

A qualitative investigation of faculty job satisfaction in Telangana's aided colleges associated with Kakatiya University.

Author: Dr. Kanaparthi Abraham Lincoln

Associate Professor,

Pannala Ram Reddy College of Business Management, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.

ABSTRACT

Since many people's waking hours are spent at work, companies of all stripes place a premium on fostering an atmosphere where employees may flourish. A person's level of happiness with his or her work, which acts as a motivating element for that person's efforts, is what is meant by the term "job satisfaction." This study was carried out by researchers in order to find out how satisfied faculty members are with their work at Kakatiya University-affiliated and aided institutions, as well as the connection between job satisfaction and demographic parameters like as age, gender, experience, and discipline. In addition to this, they investigated the relationship between elements such as motivation and health and safety in the workplace and faculty members' overall levels of job satisfaction. Researchers at Kakatiya University in Kakatiya, Telangana (India) surveyed 180 teachers at aided institutions in five districts (Warangal, Karimnagar, Nizamabad, Adilabad, and Rangareddy) using a questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale. Several statistical processes and analyses were performed to determine the significance of the results. Faculty members at funded universities express relatively low levels of satisfaction, as seen by the statistics presented below. On average, women's faculties report being happier than men's. Age, experience, discipline, and marital status are just a few of the variables that might affect how much fun you have. In the workplace, the presence of hygienic elements has a greater effect on worker satisfaction than the presence of motivating factors.

KEYWORDS: Job Satisfaction, Motivational Factors, Hygiene Factors, Demographic Factors.

INTRODUCTION

efficient and effective way. The degree of job satisfaction in the workplace has become an important issue for organisations to keep an eye on in the modern workplace. Worker motivation is influenced by how happy they are in their jobs and how satisfied they are with the work they are doing. As a result, employers must be aware of the elements that affect employee work satisfaction since doing so has a substantial effect on the company's success. Employee work satisfaction may be influenced by a number of different factors. These elements include, but are not limited to, compensation, benefits, progression, supervision, relationships with coworkers, the actual work itself, and other aspects of working conditions, accomplishment, and acknowledgment. They have an impact on how an employee views his or her work.

According to the two-factor hypothesis, workers have two primary categories of needs: cleanliness and motivation. This idea was developed by Herzberg, Manusner, Peterson, and Capwell (1959). Employee satisfaction and employee dissatisfaction have been categorised by the researchers. This category includes variables such as recognition, accomplishments, and responsibilities that contribute to job satisfaction, but if they are lacking, this does not constitute as discontent at work. However, the presence of these factors does not have an effect on whether or not employees develop a positive attitude toward their jobs.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For a number of personal reasons, men work long hours in the workplace each day. If workers are satisfied with their jobs, they will put their all into it (Mahalakshmi & John, 2015). Herzberg, who proposed the hypothesis that work satisfaction is a function of motivators (which serve as a complement to job happiness) and cleanliness, first noted the significance of job satisfaction in 1959. (which results into job dissatisfaction). However, hygienic and motivational elements had little effect on the performance of workers, according to Schwab et al. (1971). To the contrary of Herzberg's thesis, according to which hygienic factors do not motivate, Gawel (1997) found that teachers regard income to be a strong motivating element. People's attitudes about their employment are cited as a defining characteristic of job satisfaction. A productive worker is only possible if the worker is pleased (Petty et al., 1984). Studying Job Satisfaction has become more significant in today's society because of the substantial costs associated in faculty selection and recruiting (Naveen Prasadula). Studying faculty members in Uganda found that job satisfaction is strongly linked to characteristics including interpersonal ties, advancement, remuneration, supervision, work environment, and more. Employees' degree of job satisfaction may be analysed by looking at characteristics such as the working climate, morale, connections with coworkers, and a feeling of community, according to Lancy and Sheehan (1997). A link between work satisfaction and stress has been established by Necsoi (2011). As a consequence of a lack of work satisfaction, the female segment is experiencing a high degree of uneasiness and dissatisfaction. It has been shown that rural teachers are less happy with their jobs than

