coffee and Other Refreshments.

Significant differences were observed in most motivation factors, except for Recognition & Incentives, Team Bonding and Engagement and Job Stability where no statistically significant gender-based differences were found.

Results of One-Way ANOVA Test on Motivation Factors Based on Annual Salary: Table 7: Regular Anova

| Table 7: Regular Anova | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | | | | |
| Growth & Learning | Between Groups | 76.817 | 2 | 38.408 | 98.728 | <.001 | | | | |
| Opportunities | Within Groups | 46.295 | 119 | .389 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 123.112 | 121 | | | | | | | |
| Self-Actualization | Between Groups | 53.275 | 2 | 26.637 | 61.496 | <.001 | | | | |
| | Within Groups | 51.545 | 119 | .433 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 104.820 | 121 | | | | | | | |
| Recognition & Incentives | Between Groups | 6.748 | 2 | 3.374 | 15.493 | <.001 | | | | |
| | Within Groups | 25.916 | 119 | .218 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 32.664 | 121 | | | | | | | |
| Compensation and | Between Groups | 13.449 | 2 | 6.725 | 19.837 | <.001 | | | | |
| Advancement | Within Groups | 40.340 | 119 | .339 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 53.790 | 121 | | | | | | | |
| Team Bonding and | Between Groups | 36.711 | 2 | 18.355 | 50.444 | <.001 | | | | |
| Engagement | Within Groups | 43.301 | 119 | .364 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 80.012 | 121 | | | | | | | |

Table 8: Welch anova



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

| | | Statistic ^a | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-----|--------|-------|
| Managerial Support and Feedback | Welch | 124.666 | 2 | 70.201 | <.001 |
| Flexible Work Policies | Welch | .039 | 2 | 70.506 | .962 |
| Job Stability | Welch | 84.058 | 2 | 78.523 | <.001 |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | Welch | 52.814 | 2 | 70.444 | <.001 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshments | Welch | 4.585 | 2 | 79.331 | .013 |

The analysis reveals notable differences in various organizational factors based on annual salary packages, excluding Flexible Work Policies. Employees in the ₹1–10 lakh group show higher satisfaction with Growth and Learning Opportunities, Recognition & Incentives, and Managerial Support. Individuals in the ₹1–10 lakh and ₹11–20 lakh groups report similar levels of satisfaction in Managerial Support, Recognition, Compensation, Health Benefits, and Refreshments.In contrast, those in the ₹21–30 lakh group report higher satisfaction with Self-Actualization, Job Stability, Compensation, Health Benefits, and Team Bonding. Employees in the ₹11–20 lakh and ₹21–30 lakh groups show similar satisfaction in Self-Actualization, Job Stability, and Team Bonding.In conclusion, salary influences satisfaction, with lower salary groups more satisfied with growth opportunities and recognition, while higher salary groups report greater satisfaction with career stability and well-being benefits. Flexible Work Policies do not show significant variation across salary levels.

Results of One-Way ANOVA Test on Motivation Factors Based on Work experience: Table 9: Regular anova

| | | rubic > 1 reguir | | •• | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------|
| | | Sum of | | | | |
| | | Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Growth and Learning Opportunities | Between Groups | 78.348 | 2 | 39.174 | 104.140 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 44.764 | 119 | .376 | | |
| | Total | 123.112 | 121 | | | |
| Self-Actualization | Between Groups | 46.219 | 2 | 23.109 | 46.928 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 58.601 | 119 | .492 | | |
| | Total | 104.820 | 121 | | | |
| Managerial Support and Feedback | Between Groups | 80.335 | 2 | 40.167 | 204.692 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 23.352 | 119 | .196 | | |
| | Total | 103.687 | 121 | | | |
| Recognition and Incentives | Between Groups | 6.613 | 2 | 3.306 | 15.103 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 26.051 | 119 | .219 | | |
| | Total | 32.664 | 121 | | | |
| Compensation and Advancement | Between Groups | 16.148 | 2 | 8.074 | 25.524 | <.001 |



