

Determinants of Faculty Members Job Satisfaction

Dr. Allan A. Lalosa¹, Dr. Alirose A. Lalosa² and Prof. Verna A. Amboy³

¹ College of Business Management and Accountancy, Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City, Eastern Samar, 6800, Philippines

² College of Business Management and Accountancy, Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City, Eastern Samar, 6800, Philippines

³ College of Business Management and Accountancy, Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City, Eastern Samar, 6800, Philippines

Abstract

This study reveals the determinants of faculty members' job satisfaction. The data were collected through survey questionnaires distributed to 32 faculty members of the College of Business Management and Accountancy (CBMA) of Eastern Samar State University (ESSU) – Borongan Main Campus. Both descriptive and correlational methods were utilized to achieve the study objectives. It was found out that the determinants of job satisfaction were age, employment status, and years of work experience. It was concluded that faculty members were very satisfied with their job, however with lesser degree of satisfaction on compensation. It was recommended that the university should consider developing policies that will improve incentives and benefits, will provide opportunities for advancement and promotion, will utilize skills and talents, and adds faculty leisure.

Keywords: *Job Satisfaction, Faculty, Working Condition, Compensation, Work Relationship.*

1. Introduction

Faculty of a state university plays an important role in human development. They are always at the forefront of developing students to become productive members of society. Job satisfaction among faculty is necessary for them to effectively share their expertise and for the students to attain quality education. Without satisfaction, the faculty can't render the best service to the university.

At present, faculty members are facing many challenges in education and society which may affect their competence, performance, and level of job satisfaction. Issues and concerns regarding the attitude of educators towards their work and their level of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are all over the news in television and social media.

With the increasing number of enrollments of the college every year, there will be more working pressure on the faculty. This may lead to frustration and dissatisfaction if neglected by top management or authorities. However, it is difficult to apply the incentive measures if we do not know what influence faculty satisfaction.

The success of an institution relies on its academic workforce, the faculty. According to Taskina and Akhler (2009), universities may give more attention to motivate and maintain these human resources to make them more contented and to make the most of their effort by ensuring overall excellence of the organization. Recognizing that job satisfaction of faculty in a university is important, will improve faculty performance through the delivery of quality education to students and will affect the goodwill image of the university. Thus, this research will be conducted.

Objectives

1. To determine the personal profile of the faculty.
2. To measure the level of job satisfaction.
3. To determine the best indicator of job satisfaction.
4. To determine if the personal profile is significantly related to the level of job satisfaction.
5. To identify the common suggestions of the faculty to improve their level of job satisfaction.

Significance of the Study

The intent of this study would be valuable and of great significance to the following, to wit:

Top Management. The result of this study will give them positive ideas on the possible action to implement to increase the satisfaction and quality of work of the faculty. This will help them to identify why faculty members are lagging and be able to plan better solutions and assess their needs.

The faculty members. The result of this study is a reflection of how they view fulfillment at work. The support of top management and supervisors may inspire them to be competent faculty and pursue their passion to teach. This will provide practical guidance on how they can overcome obstacles and achieve optimal job satisfaction.

The Future Researchers. This study would serve as a basis in doing the same kind of research undertaken in a wider scope and coverage.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study is conducted to measure the level of job satisfaction of CBMA faculty members and to find out the best indicator of job satisfaction to identify what could improve their level of satisfaction.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and concepts were defined either conceptually or operationally in this study.

CBMA. This refers to the College of Business Management and Accountancy of ESSU main campus where the study was conducted.

CBMA Faculty. Operationally, it refers to all faculty members of the five programs of the College of Business Management and Accountancy.

Compensation. In this study, it is the direct and indirect incentives paid to the faculty member in exchange for his/her work performed as mentors to college students.

ESSU. This refers to Eastern Samar State University, the only university in the province of Eastern Samar where the study was conducted.

Facilities. This means the physical facilities of the university that helps in providing a smooth delivery of the instruction process.