their metropolitan counterparts. There was no substantial gender difference in work satisfaction, according to Nigam and Jain (2014), who looked at the data. According to Bala Pronay (2011), teachers are most pleased when they have control over their work environment, training, and the results of that training. Nitin Nayak and Madhumita Nayak (2014) found that “workers levels of job happiness are higher among married than among single employees, and they concluded that marital status is an important factor to take into account when assessing the degree of job satisfaction among employees”. Brown & McIntosh (1998) “found that salary or pay has the smallest impact on overall job satisfaction and also attracts the attention of employers to certain noteworthy factors that have a major impact on job satisfaction among employees, such as working environment, bonus, canteen facilities, etc (Vrinda & Jacob, 2015)”. Pay was rated as the least motivating element by Hagos et al. (2015), whereas accomplishments were rated higher. There are also distinct workplace challenges that contribute to job unhappiness, such as perceived discrimination, cross-cultural communication gaps, and gender concerns (Madhavan, 2001). Employers must overcome any issues that stand in the way of their employees experiencing greater work satisfaction. Only people who are content with their jobs and the company they work for are able to fully commit to the company and fulfil its strategic objectives, thereby ensuring the company's competitive edge (Dessler, 2010). Employees that is happy in their jobs save money, time, and effort, resulting in higher productivity and a higher success rate for the company's overall output (Lal et al., 2015).

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

In today's workplace, the notion of job satisfaction and associated challenges are receiving a lot of attention. It has become critical for every employer to maintain a high level of work satisfaction since it has a direct impact on an organization's overall success. It's critical for every business to figure out how happy its workers are with their jobs. It was discovered, however, that there were relatively few studies on academics' job satisfaction in underdeveloped nations while evaluating the literature. Many studies have been undertaken in western and wealthy nations, though. Initially, this was the reason why this issue was chosen for the current research. In addition, to answer questions such as: How satisfied are faculty members of aided colleges with motivation and hygienic factors? What is the relationship between employee (faculty members of aided institutions) work satisfaction and demographic variables? Because of this, it is necessary to answer the aforementioned issues, which is why this research is needed.

OBJECTIVES

- Surveying the overall work satisfaction (motivation and hygienic elements) of instructors at aided institutions.
- Gender, age, experience, and work habits all have a role in how happy employees are in their jobs.

RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

The present research project is a descriptive one. All applicable statistical procedures are being applied while keeping in mind the study challenge and its solution goal.

- **Sample Unit-** Teaching faculty from several aided institutions served as the sample unit for the present research.
- **Sample Frame-** Teachers from Kakatiya University's connected aided colleges make up the sampling frame (India).
- **Sampling Size-** The total sample size was restricted to 180 teachers including assistant professors, associate professor from art, science, commerce, management, other disciplines from the aided colleges affiliated to Kakatiya University, Kakatiya, Telangana (India).
- **Sampling Design-** Keeping in view the nature of data required, convenient-purposive sampling technique have been opted. The respondents for the survey have been selected from the aided colleges affiliated to Kakatiya University, Kakatiya located at Telangana.
- **Data Collection-** It took three months to gather data on faculty members at Kakatiya University-affiliated supported institutions in Kakatiya using a questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree).
- **Statistical Techniques-** The acquired data was analysed with the help of mean, standard deviation, one-way ANOVA, and T-test.

DATA ANALYSIS

Cronbach's alpha is more than 0.6 ($\alpha > 0.6$), which indicates that the survey instrument (questionnaire) is a credible tool for conducting this study. Teachers at aided institutions' work satisfaction are measured using the mean and standard deviation. The total faculty satisfaction mean is 3.72, with a standard deviation of 0.58, according to the findings (table 1). In order to measure work satisfaction, the mean and standard deviation are utilised.

Table 1: The total work satisfaction mean and standard deviation

	Mean	SD
Overall job satisfaction	3.72	0.58

Table 1 (a): Mean and standard deviation of motivational and hygiene factors

"Motivational Factors	Mean	SD	Hygiene Factors	Mean	SD
Promotion	3.88	0.57	Relationship with co-workers	4.06	0.49
Advancement	3.74	0.60	Relationship with administrator	3.79	0.44
Recognition	3.82	0.54	Policy	3.86	0.46
Appreciation	3.80	0.48	Salary	3.90	0.36

Achievement	3.92	0.32	Rules and procedures	3.76	0.43
Overall mean & SD of motivational factors	3.83	0.07	Overall mean & SD of hygiene factors	3.87	0.12