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume : 54, Issue 2, No.2, February : 2025

| | Within Groups | 37.642 | 119 | .316 | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|-------|
| | Total | 53.790 | 121 | | | |
| Team Bonding and Engagement | Between Groups | 39.525 | 2 | 19.762 | 58.086 | <.001 |
| | Within Groups | 40.487 | 119 | .340 | | |
| | Total | 80.012 | 121 | | | |

Table 10: Welch Anova

| | | Statistica | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------|-----|--------|-------|
| Flexible Work Policies | Welch | .052 | 2 | 64.961 | .949 |
| Job Stability | Welch | 77.484 | 2 | 77.998 | <.001 |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | Welch | 94.782 | 2 | 67.494 | <.001 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshments | Welch | 2.820 | 2 | 77.599 | .066 |

The analysis reveals key differences in motivation factors based on employee experience, except for Flexible Work Policies and Coffee and Refreshments. Employees with 1 year or less of experience prioritize Growth and Learning Opportunities, Managerial Support and Feedback, and Recognition & Incentives. In contrast, those with 10 or more years focus on Self-Actualization, Compensation and Advancement, Job Stability, Health and Wellbeing Benefits, and Team Bonding. Employees with 4 or more years of experience align more closely with 1-year employees in factors like Growth and Learning Opportunities, Managerial Support and Feedback, and Recognition & Incentives. Additionally, Self-Actualization, Job Stability, Health and Wellbeing Benefits, and Team Bonding show alignment between employees with 4+ years and 10+ years experience. This alignment suggests that experience plays a crucial role in shaping the relative importance of various workplace motivators.

Results of T-Test on Motivation Factors Based on Marital Status: Table 11: Independent sample T - Test

| | | Leve | ene's | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|-------|--------|-----|------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--|
| | | Test | t for | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Equal | ity of | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Varia | nces | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | 95 | 5% | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Confi | dence | |
| | | | | | | Signi | ficanc | | | Interva | of the | |
| | | | | | | | • | | | Diffe | erence | |
| | | | | | | | Two |] | Std. | | | |
| | | | | | | One- | - | Mean | Error | | | |
| | | | | | | Side | Side | Differ | Differe | | | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | d p | d p | ence | nce | Lower | Upper | |
| Growth | Equal | 10.98 | .001 | 7.8 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.188 | .15235 | .88734 | 1.4906 | |
| and | variances | 3 | | 04 | | 1 | 1 | 99 | | | 3 | |
| Learning | assumed | | | | | | | | | | | |



ISSN: 0970-2555

| Opportunit ies | Equal variances not assumed | | | 7.3 38 | 81. 184 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.188 99 | .16203 | .86661 | 1.5113 6 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------|-----------|-----------------|------|------|-------------|--------|-------------|-------------|
| Self- Actualizati on | Equal variances assumed | 14.03 6 | <.001 | 8.4 34 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.153 48 | .13676 | 1.4242 6 | 88270 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 9.2 16 | 119 .33 6 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.153 48 | .12517 | 1.4013 2 | 90564 |
| Manageria 1 Support and | Equal variances assumed | 56.19 2 | <.001 | 8.4 48 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.148 45 | .13594 | .87930 | 1.4176 0 |
| Feedback | Equal variances not assumed | | | 7.2 44 | 56. 528 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.148 45 | .15853 | .83093 | 1.4659 6 |
| Recognitio n and Incentives | Equal variances assumed | .052 | .820 | 3.9 81 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | .3605 4 | .09056 | .18125 | .53984 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 4.0 08 | 105 .45 2 | <.00 | <.00 | .3605 4 | .08995 | .18220 | .53889 |
| Compensa tion and Advancem | Equal variances assumed | .807 | .371 | 7.3 46 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | .7543 6 | .10269 | .95768 | 55103 |
| ent | Equal variances not assumed | | | 7.4 93 | 109 .80 9 | <.00 | <.00 | .7543 6 | .10067 | .95387 | 55484 |
| Flexible Work Policies | Equal variances assumed | 5.017 | .027 | 1.4 82 | 120 | .071 | .141 | .1653 | .11157 | .38622 | .05559 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.3 69 | 75. 452 | .088 | .175 | .1653 | .12080 | - .40594 | .07531 |