Job Satisfaction. As used in this study this means the amount of contentment and fulfillment of the faculty members in their job that affect their performance and productivity.

Work activities. As used in this study, this refers to the job responsibilities amidst the functions of the faculty in instruction, research, and extension.

Working condition. Operationally, this refers to the quality of work performed by a faculty member as related to job satisfaction.

Work relationships. Operationally, this means the relationship status among faculty members that may affect their performance at work.

2. Review of Related Literature and Studies

The existence of human resources in an organization, in the case of universities the faculty, is of priceless value that management needs to satisfy them to become effective mentors.

Several studies have been conducted to find out which determine job satisfaction and the way it influences productivity in the organization. A significant part of a person's life is dedicated to working and job satisfaction is a crucial indicator of employment (Bota, 2013). According to Buhlev and Scott, as cited in the study of Anju and Sona (2011), modern businesses cannot afford not to make employee satisfaction a top priority.

The job satisfaction of the faculty members plays a vital role in students' education. When teachers are satisfied with their job then only they can perform their responsibilities with more concentration and devotion. Job satisfaction among faculty members is good not only for themselves but for society as a whole. The factors that determine job satisfaction vary according to gender, age, experience and position (Unnamalai, 2015).

Castillo and Cano (2004) found out that faculty were generally satisfied with their jobs. The factor “work itself” was the most motivating aspect for faculty while the least motivating aspect was “working condition”. The demographic characteristics were negligibly related to overall job satisfaction.

According to Nifadkar and Dongre as cited in the study of Unnamalai (2015), to ensure a high level of job satisfaction of teachers there is a need to enhance their salary. This is needed to satisfy the pay need of the teachers and also improve the public image and self – esteem of teachers. Teachers working conditions should also be improved to ensure that highly qualified and very experienced teachers are retained in the schools.

It was revealed by Leelavathy as cited in the study of Unnamalai (2015) that job satisfaction variable were positively related to teacher-student relationships, job involvement and role change while, salary, discipline and work environment were negatively related with job satisfaction among women teachers.

Job satisfaction is also understood as a way of reporting the individual to his work situation and is determined by several factors like age, education, skills, work experience, organizational climate, working condition, policy and organizational management (Bota, 2013).

Flaherty (2018) said that most full-time faculty members across institutions are satisfied with their work. At the same time, many professors report an increase in their workload and dissatisfaction with increasing levels of bureaucracy.

Interpersonal relationships among employees serve as a source of support, comfort, advice, and assistance to the individual group members and it will have a positive impact on job satisfaction. Incentives provided to employees based on their performance boosts the morale of the employees (Anju and Sona 2011).

Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) found out that faculty members are more satisfied with their job when they perceive that their colleagues respect their research work and they are paid what they are worth. Women tend to be less satisfied and the tenured are more satisfied.

Kadtong, Unos, Antok, and Midzid (2017) revealed that the majority of the teachers are somewhat satisfied with school policies, supervision, interpersonal relations, opportunities for promotion and growth, working conditions, work itself, achievement, recognition, and responsibility. This result implies that a teacher satisfied with their job is also productive. If the teachers are contented with their jobs, they develop and maintain a high level of performance. The age, highest educational attainments, and length of service were significant to job satisfaction while sex, civil status was noted having significant difference to job satisfaction.

It was concluded by Taskina and Akhler (2009) that faculty members are overall satisfied with their present condition except on training facilities, some physical facilities, and distribution of courses. It was also revealed that there is no significant difference between male and female faculty members' job satisfaction.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This study is based on the Motivation theory of Herzberg, Mausner, and Syndermeen (1959), as cited by Castillo and Cano (2004) that jobs had specific factors that affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These factors which are considered as determinants of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. This will help assess employee's level of satisfaction on the different aspects of their work and will serve as a guide in realizing this present study.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study uses both descriptive and correlational methods to achieve the research objectives. This was conducted in the College of Business Management and Accountancy of Eastern Samar State University-Main Campus.