An employee's level of happiness at work is influenced more by hygiene elements than motivational ones, as shown in table 1 (a), which shows that hygiene aspects (mean 3.87, SD 0.12) are more important in boosting their level of happiness at work than motivating factors (mean 3.83, SD 0.07). Teachers are more content with success (mean 3.92, SD 0.32) because there are incentives for those who execute their job effectively and efficiently, as well as working for their current organisation will lead to the future they want. It is because of the accomplishments of 3.92 (SD 0.32), promotion (SD 0.57), acknowledgment (SD 0.54), and thankfulness (SD 0.48) that the average of the group's scores is 3.92. (mean 3.74, SD 0.60). Faculty members report the lowest levels of job satisfaction due to the institution's failure to provide enough resources for career advancement (mean 3.74; SD 0.60). When it comes to hygiene factors, “faculty members are more satisfied than non-faculty members with their relationship with coworkers (mean 4.06, SD 0.49), followed by their salary (mean 3.90, SD 0.36), the organization's policy (mean 3.86, SD 0.46), and the relationship between the faculty and administrator (mean 3.79, SD 0.44) (mean 3.76, SD 0.43)”. The least satisfactory hygiene aspect is rules and processes (mean 3.76, SD 0.43), which suggests that the current rules and procedures operate as a barrier to doing their work efficiently.

For faculty personnel, success, advancement, recognition, and appreciation rank highest, followed by appreciation from motivating elements, which rank the lowest in terms of satisfaction. As opposed to these two extremes, faculty members are most content when it comes to hygienic elements when it comes to their relationships with coworkers. They are less content when it comes to norms and procedures.

In order to achieve the study's second objective, the following assumptions have been developed:

Hypothesis: 1

H0: Overall job satisfaction is not diverging

with gender.H1: Overall satisfaction

diverges with gender.

Table 2
On the basis of gender

Variable	Total faculty		Male (111)		Female (69)		T-test	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Overall job satisfaction	3.73	0.57	3.71	0.61	3.74	0.53	-0.308	.255

To establish whether there was a substantial difference, the levels of happiness among male (111) and female (69) professors were compared. There is a T-test, a mean, a standard deviation, and Table 2 shows that the t value is negligible at 5%. That the level of overall pleasure differs by gender has been acknowledged as an alternate hypothesis (H1). The degree of work satisfaction differs significantly between men and women. Male and female faculty members are statistically different in their level of satisfaction with their jobs (mean 3.74; SD 0.53). There was a standard deviation of 0.61 in the mean.

Hypothesis: 2

H0: Overall satisfaction does not diverge

with experience.H1: Overall satisfaction diverges with experience.

Table 3
ANOVA on the basis of experience

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.941	3	.314	.933	.426
Within Groups	59.171	176	.336		
Total	60.111	179			

Table 3 (a)
Mean and Standard Deviation(On the basis of experience)

Experience	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
<5 years	43	3.70	0.67
5-10 years	84	3.67	0.52
10-15 years	14	3.79	0.58
>15 years	39	3.85	0.59

It's clear from Table 3 that the alternative hypothesis (H1) that overall satisfaction changes depending on experience is accepted because of the insignificant (.426) result at 5% significance. The data in [table-3(a)] shows that faculty members with 15 or more years of experience (mean 3.85, SD 0.59) are more pleased than those with less than 15 years of experience (mean 3.72, SD 0.06).

Hypothesis: 3

H0: Overall satisfaction does not diverge with age.H1: Overall satisfaction diverges with age.

Table 4

ANOVA on the basis of age

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.142	3	.381	1.136	.336

Within Groups	58.969	176	.335		
Total	60.111	179			

Table 4 (a)**Mean and Standard Deviation(On the basis of age)**

Experience	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Less than 25 years	31	3.68	0.70
25-35 years	68	3.68	0.50
35-45 years	33	3.67	0.65
Above 45 years	48	3.85	0.55

So the null hypothesis that the overall satisfaction does not differ according to age has been rejected by the data in Table 4 (.336). According to age, there is a variance in total pleasure. In terms of mean and standard deviation, faculty members who are over 45 years old (mean 3.85, SD 0.55) are more pleased than those who are under 45 years old (mean 3.68, SD 0.01).

Hypothesis: 4

H0: Discipline does not have any impact on overall satisfaction.H1: Discipline has an impact on overall satisfaction.

To analyze, the hypothesis that is there any difference in overall level of job satisfaction according to discipline, mean, standard deviation, ANOVA are used.

Table 5 ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.588	3	.196	.580	.629
Within Groups	59.523	176	.338		
Total	60.111	179			

Table 5 (a)
Mean and
Standard
Deviation(On the
basis of
discipline)

Discipline	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
------------	---	------	--------------------

Arts	53	3.79	0.45
Science	46	3.67	0.70
Commerce	37	3.76	0.55
Others	44	3.66	0.61”

Null hypothesis (H₀) are rejected since the values in Table 5 are statistically insignificant (.629) at a 5% significance level, indicating that there are differences in overall satisfaction across the disciplines. Art faculties are more satisfied (Mean 3.79 & SD 0.45), when compared to other discipline faculties (Mean 3.70, SD 0.62) as indicated by table 5(a).

