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Abstract: Motivation is very commonly used word in enterprises is a temporal and dynamic state that induces an individual to act as desired. Motivation is having the encouragement to do something. Motivation as a process of interaction between learner and the environment, which is marked by selection, initiation, increase, or persistence of goal-directed behaviour. So researcher was want to conduct this research. Objective of the present study was to find out Post Graduate Students’ Motivation in Learning. This study is done by using Descriptive Survey Method and the Researcher have analysed data in qualitative approach. Total 250 samples have been taken from PG students of various departments of university of Kalyani. One Questionnaire was framed by the Researcher which consists of 35 questions with 3 options. After the data analysis, the Researcher found that - there is no significant relationship between Urban (girls, boys) and Rural (girls, boys) students towards Motivation in Learning. But significant relationship between Govt. Job and Private Job family students towards Motivation in Learning.
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INTRODUCTION: Motivation is of particular interest to Educational psychologists because of the crucial role it plays in student learning. However, the specific kind of motivation that is studied in the specialized setting of education differs qualitatively from the more general forms of motivation studied by psychologists in other fields. Motivation in education can have several effects on how students learn and their behaviour towards subject matter (Ormrod, 2003). It can:
1. Direct behaviour toward particular goals
2. Lead to increased effort and energy
3. Increase initiation of, and persistence in, activities
4. Enhance cognitive processing
5. Determine what consequences are reinforcing

Because students are not always internally motivated, they sometimes need situated motivation, which is found in environmental conditions that the teacher creates. There are two kinds of motivation:
- **Intrinsic motivation** occurs when people are internally motivated to do something because it either brings them pleasure, they think it is important, or they feel that what they are learning is morally significant.
- **Extrinsic motivation** comes into play when a student is compelled to do something or act a certain way because of factors external to him or her (like money or good grades).

3. There are overlapping areas in these terms. For example, performance/ego goals
4. are driven by concern over what others might think or how one’s abilities might be
5. viewed by others, so they could also be considered within the domain of social goals
6. (Murphy and Alexander 34). It is also worthwhile to note that the terms attribution, self-competence, and self-efficacy relate to one’s evaluation of oneself with respect to
7. particular tasks or goals, not necessarily to oneself in general.
8. Murphy and Alexander point out an important consideration in the research
9. into self-schema constructs, one that was not overtly taken into account in the
10. literature they reviewed. They questioned the apparent assumptions by researchers
11. that an individual can accurately identify and report her or his own needs, motivations,
12. and goals (37-38). This author agrees and, based on inquiries into unconscious
13. learning (Lewicki, Hill and Czyzewska), wonders about the role of the unconscious in
14. motivation and how such could be effectively studied. Some research also suggests that
15. implicit learning (unconscious learning) may be mediated by unconscious goals after
16. priming for goal attainment (Eitam, Hassin and Schul). Unconscious learning and
17. unconscious motivation are difficult to study, but research in these areas might provide
18. valuable insights into ways we could create more interesting, engaging learning
19. environments.
20. Another conceptual issue addressed by Murphy and Alexander is the impression
21. given by some of the terminology that there are dichotomous relationships between the
22. types of motivation under study (37-41). Does such a relationship exist between
intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, for example, or between individual or situational motivation? Our realities are more complex than the terminology often suggests; an important point to keep in mind when considering the implications of the research to classrooms and other formal learning environments. They also argue that other factors—cognitive and strategic—which are not addressed in the terminology impact individual motivation, concluding that motivation constructs can probably not truly be considered independent variables (Murphy and Alexander 41).
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• Finally, Murphy and Alexander note the trend, at least in the literature they reviewed, away from the view of motivation as a personality trait toward a more situated view of motivation as a state of mind in a particular context or within a particular domain (41-42). This is a crucial distinction. If motivation is seen as a trait, how much influence is possible through a change in curriculum or environment? However, if motivation is situational, we can productively challenge ourselves to create motivationally supportive formal learning environments. A third perspective is also possible: the view that some motivational traits are inherent, but that their expression can be supported or thwarted based on the environments in which a person functions.

