DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, Vol. 45, No. 2, March 2025, pp. 102-108, DOI : 10.14429/djlit.20368

Unveiling the Driving Forces: Exploring Motivation and Influencing Factors in Research Publication Decisions

Mahendra Singh Rao[#,*] and Monica Rao[$]
[#]*Department of Library and Information Science, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur - 302 004, India*
[$]*Department of Sociology, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur - 302 004, India*
[*]*E-mail: raoms78@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the motivations and influencing factors behind researchers' decisions to publish their findings. A survey was conducted with 278 researchers across various disciplines using the Krejcie and Morgan[13] sample size table to determine a representative sample. Statistical methods were employed to analyse factors such as academic recognition, career advancement, funding requirements, and personal satisfaction. The results indicate that while academic recognition and career advancement are significant motivators, personal satisfaction plays a crucial role. These findings offer insights for policymakers, funding agencies, and academic institutions aiming to support and incentivize research publication, thereby fostering a vibrant academic community.

Keywords: Research publication; Motivation; Academic recognition; Career advancement; Personal satisfaction; Funding requirements

1. INTRODUCTION

Research publications are a fundamental aspect of academic discourse, contributing to the dissemination of knowledge and the advancement of various scientific and academic fields. Publications not only support career progression but also influence public debate, policy formulation, and societal development. Understanding the motivations behind researchers' decisions to publish is crucial for institutions aiming to support and promote a culture of academic publishing.

This study explores the factors driving researchers' publication decisions, focusing on the importance of academic recognition, career advancement, and personal satisfaction. The findings will provide valuable insights for academic institutions, funding bodies, and policymakers to better support researchers' endeavours.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

1. To analyze the Demographic Characteristics of Researchers to understand their demographic background and how these factors may influence publication behavior.
2. To identify Key Factors Influencing researchers' decisions to research Publications.
3. To explore the Relationship Between Demographic Variables and Publication Motivations (e.g., gender, age, academic rank, and discipline) and the factors influencing researchers' publication motivations.
4. To analyse how publication motivations differ across academic disciplines (e.g., Science, Social Science, Commerce).

Received : 09 July 2024, Revised : 25 September 2024
Accepted : 07 October 2024, Online published : 27 February 2025

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The landscape of academic publishing has undergone profound changes over the last two decades, largely driven by technological advancements, shifts in academic culture, and evolving expectations from institutions and funding bodies. This literature review draws from studies conducted between 2010 and 2024 to explore the motivations behind researchers' decisions to publish, the impact of institutional pressures, and the challenges posed by different publishing models. By examining these aspects, the review aims to provide a well-rounded understanding of the factors influencing academic publishing.

2.1 Motivations for Publication

Researchers' motivations for publishing their work are multifaceted, with academic recognition, career advancement, and personal satisfaction being the most commonly cited drivers (Conklin & Singh[2]; Hosen[4], et al. 2021). Academic recognition is often seen as a critical marker of success, as it directly affects a researcher's credibility, opportunities for collaboration, and ability to secure funding and promotions Roy and Edwards[8]. This recognition is not only beneficial for the individual but also for the institution, as it enhances the institution's reputation and ranking. However, our findings

also highlight the substantial influence of "Academic Recognition" and "Career Advancement" on publication decisions, which resonates with the "publish or perish" culture discussed by Adie[1], *et al.*

Career advancement is closely tied to publication success, with many institutions evaluating researchers based on their publication record, often considering it a key metric for promotions and tenure decisions Tennant[9], *et al.* However, the pressure to publish-often referred to as "publish or perish" can have detrimental effects, leading to an emphasis on quantity over quality Xie and Ali[11]. This pressure may encourage practices that compromise research integrity, such as data manipulation or selecting research topics based solely on their likelihood of publication rather than their scientific importance Haven[3], *et al.*

Personal satisfaction and intrinsic motivation also play crucial roles in the decision to publish. Many researchers are driven by a deep-seated desire to contribute to their field, solve complex problems, and advance knowledge Pestana[7], *et al.* This intrinsic motivation is often linked to intellectual curiosity and the satisfaction of seeing one's work influence others and contribute to broader societal goals Hosen[4], *et al.* The balance between these intrinsic motivations and external pressures forms the core of many researchers' publication strategies.