DISCUSSION

Furthermore, in this study, the influence of demographic characteristics on faculty members' total work satisfaction, including age, gender, experience, and discipline, was examined. It was discovered that the level of pleasure varies according on gender. “There were no significant variations in job satisfaction between men and women found by Nigam & Jain (2014)”. Overall contentment is influenced by a person's age, education, and marital situation. As they became older and more experienced, their level of enjoyment grew as well. People with more work experience which may be due to their greater control over the workplace and more knowledge with any potential issues that come with the position. Sarker et al. (2003) also found a link between work satisfaction and length of service. According to Warr (1992), “older workers are more likely than younger ones to report feeling satisfied at work”. When it comes to the workplace, elder workers have a set of views that younger employees may not share (Clark et al., 1996). Hagos et al. (2015), on the other hand, came to the conclusion that age and teaching experience had no impact on overall work satisfaction. Employees' age and teaching experience had little or no effect on their work happiness (Hagos et al., 2015). There are several factors that contribute to job satisfaction, including the kind of work and the complexity of it. Art faculty members seem to be happier than faculty members in other academic fields, according to a recent study.

CONCLUSION

There is a significant chunk of a person's life dedicated to their job. An individual looks to have settled into the societal expectation of having a job. A person's job satisfaction is necessary in order to be satisfied with his or her work. When an employee is happy, they always do their best to complete their allotted tasks. Employees' feelings including factors related to motivation (achievement, advancement, recognition, and appreciation) and factors related to hygiene (relationships with coworkers, administrators, company policy, salary, and rules and procedures). Because employee contentment and discontent have a direct influence on an organization's success, employers should take the time to

consider all of these aspects thoroughly before making any hiring decisions.

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The current study's results provide some guidance for the future. Future studies should focus on the degree of work satisfaction among faculty members at different Kakatia institutions. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, is a more general phrase. Only a few motivating elements (promotion, accomplishment, recognition, progress and appreciation) and hygienic aspects (e.g., cleanliness) were taken into account in the current research (relationship with co-workers, relationship with administrator, policy, salary and rules & procedures). Due to this circumstance, the present study's scope was constrained. A future research should look at additional independent factors, such as career possibilities and status as well as the quality of supervision, fringe benefits, and working conditions to better understand faculty members' job satisfaction levels in aided schools. In addition, additional vocations might be included in the research.

REFERENCES

1. E. Dessler (2010), "A determination of the cloud feedback from climate variations over the past decade", *Science*, 330, pp: 1523–1527.
2. Mahalakshmi and S. Franklin John (2015), "A Study on the impact of Motivational Factors on employee Job Satisfaction with special reference to Tea Plantation Industries of Anamallais, Coimbatore District", *International Journal in Management and Social Science*, Vol: 3, Issue: 1, pp: 59-64.
3. Ravichandran, L. J. Soundara Rajan, G. Bala Sendhil Kumar (2015), "A Study on Job Satisfaction of Employees of Manufacturing Industry in Puducherry, India", *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, Vol: 4, Issue: 2, pp: 344-349.
4. Abdul Kadar Muhammad Masum, Md. Abul Kalam Azad and Loo-See Beh (2015), "Determinants of Academics' Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from Private Universities in Bangladesh", *PLOS ONE Journal*, Vol: 10, Issue: 2. (Available online at: journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=
5. Andrew Clark, Andrew Oswald & Peter Warr (1996), "Is Job Satisfaction U-Shaped in Age?", *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, Vol: 69, pp: 57-81.
6. Anshu Sarna (2015), "A Theoretical Model of Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment for Academicians in Technical and Management Institutes of Developing Countries like India and Review of Literature", *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research*, Vol: 4, Issue: 1, pp: 57-81.
7. Bala Pronay (2011), "Job Satisfaction of Non-Government College Teachers in Bangladesh", *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol: 2, No: 4.
8. D. Brown and McIntosh (1998), "If You're Happy and You Know It...Job Satisfaction in the Low

