Determining Job Satisfaction among the Faculty Members in Private Education Institutions

Shweta Hooda[1], Kavita Singh[2*]

[1]BPSMV University, Khanpur Kalan, Sonepat (Haryana), India; hooda.shweta@gmail.com

[2*]Department of Management Studies, SRM University, Plot No. 39, RGEC, Sonepat (Haryana)-131029, India; kavita.him@gmail.com

Abstract

The academicians are the poles in the growth of any country as they put their efforts for growing the people who ultimately lead to a prosperous economy, so the present study is based on the job satisfaction among the faculty members in various institutions.

The findings of the research would provide valuable information to the administrators in understanding the factors that affect job satisfaction. This study would assist the administrators in creating conducive working environment so as to increase job satisfaction, hence work commitment.

Knowing the factors that can contribute to job satisfaction among faculty members would facilitate the Ministry of Higher Education in making decisions pertaining to the profession so as to benefit the faculty members and hence the society.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Model, Leadership Behavior, Rewards, Working Environment.

1. Introduction

"If you want one year of prosperity, grow grain. If you want ten years of prosperity, grow trees. If you want hundred years of prosperity, grow people."

Job satisfaction is a highly researched area of enquiry and is an outcome of a motivated workforce. The majority of job satisfaction studies in the last 80 years, since it was pioneered, have focused on industrial and organizational settings[5]. Job satisfaction has been defined as how content an individual is with his or her job. It can be said that the happier the person is in the work setting, the more satisfied he/she will be with the job. Locke[10] defines job satisfaction…"A pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences".

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of study was to examine factors affecting job satisfaction of faculty members at graduation and PG level of University and Institutions (Government and private) in Delhi and Haryana. In addition, this study sought to determine the overall job satisfaction of faculty members. To understand about this study the following research objectives were formulated:

- To determine the main factors that contributes to job satisfaction among faculty members.
- To describe the overall level of job satisfaction among faculty members.
- To suggest the techniques and tools to increase the satisfaction level of faculty members.
- To suggest a model of job satisfaction by linking the most influencing parameters.

3. Literature on Job Satisfaction

According to Meyer and Evans[9], their internal motivation and the particular importance they attribute to the characteristics of the academic profession (such as autonomy and flexibility) counter balance the multiple requirements, the strong pressures, the animadversions and the poor financial rewards.

Actually, flexibility and autonomy have been considered as key factors in becoming and remaining an academic[3].

Malik[11] quoted "A Study on Job Satisfaction Factors of Faculty Members at the University of Balochistan", found that the faculty members were generally satisfied with their jobs. However, male faculty members were less satisfied than female faculty members. The factor "work itself" was the most motivating aspect for faculty.

Results of study, "Job satisfaction of Greek university professors: Is it affected by demographic factors, academic rank and problems of higher education?", conducted by Platsidou and Diamantopoulou[10]) showed that the Greek academics were moderately satisfied with their job; no statistical significant effects of the demographic factors (such as age, gender, working experience and marital status) were found.

The study, "Modelling Job Satisfaction and Work Commitment among Lecturers: A Case of UiTM Kelantan", conducted by Awang[3], confirmed that job satisfaction has a strong positive relationship with work commitment. In universities, just as in other organizations, committed staffs are the organizations' invaluable assets.

4. Research Methodology

The present study is a scientific and systematic search for pertinent information on: "Determining Job Satisfaction among Faculty Members in Private Education Institutions". A questionnaire was constructed. The population for this study comprised faculty members from Haryana and NCR and in Haryana-Sonipat and Rohtak. Subjects were 100 Graduates and Post Graduate level faculty members (Government and Private) of Universities and Institutions, who responded to the questionnaire on job satisfaction. The sample was selected randomly. The sample comprised of 100 faculty members.

To compare and measure the job satisfaction, 56 items and sub-items and about 4 basic job satisfaction dimensions and some demographic questions were included. The job dimensions are as follows:

1. Leadership (15 items);
2. Motivation (9 items);
   a. 9th item with 15 sub-items
3. Rewards-Wages and Benefits (7 items);
   a. 2nd item in Wages with 3 sub-items
   b. 7th item in Benefits with 4 sub-items
4. Expectations (6 items);

A five point Likert scale of measurement weighted as follows: 1 = "Very Dissatisfied", 2 = "Dissatisfied", 3 = "Somewhat Satisfied", 4 = "Satisfied" and 5 = "Very Satisfied" was used and respondents were asked to tick the response.

The present study is descriptive and exploratory in nature, so that a precise investigation could be done about the job satisfaction among the academicians in private education institutions. The data was collected by designing a structured questionnaire[6].

5. Hypothesis

Hypothesis is usually considered as the principal instrument in research. Its main function is to suggest new experiments & observations. Based on literature review and previous studies, this research hypothesized that:

H1:   There is no statistically significant correlation between gender satisfactions and leadership behavior.

H2:   Motivation has a significant impact on job satisfaction among faculty members.

H3:   Rewards has a significant impact on job satisfaction among faculty members.

H4:   Job expectations don't have a significant impact on job satisfaction among faculty members.