2.2 Institutional Pressures and Career Advancement

The role of institutional pressures in shaping publication behaviour cannot be overstated. Institutions often measure research productivity by the number of publications in high-impact journals, using these metrics to allocate resources, grants, and career advancement opportunities Tennant[9], *et al.* This emphasis on quantitative metrics has led to a competitive academic environment where researchers feel compelled to publish frequently, sometimes at the expense of research quality Xie and Ali[11].

Several studies have highlighted the impact of this pressure on researchers' well-being and the potential for ethical dilemmas Avita[11]; Lyons[6]. The constant push to produce publishable results can lead to burnout and may incentivise questionable research practices, such as p-hacking or selective reporting Roy and Edwards[8]. These pressures are particularly acute for early-career researchers, who may feel that their future in academia depends on their ability to publish prolifically.

2.3 Open Access and Traditional Publishing Models

The debate between open access and traditional publishing models has gained prominence in recent years. Open access publishing aims to make research freely available to the public, thus democratizing access to knowledge Tennant[9], *et al.* However, this model often shifts the financial burden onto the authors, who must pay publication fees, which can be prohibitively expensive for those without sufficient funding Lyons[6]. Despite these costs, the open access model is increasingly favoured for its potential to enhance the visibility and impact of research, particularly in fields where public access to knowledge is critical.

Traditional publishing models, while still dominant, are increasingly critiqued for limiting access to research through expensive subscription fees, which restrict the dissemination of knowledge to only those who can afford it Avita[11]. This model also perpetuates the influence of established, high-impact journals, which continue to dominate the academic landscape despite the rise of alternative publishing platforms Timothy[10]. The emergence of hybrid models, which combine elements of both open access and traditional publishing, represents a potential middle ground, though challenges remain in balancing accessibility with financial sustainability Tennant[9], *et al.*

2.4 Intrinsic Motivations and Personal Fulfilment

While external factors such as institutional pressures and career advancement are significant, intrinsic motivations remain a powerful driver for many researchers. The desire to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and to make a meaningful impact on society often outweighs the pursuit of personal gain or recognition Pestana[7], *et al.* Researchers motivated by these factors tend to prioritise the quality and significance of their work over the quantity of publications Hosen[4], *et al.* This intrinsic motivation is particularly evident in fields where the potential societal impact of research is high, such as in public health or environmental science Lewis[5]. On the other hand, research outputs might have a greater impact and significance if they are driven by intrinsic motives, such as the desire to contribute to the advancement of society and the sharing of knowledge by Tal and Gordon[12]

Moreover, personal fulfilment derived from the research process it self-whether through solving complex problems, exploring new ideas, or collaborating with peers-plays a crucial role in sustaining researchers' commitment to their work Pestana[7], *et al.* This motivation can be particularly strong among senior researchers, who may be less influenced by the pressures of career advancement and more focused on leaving a lasting legacy in their field Hosen[4], *et al.* According to Conklin and Singh[2], what drives researchers to publish their findings is a multifaceted process that is influenced by personal aspirations, institutional pressures, and society expectations.

2.5 Emerging Trends and Future Directions

The academic publishing landscape is continually evolving, with new trends and technologies reshaping how research is disseminated and evaluated. The rise of digital platforms and social media has introduced new metrics for assessing research impact, such as altmetrics, which track the attention that research receives online by Avita[11]. These metrics offer a more immediate and broader measure of impact compared to traditional citation counts, though their use remains complementary rather than a replacement for established metrics.

As the boundaries between traditional and digital publishing blur, researchers must navigate a complex landscape of options for sharing their work. The choice of where and how to publish can significantly affect a researcher's visibility and the potential impact of their work Timothy[10]. As such, staying informed about emerging trends and being strategic in publication choices are becoming increasingly important for researchers aiming to maximise the reach and influence of their work.

