

International Multidisciplinary
Research Journal

*Indian Streams
Research Journal*

Executive Editor
Ashok Yakkaldevi

Editor-in-Chief
H.N.Jagtap

Indian Streams Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial board. Readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

Regional Editor

Dr. T. Manichander

Mr. Dikonda Govardhan Krushanahari
Professor and Researcher ,
Rayat shikshan sanstha's, Rajarshi Chhatrapati Shahu College, Kolhapur.

International Advisory Board

Kamani Perera
Regional Center For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka

Mohammad Hailat
Dept. of Mathematical Sciences,
University of South Carolina Aiken

Hasan Baktir
English Language and Literature
Department, Kayseri

Janaki Sinnasamy
Librarian, University of Malaya

Abdullah Sabbagh
Engineering Studies, Sydney

Ghayoor Abbas Chotana
Dept of Chemistry, Lahore University of
Management Sciences[PK]

Romona Mihaila
Spiru Haret University, Romania

Ecaterina Patrascu
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest

Anna Maria Constantinovici
AL. I. Cuza University, Romania

Delia Serbescu
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest,
Romania

Loredana Bosca
Spiru Haret University, Romania

Ilie Pinteau,
Spiru Haret University, Romania

Anurag Misra
DBS College, Kanpur

Fabricio Moraes de Almeida
Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil

Xiaohua Yang
PhD, USA

Titus PopPhD, Partium Christian
University, Oradea, Romania

George - Calin SERITAN
Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political
Sciences Al. I. Cuza University, Iasi

.....More

Editorial Board

Pratap Vyamktrao Naikwade
ASP College Devrukh, Ratnagiri, MS India

Iresh Swami
Ex - VC. Solapur University, Solapur

Rajendra Shendge
Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University,
Solapur

R. R. Patil
Head Geology Department Solapur
University, Solapur

N.S. Dhaygude
Ex. Prin. Dayanand College, Solapur

R. R. Yallickar
Director Managment Institute, Solapur

Rama Bhosale
Prin. and Jt. Director Higher Education,
Panvel

Narendra Kadu
Jt. Director Higher Education, Pune
K. M. Bhandarkar
Praful Patel College of Education, Gondia

Umesh Rajderkar
Head Humanities & Social Science
YCMOU, Nashik

Salve R. N.
Department of Sociology, Shivaji
University, Kolhapur

Sonal Singh
Vikram University, Ujjain

S. R. Pandya
Head Education Dept. Mumbai University,
Mumbai

Govind P. Shinde
Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance
Education Center, Navi Mumbai

G. P. Patankar
S. D. M. Degree College, Honavar, Karnataka

Alka Darshan Shrivastava
Shaskiya Snatkottar Mahavidyalaya, Dhar

Chakane Sanjay Dnyaneshwar
Arts, Science & Commerce College,
Indapur, Pune

Maj. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary
Director, Hyderabad AP India.

Rahul Shriram Sudke
Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore

Awadhesh Kumar Shirotiya
Secretary, Play India Play, Meerut (U.P.)

S. Parvathi Devi
Ph.D.-University of Allahabad

S. KANNAN
Annamalai University, TN

Sonal Singh,
Vikram University, Ujjain

Satish Kumar Kalhotra
Maulana Azad National Urdu University



JOB SATISFACTION OF ACADEMICIANS IN THE HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Dr. G. Kalyani¹ and Ms. Anicar D Manavi²

¹M.Com., Ph.D., Professor , Head of the Department of Management
in Sree Chaitanya college of Engineering (Karimnagar, Telangana, INDIA).

²MBA, PhD Research Scholar, Department of Management , School of Management,
Pondicherry University, Karaikal Campus .



