



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT ENGINEERING SCIENCES

RESEARCH ARTICLE

ISSN: 2320-9046

International Journal of Current Engineering Sciences- Vol. 6, Issue, 3, pp. 79-83, March, 2017

THE STUDY ON JOB SATISFACTION AMONG UNIVERSITY & COLLEGE FACULTIES

Divya Sharma*

Galgotias University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 15th December, 2016 Received in revised form 9th January, 2017 Accepted 20th February, 2017 Published online 28th March, 2017

Key words:

Job satisfaction, Faculty members, Teachers, Higher Education.

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies and talks about those factors which influence the satisfaction level of a faculty members in college/university. The term job satisfaction to be consider as an essential issue in the advanced education in light of the fact that if the educators in college/universities are satisfied to finish their objectives adequately, at that point just they would be inspired to contribute viably towards advanced education. Survey method has been utilized to gather the information from the teachers of universities & colleges of region Rohtak, Gurugram of Haryana. To discover those factors that are in charge of the satisfaction level among university & college faculties, the factor analysis has been conducted. Factor analysis have been applying by taking 7 factors. This review uncovered the most essential elements the satisfaction level among university and college educators are "Possibility of Growth and Administration" trailed by "Monetary Growth", trailed by "Cleanliness and Infrastructure", trailed by "Possibility of Turnover", Coordination and Cooperation, "Interpersonal Relations in Profession" & "Impartial Administration".

Copyright © **Divya Sharma**. **2017**, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Higher educational institutions plays an important part in the advance of any nation. As educated individual in the general public a medical attendant, business visionary, specialist, engineer, and so forth has gone through the hands of educator. So in such manner, faculty member plays a conclusive and developmental part in the lives of youth. Faculty members to be consider as an essential factors in developing the quality of education that students get in the University/college.

However, it is possible that faculty members of college/schools are fulfilled and motivated enough to achieve their objectives adequately. This paper focus on different factors of job satisfaction, which persuade the college/university professors for their powerful dedication to education, to upgrade their execution and to build their institutional adequacy. The renowned rule of thumb in HRM is that it is constantly less expensive to hold the present employees than to hire the new employees. The other normal perception is, where educators perform well, their students are additionally high achievers. Likewise, the academic sector where there work contribute more towards the advanced education.

In the current situation of intense rivalry, job satisfaction is a vital issue. It's being demonstrated that individuals are constantly interested to work just at those associations where they feel satisfied. Furthermore, if they are disappointed or not satisfied from their occupation then this disappointment prompts bring down level of performance, consequently it expands representative's turnover, non-appearance and various such issues. In this way, the issues with respect to university and college teachers should be considered in detail. If an institutes faculties are satisfied, they would be motivated to perform the task in an efficient manner, and after that it would add to the adequacy of advanced education subsequently.

Level of satisfaction is an essential component that prompts a positive behavior of university/college instructors & furthermore for their development. In various investigations of Social sciences it has been proved that employee's qualities & associations includes either decide or are identified with job satisfaction. (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction means one individual's sentiments in regards to the way of the work and can be persuade by various factors;, for example, the interpersonal relation with the superior, the nature of the workplace, the inspiration framework and so forth.

(Nicolescu *et al*, 2009). As indicated by Herzberg (1959), intrinsic components of the job, for example, accomplishment, acknowledgment, the work itself, obligations, and advancement are referred to as "Motivation factors" The extrinsic components, for example, working conditions, compensation, supervision, organization strategy, and interpersonal relationship are referred as "hygiene factors" or "context" factors.

Objectives

The objective of this research paper is to recognize the factors of the satisfaction level of university/college professors of Rohtak & Gurugram:

- 1. To recognize the factors in charge of satisfaction level among university/college faculties.
- 2. To identify the differences on each identified factor in terms of university/college faculties.

LITERATURE REVIEW

METHODOLOGY

Sample and data collection

This is an exploratory research and Survey method has been utilized to gather the information from the teachers of universities & colleges of region Rohtak, Gurugram of Haryana. The self-administrated study was directed to find out the factors which influence the satisfaction level of college & university professors of Rohtak & Gurugram. Rohtak & Gurugram speak about the two particular geographical and cultural zones of Rohtak and Gurugram representatives. Add up to 120 surveys were circulated among university and college educators, out of which the final sample is 85 (M- 45, F- 40). To review the data, Five- point Likert scale has been used. (SA-5 to SD-1). Factor analysis has been connected to find out the numerous factors that effects satisfaction level among university/college instructors.