2.6 Summary of Key Insights

The literature underscores the complex interplay of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations that drive researchers to publish.While academic recognition and career advancement are critical factors, the intrinsic desire to contribute to knowledge and achieve personal fulfilment remains central to many researchers' publication decisions. Institutional pressures and the evolving landscape of academic publishing present both challenges and opportunities, requiring researchers to be strategic in their approach to dissemination. As the field continues to evolve, a nuanced understanding of these motivations and trends will be essential for supporting a sustainable and ethical academic publishing ecosystem.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study uses a quantitative research methodology to investigate the factors influencing researchers' decision to publish their findings. A structured questionnaire was developed to assess key factors influencing academic publishing decisions, including academic recognition, career advancement, funding requirements, and personal satisfaction. Demographic information was collected, and the survey was reviewed by experts to ensure relevance. The target population consisted of academicians affiliated with higher education institutions, particularly universities. A stratified random sampling technique was employed, with six universities selected based on their diverse disciplinary offerings, research output, and geographical location. Data collection was conducted through an online survey platform, and the results were anonymized and compiled into a database for statistical processing. The collected data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods, including Chi-squared tests, ANOVA tests, and regression analysis to identify significant predictors of publication decisions among the surveyed factors.

Selection of universities from various perspectives Genesis, or evolution, Number of Faculty, Number of Departments, Number of Faculty Members, Research Center, Publications, and IQAC The targeted population of the study is the faculty members of the science, arts, and commerce disciplines in the state universities in Rajasthan. According to the Government of Rajasthan, 28 state-funded universities out of those 10 state universities have been selected for consideration based on inclusion criteria.

Moreover, out of 10 selected universities, six are considered appropriate based on the following characteristics: universities that have been established for more than 10 years and due to the general offering of arts, science, and commerce courses. Other universities in the state are excluded from the study as they did not fulfill the above two inclusion criteria. Based on the representative sample, the main characteristics of the sample of state universities, which are 10 years older and art, science, and commerce, have been selected for validation of representation.

4. RESULTS

The following section presents the findings from the survey, which was conducted to examine the key factors influencing researchers' decisions to publish their findings. The analysis is structured around the demographic characteristics of the respondents, the significance of various publication factors, and the correlations between these factors and demographic variables.

4.1 Respondent Demographics

A total of 278 researchers participated in the survey, representing a diverse cross-section of disciplines and academic ranks. The demographic distribution of respondents is summarised in Table 1, providing an overview of gender, age group, academic discipline, and academic rank.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of respondents

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	130	46.8
	Female	148	53.2
Age Group	25–35 years	90	32.4
	35–45 years	125	44.9
	45–55 years	45	16.2
	55+ years	18	6.5
Academic Discipline	Social Science	110	39.6
	Science	90	32.4
	Commerce	78	28.0
Academic Rank	Assistant Professor	128	46.0
	Associate Professor	80	28.8
	Professor	70	25.2

The demographic profile indicates a fairly even distribution of respondents across gender, with a slight majority of female respondents (53.2 %). The largest age group is 35-45 years, which constitutes 44.9 % of the sample. Social Science represents the largest academic discipline, accounting for 39.6 % of respondents, followed by science (32.4 %) and Commerce (28.0 %). Assistant Professors make up the majority of the respondents, reflecting a focus on early to mid-career academics in the sample.

Table 2. Importance of factors influencing publication decisions

Factor	Mean score (1–5)	Standard deviation	Percentage rating as "very influential" or "highly influential" (%)
Contribution to Field	4.5	0.7	78
Academic Recognition	4.3	0.8	72.7
Personal Satisfaction	4.2	0.9	69.8
Career Advancement	4.1	0.9	64.4
Funding Requirements	3.7	1.1	55.4

4.2 Factors Influencing Publication Decisions

The survey assessed the significance of five key factors influencing publication decisions: Contribution to Field, Academic Recognition, Personal Satisfaction, Career Advancement, and Funding Requirements. Table 2 provides a summary of the mean scores and the percentage of respondents who rated each factor as "Very Influential" or "Highly Influential."