ABSTRACT

The foundation for human development is laid in the centers for education. One among these centers is organized higher educational institution. Academicians in the institutions are the medium for transferring the knowledge and values to budding citizens. Thus academicians Job satisfaction does have greater impact on students' outcome. In this arena this paper presents a study on job satisfaction of faculty members in higher educational institutions. Self-developed questionnaire is used to collect the data and Pearson's Correlation test is performed to check the existence of significant

relationship between various variables. This study has implication on the decision making process of management team, government educational policies, academicians thought process and researchers in the field. The originality of research lies in the in depth study of job satisfaction level of faculty members in non-monetary terms at higher level educational institutions.

KEYWORDS: Job satisfaction, Higher education, workplace, work environment.

INTRODUCTION :

In the advent of government of India's steps to formulate and implement

National Policy on Education 2016, it is felt essential to analyze the satisfaction of academicians in higher education through whom education and employability skills are delivered to the students. Management of workforce in every sector including educational sector in the modern era has become laborious. Educators' job satisfaction is important as it has a direct impact on students' achievement and their future career. Employees can strongly contribute to an organization's success by having a customer-centric approach in their work and in their work-related interactions (Bulgarella, 2005). Employees need to be passionate towards their work and passion comes only when employees are satisfied with their job and organization on the whole (Kumari, 2016). Employers now recognise that the "happier" their employees are, the better will be their attitudes towards the work, the higher their motivation and the better will be their performance.

Thus structure of this paper

starts with literature review and followed by setting of objectives. Then columns of research methodology, data analysis and interpretation are presented. At the end recommendations, conclusion with further scope for research and acknowledgment are arranged.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

According to, Locke (1976) job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the valuation of their work and experience (Locke, 1976). As organisations focus on customer relationship management, they should not forget that employees are also internal customers. Organisations have satisfied their customers only if they have also satisfied their employees (Shun-Hsing Chen, Ching-Chow Yang, Jiun-Yan Shiau & Hui-Hua Wang, 2006). Beginning with Frederick Taylor in the era of Scientific Management and continuing on up to the present time, the twin goals of employee job satisfaction and organizational productivity have been touted as the ultimate managerial objective (Klingner, 1983).

Various studies have come out with determinants or factors those play crucial role in employees' job satisfaction. The university teachers' job of teaching and research contributes significantly to both their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Oshagbemi, 1997). Workforce can achieve better results in good working environment (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). Businesses generally determine enhancement priorities based on the low satisfaction items, rather than considering actual employee requirements (Shun-Hsing Chen, Ching-Chow Yang, Jiun-Yan Shiau & Hui-Hua Wang, 2006). If academic staff are to be encouraged to express higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of dissatisfaction, attention must be paid to the environment ('climate' or 'atmosphere') in which they work (Lacy & Sheehan, 1994). Bad working conditions restrict employees to portray their capabilities and attain full potential, so it is imperative that the businesses realize the importance of good working environment (Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015). Nurturing of the intellectual environment, clarity of institutional mission and faculty-administration relations are, however, just as important and are clearly related to the climate factors (Lacy & Sheehan, 1994). Euske et al. (1980) says in their study that The relationship between job satisfaction and performance is still open to question; it would be unwise to assume that high job satisfaction leads to high performance, or that high performers are satisfied with their jobs (Abou-Zaki, 2003). Employees with a high degree of job satisfaction were more inclined to engage in challenging, innovative thinking, and to be highly motivated by rewards (ZHANG, HU, & QIU, 2014). When studied separately, research shows that both teacher self-efficacy and teacher autonomy are associated with adaptive motivational and emotional outcomes (SKAALVIK & SKAALVIK, 2014). Compensation and understanding of the appraisal system is extremely important for the employees so is the communication process. Employee Satisfaction is a multidimensional phenomenon with a number of factors operating simultaneously (Kumari, 2016).

