Volume : 3 | Issue : 1 | Jan 2014 • ISSN No 2277 - 8160

Research Paper | Management

Job Satisfaction Among Teaching Staffs of Business Schools in India

Dr. G. Panneerselvam

Professor & Head, Department of Economics, Adaikalamatha College, Thanjavur

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between job dimensions and its influence on job satisfaction of teaching staffs of B-schools in India. Improving job satisfaction is one of the most important ways to deal with attrition in organizations. Since there is an acute shortage of teaching staff in management institutes in India, the present study is both relevant and purposeful. Job satisfaction is a very important attribute which is frequently measured by organizations. Attracting and retaining high quality teachers is the primary requirement of any educational institution. It is necessary to understand the factors associated with development of quality teachers in modern societies. A career in education is challenging and it requires a great deal of thoroughness and commitment but if faculty members are not satisfied with their profession, they will not be able to increase their performance. This study is concerned with exploring the dynamics of job satisfaction among teaching staffs of Indian Business schools.

KEYWORDS : Job satisfaction, Promotion, Salary

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction among workers is a significant topic which leads to promote organization and their performance in most developing countries. Improving job satisfaction is one of the most important ways to deal with attrition in organizations. Job satisfaction describes, How content an individual is with his or her job. The happier people are within their job, the more satisfied they are said to be. Job satisfaction is not the same as motivation, although it is clearly linked. Job design aims to enhance job satisfaction and performance; methods include job rotation, job enlargement and job enrichment. Other influences on satisfaction include the management style and culture, employee involvement, empowerment and autonomous work groups. It is necessary to understand the factors associated with development of quality teachers in modern societies; job satisfaction is one of the important factors in this respect. Subsequently, teacher satisfaction refers to a teacher's affective relation to his or her teaching role and is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from teaching and what one perceives as being offered to a teacher. In the last few decades, the quality of college education has decreased whereas the quantity has increased. This has raised the eyebrows of not only the academicians but also the bureaucrats. Students all over are also concerned as they link education to jobs. Keeping all these points in the background, this research was designed so that some relevant research could be done in this field.

METHODOLOGY

The present study identifies the level of job satisfaction on Business school teachers. The study investigates the impact of pay satisfaction on job satisfaction, promotion opportunities and work-schedule flexibility on job satisfaction. The dimensions of the study and the sampling procedure adopted for the present study was taken as **Independent Job Dimensions consisting of** Satisfaction on Salary (SS), Satisfaction with promotion (PS),Satisfaction with Supervision (SU), Satisfaction with Work – Schedule (SW) and **Dependent Job dimension as** Job Satisfaction (JS). The present study measured influences on Job satisfaction among the Teachers in B Schools. A Self-administered questionnaire with items related to the study dimensions was deployed. Analysis of the data was conducted through Structural Equation Modeling.

DATA ANALYSIS

Multi Discriminant Analysis

Fornell and Larcker (1981) present a method for assessing the discriminant validity of two or more factors. Here, a researcher compares the Average Variance Extract of each construct with the shared variance between constructs. If the Average Variance Extracted for each construct is greater than its shared variance with any other construct, discriminant validity is supported. From Table 1 it can be inferred that discriminant validity does exists for all the scales.

Table 1 : Average variance extracted and shared variance estimates for determining discriminant validity

VARIABLE	ITEMS	SS	PS	SU	SW	JS
SS	5	0.52	0.49	0.03	0.10	0.15
PS	6	0.69	0.32	0.05	0.18	0.23
SU	4	0.17	0.23	0.26	0.22	0.30
SW	5	0.31	0.43	0.48	0.37	0.33
JS	5	0.36	0.48	0.55	0.57	0.48

Note: AVE estimates are presented on the diagonal.