3.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted at the College of Business Management and Accountancy located at Eastern Samar State University-Main Campus, Maypangdan, Borongan City. The college offers five programs namely, Bachelor of Science in Accountancy, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship, Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management and Bachelor of Science in Tourism Management.

3.3 Respondents

All CBMA faculty members were the respondents of this study. These 32 faculty members are teaching different courses and the core faculty of the five programs namely, BS Business Administration, BS Entrepreneurship, BS Accountancy, BS Hospitality Management, and BS Tourism Management, offered by the college.

3.4 Data Gathering Procedure

The respondents were asked to answer the interview questionnaire honestly. The researchers personally administer the questionnaire to faculty respondents.

3.5 Statistical Treatment of Data

The data was analyzed through the R Commander to realize the objectives of the study. The data gathered were tallied, tabulated and analyzed using statistical measures like mean, frequency count and percentage to present the personal profile of respondents and to identify the common suggestions of the faculty to improve their level of job satisfaction. Weighted mean was used to determine the level of job satisfaction which was given qualitative description using the scale below.

Scale	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative description
4.21 – 5.0	Extremely Satisfied	The faculty is extremely satisfied in doing his job
3.41 – 4.20	Very Satisfied	The faculty is very satisfied in doing his job
2.61 – 3.40	Satisfied	The faculty is satisfied with doing his job
1.81 – 2.60	Dissatisfied	The faculty is dissatisfied with his job
1.0 – 1.80	Very Dissatisfied	The faculty very dissatisfied with his job

To find out the best indicator of job satisfaction ranking method was used. Furthermore, inferential statistics like Spearman Rank, Kruskal Wallis, and One-way ANOVA were used to test if the personal profile is significantly related to the level of job satisfaction.

4. Results and Discussion

The responses are presented in tabular form and are analyzed and interpreted according to the sequence specified in the objectives. The profile of the faculty members as respondents consists of age, years of work experience, present rank, employment status, and educational attainment.

Table 1. 1 Profile of the respondents

Variable	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Age	38.91	25	60
Years of Work Experience	11. 10	.25	35

The table above presents the profile of the respondents according to age and years of work experience. The respondents consisted of 32 faculty members of the college. The mean age for faculty was 38.91 or 38 years and 11 months old while the mean number of years of work as a faculty was 11.10 or eleven years and 1.2 months. Further, this agrees to the study of Unnamalai (2015) that aside from gender and position, age and experience are factors that determine job satisfaction.

Table 1.2 Profile of the respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentages
Present rank		
Associate Professor V	1	3.12
Associate Professor III	1	3.12
Associate Professor I	1	3.12
Assistant Professor III	1	3.12
Assistant Professor II	2	6.25
Assistant Professor I	1	3.12
Instructor III	3	9.38
Instructor I	19	59.38
Lecturer	3	9.38
Employment Status		
Permanent	21	65.62
Temporary	8	25
Lecturer	3	9.38
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor’s Degree with MA units/CAR	10	31.25
Doctorate Degree	5	15.62
Master’s Degree	6	18.75
With Doctorate units/CAR	11	34.38

Table 1.2 presents the profile of respondents according to present rank, employment status, and educational attainment. It shows that majority of the respondents (59.38%) belong to the Instructor I rank followed by the Instructor III and Lecturer position, 9.38%; Assistant Professor II, 6.25%, followed by those respondents

having the position of Assistant Professor I, III and Associate Professor I, III and V with only 3.12% distribution respectively. The data implies that most of the respondents belong to the lowest rank. This means that most of the faculty members are making less income or salary. To enjoy reclassification or promotion of rank the respondents need to earn points in instruction, research and extension for a higher rank in National Budget Circular (NBC) 461 evaluation. A faculty with very satisfactory performance in all functions will earn points for NBC 461 and may be promoted to a higher rank and correspondingly enjoy a higher salary.