OBJECTIVES:

- To measure the overall workplace satisfaction (Non-monitory terms) of faculty members.
- To examine the existence of significant relationship between Job Satisfaction & Management Interaction
- To examine the existence of significant relationship between Job Satisfaction & Performance Appraisal
- To examine the existence of significant relationship between Job Satisfaction & Designation fairness
- To examine the existence of significant relationship between Job Satisfaction & Promotion fairness
- To examine the existence of significant relationship between Job Satisfaction & Training and development

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The empirical study was conducted, in the framework of descriptive and correlation study. It is an attempt to measure the job satisfaction level among the teaching staff of Sri Chaitanya educational Institutions, Karimnagar, Telangana state, India. It also tests the existence of relationship between Job satisfaction and other variables like management interaction with staff, communication of events update, performance appraisal system, satisfaction with designation placed, satisfaction on promotion system and training & development program available in the institution.

The data collection is conducted with the help management students by the means of a structured

questionnaire as a survey. The population to study is 385 teaching staff of the institution. Of these 100 is considered for the research through simple random sampling. Satisfaction for various parameters is considered based on the available literature and as per the need of Sri chaitanya educational Institutions it is customized. Respondents (academicians) were asked to indicate the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction which they derived from each of the 15 aspects of their job. The scale ranged from 1 to 5 representing : 1 = "Highly dissatisfied": 2 = "Dissatisfied": 3 = "Somewhat satisfied" : 4 = "Satisfied" : 5 = "Highly satisfied". The questionnaire consisted of 20 items. The job satisfaction questions covers job facets other than monetary rewards such as, management interaction with staff, communication about the events, keep informed with updates of institution, facilities & rights, work atmosphere, freedom to perform job efficiently, work timings, balance between family life & work life, social security, sports activity, medical facility, adaptation to change, training & development program, designation according to competencies, promotional system, performance appraisal, and opportunities for learning from performance appraisal. The collected data was analyzed with the help of computer program statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 16.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:

To check the reliability, the instrument is submitted to reliability analysis via Cronbach's alpha. The reliability of the instrument is 0.834. Coefficients of reliability above 0.7 are generally acceptable (Nunnally, 1978). Thus no item is deleted in the instrument that is meant to measure over all job satisfaction of employees. Using descriptive tools over all Job satisfaction level of faculty members of institution is determined where mean of job satisfaction is 3.446 with standard deviation with 0.624 as presented in the table 1 below:

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Job Satisfaction	98	2.07	5.00	3.4463	.62395
Valid N (list wise)	98				

Table 1

The above table shows that on the scale of 1-5, where 1 represents Strongly dissatisfied and 5 represents strongly satisfied, there is no strongly dissatisfied employee at overall level as minimum satisfaction level shown is 2.07. At the same time as mean value 3.4463 can be interpreted as overall satisfaction of faculty is above average.

In the same way overall satisfaction of faculty on each determinant presented in Table 2 reflects that except efficiency based placement in terms of designation and performance appraisal leading to career development stands between Neutral '3' and satisfied '4'. Efficiency based designation and Performance appraisal leading to career development are below Neutral '3'. Thus faculty are not much satisfied with current environment.

Percentages and Mean Scores

Sl. No		Highly Dissatisfied (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Highly Satisfied (%)	Total (%)	Mean Score
1	Management Interaction	11.00	16.00	19.00	35.00	18.00	100	3.33
2	Keep informed about events	04.08	11.22	19.38	42.86	22.45	100	3.68
3	Facilities & Rights	05.10	11.22	25.51	35.71	22.44	100	3.59
4	Work Atmosphere	03.06	09.18	18.36	39.79	29.59	100	3.84
5	Freedom to work efficiently	11.22	15.31	24.49	36.73	12.24	100	3.23
6	Working Hours	05.10	09.18	17.35	32.65	35.71	100	3.85
7	Balance between Profession & Personal Life	06.12	10.20	19.38	48.98	15.31	100	3.57
8	Social Security	03.06	15.31	27.55	38.78	15.37	100	3.48
9	Sports Activity	01.02	07.14	27.55	42.86	21.43	100	3.77
10	Institution support to adapt changes	05.10	14.29	32.65	29.59	18.37	100	3.42
11	Training & Development	06.12	25.51	23.47	29.59	15.31	100	3.22
12	Fairness in Promotions	07.14	22.45	26.53	26.53	17.35	100	3.24
13	Efficiency based Designation	16.33	19.38	32.65	16.33	15.31	100	2.95
14	Performance Appraisal System	07.14	10.20	28.57	30.61	23.47	100	3.53
15	Performance Appraisal is leading to Development	15.31	15.31	37.76	18.37	13.27	100	2.99
16	Over all Job Satisfaction	05.10	14.30	32.65	29.59	18.37	100	3.44

