

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

## A Study of Job Satisfaction among Public University Teachers

**Dimpy Sachar**

Research Scholar, Banasthali Vidyapeeth, University, Rajasthan, India

### **Abstract:**

*The major purpose of this study is to explore the level of job satisfaction among public university teachers in India (Delhi & NCR region). The objectives of the study were to assess the general satisfaction level of university teachers, to determine the impact of different dimensions on the satisfaction level of university teachers, and to give suggestions to improve the university teacher's job satisfaction level. The public university teachers from Delhi and NCR region constituted the population of the study. A sample of 200 teachers was drawn from this population. A questionnaire was used as a research tool to assess the level of job satisfaction level of public university teachers on different dimensions like: Service condition policies, technological and information needs, attitude and behavior of authorities, academic environment conditions, working environment conditions, compensation policies, research and development facilities, fringe benefits, attitude and behavior of colleagues, attitude and behavior of administrative staff, and attitude and behavior of students. Findings of the study shows that public university teachers are almost satisfied in most of the dimensions except on the dimensions like facilities provided by the university, attitude and behavior of administrative staff, attitude and behavior of students and coordination and cooperation among the co-faculty members.*

**Keywords:** Job Satisfaction, Public University, Research and Development Facilities, Technological and Information Needs, Coordination and Cooperation among the Co-faculty Members

### **1. Introduction**

Job is a group of homogeneous tasks related by similarity of functions. When performed by an employee in an exchange for pay, a job consists of duties, responsibilities and tasks. Whereas, satisfaction is a pleasant feeling that a person receives while performing a job. Due to the competitive nature of the job environment most of the people in the world are spending their time for job related work purposes resulting satisfaction and dissatisfaction among employees. Job satisfaction seems to have a greater impact on teacher performance. Teachers are the change agents of the society. Satisfied teachers bring positive changes for the society. Whereas, a dissatisfied teacher affects the performance of the institution badly. The aim of this study is to assess the satisfaction level of the public university teachers.

### **2. Literature Review**

Job satisfaction is one of the important functions of human resource management department. Organization focuses on identifying the satisfaction level of employees because it helps them in retaining their talented workers and simultaneously helps in increasing the performance and efficiency of the employees. According to (Hoppock, 1935) job satisfaction is "any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person to say, I am satisfied with my job". (Ivancevich et al. 1997) state that job satisfaction is something due to which a worker feels that how well he/she is in an organization. (Davis, 1981) defined job satisfaction as "the favorableness or unfavorableness with which employees view their work". Similarly, (Davis and Lofquist, 1984) defined job satisfaction as "a pleasurable effective condition resulting from one's appraisal of the way in which the experienced job situation meets one's needs, values, and expectations". This is similar to other definitions where job satisfaction is viewed as the degree of an employee's affective orientation toward the work roles. Significantly, (Balzer et al., 1990) defined job satisfaction slightly differently, as "the feelings a worker has about his or her experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations, or available alternatives". Though the researchers and scholars used a variety of concepts, variables and situation to determine the satisfaction level of employees the base had been Herzberg two factor theory. Higher education is also vulnerable to job satisfaction problems; university administration and leadership have amplified the quantity of research studies in order to recognize and causes that affect job satisfaction of employees and particularly faculty. (Davis, 2001) (Grace & Khalsa, 2003) (Scarpinato, 2001) (Trei, 2001), (Truman, 1999).

### **3. Statement of the Problem**

The major purpose of the study was to explore the job satisfaction level of university teachers in public sector universities of the Delhi and NCR region.

#### 4. Methodology

- *Objectives of the Study:*
  - a) To assess the general job satisfaction level of university teachers
  - b) To determine university teacher's satisfaction level for each of the eleven dimensions of the job.
  - c) To give suggestions to improve university teacher's job satisfaction level.
- *Type of Research:* An exploratory research was conducted for determining the factors affecting job satisfaction.
- *Sample:* The present study consisted of 200 academicians from Public Universities in Delhi and NCR region.
- *Sampling Method:* Convenient sampling method was used for collecting data.
- *Data Collection:* Research data was collected through a questionnaire. Total 202 questionnaires were distributed to the university teachers, consisting of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. Out of these 202 questionnaires, 200 relevant questionnaires with a response rate of 98% were received. The confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents has been cautiously maintained.
- *Research Instrument:* The survey instrument was created after conducting literature reviews and in depth interviews with experts and statisticians. Preliminary versions of this questionnaire were reviewed and discussed by peers and academicians within the university.
- *Statistical Tools:* The data has been analyzed by using SPSS 20.0 version. Cronbach alpha test has been administered to know the reliability of the data. Descriptive analysis is conducted to find out the mean values and standard deviation of each dimension.

*Demographic Profile:* Table 1 below represents detailed information on the profile of the respondents used in the study. These include designation, age, gender, qualifications, teaching experience, marital status, and income.