Motivational Theories—In Brief

The reader is likely familia

• elf with respect to particular tasks or goals, not necessarily to oneself in general.
• Murphy and Alexander point out an important consideration in the research into self-schema constructs, one that was not overtly taken into account in the literature they reviewed. They questioned the apparent assumptions by researchers that an individual can accurately identify and report her or his own needs, motivations, and goals (37-38). This author agrees and, based on inquiries into unconscious learning (Lewicki, Hill and Czyzewska), wonders about the role of the unconscious in motivation and how such could be effectively studied. Some research also suggests that implicit learning (unconscious learning) may be mediated by unconscious goals after priming for goal attainment (Eitam, Hassin and Schul). Unconscious learning and unconscious motivation are difficult to study, but research in these areas might provide valuable insights into ways we could create more interesting, engaging learning environments. In reality, our motivations are often a mix of both intrinsic and extrinsic factors, but the nature of the mix of these factors might change over time (often in ways that seem counter-intuitive). There is an old adage: “Choose a job that you love, and you will never have to work a day in your life,” meaning that if you enjoy your occupation, work doesn’t seem like . . . well, work. Some research suggests that this isn’t necessarily the case (Daniel & Esser, 1980; Deci, 1972; Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999). According to this research, receiving some sort of extrinsic reinforcement (i.e., getting paid) for engaging in behaviours that we enjoy leads to those behaviours being thought of as work no longer providing that same enjoyment. As a result, we might spend less time engaging in these reclassified behaviours in the absence of any extrinsic reinforcement. For example, Odessa loves baking, so in her free time, she bakes for fun. Oftentimes, after stocking shelves at her grocery store job, she whips up pastries in the evenings because she enjoys baking. When a coworker in the store’s bakery department leaves his job, Odessa applies for his position and gets transferred to the bakery department. What Odessa has experienced is called the over justification effect—intrinsic motivation is diminished when extrinsic motivation is given. This can lead to extinguishing the intrinsic motivation and creating a dependence on extrinsic rewards for continued performance (Deci et al., 1999).

In educational settings, students are more likely to experience intrinsic motivation to learn when they feel a sense of belonging and respect in the classroom. This internalization can be enhanced if the evaluative aspects of the classroom are de-emphasized and if students feel that they exercise some control over the learning environment. Furthermore, providing students with activities that are challenging, yet doable, along with a rationale for engaging in various learning activities can enhance intrinsic motivation for those tasks (Niemiec & Ryan, 2009). Consider Hakim, a first-year law student with two courses this semester: Family Law and Criminal Law. The Family Law professor has a rather intimidating classroom: He likes to put students on the spot with tough questions, which often leaves students feeling belittled or embarrassed. Grades are based exclusively on quizzes and exams, and the instructor posts results of each test on the classroom door. In contrast, the Criminal Law professor facilitates classroom discussions and respectful debates in small groups. The majority of the course grade is not exam-based, but centres on a student-designed research project on a crime issue of the student’s choice. Research suggests that Hakim will be less intrinsically motivated in his Family Law course, where students are intimidated in the classroom setting, and there is an emphasis on teacher-driven evaluations. Hakim is likely to experience a higher level of intrinsic motivation in his Criminal Law course, where the class setting encourages inclusive collaboration and a respect for ideas, and where students have more influence over their learning activities.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE:
Amraei, K. Elahi, S. R. & Parhoon, H. (2011) Studied on The relationship between academic motivation and academic achievement students. The purpose of this study was to explore the correlation between academic motivation and academic achievement among Tehran University students. In this cross-sectional correlation study, 252 Tehran University students were required to fill the academic motivation questionnaire. This 43-item questionnaire measured 8 aspects of motivation. Criterion for academic achievement was a mark which students themselves reported. Data were analysed through using SPSS16 by means of Pearson Correlation coefficient. Data analysis indicated positive and significant correlation between Academic Motivation and Academic Achievement. Furthermore subscales of task, effort, competition, social concern within eight subscales had a significant relationship with academic achievement. Regarding the results, students’ academic achievement requires coordination and interaction between different aspects of motivation.

Bakar, N. A. Alsmadi, M. S. Ali, Z. & Slahudin, M. H. (2022) conducted a study on Influence of students Motivation on Academic Achievement among Undergraduate students in Malaysia. This study aimed to assess the impact of student motivation on academic accomplishment among undergraduate students in the University Sultan Zainal Abiding, Malaysia. How pupils build motivation in themselves may influence how successful they are academically. Pilot research was conducted on 144 participants using exploratory factor analysis to establish the instrument's reliability and validity. However, the study showed no significant difference in accomplishment motivation between high and poor achievers. Similarly, the data found that males and females differed significantly in achievement desire. Using the Statistics Program for Social Science (SPSS) version 20, the data were analysed using correlation analysis and fundamental linear regression analysis. The findings revealed that students' motivation boosted their academic success. Similarly, the regression analysis revealed that motivation was a strong predictor of greater academic accomplishment (GPA).

