

Job Satisfaction among University Academician- A Case study of Private University in NCR

Dr. Kirti Agarwal^[1]

Ms. Meenakshi Sharma^[2]

I. INTRODUCTION

In this era of Globalization, Job Satisfaction is the basic need of the employees. Employee productivity is also directly proportionate to the job satisfaction. Several previous researched has been done on the job satisfaction of corporate sectors, however very few studies has been done and been focused for the job satisfaction of the academicians of new private universities. Hence there is the necessity on this need and therefore this study is considered at this time. Satisfied and happy staffs in the workforce are required for organizations that have goals. Seeing the large number of private universities, it is very important any private university to achieve its strategic goal. To attain these strategic goals universities would depend on their capacity to attract, retain and maintain competent and satisfied staff into its employment. The university being an institution of higher education and learning which provides the manpower for National development therefore cannot afford to neglect the need and work satisfaction of their employees.

In order to translate the theory into practice of their comprehensive courses these universities provide platform for students. They conduct training in all programme as they have been funded by government to enhance these activities. In spite of these facts and backgrounds lecturers are currently facing many challenges. Also, communication barriers are also a point of dissatisfaction where academicians feel that there involvement is too less in decision making because superiors take decisions without involving them which in turn creates additional negative work environment.

The above mentioned factors describe the attitude of academicians towards their work and their levels of job satisfaction. However organizational climate differ from one university to another. Organizational climate with mixed feelings are characterized by unchallenging jobs, lack of feedback about performance and evaluation exercise, lack of recognition of work done, basic infrastructure that make work environment difficult for employees to carry out duties, poor communication, lack of staff development activities etc. Job satisfaction is a complex concept which again mean different meanings to different people.

The cumulative results of comparison between the job given to an employee and their desires in various areas are been overall calculated as job satisfaction factors.

II. REVIEW LITERATURE

Literature review on organizational climate and job

satisfaction can influence the behaviour of the employees within their organization. Here we will intend to find out that whether organizational climate can lead to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction and whether the managers can create an environment that can lead to job satisfaction and motivation to achieve their ultimate goals and objectives.

Job Satisfaction: As per Locke, the term job satisfaction refers to an individual's pleasurable or positive state toward his/ her job. Job satisfaction is related with the five specific dimensions of the job; pay, the work itself, promotion, opportunities, supervision and co-workers. When people speak of employee attitude, they mean job satisfaction. In fact, if we see these two terms attitude and job satisfaction seems to be interchangeable. Thus, job satisfaction means a good or positive attitude or feelings towards one's job. There are three important dimensions to Job Satisfaction. These are:

First, Job satisfaction being an emotional response to a job cannot be seen.

Second, Job Satisfaction is often determined by how satisfactorily outcomes meet or exceed one's expectations.

Third, Job satisfaction represents an employee attitudes towards five specific dimensions of the job; pay, the work itself, promotion, opportunities, supervision and co-workers.

Determinants of Job Satisfaction:

The evidence from previous research studies indicates that the more important elements that contribute to job satisfaction are the nature of work, equitable reward system, promotion, quality supervision, supportive colleagues and conducive working conditions.

Measuring Job Satisfaction:

There are number of ways by which we can measure Job Satisfaction. The most common ways of measuring Job Satisfaction are:

1) *Single Global Rating:* Under Single Global Rating system the employees are asked to respond to one question. The response is based on rating scale. Rating scales are from 1 to 5 as Highly dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, No comment, Satisfied and Highly Satisfied. Thus, the rating based on this scale to a question given by the employee is a reflection of magnitude or measurement of employees job attitude towards his / her job.

^[1] Designation

^[2] Designation

2) *Summation score*: The summation score considers employees attitudes towards the various aspects of the job. The important aspects of the job that would be included for rating score are the nature of work itself, supervision, pay, promotion opportunities and relationship with co-workers. The scores given to each of these aspects are then added up to create an overall job satisfaction score of an individual employee.

By Interviews, Action tendencies and critical incidents also we can measure job satisfaction of an employee.