Authors	Area	Sample	Finding	Method
(Nicolescu, 2009)	Romania	832	This paper identifies and discuss the no. of factors in the job that builds satisfaction and dissatisfaction level among the teachers. They came up with the conclusion that the factors like facilities, working conditions, working environment, salary/incentives contributes to increase the level of satisfaction and other factors contributes to the dissatisfaction level.	T-test
Bilal, H	Pakistan	100	This paper focus on the effect of the several extrinsic factors on the satisfaction of an employees. Factors like, working conditions, perks and benefits can affect the satisfaction level and sharing capability of the employees.	Likert Scale
(Castillo & Cano, 2004)	Ohio	170	This research came with the conclusion that teachers were generally satisfied with their jobs. But male's members were more satisfied than female members. The analysis shows that "work-itself" has found to be the motivating factor and "working condition" as the least motivating factors in the research.	Regression
(Rahman & Parveen)	Bangladesh	65(Govt) & 65(Private)	This research focused on the satisfaction and dissatisfaction level of govt and private sector university/colleges. The findings clarifies that there was significant variance in the level of satisfaction among public and private university.	Chi Square Test
(Mawoli & Babandako, 2011)	Nigeria	140	This paper focus on the motivational level of academic staff and found that they were highly motivated and the performance of the staff with regards to teaching is very high.	Cronbach's Alpha Method.
(Bakhshi)	Jammu	30(M) 30(F)	The study focused and try to find out the difference in the satisfaction level of govt and private sector educators & the outcome shows that govt educators have high – job satisfaction that the private college teachers.	SPSS 12 T-test

Table 1

Statements	Factor Loadings							Communality
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	-
S1	.089	.293	.457	197	.185	.637	.074	.787
S2	.123	.399	.797	009	038	.123	116	.840
S3	.028	.314	.758	048	008	.171	.048	.708
S4	.510	266	.575	.103	.302	146	.275	.861
S5	.756	072	.263	013	.270	.104	250	.792
S6	.191	130	.043	.865	.067	107	.150	.842
S7	118	.732	.235	.044	274	115	144	.716
S8	.355	.258	.480	098	.057	472	.414	.829
S9	.497	.290	.619	123	155	276	.220	.878
S10	.136	.736	.224	171	038	.281	.033	.721
S11	.030	164	.065	.147	104	.093	.858	.809
S12	.198	.156	001	018	.259	.745	.071	.691
S13	100	136	.206	.013	.702	.333	017	.675
S14	020	.854	.214	163	.115	.074	151	.844
S15	.043	.844	.072	125	.132	.056	.056	.759
S16	039	161	144	.795	.144	025	.199	.742
S17	.294	.167	249	.102	.738	.136	114	.763
S18	.788	.197	.176	.223	.157	.191	115	.815
S19	.557	.148	.075	.534	.006	068	268	.699
S20	.101	235	058	.578	282	.122	345	.617
S21	.796	.032	006	085	.093	222	.178	.732
S22	.774	013	.211	.073	053	.119	.237	.722
Eigen Value	6.062	4.303	2.330	1.870	1.641	1.142	1.043	
% of Variance	20.356	13.962	11.699	9.486	7.515	7.220	6.395	
Cumulative Variance	20.356	34.317	46.016	55.502	63.017	70.237	76.632	

Limitations

- 1. Sample size was small because of time requirements.
- Educational Institutions from different areas have not been taken into the example which may include more bits of knowledge.
- 3. Limited factual examination has been connected, in this way more tests and measurable information translation might led to more discoveries.

Data Analysis & Interpretation

Table 1: Demonstrates the reliability of the information by utilizing Cronabach's alpha method. In this review, information was observed to be reliable in light of the fact that Cronabach alpha is more noteworthy than 0.5 i.e. (.832). Then again to look at the sample adequacy KMO test has been connected (KMO=.572 which is more noteworthy than 0.5). Consequently we can continue for further factor analysis.

Table 1: Demonstrates the findings of the factors, extracted in order of their importance. The initial factors clarifies moderately large amount of variance though last factors clarifies less measure of difference. All eigen values came to be more noteworthy than 1.

Factor 1 clarifies most extreme variance (20.356%) in the information and remaining components clarified moderately smaller part of variance. The 7 factors represents the aggregate variance of 76.632.

KMO MSA -.573, Bartlett -626.694, Cronbach's Alpha-.832

Explanation of 7 Extracted Factors

The another statement demonstrate that faculty members are not exceedingly disappointed from different things with the exception of one thing S19, "Administration policies are transparent" (.557)

Factor 2: Monetary Progress: The element clarifies 13.962 % of the aggregate difference with 4 items. The highest coefficient scored by explanation S14, "I am being paid decent measure for the work I do" (.854), trailed by S15, Happy with the perks & benefits of my job "(.844). Alternate proclamations demonstrate the monetary growth is being received by college/University as others are putting forth.