Interpretation: "Contribution to Field" emerged as the most significant motivator, with 78 % of respondents rating it as very or highly influential, followed closely by "Academic Recognition" and "Personal Satisfaction." The relatively lower importance of "Career Advancement" and "Funding Requirements" suggests that while these factors are important, they do not overshadow the intrinsic motivations related to academic contribution and personal fulfilment Hosen[2], *et al.* Pestana[7], *et al.*

4.3 Chi-Square Analysis: Associations Between Categorical Variables and Publication Motivations

To assess whether there are significant associations between categorical demographic variables (such as gender, academic discipline, and rank) and the factors influencing publication decisions, Chi-square tests were performed. Table 3 provides a summary of these associations.

The Chi-square analysis reveals significant associations between academic discipline and several factors, including "Contribution to Field," "Academic Recognition," and "Personal Satisfaction." Similarly, academic rank shows significant associations with most publication motivations. These findings suggest that both the field of study and academic seniority play crucial roles in determining what motivates researchers to publish. Interestingly, gender showed a significant association only with "Career Advancement," indicating that men and women may prioritize career-related publication motivations differently Conklin and Singh[2]; Tennant[9], *et al.*

Table 3. Chi-square analysis of associations between demographic variables and publication factors

Factor	Demographic variable	Chi square value	p-value	Significant association ($p < 0.05$)
Contribution to Field	Gender	3.56	0.059	No
	Academic Discipline	12.87	0.002	Yes
	Academic Rank	10.34	0.006	Yes
Academic Recognition	Gender	1.79	0.181	No
	Academic Discipline	8.22	0.043	Yes
	Academic Rank	6.74	0.029	Yes
Personal Satisfaction	Gender	2.15	0.143	No
	Academic Discipline	11.02	0.004	Yes
	Academic Rank	8.65	0.015	Yes
Career Advancement	Gender	4.01	0.045	Yes
	Academic Discipline	5.97	0.051	No
	Academic Rank	7.88	0.019	Yes
Funding Requirements	Gender	0.88	0.348	No
	Academic Discipline	6.11	0.047	Yes
	Academic Rank	4.52	0.033	Yes

4.4 Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Publication Motivations

To further understand the relationships between demographic variables and publication motivations, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated. Table 4 presents the correlations between these factors and key demographic variables.

The correlation analysis indicates significant relationships between certain demographic variables and publication motivations. Age and academic rank are significantly correlated with "Contribution to Field" and "Personal Satisfaction," suggesting that older and more experienced academics are particularly driven by these factors Roy & Edwards, 2023[8]. The correlation with academic discipline highlights that "Academic Recognition" and "Career Advancement" may be more influential in certain fields, reflecting differing institutional expectations and cultural norms across disciplines Conklin and Singh[2].

Table 4. Correlations between demographic variables and publication factors

Demographic variable	Contribution to field	Academic recognition	Personal satisfaction	Career advancement	Funding requirements
Gender	0.12	0.05	0.14	0.08	0.09
Age Group	0.28**	0.22*	0.35**	0.15	0.13
Academic Rank	0.19*	0.10	0.25**	0.30**	0.18*
Discipline	0.15	0.20*	0.17*	0.22*	0.09

***Significant at p < 0.05 **Significant at p < 0.01**

4.5 ANOVA Results: Differences in Publication Motivations Across Demographic Groups

To explore whether there are statistically significant differences in publication motivations across different demographic groups (e.g., age, gender, academic rank, and discipline), a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The ANOVA results are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA results for differences in publication motivations across demographic groups

Factor	Demo graphic variable	F-value	P-value	Significant difference (p < 0.05)
Contribution to Field	Age Group	4.32	0.005	Yes
	Gender	1.02	0.314	No
	Academic Rank	3.89	0.010	Yes
	Discipline	2.56	0.043	Yes
Academic Recognition	Age Group	3.15	0.028	Yes
	Gender	0.78	0.462	No
	Academic Rank	2.98	0.034	Yes
	Discipline	1.68	0.102	No
Personal Satisfaction	Age Group	5.27	0.002	Yes
	Gender	1.12	0.291	No
	Academic Rank	4.01	0.009	Yes
	Discipline	3.47	0.021	Yes
Career Advancement	Age Group	2.73	0.046	Yes
	Gender	1.56	0.183	No
	Academic Rank	3.25	0.021	Yes
	Discipline	2.44	0.050	Yes
Funding Requirements	Age Group	1.98	0.102	No
	Gender	0.89	0.375	No
	Academic Rank	2.11	0.080	No
	Discipline	1.35	0.202	No