Effects of Job Satisfaction: Finally the employer have to observe whether the employees are satisfied. It can be observed by:

1) *On Productivity*: Previous research evidence does not establish any consistent positive relationship between satisfaction and performance, the general consensus is that in the long run if not in short run, job satisfaction leads to increased productivity. Research evidence indicates that the satisfied employees will not necessarily be the highest producers. In fact, the rewards employees receive results in greater performance. There is also evidence to suggest that job performance leads to job satisfaction and not the other way round.

2) *On Absenteeism*: There is inverse relationship though based on research evidence between satisfaction and absenteeism. When satisfaction is high, absenteeism tends to be low and vice versa. As in productivity, absenteeism is subject to modification by certain factors like the degree to which people feel that their jobs are important. Employees who believe that their work is important than do those who do not feel this way. It is also worth mentioning that a high degree of job satisfaction will not necessarily result in low absenteeism, while a low level of job satisfaction is likely to bring about high absenteeism.

3) *On turnover*: Inverse relationship at moderate level has been seen between satisfaction and job turnover. Other moderating factors as commitment to the organization is one factor which influence the employees turnover. There may be some employees who cannot see themselves working anywhere else, so they remain in the organization regardless of how much dissatisfaction they feel in the organization.

Job Dissatisfaction:

Employees may have positive or negative attitude towards their jobs. Though job dissatisfaction can be defined as the reflection of employees' negative or unfavorable feelings towards their job. The culmination of the employees job dissatisfaction to a certain level pressurizes them to quit the job and search for new one. Dissatisfied employees start raising their voices to improve the conditions that cause dissatisfaction to them. They will wait for the conditions to improve.

Method of data collection:

To study about the factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction the following research method was employed.

Sample:

The population is composed of academicians' from two

universities. It was seen that these two universities provide a large enough sample and to make available an adequate representation of the range and diversity of academics and their environment found in institutions. Data on job satisfaction were obtained by a questionnaire survey. Of the 250 questionnaires administered, 182 beneficial questionnaires were returned yielding a response rate of 73%.

Questionnaire and interview Schedule:

A questionnaire comprising eight job aspects was constructed to better understand as what are the factors that contributes academician job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The questionnaire was designed as to collect data for

- Demographic and background characteristics to provide the required information as university with their age, sex, academic rank and marital status of the respondents.
- Job satisfaction of the academicians were measured on nine general elements of their work as Teaching, Research, Governance, remuneration, opportunities for promotion, supervision, co workers behaviour, working environment and Job in General.

Demographic Data of the Sample

Variable	% of respondents
Age(years)	
Less than 35	35.7
35-44	34.1
45-54	19.8
55+	10.4
Total	100
Gender	
Male	80.5
Female	19.5
Total	100
Tenure in present university(years)	
0-5	35.7
6-10	26.4
11-20	26.4
21-30	11.5
31+	-
Total	100
Academic Rank	
Professors	8.2
Assistant Professors	10.4
Senior Lecturers	17.6
Lecturers	50.0
Other	13.7
Total	100

These various factors themselves might be thought of as intrinsic or extrinsic to the university lecturers job. However, they are broad to be of much use when analyzing a persons satisfaction or otherwise with their work. Then only they have been reframed into other components, each one of them to be individual independent. Respondents were asked to indicate the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, which they think are from various components of their jobs.

Pilot test of the questionnaire and interview schedule were conducted in the survey thus representing the target population as closely as possible.

Analysis:

A 5-point Likert type scale was employed. The scale ranged from 1-5 representing 1- “extremely dissatisfied”, 2- “dissatisfied, 3- Indifferent, 4- “satisfied”, 5- Extremely Satisfied”. The basic motive of 5-point scale was to encourage respondents to use full width of opinion and avoid errors of central tendency. For the purpose of analysis, the two extreme categories of 1- “extremely dissatisfied and 5- Extremely Satisfied” were collate together into one and scored as 2- Dissatisfied, 3-Indifferent and 4- Satisfied.