Table 1.2 also shows that the majority of the respondents (65.62%) are permanently employed followed by faculty respondents with temporary status, 25%; and lecturer faculty respondents 9.38%. This trend shows that most respondents are receiving indirect benefits and incentives aside from the basic salary. They will feel secure to do their best work and need not worry and stress about the possibility that they could be replaced anytime. With the faculty development program offered by the university, the temporary and lecturers respondents may avail of the scholarship for them to earn a master's degree and be permanently appointed.

The data also show that most of the faculty members (34.38%) have earned doctorate units and/or certificate of academic requirements followed by bachelor's degree with master's units and/or certificate of academic requirements, 31.25%; master's degree respondents, 18.75; and with doctorate respondents 15.62%. These findings disclose that most respondents are pursuing further studies leading to a higher degree and so would be expected to deliver effective instruction, conduct research and participate in the extension activities of the college.

Table 2. Level of job satisfaction

Level of Job Satisfaction	Means	Interpretation
Working Condition	3.80	Very Satisfied
No. of hours worked	3.88	Very Satisfied
Location of work	3.97	Very Satisfied
Flexibility of work	3.78	Very Satisfied
Leave credits	3.56	Very Satisfied
Compensation	3.23	Satisfied
Salary	3.18	Satisfied
Benefits/Incentives	3.12	Satisfied
Recognition for work accomplished/achievement	3.16	Satisfied
Opportunities for advancement/promotion (training & further studies)	3.44	Very Satisfied
Security of tenure	4.03	Very Satisfied
Work Relationships	3.91	Very Satisfied
Opportunities to utilize skills and talents	3.75	Very Satisfied
Fair treatment of superiors/higher authorities	3.78	Very Satisfied
Getting along well with colleagues	4.18	Very Satisfied
Work Activities	3.74	Very Satisfied
Variety of job responsibilities	3.66	Very Satisfied
Degree of independence associated with work roles	3.87	Very Satisfied
Interesting and enjoyable work activities	3.68	Very Satisfied
Overall Level of Job Satisfaction	3.67	Very Satisfied

Based on a five-point Likert type scale with responses ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to extremely satisfied (5), the result of the overall level of job satisfaction was 3.67 (n = 32). This shows that the faculty members of

the college are generally very satisfied with their work. The highest job satisfaction level is seen in work relationships with 3.91 interpreted as very satisfied. This implies that most faculty members like their colleagues. Work relationships especially getting along well with fellow faculty members is the top indicator that positively affected their overall job satisfaction. This finding supports the study of Anju and Sona (2011) that interpersonal relationships among employees serve as a source of support, comfort, advice, and assistance to the individual group members and it will have a positive impact on job satisfaction.

The findings also show that compensation matters but it is not everything as evidenced by the result of 3.23 interpreted as satisfied. However, this suggests that providing the faculty enough compensation may further increase their level of job satisfaction. The result of the study agrees with the findings of Castillo and Cano (2004) that faculty were generally satisfied with their jobs. However, it contradicts the findings that the factor “work itself” was the most motivating aspect for faculty while the least motivating aspect was “working condition”. This study also finds support from the study of Calvin Mzwenhlanhla Mabaso and Bongani Innocent Dlamini (2017) that there is a significant effect of compensation to job satisfaction.

Table 3. Ranking of indicators of job satisfaction

Level of Job Satisfaction	Means	Rank
Work Relationships	3.91	1st
Working Condition	3.80	2nd
Work Activities	3.74	3rd
Compensation	3.23	4th
Overall Level of Job Satisfaction	3.67	

Table 3 shows the ranking of indicators of job satisfaction. The first rank is work relationships, followed by working conditions as the second rank, the third rank is work activities and the last rank is compensation. The findings suggest that the best indicator of job satisfaction is compensation. Pay and benefits may not always be the biggest motivator for faculty as in this study, they are satisfied with their compensation, but by paying faculty enough to sustain their needs will certainly help them to be productive and work harder to demonstrate that they deserve the pay they receive. The findings of this study confirm the study of Nifadkar and Dongre as cited in the study of Unnamalai (2015), that to ensure a high level of job satisfaction of teachers there is a need to enhance their salary. This is needed to satisfy the pay need of the teachers and also improve the public image and self – esteem of teachers. Further, Anju and Sona (2011) confirms that incentives provided to employees based on their performance boost the morale of the employees.