9. Daniela Nescoi (2011), “Stress and Job Satisfaction among University Teachers”, International Conference of Scientific Paper, pp: 320-325.
10. Dessler (2005), “Human Resource Management”, Pearson Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Inc; India, pp. 410.
11. Dr. Ms Pabla (2012), “A Study of Job Satisfaction among Teachers of Professional Colleges in Punjab”, Indian Journal of Research (PARIPEX), Vol: 1, Issue: 10.
12. Fiona J. Lancy and Barry A. Sheehan (1997), “Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff: An International Perspective”, Higher Education Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol: 34, pp: 305-322.
13. Gawel, Joseph E. (1997), “Herzberg's Theory of Motivation and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs”, ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, Washington, DC, [ED421486].
14. Gebrekiros Hagos, Kebede Abrha (2015), “Study on factors affecting Job Satisfaction in Mekelle University Academic Staff at Adi-Haqi Campus”, International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol: 5, Issue: 1, pp: 1-6.
15. Indu Bhushan Lal, Vibhawendra Pathak & Shiv Kant Kumar (2015), “A Study of Job Satisfaction in Software Industry– Myths and Realities”, International Journal of Emerging Research in Management & Technology, Vol: 4, Issue: 5, pp: 43-49.
16. J. L. Price (1997), Handbook of Organisational Measurement, International Journal of Manpower, pp. 303-558. Nabizadeh Tahere, Gharib Tarzeh Zahra, Dorbanai Fateme & Yaghoobi Jami Asma (2012), “Investigating the Effects of Job Experience, Satisfaction, and Motivation on Organizational Commitment Case Study: The Nurses of Ghaem Hospital in Mashhad, Iran”, Research Journal of Recent Sciences, Vol: 1, Issue: 7, pp: 59-67.
17. Nigam, Narander Kumar & Saumya, Jain (2014), “Gender based study on job satisfaction of Delhi University Faculty”, Indian Streams Research Journal, Vol: 3, Issue: 12. (Available online at: www.isrj.net).
18. Nitin Nayak & Madhumita Nayak (2014), “A Study Job Satisfaction Among University Teachers In India”, The Clute Institute International Academic Conference, Orlando, Florida, USA.
19. M. M. Petty, G. W. Mcgee, D. E. Gail, & J. W. Cavender (1984), “A Meta-analysis of the Relationships between Individual Job Satisfaction and Individual Performance”, Academy of Management Review, Vol: 9, Issue: 4, pp: 712- 721.
20. Peter Warr (1992), “Age and Occupational Well-being”, Psychology and Aging, Vol: 7, Issue: 1, pp: 37-45.

Sabri, M. Ilyas, & Z. Amjad (2011), “Organisational Culture and Its Impact on the Job Satisfaction of the University Teachers of Lahore”, International Journal of Business and Social Sciences, Vol: 2, Issue: 24.

Safdar Rehman Ghazi, Riasat Ali, Gulap Shahzada & Muhammad Israr (2009), “University Teachers’ Job Satisfaction in the North West Frontier Province of Pakistan, Asian Social Science, Vol: 6, Issue: 11, pp: 188-192.

Salman Khalid et al (2012), “Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff: A Comparative Analysis between Public and Private Sector Universities of Punjab, Pakistan”, International Journal of Business and Management, Vol: 7, Issue: 1.

Saraswati (2013), “A Study to measure Job Satisfaction Level amongst Lecturers of Government & Private Colleges in Delhi”, International Journal of Research & Development in Technology and Management Sciences, Vol: 20, Issue: 06.

Shah Jalal Sarker, Alf Crossman & Parkpoom Chinmeteeputuck (2003), “The Relationships of Age and Length of Service with Job Satisfaction: An Examination of Hotel Employees in Thailand”, Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol: 18, Issue: 7, pp: 745-758.

Schwab & DeVitt (1971), “A test of the adequacy of the two factor theory as a predictor of self-report performance effects”, Personnel Psychology, Vol: 24, Issue: 2, pp: 293-303.

S.M. Madhavan, (2001), “The Job Satisfaction level of Chinese and Indian-born Engineering Faculty at a Research University”, Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.

S. Sesanga, Karim & Garrett, Roger M. (2005), “Job satisfaction of University academics: Perspectives from Uganda” Vol: 50, pp: 33–56.

Tripti Singh, Aventika Singh and Prabha Singh (2007), “Relationship of Stress and Job Satisfaction: A Comparative study of Male & Female of Dual Career Teacher Couples of India”, IIM Bangalore Research Paper No: 263 (Available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2144720> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2144720>).

Vrinda NN, Nisha Ann Jacob (2015), “The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Job Performance”, International Journal in Commerce, IT and Social Sciences, Vol: 2, Issue: 2, pp: 27-37.

Wikipedia (2014), “Job Satisfaction”, Available at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/jobsatisfaction> accessed on 12th January, 2019.