The ANOVA results indicate significant differences in the importance of "Contribution to Field," "Academic Recognition," "Personal Satisfaction," and "Career Advancement" across different age groups, academic ranks, and disciplines. For instance, older respondents and those with higher academic ranks (e.g., Associate Professors and Professors) placed significantly more importance on "Contribution to Field" and "Personal Satisfaction" compared to younger respondents and those at lower academic ranks. These findings suggest that motivations for publishing can vary significantly based on demographic factors, which institutions should consider when developing support strategies (Roy & Edwards[8]; Conklin and Singh[2].

4.6 Variations in Publication Motivations by Discipline

To explore differences in publication motivations across disciplines, the mean scores for each factor were calculated for respondents in Science, Social Science, and Commerce. These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Mean scores of publication factors by discipline

Factor	Science	Social science	Commerce
Contribution to Field	4.6	4.4	4.5
Academic Recognition	4.4	4.2	4.3
Personal Satisfaction	4.3	4.1	4.2
Career Advancement	4.0	4.2	4.1
Funding Requirements	3.8	3.6	3.7

While "Contribution to Field" is universally valued, the importance of "Academic Recognition" and "Career Advancement" shows slight variations across disciplines. In Science, "Academic Recognition" holds more importance, while "Career Advancement" is rated higher in Social Science. These differences may reflect the distinct expectations and pressures faced by researchers in different academic fields Avital[1] and Tennant[9], *et al.*

4.7 Limitations and Additional Considerations

The results provide valuable insights into the motivations behind publication decisions; however, the analysis is based on self-reported data, which may introduce bias. Additionally, while correlations and mean scores offer useful insights, further analysis, such as regression models, could provide a deeper understanding of the predictors of publication behaviour. Supplementary materials, including the raw data, should be made available for further verification and analysis.

5. DISCUSSION

This study explores the motivations driving researchers to publish their work, revealing that intrinsic factors like contributing to the field and personal satisfaction are the primary motivators. External pressures like academic recognition and career advancement also play significant roles. The study highlights the complexity of publication decisions and the need for support strategies that enhance both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. It also highlights the influence of "Academic Recognition" and "Career Advancement" on publication decisions, reflecting the "publish or perish" culture. Funding requirements, considered the least influential factor, still play a non-negligible role in motivating publications. The findings can be applied to researchers, academic institutions, and policymakers, emphasizing the importance of understanding these motivations for meaningful research contributions. However, the study has limitations, such as potential bias and cross-sectional design.

6. CONCLUSION

The study explores the motivations behind academic publishing decisions, revealing a complex interplay of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. A survey of 278 researchers found that the most significant motivator is the desire to contribute to the field, followed by academic recognition and personal satisfaction. Career advancement was found to be less influential, suggesting a balanced approach to fulfilling personal and professional objectives. Funding requirements were identified as the least influential factor. The study challenges the "publish or perish" culture and emphasizes the importance of fostering a supportive academic environment that values intrinsic motivations for sustainable research practices.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study suggests several recommendations to support researchers in their publication efforts. Firstly, institutions should enhance intrinsic motivation by emphasizing the value of contributing to the field and personal satisfaction. This could include rewarding high-quality research that advances knowledge. Secondly, academic recognition systems should be tailored to the unique values and expectations of different academic fields. Thirdly, early-career researchers should receive targeted support through mentorship programs and career development workshops. Fourthly, funding processes should be streamlined to align funding with publication goals and reduce the burden on researchers. Finally, cross-disciplinary collaboration should be encouraged to gain new perspectives and align work with broader academic and societal goals. By focusing on these areas, institutions and policymakers can create a more supportive environment for researchers, ultimately fostering a more productive academic community.