Table 4. Relationship of respondents’ profile to their level of job satisfaction

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	P-value	Correlation/Diff . in Mean	Interpretation
Age	Job Satisfaction			
	Working Condition	.11	-.29	NS
	Compensation	.06	-.32	NS
	Work Relationship	.26	-.20	NS
	Work Activities	.06	-.34	NS
Rank	Overall Job Satisfaction	.03	-.36	S
	Working Condition	.82	-	NS

	Compensation	.80	-	NS
	Work Relationship	.29	-	NS
	Work Activities	.49	-	NS
	Overall Job Satisfaction	.75	-	NS
Employment Status	Job Satisfaction			
	Working Condition	.11	-	NS
	Compensation	.00	Temporary > Permanent	S
	Work Relationship	.29	-	NS
	Work Activities	.49	-	NS
	Overall Job Satisfaction	.00	Temporary > Permanent	S
Years of Work Experience	Job Satisfaction			
	Working Condition	.17	-.25	NS
	Compensation	.00	-.47	S
	Work Relationship	.12	-.28	NS
	Overall Job Satisfaction	.05	-.35	S
Educational Level	Job Satisfaction			
	Working Condition	.772	-	NS
	Compensation	.174	-	NS
	Work Relationship	.890	-	NS
	Overall Job Satisfaction	.268	-	NS
		.588	-	NS

Table 4 shows the relationship of respondents' profile to their level of job satisfaction. The hypothesis was tested at .05 level of significance and test of normality was done using Shapiro Wilk. Spearman rank was used to test if age and years of work experience are correlated to the faculty's job satisfaction. On the other hand, One-way ANOVA and Kruskal Wallis were used accordingly to test if rank, employment status, and educational level are factors of job satisfaction.

Based on the analysis, age was found out to be negatively related to job satisfaction ($\rho = -.36, p < .05$). This implies that younger faculty members are more satisfied than the older ones. This finding is similar to the finding of Unnamalai (2015) stating that age is one of the factors that influence job satisfaction. Employment status was also found to be a variable that influences job satisfaction. The difference lies in compensation between temporary and permanent faculty. Temporary faculty members have shown higher job satisfaction than the permanent ones. This only means that temporary faculty members are more satisfied with their compensation than the permanent faculty.

Years of work experience was another factor found to be negatively correlated with job satisfaction ($\rho = -.40, p < .05$). Specifically, it is negatively correlated to compensation and work activities. This result means that faculty with few years of experience are more satisfied with their compensation and work activities than those with long years of experience. It can be inferred that new entries and those with just a few years of teaching experience were more contented with their compensation and enjoy their work activities at higher degree compared to those who have more years of teaching experience.

However, rank and educational level are variables not found to influence the level of faculty job satisfaction. This result contradicts the findings of Guo (2017) that professional rank is the most important factor for teachers in the university. Further, the result of the study revealed that younger faculty even with temporary

status and with few years of teaching experience has shown higher satisfaction because at first a faculty or any employee for that matter is motivated to work to satisfy basic physiological needs for survival before moving to a higher level need. As a person grows older, his wants and needs change and increase thus, resulting in a decrease of a certain level of satisfaction from his job if some of his wants and needs are not satiated.

Table 5. Suggestions of faculty to improve the level of their job satisfaction

Suggestions	Frequency	Rank
Provide additional benefits/incentives like healthcare and others	9	1
Increase salary	5	2
Develop work activities to utilize the skills and talents of faculty	3	3
Lessen reportorial works/paperwork	2	4.5
Provide more opportunities for professional advancement	2	4.5

Table 5 shows the consolidated suggestions of faculty that will help in improving their job satisfaction. The first in rank suggestion having the highest frequency was “provide additional benefits/incentives like healthcare and others”. The second was “increase salary”, followed by “enhance work activities to utilize skills and talents of faculty”. The last in rank suggestions were “Lessen reportorial works/paperwork” and “Provide more opportunities for professional advancement”.

