

# Factors Effecting Job Satisfaction among Faculty

Punam Aggarwal

Assistant Professor Technia Institute

**Abstract-**Job satisfaction is one of the most widely discussed issues in organizational behavior, personnel and human resource management and organizational management. As teaching does require a great deal of thoroughness and commitment, so in teaching it is more important to have mental commitment and loyalty than physical presence. In this study the researcher investigated the present level of job satisfaction among the faculty members of university of Hyderabad. The major purpose of this descriptive-correlational study was to examine factors affecting job satisfaction of faculty members of University of Hyderabad which is explained by Herzberg job motivator and hygiene factors. A random sample of 120 faculty member of Hyderabad University was selected as a statistical sample. Employing a descriptive-correlative survey method and data were collected through questionnaire. 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. The least motivating aspect was "working conditions." The demographic characteristics were negligibly related to overall job satisfaction. The factors "work itself," and "advancement" explained 60 percent of the variance among faculty members' overall level of job satisfaction. The demographic characteristics (age, years of experience, academic rank, degree) were negligibly related to overall job satisfaction.

**Key words:** Faculty Members, Job Satisfaction, Motivator Factors, Hygiene Factors

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The extensive research that has been done on levels of job satisfaction may have distinctive applications to academic faculty. This is especially true when the separation between satisfaction and dissatisfaction is viewed in relation to the intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of academic employment.

In his well known motivational model, Herzberg (1987) makes some basic distinctions between intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The differentiations are founded on needs related to prime human characteristics, the ability to achieve and through that achievement to experience psychological growth. The dual factors arise from alternate needs that spring from basic animal nature, a drive to avoid pain from the environment and all the learned drives that are built on those basic needs. For example, an extrinsic factor, the drive to earn a good salary, is built upon the basic need of hunger. However, intrinsic factors such as responsibility and the satisfaction with work itself arise from the human ability to personally advance and grow.

In the educational setting, intrinsic factors involve a direct link between faculty and their day to day routine, the actual performance of the job itself. "Intrinsic to the job are: the work itself, responsibility, and growth or achievement (Herzberg, 1987)." Herzberg's extrinsic or dissatisfaction-avoidance factors include organizational

policy, status, pay, benefits, and overall work conditions. These factors comprise the background of one's work, the environment setting. Extrinsic factors less immediately affect the day to day job but are always in the background.

Job satisfaction is an elusive, even mythical, concept that has been increasingly challenged and refined particularly since the Herzberg, Mauser and Snyderman study in 1959. The job satisfaction of an employee is a topic that has received considerable attention by researchers and managers alike (Gautam; Mandal and Dalal, 2006). The most important information to have regarding an employee in an organization is a validated measure of his/her level of job satisfaction (Roznowski and Hulin, 1992).

Behavioral and social science research suggests that job satisfaction and job performance are positively correlated (Bowran and Todd, 1999). A better understanding of job satisfaction and factors associated with it helps managers guide employees' activities in a desired direction. The morale of employees is a deciding factor in the organization's efficiency (Chaudhary and Banerjee, 2004). Thus, it is fruitful to say that managers, supervisors, human resource specialists, employees, and citizens in general are concerned with ways of improving job satisfaction (Cranny et al 1992). The foundation of job satisfaction or job motivation theory was introduced by Maslow. He (1943, 1954) asserts that human motives

emerge sequentially to satisfy a hierarchy of five needs: physiological (food, clothing, shelter, sex), safety (physical protection), social (opportunities to develop close associations with other persons), and achievement/esteem (prestige received from others), and self-actualization (opportunities for self-fulfillment and accomplishment through personal growth). Individual need satisfaction is influenced both by the importance attached to various needs and the degree to which each individual perceives that different aspects of his or her life should, and actually do, fulfill these needs. Porter (1961) argues that within the work environment, individuals develop attitudes concerning their jobs based upon their perception of the presence or absence of positively-valued job characteristics that address specific needs. Thus, a person's job satisfaction is contingent on that individual's expectations of and actual need fulfillment from his or her position. Job dissonance results when job-related expectations and needs remain unfulfilled.

Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) posited the view that job satisfaction is not a unidimensional concept, but rather that work-related variables which contribute to job satisfaction are separate and distinct from those factors which contribute to job dissatisfaction. By 1968 Herzberg had advanced the dual factor theory, which held that to not have job satisfaction does not imply dissatisfaction, but rather no satisfaction, whereas the absence of job dissatisfaction does not imply satisfaction with the job, but only no dissatisfaction. Looked at in terms of 'opposites', the 'opposite' of job satisfaction is no satisfaction rather than dissatisfaction and the 'opposite' of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, rather than satisfaction. According to Herzberg (1959), intrinsic elements of the job are related to the actual content of work, such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibilities, and advancement. These were referred to as 'motivational' factors and are significant elements in job satisfaction. By contrast, Herzberg described extrinsic factors as elements associated with the work environment, such as working conditions, salary, working conditions, supervision, company policy, and interpersonal relationships. These were referred to as 'context' or 'hygiene' factors which are related to job dissatisfaction. Herzberg concluded that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not on the same continuum. As a result, he argued that income), and that such decisions are influenced by intrinsic motives, such as seeking opportunities for professional growth through compatible work activities and colleagues. Manger and Eikeland (1990) also examined factors that impact on academics' intentions to leave the university, and found that relations with colleagues were the largest predictor of intention to leave. They also found that general job satisfaction was a further strong predictor of intention to leave. In short, academics who found their work less intrinsically satisfying than others, more commonly intended to leave the university. Salary or economic resources as such did not appear to influence intentions to stay or go. Such studies indicate

that the 'climate' or 'culture' of the environment in which academics work has a large influence on their feelings of satisfaction with the job as a whole, and their commitment to stay in the job rather than seeking to fulfill intrinsic needs elsewhere. The motivation to investigate the degree of job satisfaction arises from the fact that a better understanding of employee satisfaction is desirable to achieve a higher level of motivation which is directly associated with student achievement. Recently, the assessment of employees' attitude such as job satisfaction has become a common activity in organizations in which management is concerned with the physical and psychological well being of people (Spector, 1997).

The relationship between the individual and the factors determining job satisfaction has been extensively researched in developed countries. In 1992, it was estimated that over 5,000 articles and dissertations have examined the topic of job satisfaction (Cranny et al., 1992), and this is a continuing topic for research. An early assumption can be made that interest in the subject illustrates the significance that employee satisfaction seriously influences the total operation of an organization. Staples et al. (1998) suggest that the reason for this interest is that work takes up such a significant amount of a person's life, and by increasing an individual's overall satisfaction with his or her work life improves the overall well-being of the individual, the organization, and the society where both the individual and the organization reside.

## 2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of study was to examine factors affecting job satisfaction of faculty members of University of Hyderabad that explained by Herzberg job motivator and hygiene factors. 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 describe selected demographic characteristics of Hyderabad University teachers.
- To describe the overall level of job satisfaction among University faculty members.
- To describe the University of Hyderabad faculty member's level of satisfaction with the job motivator factors (achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself).
- To describe the University faculty member's level of satisfaction with job hygiene factors (pay, working conditions, supervision, policy and administration, and interpersonal relations).
- To describe relationships between faculty members' level of job satisfaction and demographic characteristics.

□ To describe relationships between selected job satisfier factors (achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and the work itself) and the overall job satisfaction of faculty members.

□ To describe the relationships between selected jobs dissatisfied factors (interpersonal relations, policy and administration, salary, supervision, and working conditions) and the overall job satisfaction of faculty members.

The population for this study was all faculty members of University of Hyderabad (N=450). A random sample of 120 faculty members was selected as a statistical sample. The sample comprised of 100 male and 20 female faculty members. Employing a descriptive-correlative survey method and data were collected through questionnaire.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The research design was descriptive-correlative survey method and data were collected through a questionnaire that Castillo and Cano (2004) developed. Section one of the questionnaire consisted of the Faculty job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction scale (Wood, 1973) which assessed the dimensions of the Herzberg motivator-hygiene theory. This Section consisted of a 75-item five-point Likert type scale with responses varying from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Section tow consisted of the Job Satisfaction Index. The Job Satisfaction Index considered all facets of the job when measuring job satisfaction, utilizing an 18-item, five-point Likert type scale, with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The final section of the questionnaire consisted of questions pertaining to the demographic characteristics. Content and face validity were established by a panel of experts consisting of faculty members at University of Hyderabad. A pilot test was conducted with 16 faculty members not included in the sample. Questionnaire reliability was estimated by calculating Cronbach's alpha. Reliability for the overall instrument was .83. The reliability coefficient for section one of the questionnaire was .81, while the coefficients for the ten subscales of Part II were: achievement, .72; advancement, .76; interpersonal relations, .64; policy and administration, .85; recognition, .77; responsibility, .80; salary, .86; supervision, .79; work itself, .66; and, conditions, .88. The reliability coefficient for Section tow of the questionnaire was .85.