Cakmak, M. (2017) deliberated on Student Teachers views regarding the Impact of Effective Teaching Strategies on Student Motivation. The study attempts to identify student teachers’ views on the impact of effective teaching strategies regarding student’s motivational levels. The participants of this descriptive study include 144 student teachers enrolled in four departments (primary education, mathematics education, chemistry education, physics education and secondary mathematics education) of Faculty of Education in a university in Ankara, Turkey. The data were collected through a questionnaire including 22 teaching strategies. The main results of the study indicated that the participants regarded ‘paying importance to communicate’ as the most important strategy (Mean=4.74) whereas they considered ‘use of different classroom arrangements’ as the least important strategy (Mean=3.48) to motivate students. In light of these results, it is possible to note that there are many things that can still be investigated about motivation in educational context which should be studied in future research.

Ferreira, M. & Abrantes, J. L. (2011) Considered on Motivation and Relationship of the students with the school as Factors Involved in Perceived Learning. Motivation should be seen as a very important factor in the learning process. The motivated student has the inner strength to learn, to discover and capitalize on capabilities, to improve academic performance and to adapt to the demands of the school context. Contextual factors like the psychological sense of school membership may be also especially important to students’ classroom engagement, their motivation and learning success. So with this study we intend to examine how the sense of school belonging and intrinsic motivation influences perceived learning. A structural model reveals that the negative sense of school belonging has a negative impact on intrinsic motivation and on perceived learning. In turn, intrinsic motivation positively and significantly influences perceived learning in the course.

Forson, J. A. Dwamena, E. O. Opoku, R. A. & Adjavon, S. E. (2021) Opined on Employee motivation and job performance: a study of basic school teachers in Ghana. In this study, researchers examine the relationship between job motivation factors and performance among teachers of basic schools in Ghana. The study employs a quantitative approach on a sample of 254 teachers from a population of 678 in the Effete Municipality of Ghana, of which 159 questionnaires were duly answered and returned (representing 62.6% return rate). Using multiple regression and ANOVA, the study finds compensation package, job design and environment and performance management system as significant factors in determining teacher’s motivation in the municipality. Thus, these motivation factors were significant predictors on performance when regressed at a decomposed and aggregated levels. These findings support the self-determination theory, more specifically on the explanations advanced under the controlled and autonomous motivation factors. Significant differences were also observed in teachers’ performance among one of the age cohorts.

Saeed, S. & Zyniger, D. (2012) Studied on How Motivation Influences Students Engagement: A Qualitative Case Study. The study seeks to understand which type of motivation – intrinsic or extrinsic – is more closely aligned to authentic student engagement as identified by Schlechty (2002, 2011). A qualitative research framework was adopted and data was collected from one elementary school class. According to Ryan and Deci’s SDT, the majority of students who indicated that their motivation type was either intrinsic or integrated regulated motivation also demonstrated that they were authentically engaged in their education (Schlechty, 2002, 2011). The students who preferred extrinsic motivation also showed ritual and retreatist forms of engagement and students demonstrating both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation showed authentic, ritual, retreatist and rebellious engagement. In line with findings by Zyniger (2008) in this particular study at least, when pedagogical reciprocity (Zyniger, 2011) was present, intrinsic motivation assisted authentic student engagement in learning, and that extrinsic motivation served to develop ritual engagement in students however, students who had both types of motivation showed different types of engagement in their learning.

Tohidi, H. & Jabbari, M. M. (2012) Conducted on The Effects Of Motivation In Education. The present study aimed to investigate the relationship among nurses’ locus of control, work motivation factors, and their organizational commitment. A descriptive correlational design was utilized. The study was conducted in all in patient units at Benha Teaching Hospital. A convenience sample of staff nurses (129) who are working in the above mentioned study setting. Three tools were used: (1) the Rotter’s internal-external (I-E) locus of control scale, (2) Wok motivation factors questionnaire, and (3) staff nurses’ organizational commitment questionnaire. The findings of this study showed that the highest percentage of studied staff nurses’ (57.6%) had internal locus of control, while the lowest percentage of them (15%) had external locus of control. And, the majority of the staff nurses (79.9%) had high perception level regarding work motivation factors. Also, more than three fifth of staff nurses (63.3%) had moderate level of
organizational commitment. The study concluded that there was a positive highly statistical significant correlation between overall score of locus of control, work motivation factors and organizational commitment for nurses.

OBJECTIVES: Researcher has selected the following objectives-
● To find out the factors of motivation those influence PG students.
● To find out any differences between boys and girls Motivation.
● To find out any difference between rural and urban boys and girls towards Motivation.
● To find out any difference between reserved and unreserved category students towards Motivation.
● To find out any difference between small and big family students towards Motivation.
● To find out any difference between science and art students towards Motivation.
● To find out any difference between government job family and private job family students towards Motivation.