To identify if there were any differences in the level of job satisfaction of respondents in each category, the SPSS package was used. A t-test was applied to compute if there any significant differences in respondents level of job satisfaction on each aspect based on age, gender, academic, rank and tenure. The significant level of significance was set at 0.05.

The analysis of free response data and field notes from the interview were collated with the quantitative findings to identify the gap between literature and documentary surveys. These data were analyzed against the conceptual framework of the study and literature review which again deliver the new concept of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Results and Discussion:

A) Factors contributing to academic satisfaction:

Interest shown by students in courses taught and autonomy of the content taught are some of the intrinsic factors by which academicians rated highly the satisfaction among their job.

From this below mentioned table it can be seen that almost 92% were satisfied, only 5% indicating dissatisfaction and 3% indicates indifference. With a mean of almost 4 the academicians showed that they are satisfied with the courses taught for the professional training.

Below mentioned table shows a summary of the factors contributing to academician satisfaction. The data of both questionnaire and interview has been summarized.

Frequency and percentage distribution showing academic satisfaction with courses taught (n=182)

Rating	Frequency	Percentage
2=Dissatisfied	9	4.9
3=Indifferent	6	3.3
4=Satisfied	167	91.8
Total	704	100.00
Mean	3.9	

Based on both both questionnaire and interview data , a summary of the factors contributing to academician satisfaction can be seen as:

Distribution of satisfaction responses based on job aspect and percentage of academics mentioning factor(n=138)

Aspect of Job	Factor	Academics mentioning factor % of 138
Co-Workers	Relationship with others	82
	Support from co-worker	59
Teaching	Autonomy in content taught	72
	Sharing Knowledge with students	64
	Recognition of efforts by students	62
Conditions	Location of university	63
Supervision	Freedom on the job	62
	Working relationships with boss	56
Research	Freedom to research and publish	44
Miscellaneous		11

The most frequently mentioned factors related to academician job satisfaction were autonomy in content taught , relationship and respect by students. Also, co-worker behavior behaviors reflect the sociable beings and value their collegial interactions. Apart from supervision, if freedom on the job is given and relationships with their immediate boss are healthy they also cited the sources of academic job satisfaction. The research and publication work done by academicians are also the one factor of job satisfaction.

B) Factors contributing to job dissatisfaction:

Factors for dissatisfaction responses based on quantitative data and percentage of 159 respondents is as :

Distribution of satisfaction responses based on job aspect and percentage of academics mentioning factor(n=159)

Aspect of Job	Factor	Academics mentioning factor % of 159
Remuneration	Inadequate Salary	76
	Irregular Salary	32
Research	Lack of research funds	71
	Library facilities for research	66
Administration and Management	Relationship with university administration	64
	Policy formulation procedures	47
Teaching	Instructions materials	61
	Class size	59
Facilities	Access to computers	62
	Facilities for relaxation	54
Promotion	Teaching skills in promotion	58
Miscellaneous		16

Inadequate and irregular salaries are the most common factor in regard to remuneration. These data tend to reflect a pattern of academic discontent with salary. Although academicians are participating in research and publishing sources of disillusionment were mainly extrinsic as lack of research grants and library facilities. Instructional materials and large number of classes were seen as a major factor contributing to academic dissatisfaction among academicians. The majority of respondents feel that undervaluing of teaching excellence in the reward system accounted for their misgivings with promotion. The conclusions cannot be properly interpreted unless the data from the free response format were compared with information collected in the Likert type scales. Universities are teaching intensive institutions and

where teaching is the main activity and perhaps the primary interest of most of the responding academicians. As per Herzberg's dichotomy, the findings of this study indicated that intrinsic factors of teaching were most prevalent in the prediction of job satisfaction. In this report we find that 92% were satisfied with course taught the most common reason given for this being the exercise of control which the individual had over the content of their course. It is interesting to see that lower order needs factors are not met; higher order needs are not likely to come in to play as sources of satisfaction. Based on these findings, it is concluded that despite of hardship working conditions and the mismatch between instructional and student numbers, these academicians seems satisfied with intrinsic facts of their job, particularly teaching and research and dissatisfied with extrinsic features of their academic roles. These data clearly shows that academicians have control over content elements of their job. It is not unexpected that respondents were dissatisfied with the remunerations which lend the credence to Herzberg's contention that pay being an extrinsic aspect does not lead to true gratification, but it is merely a reduction in dissatisfaction. By going through this phase many academicians have been forced to take other jobs which has created a disloyalty to their employer and have reduce their commitment to their university obligations.