Table 2

Based on mean scores in table 2 the determinants are categorised in to three categories namely Better, Average and Poor. This categorisation is made by comparing the cumulative percentages of highly dissatisfied, dissatisfied & Neutral and Cumulative percentages of Satisfied & Highly Satisfied. Factors whose cumulative frequency of percentage of “Strongly dissatisfied, dissatisfied & neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” is greater than “satisfied and strongly satisfied” is considered as Poor performing. Determinants whose cumulative frequency of percentage of “Strongly dissatisfied, dissatisfied & neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” is equal to (approximately) “satisfied and strongly satisfied” as Average performing. As the cumulative frequency of percentage of “Strongly dissatisfied, dissatisfied & neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” less than “satisfied and strongly satisfied” as Better Performing. The poor performing determinants are Designation as per capabilities, Fairness in promotion, and Training and development Program. Average performing determinants are Performance appraisal and Institution’s help in adapting the change. Better performing determinants are Communication in the campus, Keep informed about events happening, Sports activity to the faculty, Work atmosphere, Work timings, Capacity to balance work life and family life, Management Interaction, Facilities and rights, Freedom to perform job efficiently, and Social security by institution.

Hypothesis Test:

As per the objectives following null hypothesis are framed to examine the existence of significance relationship between variables.

1. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Management Interaction
2. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and performance appraisal
3. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Designation Fairness
4. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Promotion fairness
5. H_0 : There is no significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and training & development

To measure the strength and direction of association that exists between 2 variables Pearson's Correlation is used at 0.01% level of significance. All the required conditions to perform Pearson's Correlation are satisfied. Two variables are in continuous (Likert scale considered as continuous), There is linear relationship between two variables (scatter Plot), There are no significant outliers, and Variables are normally distributed (large size data). The results of Pearson's correlation test are presented in the below table 3.

correlation results				
Variables	Pearson's Correlation	p value (at 0.01 level)	Null Hypothesis	Interpretation
Job Satisfaction & Management Interaction	0.561	0	rejected	Moderate positive relationship and are significant
Job Satisfaction & Communication on events	0.566	0	rejected	Moderate positive relationship and are significant
Job satisfaction & Performance Appraisal	0.111	0.276	failed to reject	Moderately related but not significant
Job Satisfaction & Designation fairness	0.315	0.002	rejected	Moderate positive relationship and are significant
Job Satisfaction & Promotion fairness	0.367	0	rejected	Moderate positive relationship and are significant
Job Satisfaction & training and development	0.444	0	rejected	Moderate positive relationship and are significant

Based on the p-values in table-3 Null Hypotheses 1, 2, 4 & 5 are rejected. Therefore there is a significant relationship there is a significant relationship between variables Job Satisfaction & Management Interaction, Job Satisfaction & Communication on events, Job Satisfaction & Designation fairness, Job Satisfaction & Promotion fairness, and Job Satisfaction & training and development except between Job satisfaction & Performance Appraisal. However many literature review says there is a significant relationship between Job satisfaction & Performance Appraisal.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MANAGEMENT BASED ON OBSERVATIONS:

- ✦ As the overall satisfaction level is in between 3-4, there is a need to take initiation by the management team to improve employee satisfaction in every dimension workplace environment.
- ✦ More concentration is to be paid on Designation as per capabilities, Fairness in promotion, Training and development Program by the management to improve the level of faculty satisfaction significantly as correlation test shows there exists significant relationship between job satisfaction and other variables. Being just and fairness by employer increases the trust on them.
- ✦ Performance appraisal system should become one of the learning experience and more informative to the employees. Then management can not only get picture of performance of employees but also they can gain cooperation from them.
- ✦ There is a need to focus on the facilities which are yet to be introduced in to the system like supporting for development of teaching skills, research center and medical care.
- ✦ Change is a continuous process. Thus Institution can provide better support to adapt the change taking place in the working of the organization
- ✦ Regular training and development is required for career development of employees in turn for better employee satisfaction.

CONCLUSION:

Job satisfaction is a relative term. It's highly difficult to meet everyone's expectations to bring satisfaction. However employees are the customers touch points especially in the service sector like education where faculty members are employees and students are customers. Thus a satisfied faculty can render better service for both teaching field as teacher and administration part as an employee of the institution. This study is

concentrated only on non-monitory determinants of satisfaction. There is a scope to include other monitory determinants to measure the job satisfaction. The research tool used is a self-developed questionnaire which undergone only reliability test of data collected. Thus there is every chance of rising validity question. With the passage of time the research on the concept of job satisfaction can be done to examine the changes taken in the concept from time to time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

The Management, faculty members, and Students of Sri Chaitanya Educational Institutions have provided immense cooperation for us to conduct this research. We are conveying our thanks to faculty members and students for helping us in collection of data. We are also conveying our special gratitude to the Top level management for providing their complete support and encouragement to conduct the research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abou-Zaki, A. C. (2003). Job satisfaction and employee performance of Lebanese banking staff. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 368 - 376.
2. Bulgarella, C. C. (2005). Employee Satisfaction & Customer Satisfaction: Is There a Relationship? *GUIDESTAR RESEARCH*, 1-6.
3. Euske, K., Jackson, D., & Reif, W. (1980). Performance and satisfaction of bank managers. *Journal of Bank Research*, 36-42.
4. Klingner, D. E. (1983). What's so important about Job Satisfaction. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 64.
5. Kumari, N. (2016). Study of Parameters Affecting Employee Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 34-42.
6. Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. (1994). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher Education*, 34, 305-322.
7. Locke, E. (1976). Nature and causes of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing*, 1297-1349.
8. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
9. Oshagbemi, T. (1997). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in higher education. *Education + Training*, 354-359.
10. Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 717-725.
11. Shun-Hsing Chen, Ching-Chow Yang, Jiun-Yan Shiau & Hui-Hua Wang. (2006). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *The TQM Magazine*, 18 (5), 484-500.
12. SKAALVIK, E. M., & SKAALVIK, S. (2014). TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY AND PERCEIVED AUTONOMY: RELATIONS WITH TEACHER ENGAGEMENT, JOB SATISFACTION, AND EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION. *Psychological Reports: Employment Psychology & Marketing*, 68-77.
13. ZHANG, X., HU, B., & QIU, M. (2014). JOB SATISFACTION AS A MEDIATOR IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND VOICE BEHAVIOR. *SOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND PERSONALITY*, 1315-1324.



Dr. G. Kalyani

**M.Com., Ph.D., Professor , Head of the Department of Management
in Sree Chaitanya college of Engineering (Karimnagar, Telangana, INDIA).**



Ms. Anicar D Manavi

**MBA, PhD Research Scholar, Department of Management , School of Management,
Pondicherry University, Karaikal Campus .**

Publish Research Article

International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal

For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Book Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

Associated and Indexed, USA

- Google Scholar
- EBSCO
- DOAJ
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database
- Directory Of Research Journal Indexing

Indian Streams Research Journal
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005, Maharashtra
Contact-9595359435
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com
Website : www.isrj.org