Factor 3: Hygiene & Infrastructure:

This element clarifies the difference of 11.699 % with 5 statements. The statement S2, "Restrooms are tidy & hygienic" (.797). Out of five things there is 1 such thing which has scored less coefficient which demonstrate that educators are less satisfied on that thing than various things i.e S8, "My office is comfortable" (.480).

Factor 4: Possibility of Turnover:

This element clarifies 9.486% of the aggregate difference with 3 statements. The examination uncovers that S6, "I will change my job if I get a better opportunity (.87), scores most astounding coefficient taken after by S16 'I will change my profession if I get a better opportunity (.795) and S20, "I appreciate working in a team rather than working alone (.578).

Factor 5: Coordination and Cooperation:

This element clarifies 8.327 % of the total variance with 2 statements.

Factor Name Name of Dimension (% of Variance)		Label	Variables associated with each factor and factor loadings			
	Descibility of Cocyeth and	S21	Satisfied with my professional growth. (.796)			
	Possibility of Growth and Administration	S18	Personal growth. (.788)			
Factor 1	Administration	S22	Administration is fair. (.774)			
	(20, 2560/)	S5	Administration policies are clear. (.756)			
	(20.356%)	S19	Administration policies are transparent/clear. (.557)			
		S14	I am being paid considerable measure for the work I do(.854)			
Factor 2	Monetary Growth	S15	Happy with perks and benefits. (.844)			
ractor 2	(13.962%)	S10	Package is good. (.736).			
		S7	Satisfied with monetary growth. (.732).			
	Hygiene & Infrastructure (11.699%)	S2	Restrooms are tidy & hygienic. (.797)			
		S3	Infrastructure is good. (.758).			
Factor 3		S9	Furniture facilities. (.619).			
		S4	Working condition is good. (.575).			
		S8	Office is comfortable. (.480).			
	D 11117 CT	S6	I will change my job, if I get a better opportunity. (.865).			
Factor 4	Possibility of Turnover	S16	I will change my career line, if I get a better opportunity. (.795).			
	(9.486%)	S20	I appreciate to work in a team rather than working alone. (.578).			
F . 5	Cooperation & Coordination	S17	Load is manageable. (.738).			
Factor 5	(8.327%)	S13	Sharing informal relations with colleagues. (.702).			
Et(Interpersonal Relation	S12	Interpersonal relations at job. (.745).			
Factor 6	(7.220%)	S1	Happy with teaching profession. (.637).			
F . 7	Unbiased Administration	011	Administration does not differentiate between effective and ineffective			
Factor 7	(6.395%)	S11	faculties. (.858).			

Explanation of Extracted factors

Factor 1: Growth and Administration: This clarifies the most elevated rate of difference. i.e 20.356% with 5 statements. The statement S21, "I am happy with my professional growth" scores the most noteworthy coefficient(.796), trailed by S18, "Individual growth on current job is satisfactory (.788).

The highest coefficient is of S17, "My load is manageable" (.738) trailed by S13, "I am friendly with my coworkers" (.702).

Factor 6: Interpersonal Relation:

The 6th element clarifies the difference of 7.220 % of the aggregate change. The most noteworthy coefficient is of S12, "I have great interpersonal relations in job" (.745),

trailed by S1, "I am satisfied with my profession as a teacher" (.637)

Factor 7: Unbiased Administration:

This element clarifies 6.395% of the aggregate change with S1. The most noteworthy coefficient got by S11, "Administration does not differentiate between effective and ineffective faculties. (.745).

Analysis of Teacher's (Male and Female) Responses:

Comes about exhibited in the table underneath demonstrates the watched noteworthy contrast in the job satisfaction amongst male and female instructors. In the beneath table it can be seen that noteworthy contrast are found in S4, ".Working condition on this occupation is great" (1.820*), S14, "I am being paid considerable measure for the work I do" (2.470**), S15, "Happy with my perks & other benefits of my job" (2.209**), and S21, " I am happy with my professional growth " (-1.841*). In the staying different things no noteworthy contrast are found.

"trailed with "Monetary Growth". Likewise, "Cleanliness and Infrastructure" & "possibility of turnover "component impacts the attitude of educators. Another "cooperation and coordination" influences the fulfillment level of university & college educators taken after by "interpersonal relations in profession" and trailed by "unbiased administration ". By applying T-test result uncovered the important distinction amongst male and female instructors have been identified inside 4 statements i.e (items no. S4, S14, S15 and S21). Investigation uncovered the point where guys were exceedingly influenced by two statements i.e. S14 and S15 (Getting decent pay for the work I do, Happy with my perks & other benefits of my job) on the opposite side females were very influenced by 2 statements i.e. S4 and S21 (Working condition is great, Happy with my professional growth). In staying every other explanation no huge distinction amongst male and female has been found.