6. Data Analysis and Interpretation Procedure

The data is collected by the help of questionnaire as mentioned earlier. The questionnaires were distributed manually by visiting the universities and institutions or colleges and collected the same over two month period of time.

6.1 Results

Results are based on the responses given by 100% full time and regular faculty members working in government or private universities/institutions/colleges.

The normality of data has been analyzed through Levine's test; Skewness and Kurtosis are also observed and their value lies between $+1$ and -1. The test for normality of data concludes that data is normally distributed.

To find out relationship between variables Pearson Correlation test is applied and it is found that the value of 'r' lies between $+1$ and -1. Correlation of 'Y' (job satisfaction among faculty members), is tested one by one with all the independent variables namely leadership, motivation, rewards, job expectation, job organization and working environment represented by X_1, X_2, X_3, and X_4, respectively. Also the hypothesis which were defined earlier are accepted or rejected on the basis of value of p (where $p > 0.05$).

Job satisfaction among faculty members has positive correlation with the leadership behavior of their HOD's/Deans[4]. Correlation of faculty members with leadership shown the value of $r = 0.272$, and $p = 0.006$. As value of $p = 0.006$, <0.005, so null hypothesis of no correlation can't be accepted. It means job satisfaction among faculty members is having statically significant impact on leadership behavior of their department heads. It proves hypothesis H_1.

As the value of $r = 0.182$, so there is positive correlation between job satisfaction among faculty members and their motivation level. The value of $p = 0.189$ (>0.05), hence the hypothesis (H_2) is accepted.

When job satisfaction among faculty members (Y) is taken as dependent variable and rewards as independent variable, value of $r = 0.167$ indicates a positive correlation between these two variables, and $p = 0.097$ (>0.05) indicates that gender has significant impact over the rewards, and hence hypothesis (H_3) is accepted.

Now, correlation of Y (job satisfaction among faculty members) is tested with X_4 (job expectation) and results obtained are $r = 0.098$, and $p = 0.334$, which leads to the interpretation that there exists a positive correlation between the parameters taken for test above and the hypothesis H_4 is rejected (as value of $p>0.05$), and its alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that job satisfaction among faculty members has a significant impact on expectations of faculty members which they expect from their job.

7. Model of Job Satisfaction [by using Four Variables (X_1–X_4)]

In model building we go for applying linear regression analysis and check the conditions as follows:- (i) If addition of a variable leads to increase in the adj R^2, then that variable is included whereas (ii) if the inclusion leads to decrease in the value of adj R^2, that particular variable was removed.

R is regression (correlation between dependent and independent variable; R^2 measure of common variance, called coefficient of determination i.e. proportion of variance in dependent variable due to independent variable.

7.1 Interpretation of Result

From Table 1 it can be observed that when all the variables are taken together, the value of $R^2 = 25.8$ and of adj $R^2 = 21.0$.

(i) If X_1 is removed, value of both R^2 and adj R^2 decreases, so it is advisable that removal of X_1 will not lead to a better model. So, X_1 should not be removed.

(ii) If X_2 is removed the value of adj R^2 increase, it means model would be better if X_2 is removed. Therefore, X_2 variable should be excluded from the present model.

(iii) If X_3 is removed, again value of R^2 and adj R^2 decreases, so X_3 should not be removed.

(iv) If X_4 is removed the value of adj R^2 increase, it means model would be better if X_4 is removed. Therefore, X_4 variable should be excluded from the present model.

So, the model represented in (Figure 1) is best as per the survey.

Table 1. Summary of model

Condition	R^2	adj R^2	F	Interpretation
When all the variables are taken together (Y, X_1–X_4)	25.8	21.0	5.384	
If X_1 is removed	7.4	6.4	7.814	Don't remove
If X_2 is removed	25.1	21.1	6.180	Remove
If X_3 is removed	20.6	17.2	6.147	Don't remove
If X_4 is removed	24.8	22.4	10.540	Remove

Figure 1. Proposed job satisfaction model.

In mathematical form, the model can be further represented as:

$$Y = X_1 + X_3 \qquad \text{(A)}$$

where, Y = job satisfaction among faculty members;

X_1 = Leadership behavior;

X_3 = Rewards designed for the faculty members; and

In general,

$$C = \alpha + \beta I + \varepsilon \qquad \text{(B)}$$

where, C = Dependent Variable;

α = Standard α error which is permissible;

B = Standard β error which is used to analyze Comparative influence;

I = Independent Variable;

ε = Standard error which is permissible

$$\therefore Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_3 + \varepsilon \qquad \text{(C)}$$

Hence,

$$Y = 1.285 + 0.232\, X_1 + 0.253\, X_3 \qquad \text{(D)}$$

This model is termed as fit, because when these three variables were taken together the value of R^2 = 24.8, adj R^2 = 22.4, F = 10.540, and t = 6.224. F is measure of goodness of fit and if the value of F > 4 for any model then that model is considered significantly fit. Hence, we can see from the results obtained above that F > 4, the model generated is significantly fit.

This model may also work best in other fields besides the education sector to explain the job satisfaction among the faculty members of Government/private universities and the various other institutions.