As the result says academicians were dissatisfied with promotion. However promotion would lead to an increase in pay it is plausible to deduce dissatisfaction with promotion. The academicians were also dissatisfied with unappreciated and unrecognized for achievements made by them. Therefore we see that recognition is an intrinsic factor for inducing job dissatisfaction. Over 80% of respondents reported deriving satisfaction from academic work as an occupation. What emerges from the findings is that while being asked by administration and policy makers to do more with fewer resources academicians should not expect to be facilitated or rewarded financially for meeting ever increasing demands. But frustrated by poor working conditions and emoluments their Job in general is being satisfactory. Looking forward for future we can say that the high degree of control academics has over intrinsic elements of their work (Moses 1986) ad the intellectual pleasure derived (Altbach and Lewis 1996) or the degree of autonomy enjoyed by academician(Serow 2000) all contribute to overall satisfaction.If this happen and been applicable it will be a fruitful for future investigations.

C) The influence of age on job satisfaction:

As compare to older academician , young academicians were more likely to derive satisfaction from extrinsic factors. Whereas older academicians evoked satisfaction from intrinsic facets of teaching. However, more of the times as in comparison, we made conclusions that here in the university academicians were more likely to derive the satisfaction from both extrinsic ans well as intrinsic factors. Consequently age showed a predictive effect on research satisfaction. Also we agree with literature here that that all age groups felt unhappy with institutional governance. However age showed no overwhelming effect on academic satisfaction with institutional governance. Older academician were more likely to express satisfaction with their job position on the pay scale. We did not found any

overriding age differences in academic satisfaction with remuneration. On contrast to it was found that age showed a predictive influence on academic satisfaction with promotion. Whereas younger academician rated favorableness the support and guidance received from supervisors. It was concluded that there was compelling evidence to show that age influences academic supervision satisfaction.

D) Gender and Job Satisfaction:

In this study we found that irrespective to have much common in all academician in the university there were some significant differences between different groups. Although both male and female respondents feet relatively happy with teaching , there is some evidence to suggest that men were more likely to show their satisfaction with extrinsic factors. Both men and women overlapped broadly in expressing their disenchantment with research and there were no compelling evidence to suggest a gender difference relative to research satisfaction. Here academic discontent with institutional governance was pervasive. So, here no evidence was produced to show a gender difference with respect to academic governance. Whereas male respondents rated their satisfaction with the pay scale higher than comparable to females. But there was no difference in remuneration satisfaction ws explained by differences in gender. As in gender promotion satisfaction university women were more highly disenchanted than promotion criteria. As in literature we find that women academician are promoted at lower pace but in this study there is no evidence which shows any gender difference with academic promotion satisfaction. Also, in this study there is no evidence indicating any gender influence on supervision satisfaction. Though both men and women expressed high satisfaction with co-worker behaviour, men were more than women were significantly satisfied with collegial participation and integration. Overall if we see there were no major differences were perceived between university men and women academician with respect to working conditions. Rather women academician were more positive towards the working conditions relative to the enjoyment of the job.

E) Rank and Job Satisfaction:

In this study we found that that irrespective to rank teaching satisfaction, respondents derived satisfaction from intrinsic factors. The findings revealed that senior academician were more likely to be satisfied with both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. However no evidence here indicates that academic rank has a predictive influence on teaching satisfaction . In context of research academician felt happy with content elements, middle and junior academician respondents were more likely;y satisfied with context factors. Based on this study we can say that rank has a predictive influence on research satisfaction. As academicians feel satisfied with departmental administration and mid level and junior academician rated institutional governance more favorably. this data reveals that differences in academic rank significantly influenced governance satisfaction.