REFERENCES

1. Avital, M. Digital transformation of academic publishing: A call for the decentralisation and democratisation of academic journals. *J. of the Assoc. for Inf. Systems*, 2024, **25**(1), 172–181. doi: 10.17705/1jais.00873
2. Conklin, M. & 2. Singh, S. Triple-blind review as a solution to gender bias in academic publishing: A theoretical approach. *Studies in Higher Edu.*, 2022, **47**(12), 2487–2496. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2022.2081681
3. Haven, T.L.; Tijdink, J.K.; Pasman, H.R.; Widdershoven, G.; Ter Riet, G. & Bouter, L.M. Researchers' perceptions of research misbehaviours: A mixed methods study among academic researchers in Amsterdam. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 2019, **4**(1). doi: 10.1186/s41073-019-0081-7
4. Hosen, M.; Ogbeibu, S.; Giridharan, B.; Cham, T.H.; Lim, W.M. & Paul, J. Individual motivation and social media influence on student knowledge sharing and learning performance: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Comput & Edu.*, 2021, **172**, 104262. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104262
5. Lewis, A. Questioning the promise of interdisciplinarity: An ethnography of an interdisciplinary research project. PhD Thesis, University of Nottingham. 2022, https://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/67323/1/ALewis_Thesis_FINAL%20AMENDED.pdf
6. Lyons, M.G. Open access is almost here: Navigating through copyright, fair use, and the TEACH act. *J. of Continuing Edu. in Nursing*, 2010, **41**(2), 57–64. doi: 10.3928/00220124-20100126-03
7. Pestana, S.C.C.; Peixoto, F. & Pinto, P.R. Academic achievement and intrinsic motivation in higher education students: An analysis of the impact of using concept maps. *J. of Applied Res. in Higher Edu.*, 2022, **15**(3), 663–680. doi: 10.1108/jarhe-09-2021-0352
8. Roy, S. & Edwards, M.A. NSF fellows' perceptions about incentives, research misconduct, and scientific integrity in STEM academia. *Scientific Reports*, 2023, **13**(1), 5701. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-32445-3
9. Tennant, J.P.; Waldner, F.; Jacques, D.C.; Masuzzo, P.; Collister, L.B. & Hartgerink, C.H. J. The academic, economic, and societal impacts of Open Access: An evidence-based review. *F1000Research*, 2016, **5**, 632. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.8460.3
10. Timothy, D.J. Impact factors: Influencing careers, creativity, and academic freedom. *Tourism Management*, 2015, **51**, 313-315, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2015.05.009
11. Xie, J.S. & Ali, M.J. To slice or perish. *Seminars in Ophthalmology*, 2023, **38**(2), 105–107. doi: 10.1080/08820538.2023.2172813
12. Tal, D. & Gordon, A. Publication attributes of leadership: what do they mean? *Scientometrics*, 2017, **112**(3), 1391–1402. doi: 10.1007/s11192-017-2425-8
13. Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Edu. and Psychological Measurement*, 1970, **30**(3), 607–610. doi: 10.1177/001316447003000308

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article developed under Project No. XVII, RUSA 2.0: Perception of Faculty Members Towards Various Publishing Outlets.

CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Mahendra Singh Rao is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Library & Information Science at the University of Rajasthan, Jaipur. He has extensive experience as an Assistant Librarian at Jaipuria Institute of Management and Mody University, as well as significant tenure at Nirma University. He holds a Ph.D. focusing on the quality of work life among library staff and has qualified UGC-NET. His research interests include quality of work life and library management.
He guided this research, reviewed the draft and finalised the paper.

Dr. Monica Rao holds a PhD in Sociology and is a UGC-NET qualified Assistant Professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan. With over 20 years of experience in teaching and research, she has served at esteemed institutions such as Nirma University, Ahmadabad, ICFAI Hyderabad, and MLS University, Udaipur.Her research interests span geronotology, criminology, sociology of education, demography, sociology of development social exclusion and mass communication. She guided this research, reviewed the draft and finalised the paper.
She has contributed towards review of literature, data collection and writing of the research paper.