Structural Equation Modeling

The relationship between dependent and independent variables was measured using SEM in LISREL 8.50. For proceeding with SEM, Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) method was employed. SEM is a multivariate statistical technique based on regression, and it can be utilized to confirm the causal relations among latent variables. This study follows a two-step procedure proposed by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The first step involves developing a good measurement model with high goodness of fit, shown in Table 2, while the second step analyzes the structural model.

Table 2 : SEM fit Indices

FIT INDICATOR	VALUE
Goodness of fit Index (GFI)	.861
Adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI)	.847
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	.924
Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)	.944
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	.960
Root Mean Square error of approximation (RMSEA)	.055
Chi-Square / Degrees of Freedom	1.93

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Measurement model was assessed for all five scales viz. Salary satisfaction (SS), Satisfaction with promotion (PS), Satisfaction with supervision (SU), Satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility (SW) & Job satisfaction (JS). The results obtained in EFA showed that all the scales were uni dimensional in nature, except the SU scale. Various forms of construct validity i.e. convergent, discriminant predictive and criterion validity were assessed. While the first three were the part of the measurement model, the last was part of structural model. Evidence of all forms of validity was found in the study. SEM was used to establish the relationship between job related factors (SS,PS,SU and SW) as exoge-

nous variables, and JS as endogenous variable. Although the structural model did converge, mixed support was found for the hypothesized relationships between each of the constructs. In majority of the cases significant, direct and positive relationship existed between exogenous and endogenous variable. Teacher satisfaction is an area that continues to evoke debate. Factors that transform teachers' perceptions from satisfaction to dissatisfaction over time, especially in the context of developing countries need to be explored. Revealing the relationships of job related dimensions and job satisfaction with various job outcomes is a potent area for further research.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, N. (2007). Factors Affecting Overall Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention, Journal of Managerial Sciences, II (2). | 2. Amey, M. J. (2002). Unwritten Rules: Organizational and Political Realities of the Job. In Amey, M. J. and L. M. Reesor (Eds.). Beginning your journey: A guide for new professionals in Student Affairs. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc. | 3. Anderson, J. C. and Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-step Approach. Psychological Bulletin, 103 (3), pp. 411-23. | 4. Brown, S. and R. A. Peterson. (1993). Antecedents and Consequences of Salesperson Job Satisfaction: Meta-Analysis and Assessment of Causal Effect. Journal of Marketing Research. 30 (1), pp. 63-77. | 5. Carmeli, A. and Freund, A. (2004). Work Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance: An Empirical Investigation. International Journal of Organisation Theory and Behavior, 7(3), pp. 289-309. | 6. Fornell, C. and Bookstein F. L. (1982). Two Structural Equation Models: LISREL and PLS Applied to Consumer Exit-Voice Theory. Journal of Marketing Research, 19 (4), pp. 440-452. | 7. Friedman, I. A. and Farber, B. A. (1992). Professional Self-concept as a Predictor of Teacher Burnout. Journal of Educational Research, 86, pp. 28-35. | 8. Luthans, F. (1998). Organizational Behavior, Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill. | 9. Miller, H. A., Mire, S. and Kim B. (2009). Predictors of Job Satisfaction among Police Officers: Does Personality Matter?, Journal of Criminal Justice, 37 (5), pp. 419–426. | 10. Mistry, M. T. (2010). A Study for Teachers Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Mental Health Awareness. Journal of Advances in Developmental Research, 1 (2), pp. 183-185. | 11. Sharma, R. D. and Jyoti, J. (2006). Job Satisfaction among School Teachers. IIMB Management Review, 18 (4), pp. 349-363. | 12. Sherman, A.W. and Bohlander, G. W. (1992). Managing Human Resources. Ohio: South Western Publishing Co. Shibu, N. S. (2011. Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members of Private Engineering Colleges - In Context of Tamilnadu, India. Global Journal of Finance and Management, 3 (1), pp. 1-13. | 13. Troman, G. and Woods, P. (2000). Careers under Stress: Teacher Adaptations at a Time of Intensive Reform. Journal of Educational Change, 1, pp. 253-275. | 14. Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons. |