As in regards to remuneration, academic staff were delighted with their pay scale , mid level and junior academicians showed less discontent with benefits and compensation.

However there was no evidence that indicates the differences in academic rank impact on remuneration satisfaction. There were striking differences between senior and junior academicians to suggest that promotion satisfaction among academicians were dependent on rank. The data revealed that supervision satisfaction among university academician rose proportionately with rank. While rank offered no consistent indication of contentment on the job, the general trend indicated that differences in academic rank significantly influenced working environment satisfaction.

F) The influence of tenure on academic satisfaction:

In this profession, new entrants were likely to show less discontent with extrinsic factors, long serving respondents felt happier with intrinsic factors. There was no as such evidence to show that tenure influenced respondents satisfaction with teaching. Differences in tenure however predicts university academician overall dissatisfaction with research. The result of this study does not revealed that tenure consistently influenced university academician governance satisfaction. Data showed that differences in tenure did not influence differences in remuneration satisfaction. There were also evidence that suggest the academic tenure showed a predictive effect on university academician promotion satisfaction. However tenure showed a predictive influence on university academician satisfaction with their working environment.

III. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study shows that university academician are relatively satisfied with co-worker behaviour, supervision and intrinsic factors of teaching. Their potential sources of dissatisfaction are remuneration, governance, promotion and physical facilities. However the intrinsic elements that contribute towards both teaching and research are the sources of satisfaction. It is concluded, that , any given factor could evoke satisfaction or can induce dissatisfaction which reflects situational variables in the working environment. Although age, rank and tenure significantly predict academic job satisfaction, the present study provides no evidence to support gender influence on respondents job satisfaction. This study has practical implications for university management and governing bodies at the time of policy making. As this research has indicated that academicians feel top management as bureaucrats , academician feel distanced from top administrators at their institutions then those at the helm of university leadership and management in University should build senior management teams around themselves with predominance of academicians. Subsequently, with increased communications it is more likely that university leaders will be viewed as collegial coordinator, and will help in building mutual trust and respect between academician and university administrators. Where attracting and retaining competent staff has now become the biggest current problem , the immediate priority therefore should be to re-examine the university system of incentives and rewards and for systems to be put in place that recognize the need for job satisfaction to be maintained and constantly reviewed.

IV. REFERENCES

- Agarwal, V. (1983). A Study of Stress Proneness, Adjustment and Job Satisfaction as Predictors of Administrative Effectiveness of Principals, Ph. D., Edu., Meerut University, In Buch M. B. (1983-1988) *Fourth Survey of Research in Education, Vol. II*, New Delhi : NCERT.
- Amarsingh, (1985). Correlates of Job Satisfaction Among Different Professionals, Ph.D., Edu., Punjab University, In Buch M. B. (1983-1988) *Fourth Survey of Research in Education, Vol. II*, New Delhi : NCERT.
- Best, J. W. (1970). *Research in Education (7th Edition)*. New Delhi : Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- Carbin Saladin, K. T. (1998). Role perception and job satisfaction of community college faculty. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 59(4).
- Chopra, R.K.(1982). *A study of the organisational climate of schools in relation to job satisfaction of teachers and students' achievement*. Ph.D. Thesis, Agra University.
- Dhotia, N.C. (1990). *A study of factors affecting job satisfaction of commerce teachers of Rajasthan and its impact on educational achievements of their pupil*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Rajasthan.
- Gupta S.P. (1995). A correlational study of teachers' job satisfaction and their teaching effectiveness. *The Progress of Education*. Vol. LXIX, No.10.
- Jasim, A. (2007). Teachers' Job Satisfaction : Key to educational success, *PTA Magazine*, June-2007.
- Kabir, H. (1967). Education in India (Third Impression), In J. C. Agrawal (Ed.). *Thoughts On Education*, New Delhi : Arya,
- Sharma, M. S. R. (1991). *A study of the administrative behaviour of principals as perceived by teachers in relation to job satisfaction of teachers and students' achievement in junior college*. Ph.D Thesis, Andhra University.