### 4. RESULTS

The mean age of respondents was 45 years. Respondents consisted of 85% (n =102) male and 15% (n =18) female faculty. The 25% faculty had attained a doctorate degree. Almost 2.5% of the respondents were professor, 6.5% associate professor, 57% assistant professor, and 34% lecturers. The mean number of years teaching experience faculty was 11.5 years. The majority

of the respondents (n = 102 or 85%) are permanently employed. The contract faculty comprise eighteen or (15%) respondents.

Based on a five point Likert type scale with responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), the overall level of job satisfaction was 3.48 (SD=.78). In terms of Table 1 the results indicate that there is a significant mean difference in the levels of job satisfaction experienced by male and female employees. Females reported lower levels of job satisfaction (Mean = 4.2, SD = .65) relative to male faculty (Mean = 3.7, SD= .87).

Cognizance must however, be taken of the fact that the number of the females who participated in the study made up only 8% of the sample. Thus, drawing conclusions from the results will have little substance.

**Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Overall Job Satisfaction**

Variable	All Faculty		Female		Male		t-test	Prob
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Overall Job Satisfaction	3.47	0.77	4.3	0.66	3.8	0.88	-2.27	0.03

Based on a five point Likert type scale with responses ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5), faculty members provided the following mean satisfaction scores with the job motivator and hygiene factors: achievement, 3.2; advancement, 3.28; recognition, 2.78; responsibility, 3.3; work itself, 3.62; interpersonal relations, 3.26; policy and administration, 2.86; salary, 2.75; supervision, 2.88; and working conditions, 2.67 (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Means and Standard Deviations for Job Motivator and Hygiene Factors

Motivator Factors	Mean	SD	Hygiene Factors	Mean	SD
Achievement	3.2	0.8	Relationships	3.25	0.92
Advancement	3.28	0.75	Policy	2.87	0.93
Recognition	2.78	1.0	Salary	2.74	0.69
Responsibility	3.3	0.83	Supervision	2.87	1.0
Work itself	6.62	0.84	Work Conditions	2.66	0.68

Correlations were calculated to describe the relationships between faculty member's overall level of job satisfaction and the job motivator and hygiene factors (Table 3).

Correlation coefficients were as follows: advancement,  $r = .24$ ; achievement,  $r = .43$ ; recognition,  $r = .20$ ; responsibility,  $r = .36$ ; work itself,  $r = .45$ ; working conditions,  $r = .36$ ; salary,  $r = .07$ ; supervision,  $r = .32$ ; policy and administration,  $r = .30$ ; and interpersonal relations,  $r = .32$ .

**Table 3.** Relationships between Overall Job satisfaction and Job Motivator and Hygiene Factors

Motivator	r	P	Hygiene	r	P
Achievement	0.43	0.000	Relationships	0.32	0.001
Achievement	0.24	0.023	Policy and Administration	0.30	0.004
Recognition	0.20	0.071	Salary	0.07	0.540
Responsibility	0.36	0.000	Supervision	0.32	0.002
Work itself	0.45	0.000	Work Conditions	0.31	0.004

Correlations were calculated to describe the relationships between faculty member's overall level of job satisfaction and selected demographic variables (Table 4). The coefficients were as follows: age,  $r = -.13$ ; total years teaching,  $r = -.01$ ; highest earned degree,  $r = .17$ , and academic rank,  $r = -.02$ .

**Table 4.** Relationship between Overall Job Satisfaction and Selected Demographic Variables

Variable	r	Probability
Age	-.13	0.21
Total Years Teaching	-.01	0.90
Degree	0.17	0.10
Academic rank	-.02	0.99

The multiple regressions revealed that three distinct factors could explain the variability among overall job satisfaction. The multiple regression analysis revealed that work itself accounted for 63% of the variance in the level of overall job satisfaction. When advancement was added to the regression equation, 64% of the variance in overall job satisfaction could be accounted for (Table 5).