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

| Job | Equal | 34.26 | <.001 | - | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | - | .14664 | - | - |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|--------|-------------|-------------|
| Stability | variances assumed | 2 | | 8.8 16 | | 1 | 1 | 1.292 80 | | 1.5831 | 1.0024 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 9.8 75 | 114 .20 2 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.292 | .13091 | 1.5521 | 1.0334 |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | Equal variances assumed | .136 | .713 | - 18. 822 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.689 22 | .08975 | 1.8669 1 | 1.5115 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 18. 907 | 104 .67 4 | <.00 | <.00 | 1.689 22 | .08935 | 1.8663 8 | 1.5120 6 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshme | Equal variances assumed | 7.739 | .006 | .40 2 | 120 | .344 | .688 | .0702 | .17480 | .41635 | .27583 |
| nts | Equal variances not assumed | | | .42 | 116 .32 5 | .338 | .675 | .0702 | .16728 | .40158 | .26106 |
| Team Bonding and | Equal variances assumed | 18.23 | <.001 | 8.0 95 | 120 | <.00 | <.00 | .9817 4 | .12128 | 1.2218 7 | 74160 |
| Engageme nt | Equal variances not assumed | | | 8.9 67 | 117 .11 9 | <.00 | <.00 | - .9817 4 | .10948 | 1.1985 6 | 76491 |

The t-test findings show that, apart from Flexible Work Policies and Coffee and Refreshments, all other motivational factors show a considerable difference based on marital status. A comparison of mean scores highlights distinct preferences among employees. Married employees exhibit a stronger inclination toward Self-Actualization, Compensation and Advancement, Job Stability, Health and Wellbeing Benefits, and Team Bonding and Engagement, indicating a preference for stability and interpersonal connections. On the other hand, single employees demonstrate higher motivation toward Growth and Learning Opportunities, Managerial Support and Feedback, and Recognition & Incentives, reflecting their focus on personal development and acknowledgment.

Results of One-Way ANOVA Test on Motivation Factors Based on Work Mode:

Table 12: Regular anova

| | | 1 ubic 12. 1105uit | ii uiio | · u | Tuble 12: Regular anova | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|-------------|-------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Sum of | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | | | | | | | | | |
| Growth and Learning | Between | 2.500 | 2 | 1.250 | 1.233 | .295 | | | | | | | | | |
| Opportunities | Groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



ISSN: 0970-2555

| | | | | . [| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| | Within Groups | 120.612 | 119 | 1.014 | | |
| | Total | 123.112 | 121 | | | |
| Self-Actualization | Between Groups | 8.191 | 2 | 4.096 | 5.044 | .008 |
| | Within Groups | 96.628 | 119 | .812 | | |
| | Total | 104.820 | 121 | | | |
| Managerial Support and Feedback | Between Groups | 1.830 | 2 | .915 | 1.069 | .347 |
| | Within Groups | 101.857 | 119 | .856 | | |
| | Total | 103.687 | 121 | | | |
| Recognition & Incentives | Between Groups | .499 | 2 | .249 | .923 | .400 |
| | Within Groups | 32.165 | 119 | .270 | | |
| | Total | 32.664 | 121 | | | |
| Compensation and Advancement | Between Groups | .191 | 2 | .095 | .212 | .809 |
| | Within Groups | 53.599 | 119 | .450 | | |
| | Total | 53.790 | 121 | | | |
| Flexible Work Policies | Between Groups | .926 | 2 | .463 | 1.262 | .287 |
| | Within Groups | 43.671 | 119 | .367 | | |
| | Total | 44.597 | 121 | | | |
| Health and Wellbeing Benefits | Between Groups | 6.667 | 2 | 3.334 | 3.766 | .026 |
| | Within Groups | 105.334 | 119 | .885 | | |
| | Total | 112.001 | 121 | | | |
| Team Bonding and Engagement | Between Groups | 4.219 | 2 | 2.110 | 3.312 | .040 |



ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

| Within Groups | 75.792 | 119 | .637 | |
|------------------|--------|-----|------|--|
| Total | 80.012 | 121 | | |

Table 12: Welch Anova

| | | Statistic ^a | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-----|--------|-------|
| Job Stability | Welch | 4.680 | 2 | 76.599 | .012 |
| Coffee and Other Refreshments | Welch | 157.451 | 2 | 77.992 | <.001 |

The analysis indicates significant differences across work modes for the motivational factors Self-Actualization, Health and Wellbeing Benefits, Team Bonding and Engagement, Job Stability, and Coffee and Refreshments (p < 0.05). Post-hoc tests reveal that employees working onsite exhibit the highest scores in these areas, suggesting strong alignment with these motivational factors. Hybrid employees closely align with their onsite counterparts, reflecting moderate but positive perceptions of these elements. In contrast, remote employees show comparatively lower levels of satisfaction with these factors, suggesting a reduced sense of connection in areas such as team bonding, health support, and job stability.

CONCLUSIONS:

This study highlights the complex interplay of demographic and organizational factors in shaping employee motivation within the IT sector. An evaluation of 122 participants revealed that age, gender, salary, experience, marital status, and work mode significantly influence motivational preferences (p < 0.05), emphasizing the need for tailored organizational strategies.

Age-based variations show that younger employees (18–30, 38.5%) prioritize Growth and Learning Opportunities, Managerial Support, and Recognition & Incentives, while older employees (30–50+, 61.4%) focus more on Self-Actualization, Job Stability, Compensation, and Well-being Benefits. Gender-based differences indicate that males (61.5%) emphasize career growth and managerial support, while females (38.5%) place greater importance on Self-Actualization, Compensation, Flexible Work Policies, and Health Benefits.

Salary levels also influence motivation, with employees earning ₹1–10 lakh (37.7%) showing higher satisfaction with Growth and Recognition, while those in the ₹21–30 lakh range (27.9%) report greater satisfaction with Stability, Self-Actualization, and Team Bonding. Experience plays a similar role—early-career employees (≤1 year, 42.6%) favor Growth, Recognition, and Support, whereas experienced professionals (10+ years, 26.2%) prioritize Stability, Compensation, and Health Benefits. Marital status further differentiates motivational drivers, with single employees (59.8%) seeking career development, while married employees (40.2%) value stability and interpersonal connections.

Work mode also impacts motivation, with onsite employees (36.1%) reporting the highest satisfaction with Self-Actualization, Team Bonding, Job Stability, and Well-being, followed closely by hybrid employees (32.8%). Remote employees (31.1%) exhibit lower satisfaction in these areas, indicating a reduced sense of workplace connection. Notably, Flexible Work Policies remain consistently valued across demographics.

These findings provide actionable insights for organizations to develop targeted motivation strategies that enhance employee satisfaction, engagement, and retention in the evolving IT landscape.

REFERENCES:

1. Rani, L., Tyagi, V., & Arora, M. (2021). Employee motivation: An Indian perspective. The Management Journal, 9(3).



ISSN: 0970-2555

- 2. Pandya, J. D. (2024). Intrinsic & extrinsic motivation & its impact on organizational performance at Rajkot city: A review. Journal of Management Research and Analysis, 11(1), 46–53.
- 3. Ghodrati, H., & Ghaffari Tabar, R. (2013). A study on effective factors on employee motivation. Management Science Letters, 3(5), 743–752.
- 4. Le, D. H., Aquino, P. G., Jalagat, R. C. Jr., Truc, N. T., Quang, L. K. S., & Mye, L. T. H. (2021). Factors affecting employees' motivation. Management Science Letters, 11(3), 411-418.
- 5. Rakić, M., Radosavljević, M., & Janković Milić, V. (2022). Analysis of motivation factors: Dependence on personal and professional characteristics of employees. eThemes Journal, 12(1), 91–103.
- 6. Barreto, M. A. M., Vasconcelos, S. S., & Ferro dos Santos, E. (2018). Motivation and work: A survey of the motivational aspects in industries. In Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing (pp. 225-234). Springer.
- 7. Kukolj, S., Deretić, N., & Kamiš, A. (2023). Study on work life quality and employee motivation in IT companies. *Science International Journal*, *2*(3), 157-163.
- 8. Mohana, P. M., & Vasumathi, A. (2024). A study on factors affecting job satisfaction in the IT industry. Multiscience Journal, 12(4).
- 9. Aarabi, M. S., Subramaniam, I. D., & Almintisir Abu Baker, A. B. (2013). Relationship between motivational factors and job performance of employees in the Malaysian service industry. Asian Social Science, 9(9), 301-310.
- 10. Shravan, M. S., & Sivakanni, S. (2023). A study on employee motivation in the IT sector. International Journal of Research in Management and Engineering, 2(4), 45-53.
- 11. Varma, C. (2017). Importance of employee motivation & job satisfaction for organizational performance. ResearchGate.
- 12. Makki, A., & Abid, M. (2016). Influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee's task performance. Social and Applied Sciences, 4(1), 38-46.
- 13. Maduka, C. E., & Okafor, O. (2014). Effect of motivation on employee productivity: A study of manufacturing companies in Nnewi. International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research, 2(7), 137-147.
- 14. Srivastava, A., & Bhatia, P. (2013). A qualitative study of employee motivation factors in the nationalized banking sector of India. International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2(7), 18-22.
- 15. Dasgupta, D., & Sahai, A. K. (2017). Impact of organizational and psychological factors on the job satisfaction of professors in private universities in India. ResearchGate.
- 16. Baghdadi, I. (2019). The impact of employees' motivation on employees' productivity. Group Project Report.
- 17. Talukder, A., & Saif, A. N. M. (2015). Employee motivation measurement: A descriptive analysis. ResearchGate.
- 18. Nguyen, P. T., Yandi, A., & Mahaputra, M. R. (2020). Factors that influence employee performance: Motivation, leadership, environment, culture organization, work achievement, competence, and compensation. DIJDBM Journal, 5(1), 102-115.
- 19. Agustiar, H., & Hazriyanto, A. (2020). Analysis of motivation, job satisfaction, and employee performance. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Galileo, 137-147.
- 20. Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. The Journal of the American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 112-119.

OF INDUSTRIAL ENGLY

Industrial Engineering Journal

ISSN: 0970-2555

Volume: 54, Issue 2, No.2, February: 2025

- 21. Yusof, Hani Sakina Mohamad, Nur Shafini Mohd Said, and Siti Rapidah Omar Ali. (2016). A Study of Organizational Culture and Employee Motivation in Private Sector Companies. Faculty of Business Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA.
- 22. William, Akah Ndang. (2010). Employee Motivation and Performance. Bachelor's thesis, Business Management.
- 23. Bawa, M. A. (2017). Employee Motivation and Productivity: A Review of Literature and Implications for Management Practice. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management, 5(12), 662.
- 24. Ibrahim, Masud, and Veronica Adu Brobbey. (2015). Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance: The Case of Some Selected Microfinance Companies in Ghana. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management, 3(11), 1218.
- 25. Hosseini, Seyed Abdol Rasoul. (2014). Factors Affecting Employee Motivation. Management and Administrative Sciences Review, 3(4), 713-723.
- 26. Jain, Ankur, Bhuwan Gupta, and Meenakshi Bindal. (2019). A Study of Employee Motivation in Organization. International Journal of Engineering and Management Research, 9(6).

UGC CARE Group-1