Gender-wise Differences on each item

	Statements	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value
1	II	M	45	4.42	.75	1 221
1.	Happy with my teaching profession.	F	40	4.15	.50	1.331
2	Destruction of the O best train	M	45	3.52	1.12	222
2.	Restrooms are tidy & hygienic	F	40	3.63	.90 (.89508)	333
2	To forest markets and the second	M	45	3.90	.99523	1.081
3.	Infrastructure is good.	F	40	3.57	.90159	1.081
		M	45	2.9524	1.07127	1.820
4.	Working condition is good	F	40	3.5263	.90483	1.820
5.	Administration policies are clear	M	45	3.5714	1.02817	7.25
	•	F	40	3.7895	.85498	-7.25
		M	45	3.4286	1.07571	-1.011
6.	I will change my job, if I get a better opportunity.	F	40	3.7895	1.18223	
7.	Satisfied with monetary growth	M	45	3.6190	1.02353	.428
	• •	F	40	3.4737	1.12390	
0	M	M	45	2.9048	1.22085	165
8.	My office is comfortable	F	40	2.7368	1.04574	.465
0	E ' C '11'	M	45	2.9524	1.20317	67.1
9.	Furniture facilities	F	40	3.2105	1.22832	671
10	Destructioned	M	45	3.8095	.98077	2.47
10.	Package is good	F	40	3.6842	1.29326	.347
11.	Administration does not differentiate between effective and	M	45	3.333	1.06458	455
	ineffective faculties.	F	40	3.1579	1.25889	.477
10		M	45	3.9048	.62488	070
12.	Interpersonal relations in my job	F	40	4.0526	.40465	878
10		M	45	4.1905	.74960	2 470
13.	Sharing informal relations with my colleagues.	F	40	4.3684	.59726	2.470
		M	45	4.000	.70711	2.450
14.	Getting fair amount for the work I do.	F	40	3.3158	1.00292	2.470
		M	45	3.7619	.76842	
15.	Happy with my perks and benefits.	F	40	3.1579	.95819	2.209
		M	45	3.0476	.97346	
16.	I will change my career line, if I get a better opportunity	F	40	3.5789	1.16980	-1.567
		M	45	3.9048	.88909	•••
17.	My workload is manageable	F	40	3.8421	.76472	.238
4.0		M	45	3.3810	1.07127	120
18.	Personal growth.	F	40	3.5263	1.02026	428
		M	45	3.8571	.91026	
19.	Administration policies are transparent	F	40	3.7368	.93346	.412
20.	I enjoy working in a team rather than working alone.	M	45	3.4286	.81064	
20.	(.578).	F	40	3.4211	.76853	.30
		M	45	2.0476	.86465	
21.	Satisfied with my professional growth.	F	40	2.5789	.96124	-1.841
		M	45	2.9524	1.28360	
22.	Administration is fair	F	40	3.5263	.90483	-1.646

Findings

The findings of this research paper is that faculties are influenced by possibility of growth & administration

References

- Nicolescu, L. *et al.* (2009) "Job satisfaction at the academic level: A Romanian case Study", *Global Journal of Business Research*, 3(1), 83
- Spector, P. E. (2012) "Job satisfaction: application, assessment, causes, and consequences". Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. As quoted in Bilal, H. (2012). "Job satisfaction of university teachers: Impact of working conditions and compensation", *Rev. Integr. Bus. Econ. Res*, 1(1), 102.
- Castillo, J. X.; Cano, J. (2004) "Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty" *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), 65-74.
- Rahman, M.I.; Parveen,R. "A study of Job Satisfaction among public and private university teachers" electronic copy available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1155303
- Mawoli, M.A.; Babandako, A.Y. (2011) "An evaluation of staff motivation, dissatisfaction and job performance In an academic setting" *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 1-13.

- Bakhshi, A. "Job satisfaction as predictor of life satisfaction: A study on lecturers in govt. & private colleges in Jammu" available at: Electronic copy available at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1408641.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959, 1987) "The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley & Sons. As quoted in Malik, N. "A Study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at the university of Balochistan" *Journal of Research in Education*, 21(2), 50.

Gender and Society, (Aug., 2006), 20(4) 491-510 Published

http://www.howtobooks.co.uk http://www.jstor.org/stable/27640906 www.ajbmr.com-articlepdf-ajbmr_16_25i1n7a9 www.macrothink.org/jm