**Table 5.** Regression of Overall Job Satisfaction on Selected Independent Variables (Stepwise Entry)

Variable	R2	b
Work itself	0.63	0.44
Advancement	0.64	0.23
Constant		1.71

## 5. CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey reveals that demographic factors such as age, academic rank, and degree no significant impact on job satisfaction; which implies that based upon age, total years teaching, and academic rank faculty are stable with regard to their overall level of job satisfaction.

Nonetheless, demographic characteristics facilitated the discovery of differences in overall job satisfaction by gender. Faculty members in University of Hyderabad were generally satisfied with their jobs. However, male faculty members were less satisfied than female male faculty in the current study. In the Study the factor "work itself" was the most motivating aspect. The least motivating aspect of faculty member's jobs was the "working conditions." The findings imply those faculties were most satisfied with the *content* of their job and least satisfied with the *context* in which their job was performed. Individual department heads should conduct a job analysis for each position and seek innovative ways to enhance the work faculty members actually perform. Conversely, the environment in which faculty member's work is performed should be reviewed to improve the context. Concern about the context was clearly evidenced in the comment portion of the instrument where female respondents, in particular, indicated that they wanted to participate in the study but were concerned about their perceptions being made public and retribution following.

All of the job motivator and hygiene characteristics were moderately or substantially related to overall job satisfaction. Unfortunately, this conclusion implies that the basic tenants of the motivation-hygiene theory may not hold true for faculty in the University. In this regard, factor analysis should be employed on the motivator-hygiene factors to derive a more parsimonious set of factors which serve as independent variables in facet-satisfaction investigations. Moreover, a lesser amount of items on a measure would possibly decrease non-response error and increase the percentage of usable responses.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis revealed that the factors work itself and advancement explained the variability among faculty member's overall job satisfaction scores which implies, that to elevate the collective overall level of job satisfaction among faculty members, college administrators must focus on improving the work itself and advancement aspects of a faculty member's job.

The findings reported in this study make a valuable contribution to the awareness of understanding the concept of job satisfaction and the effect the motivator and hygiene factors on job satisfaction. However, 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 members' 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 University. It is the desire of the society that the faculty members are to give such input those can make them happy as well as satisfied. This satisfaction will then be infused to the students and next to the nation.

## REFERENCES

1. Bowen, B. E. (1980). Job satisfaction of teacher educators in agriculture. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.
2. Bowran J and Todd K 1999 Job stressor and job satisfaction in a major metropolitan public EMS service. *Pre hospital and disaster medicine* 14(4):236-239
3. Castillo, J. X. and Cano, J. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 45(3), 65-74.
4. Castillo, J. X.; Cano, J., & Conklin, E. A. (1999). Job satisfaction of Ohio agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 45(2), 19-27.
5. Chaudhury, S. and Banerjee, A. (2004). Correlates of job satisfaction in medical officers. *MJAFI*,60(4):329-332
6. Cranny, C. J., Smith, P .C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. Lexington Books: New York.
7. Finkelstein, M.J. (1984). *The American Profession. A Synthesis of Social Inquiry Since World War II*. Columbus: Ohio State University.
8. Flowers, V.S. and Hughes, C.L. (1973). 'Why employees stay'. *Harvard Business Review*.51.4, 49–60.
9. Gautam, M.; Mandal, K. and Dalal, R.S. (2006). Job satisfaction of faculty members of veterinary sciences: an analysis. *Livestock Research for Rural Development* 18 (7).
10. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959, 1987). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
11. Lacy, F.J. and Sheehan, B.A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher Education* 34, 305–322
12. Lawler, E. E., III (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company: Monterrey, CA.
13. Manger, T. and Eikeland, O. (1990). 'Factors predicting staff's intentions to leave the university'.
14. Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper.
15. Moses, I. (1986). 'Promotion of academic staff'. *Higher Education* 15, 33–37.
16. Moxley, L. S. (1977). Job satisfaction of faculty teaching higher education: An examination of Herzberg's dual factor theory and Porter's need satisfaction research.

(ERIC Document Service No. ED 139 349).

17. Niehouse, O.L. (1986). Job satisfaction: How to motivate today's worker. Supervisory management, 8-11.

18. Padilla-Velez, D. (1993). Job satisfaction of vocational teachers in Puerto Rico Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus

19. Pearson, D.A. and Seiler, R.E. (1983). 'Environmental satisfiers in academe' Higher Education 12, 35-47

20. Poling, R. L., (1990). Factors associated with job satisfaction of faculty members at a land grant university. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.