8. Scope and Limitations of the Study

The research is conducted on various University and Institutions faculty members in Haryana and NCR. Thus, the results may be generalized to other professions as well as faculty members in other higher learning institutions of other states. As with other research that uses questionnaire as the instrument to collect data, there may be a problem of social desirability. Some respondents may have the tendency to exaggerate or provide responses deemed to be desirable by others, instead of giving honest responses.

9. Conclusion

The survey reveals that job satisfaction among the faculty members is influenced by three variables namely leadership behavior of their heads, rewards they receives for the work done by them, and the working environment of the organization, which implies that:

- Leadership behavior of the head of the departments/dean/ the immediate authority is having influence on the job satisfaction among the faculty members which considers some of the facts like the relationship with immediate head, the amount of attention a faculty members gets from the head for the work they do, easiness in communicating, if faculty members get sufficient amount of information to complete a particular task, the amount of constructive feedback received from the head, information received from the head about the situation of the university/institute, the amount of appreciation got from the head of the work done by the faculty member, the awareness level of the head about the abilities of the faculties, style of head's directions, the support got form head, management style adopted by the head in dealing with the faculty members, the amount of time given by the head to listen to faculty concerns and support on reasonable suggestions, assistance received from the head in planning the essential training to help faculty members to perform their task efficiently and to take further steps in research for their career advancement, and finally the knowledge level of the head regarding all aspects of job responsibilities of the faculty members.

- Rewards which are designed for the faculty members are also having a remarkable impact on the job satisfaction which includes the salary and other benefits like satisfaction with the current salary, fairness of the salary system in their university/institute compared to the work they do, other faculties working in the same area, library with modern facilities support in doing research work, support for attending conferences and faculty development programmes, and other benefits like theatre, vacations, interesting projects, support, appreciation, working hours, insurance, health care, child care etc. facility.

Along with the findings reported in this study, additional research is needed to further investigate the potential relationship and effect these variables and other variables have on job satisfaction.

It is hoped that the barrier to the faculty member's job satisfaction are found in this research can contribute to a great extent to improve the level of faculty members as well as academic education level in Universities Institutes/Colleges.

10. The Implications of the Study

It is the hope of the researchers that the findings would contribute towards developing ways to improve job satisfaction among

faculty members. This would definitely benefit the education industry and the nation in the long run.

11. Suggestions

Following suggestions need to be adopted by the education ministry as well as the administrators of various universities/institutions/colleges so as to increase the motivation level of faculty members:

- Leadership behavior of the head of the departments/dean/the immediate authority should be good as it is having influence on the job satisfaction among the faculty members.
- Rewards need to be designed properly for the faculty members as rewards have a remarkable impact on the job satisfaction. In education sector, on the occasion of teachers day faculty members may be given appreciation certificates, awards, and increments in salary, gifts on the occasion of festivals.
- Career prospects are also required for the upliftment of both, the organization and the faculty member. They should be supported to attend seminars, conferences and faculty development programmes. Attributes of the job should comply with the demands of the faculty member and the faculty member is pleased with his job.
- Paid vacation will work like anything for the faculty member as they are not there in the private colleges/institutions.

12. References

1. Ali P. Job satisfaction characteristics of higher education faculty by race. Educational Research and Reviews. 2009 May; 4(5):289–300. Available from: http://www.academicjournals.org/ERR

2. Awang Z, Ahmad H, Junaidh Z, Mohamad, N. Modelling job satisfaction and work commitment among lecturers: a case of UiTM Kelantan. Journal of Statistical Modeling and Analytics. 2010; 1(2):45–59.

3. Bellamy S, Morley C, Watty K. Why business academics remain in Australian universities despite deteriorating working conditions and reduced job satisfaction: an intellectual puzzle. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management. 2003; 25:13–28.

4. Bilimoria D, Perry SR, Liang X, Stoller EP, Higgins P, Taylor C. How do female and male faculty members construct job satisfaction? The roles of perceived institutional leadership and mentoring and their mediating processes. Journal of Technology Transfer. 2006; 31:355–65.

5. Hickson C, Oshagbami T. The effect of age on job satisfaction of academicians with teaching and research. International Journal of Social Academicians. 1999; 26(4):209–16.

6. Kothari CR. Business research methodology. 2nd ed. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited Publishers; 2004.

7. Locke EA. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. In: The Nature and Course of Job Satisfaction. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally. 1976. p. 1297–1343.

8. Malik N. A Study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at the University of Balochistan. Journal of Research in Education. 2004 Jan; 21(2):49–57.

9. Meyer LH, Evans IM. Motivating the professoriate: why sticks and carrots are only for donkeys. Higher Education Management and Policy. 2003; 15:151–167.

10. Platsidou M, Diamantopoulou G. Job satisfaction of Greek university professors: Is it affected by demographic factors, academic rank and problems of higher education? In: Zarifis GK, editor. Educating the Adult Educator: Quality Provision and Assessment in Europe, Conference Proceedings, ESREA-ReNAdET. Thessaloniki: Grafima Publications. 2009. p. 535–545.