HYPOTHESES:
Researcher have selected the following hypotheses: -
H01: There are no significant differences between PG boys and girls students towards Motivation.
H02: There are no significant differences between Rural and Urban students towards Motivation.
H03: There are no significant differences between Unreserved & Reserved category students towards Motivation.
H04: There are no significant differences between joint and small family students towards Motivation.
H05: There are no significant differences between science and art students towards Motivation.
H06: There are no significant differences between government job family and private job related family’s students towards Motivation.
H07: There are no significant differences between rural girls and urban girls towards Motivation.
H08: There are no significant differences between rural boys and urban girls towards Motivation.

METHODOLOGY: Researcher followed Descriptive Survey Method for conducting the study. The important constructions of the study were:
  o Variable: Researcher considered two variable – Motivation and Learning.
  o Sample: Researcher selected 250 students (PG) from Various Department under University of Kalyani.
  o Tools: Researcher have constructed one questionnaire consisting of 35 items for this study with 3 options. Questionnaires was validated by the experts.

DATA ANALYSIS:
Researcher have analysed data according to the research Hypotheses. At first researcher have analysis data and then presented in Bar Graph with explanations.

H01: There are no significant differences between PG boys and girls students towards Motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Girls</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>82.46</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.3818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boys</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82.78</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Significant at 0.05 Level

Fig-1: Mean Differences of Total Girls' and Boys’
In the Above table, the calculated’ value was found to be not significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H0) was accepted. As such, it could be inferred that there is the no significant difference in the mean scores total girls and boys students towards Motivation.

H02: There are no significant differences between Rural and Urban students towards Motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>82.46</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Students</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82.78</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Above table, the calculated t-value was found to be not significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H₀) was accepted. As such, it could be inferred that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Rural and Urban students towards Motivation.

**H₀₃:** There are no significant differences between Unreserved & Reserved category students towards Motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Girls</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boys</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>82.67</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Above table, the calculated t-value was found to be not significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H₀) was accepted. As such, it could be inferred that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Reserved and Unreserved students towards Motivation.

**H₀₄:** There are no significant differences between joint and small family students towards Motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83.52</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Family</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig-4: Mean Differences of Joint Family and Small Family Students
In the Above table, the calculated t-value was found to be not significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H₀) was accepted. As such, it could be inferred that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Joint and small family students towards Motivation.

H₀₅: There are no significant differences between science and art students towards Motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>82.74</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Significant at 0.05 level

Fig-5: Mean Differences of Science and Arts Students
In the Above table, the calculated t-value was found to be not significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H₀) was accepted. As such, it could be inferred that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of Science and Arts students towards Motivation.

H₀₆: There are no significant differences between government job family and private job related family’s students towards Motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Job</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81.09</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Job</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>83.21</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05 Level
Fig-6: Mean Differences of Govt. Job and Private Job-related Family’s Students
In the Above table, the calculated t-value was found to be significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H₀) was rejected. As such, it could be inferred that there is the significant difference in the mean scores of Govt. job and Private Job students towards Motivation.

H₀7: There are no significant differences between rural girls and urban boys towards Motivation.

Table-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural girls</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82.65</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban girls</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82.20</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Significant at 0.05 level

Fig-7: Mean Differences of Rural Girls’ and Urban Girls
In the Above table, the calculated t-value was found to be not significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H₀) was accepted. As such, it could be inferred that there is the no significant difference in the mean scores of Rural Girls and Urban Girls students towards Motivation.

H₀8: There are no significant differences between rural girls and boys towards Motivation.

Table-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Boys</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82.90</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Girls</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82.65</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Significant at 0.05 Level

Fig-8: Mean Differences of Rural Boys and Urban Girls
In the Above table, the calculated t-value was found to be not significant, therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis (H₀) was accepted. As such, it could be inferred that there is the no significant difference in the mean scores of Rural Boys and Urban Girls students towards Motivation.

DISCUSSION: Basis of this analysis, Researcher concluded that there is no significant relationship between Urban (girls, boys) and Rural (girls, boys) students towards Motivation in Learning. But significant relationship between Govt. job and Private Job family students towards Motivation in Learning. In education, motivation helps students and young people to focus their attention on a key goal or outcome. In doing so, they are unfazed by possible distractions and are therefore able to maintain their attention during longer periods of time. Students who are motivated display goal-oriented behaviours. The role of teachers as well as parents in enhancing students’ motivation is undeniable.
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