Based on this result, it is revealed that suggestions on improving job satisfaction fall on improving compensation. The findings confirm the study of Calvin Mzwenhlanhla Mabaso and Bongani Innocent Dlamini (2017) that higher education institutions must improve their compensation strategy to boost employees' dedication that will enable commitment, while efficiently deliver outstanding results. Indicators like salary, benefits/incentives, recognition for work accomplished/achievement, opportunities for advancement/promotion (training & further studies) were suggested to be taken into account. Work activities that will utilize faculty's skills and talents and lessening of reportorial works/paper works were also disclosed to improve the faculty's job satisfaction.

It can be inferred from this result that faculty members highly value compensation, skills and talents, and leisure time.

5. Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the findings of this study it is concluded that CBMA faculty members are very satisfied with their job, however with lesser degree of satisfaction on compensation which is determined by age, employment status, and years of work experience.

The result showed that faculty members have a mean age of 38 years and 11 months, with an average of 11 years and 1.2 months of work experience. The majority of them are Instructor I, with a permanent position, and with Doctorate units/CAR. They were very satisfied with their job, however with a lesser degree of satisfaction on compensation which was found to be the best indicator of their job satisfaction.

Age, employment status, and years of work experience are the factors found to influence job satisfaction, specifically compensation. On the other hand, rank and educational level do not influence the faculty's job satisfaction. The following are the top suggestions direct on improving compensation, work activities, and leisure.

1. The university should take into account the improvement of faculty Incentives/Benefits with emphasis on age, employment status, and years of work experience.
2. Since salary increases with promotion, the university must provide more opportunities for advancement and promotion.
3. The University or College must develop work activities that will utilize faculty skills and talents, and will add to their leisure.
4. Further study is suggested to understand the determinants of faculty members' job satisfaction to improve their productivity.

References

- [1] Bota, Oana. (2013). Job Satisfaction of Teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*.83.634-638.10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.120
- [2] Bozeman, B., and Gaughan, M. (2011). Job Satisfaction Among University Faculty: Individual, Work and Institutional Determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-186. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29789513>
- [3] Calvin Mzwenhlanhla Mabaso and Bongani Innocent Dlamini. (2017). Impact of Compensation and Benefits on Job Satisfaction. *Research Journal of Business Management*, 11: 80-90. DOI: 10.3923/rjbm.2017.80.90 URL: <https://scialert.net/abstract/?doi=rjbm.2017.80.90>
- [4] Castillo, Jaime X. and Cano, Jamie. (2004). Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction Among Faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*. Vol. 45, Number 3, pp 65-74. DOI:10.5032/jae.2004.03065
- [5] Flaherty, C. (2018). New Data on Faculty Job Satisfaction. insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2018/03/09/new-data-faculty-job-satisfaction
- [6] Guo, L., Wang, B. (2017). What Determines Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Universities?. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 13(8), 5893-5903 <https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017-010389>
- [7] K J, Anju, and George, Sona. (2011). A Study on Job Satisfaction of Employees in BPCL – KOCHI Refinery Limited, Ambalamugal.
- [8] Kadtong, Maeda Langguyuan, and Unos, Musa and Antok, Tomanda D. and Midzid, Muhamad Ali E. (2017). Teaching Performance and Job Satisfaction Among Teachers at Region XII. *Proceedings Journal of Education, Psychology and Social Science Research*, Volume 4, Issue 1, SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3169846> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3169846>
- [9] Taskina, Ali and Akhler, Ireen. (2009). Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members in Private Universities-In Context of Bangladesh. *International Business Research*. 2.10.5539;br.v2n4p167
- [10] Unnamalai, T. (2015). A Study on Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members (With Special Reference to Arts and Science Colleges in Tiruchirapalli). *International Journal of Management*. Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp. 161-170 <http://www.iame.com/IJM.asp>