Demographic Variables		Percentage (%)
Designation	Assistant Professor	44.0
	Associate Professor	33.5
	Professor	22.5
Age (In Years)	25 – 35	41.0
	35 – 45	41.5
	45 & above	17.5
Gender	Male	40.0
	Female	60.0
Qualifications	Postgraduate	38.5
	Ph.D.& above	61.5
Teaching experience (In Years)	1 – 10	48.5
	11 – 20	30.0
	21 - 30	16.5
	31 & above	5.0
Marital status	Married	84.0
	Unmarried	16.0
Income	Below 30,000	.5
	30,001 – 50,000	30.5
	50,001 – 1,00,000	24.5
	1,00,000 & above	44.5

Table 1: Demographic Statistics

As shown in Table 1, the data has been collected from assistant professor, associate professor and professors from the public universities. Response rate comprising of 44.0% assistant professors, 33.5% associate professors, and 22.5% professors. The gender of respondents comprises of 40% males and 60% females. With respect to age, 41.0 % respondents are from age group 25-35 years, 41.5% belong to 35-45 years of age group, and only 17.5% are 45 years and above. With respect to qualifications, 38.5% of the respondents have a postgraduate degree whereas 61.5% respondents have doctoral degree. The teaching experience of 48.5% of the respondents is 1-10 years, 30.0% respondents have an experience of 11-20 years, 16.5% of the respondents have taught for around 21-30 years, and only 5.0% respondents have a teaching experience of above 31 years. Around 84.0% of the respondents are married, whereas, 16.0% are unmarried. With respect to income group, 30.5% belong to the income group ranging from 30,001-50,000 rupees, 24.5% of the respondents range between 50,001-1,00,000 rupees, 44.5% have an income of 1,00,000 rupees and above, and only 0.5% teachers have an income of less than 30,000 rupees.

## 5. Analysis & Discussion

Table 2 represents the reliability statistics of the collected data. The reliability of the scale was assessed by computing the coefficient of alpha ( $\alpha$ ). The value of the coefficient of alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was computed as .901, which is greater than 0.6. Therefore, this value was considered reliable and acceptable.

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.901	90

Table 2: Reliability Analysis

The collected data was analyzed by using descriptive method Mean and Standard Deviation presented in tabular form and interpreted accordingly. A questionnaire on five-point Scale "Highly Satisfied, Satisfied, Neutral, Dissatisfied, Highly Dissatisfied" was developed. The questionnaire was consisted of ninety items those measured eleven dimensions of job. The researcher administered the questionnaires personally.

Dimensions	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attitude and behaviour of Authorities	200	3.38	1.02
Research and Development	200	3.35	0.90
<b>Facilities</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>1.15</b>
<b>Attitude and behaviour of Administrative staff</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>1.92</b>	<b>0.73</b>
<b>Attitude and behaviour of students</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>0.91</b>
<b>Coordination and cooperation among co-faculty members</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>0.97</b>
Technological and Informational needs	200	3.41	0.90
Working Environment	200	3.65	1.04
Academic Environment	200	3.63	0.76
Service Condition Policies	200	3.22	0.83
Compensation	200	3.58	0.91

Table 3: Descriptive Analysis of Job Satisfaction

The result reveals that teachers in public universities are almost satisfied on all dimensions. Except they are highly dissatisfied on dimension attitude and behavior of administrative staff having mean satisfaction score of 1.92 (S.D = 0.73). It also shows that teachers in public universities are dissatisfied on dimensions like facilities provided by the university having satisfaction mean score of 3.01 (S.D = 1.15), attitude and behavior of students with satisfaction mean score of 3.06 (S.D = 0.91) and coordination and cooperation among the co-faculty members with satisfaction mean score of 3.10 (S.D = 0.97).

## 6. Conclusion

1. The university teachers are generally satisfied with their jobs.
2. Teachers are less satisfied on the dimensions like attitude and behavior of authorities, research and development facilities, service condition policies.
3. Teachers are satisfied on the dimensions like technological and informational needs, working environment conditions, academic environment conditions, and compensation.

## 7. Recommendations

1. Proper and timely actions should be taken for maintaining harmonious relations, mutual trust and respect for each other between teachers and administrative staff.
2. Universities need to focus on maintaining cordial relationships between the co-faculty members as this will create a safer and secure work environment.
3. In order to draw talented professional to work for them and to retain their existing highly-qualified staff, universities should offer fringe benefits and other perks to the teachers. These benefits promote a feeling of economic security and job-stability within the faculty.
4. It is recommended that there should not be unnecessary pressure on the teachers from their direct authorities.
5. It is the responsibility of the university to provide politics-free environment to teachers and avoid the misuse of teachers by the authorities for their personal and professional gains
6. Teachers should not be overloaded so that they can devote their valuable time to enhance their research skills.

7. It should be taken care of that teacher's performance should be evaluated on the basis of their merit not on the feedback provided by the students

#### 8. References

- i. Balzer, W. K., et al. (1990). Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) Scales. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University
- ii. Davis, F. W. (1981). Job Satisfaction and Stress. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 52, pp.37-38.
- iii. Dawis, R. V. & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment: An Individual-Differences Model and its Applicants*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- iv. Davis, R. H. (2001). Faculty recruitment and retention task force report. Boulder: University of Colorado.
- v. Grace, D. H., & Khalsa, S. A. (2003). Re-recruiting faculty and staff: The antidote to today's high attrition. *Independent School*, 62(3), 20-27.
- vi. Hoppock, R. (1935), *Job satisfaction*. Harper and row, New York NY, page 343.
- vii. Ivancevich J. Olelans M. and Matterson M (1997), *Organizational Behavior and Management*. Sydney: Irwin.
- viii. Scarpinato, D. (2001). Faculty retention continues to suffer amid university budget cuts. *Arizona Daily*.
- ix. Truman State University. (1999). Retention of quality professors: Key to a successful liberal arts education? Kirksville, MO: American Association of University Professors.
- x. Trei, L. (2001). Cambridge seeks faculty's help in managing staff turnover. *Stanford Report*. Retrieved February 21, 2011, from <http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/2001/january31/senwork-131.htm>