

Job Satisfaction Among Faculty of B Schools in India – Perspicacity



Management

KEYWORDS : Job Satisfaction, Promotion, Work Schedule

Dr. N. VIJAI ANAND

Professor & Head, Department of Management Studies, Srinivasan Engineering College, Perambalur.

ABSTRACT

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. Having considered the fact that most of the studies on teacher satisfaction have been conducted in developed countries, one realizes the need in the available literature for similar research in developing countries as well. A career in education is challenging and it requires a great deal of thoroughness and commitment (Akhtar et al., 2008) but if faculty members are not satisfied with their profession they will not be able to increase their performance. This study is concerned with providing insights into the dynamics of job satisfaction among teachers of Indian B-schools.

INTRODUCTION

In developing countries, job satisfaction among workers is a significant topic which leads to promote organization and their performance. 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. 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 (Sharma and Jyoti, 2006). 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 (Sharma and Jyoti, 2010). 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 (Lawler, 1973). Job satisfaction of academicians is well documented across the literature (Saif-ud-Din et al., 2010) and over the last few decades, many studies have attempted to identify sources of teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979; Mykletun, 1984; Kyriacou, 1987; Farber, 1991; Friedman and Farber, 1992). Having considered the fact that most of the studies on teacher satisfaction have been conducted in developed countries, one realizes the need in the available literature for similar research in developing countries as well. The evidence available from educational systems in developed countries identifies a complex picture in which job satisfaction is closely related to the other key factors of the complexities of work and life in general within a particular social context. 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.

STUDY OBJECTIVE

The focus of this study is to identify the calibre of job satisfaction on B-schools' teachers. The study investigates the impact of pay satisfaction on job satisfaction, promotion opportunities and work-schedule flexibility on job satisfaction

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A career in education is challenging and it requires a great deal of thoroughness and commitment (Akhtar et al., 2008) but if faculty members are not satisfied with their profession they will not be able to increase their performance (Shibu, 2011). The nature of job satisfaction of college lecturers and its relationships

with management support, salary and promotion opportunities still remain ambiguous and need to be investigated further (Ch'ng et al., 2010). In India, very little is known as to how far the teachers are satisfied in their jobs (Mistry, 2010). The study is concerned with providing insights into the dynamics of job satisfaction among teachers of Indian B-schools.

METHODOLOGY

The study is based on a single cross-sectional survey. A Self-administered questionnaire with items related to the study dimensions was deployed. Analysis of the data was conducted through Structural Equation Modeling. The dimensions of the study and the sampling procedure adopted for the present study are explained below.

Independent Job Dimensions

1. Pay Satisfaction (PS)
Pay satisfaction was measured with an adapted version of a 6 - item scale developed by Spector(1994). A sample item is 'I am satisfied with what my institute pays me'.
2. Satisfaction with promotion Opportunities (PR)
Satisfaction with promotion opportunities was measured with an adapted version of a 6- item scale developed by Spector (1994).
3. Satisfaction with Supervision (SU)
Satisfaction with supervision was measured with a 7 – scale . It measures the employees satisfaction with the quality of supervision.
4. Satisfaction with Work – Schedule Flexibility (SWF)

It measures the extent to which an employees feel the flexibility in scheduling work in doing part-time or flexible work and in balancing family and work related responsibilities with the help of sample developed by Rothausen(1994).

Dependent Job dimension

1. Job Satisfaction (JS)

Job Satisfaction was measured with the Scale developed by Ho and Au(2006). It Measures the level of satisfaction the employee has. In the present study the Teachers in B Schools job satisfaction influences are measured.

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 exist for all the scales.

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

VARIABLE	ITEMS	PS	PR	SU	WSF	JS
PS	6	0.53	0.48	0.04	0.11	0.15
PR	6	0.69	0.34	0.05	0.18	0.21
SU	4	0.18	0.23	0.25	0.22	0.30
WSF	6	0.31	0.45	0.48	0.37	0.33
JS	5	0.38	0.49	0.55	0.57	0.49

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)	.871
Adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI)	.847
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	.824
Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)	.945
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	.950
Root Mean Square error of approximation (RMSEA)	.055
Chi-Square / Degrees of Freedom	612.08/314 = 1.94

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Measurement model was assessed for all five scales viz. Pay satisfaction (PS), Satisfaction with promotion opportunities (PR), Satisfaction with supervision (SU), Satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility (WSF) & 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 (PS,PR,SU and WSF) as exogenous 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. Studies that can provide further insight into the nature of teacher job satisfaction both generally and particularly in the context of developing countries are still few and far between. There is a need for such studies on a larger scale. Factors that transform teachers’ perceptions from satisfaction to dissatisfaction over time, especially in the context of developing countries need to be explored. Unearthing the relationships of job related dimensions and job satisfaction with various job outcomes is a potent area for further research.

REFERENCE

1. Akhtar, I., Muniruddin, G. and Sogra, K. J. (2008). A Trend Analysis of Faculty Turnover at the Private Universities in Bangladesh: A Business School Perspective. *Journal of Business Studies*, IV (1). | 2. Ali, N. (2007). Factors Affecting Overall Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention, *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, II (2). | 3. 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. | 4. Amey and L. M. Reesor (eds.). *Beginning Your Journey: A Guide for New Professionals in Student Affairs*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. | 5. 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. | 6. 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. | 7. 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. | 8. Chng, H. K., Chong, W. K. and Nakesvari (2010). The Satisfaction Level of Penang Private Colleges Lecturers. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 1 (2). | 9. Chase, F. S. (1971). Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 33 (November), pp. 127-132. | 10. 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. | 11. 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. | 12. Luthans, F. (1998). *Organizational Behavior*, Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill. | 13. McCormick, E. J. and Ilgen, D. R. (1985). *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, London: Allen and Unwin. | 14. 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. | 15. 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. | 16. Sharma, R. D. and Jyoti, J. (2009). Job Satisfaction of University Teachers: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Services Research*, 9 (2), pp. 51-80. | 17. Sharma, R. D. and Jyoti, J. (2006). Job Satisfaction among School Teachers. *IIMB Management Review*, 18 (4), pp. 349-363. | 18. Sherman, A.W. and Bohlander, G. W. (1992). *Managing Human Resources*. Ohio: South Western Publishing Co. | 19. 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. | 20. Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons. |