

Impact of Demographic Diversities on Job Satisfaction Among Academicians in Higher Education Institutions (HEIS)

Debasish Kanungo,

Research Scholar, Department of MBA, CV Raman Global University.
debasishkanungo2c@gmail.com,

Dr. Sanjita Lenka,

Associate Professor, HOD, Department of Business Management, C.V. Raman Global University
sanjitalenka@cgu-odisha.ac.in,

Dr. Leena P. Singh,

Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Ravenshaw University,
leenapsingh@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the level of job satisfaction among Academicians in Higher Education Institutions in India. In order to accomplish this objective, a cross-sectional research methodology was utilised. The researcher employed the proportionate stratified random sampling approach to choose a sample of 274 Academicians. The collected data was subjected to analysis using appropriate statistical techniques, such as calculating the Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation, T-test, and One-way ANOVA. The results of the study suggested a considerable proportion of Academicians in India have a moderate degree of job satisfaction.

The primary objective of this study is to assess the job satisfaction levels of Higher education academicians in India. To achieve this goal, the research employed a cross-sectional research methodology. The researcher opted for the proportionate stratified random sampling technique to select a representative sample of 274 Academicians, ensuring that the sample reflected the diversity of the instructor population.

The key findings of the study shed light on the job satisfaction landscape among academicians of higher education in India. The result indicated that a substantial proportion of these educators report a moderate degree of job satisfaction. This observation is of paramount significance, as job satisfaction plays a pivotal role in the overall well-being and performance of instructors. Understanding the factors contributing to this moderate level of job satisfaction can enlighten future initiatives and policies aimed at improving the working conditions and job satisfaction of academicians of higher education in India.

Keywords: job satisfaction, academicians of higher education, cross-sectional research, proportionate stratified random sampling, moderate degree.

1. Introduction

Universities play a crucial role in the realm of higher education, serving as essential centres that fulfil many functions in the pursuit of knowledge, advancement of equality, and facilitation of societal leadership. The satisfaction of university educators with their employment is of utmost significance,

given the significant allocation of resources from governmental entities such as the UGC (University Grants Commission) originating from both state and central funding. Job satisfaction plays a crucial role in optimising the impact of universities on society, namely in moulding the future human capital of the nation.

The efficacy of a university in achieving its goals is contingent upon its ability to attract, maintain, and cultivate a competent and knowledgeable faculty. Currently, Academicians in HIEs are faced with a multitude of issues arising from the changing educational environment and societal factors, which have the potential to impact their job satisfaction levels. Therefore, it is imperative to investigate the attitudes of academicians towards their profession and evaluate their levels of job satisfaction or unhappiness.

The level of job satisfaction is a crucial determinant associated with the retention or attrition of academicians within a higher education institution. Understanding the complexities of job satisfaction holds significance in improving the professional experiences of academicians. In the domain of higher education, the achievement of excellence in teaching and research is heavily contingent upon the level of happiness experienced by university instructors.

Given the aforementioned context, the primary objective of this study is to examine the level of job satisfaction among university educators throughout India. It is important to acknowledge the crucial role they fulfil in shaping the landscape of higher education and, consequently, the future of the nation.

Job satisfaction in a general sense, job satisfaction encompasses the comprehensive feeling of fulfilment that individuals in their respective positions encounter. The concept of job satisfaction comprises a spectrum of positive or negative emotions and sentiments that employees identify with their work. According to the scholarly work of Locke (1976), the concept of job satisfaction can be delineated as a state characterised by pleasure and positivity, which emanates from an individual's occupation and the comprehensive work encounter. When individuals experience job satisfaction, they typically display favourable and pleasurable dispositions towards their employment. The expression of positive attitude serves as an indicator of an individual's level of job satisfaction.

2. Problem statement

Academicians often express apprehensions regarding inadequate involvement in the decision-making process pertaining to policy changes and perceived infringements upon their entitlements within the realm of education. These aforementioned concerns frequently result in feelings of irritation and dissatisfaction, which ultimately have negative implications for the dedication and effectiveness of educators. As a result, there is an increasing focus on the importance of job satisfaction in the field of education.

The present study aims to examine the level of job satisfaction among academicians (HEIs) throughout India.

3. Significance of the Study

Individuals who possess a strong sense of job satisfaction typically have favourable attitudes towards their profession. Understanding the levels of job satisfaction among academicians in HEIs holds importance within this particular environment. The presence of any dissatisfaction among individuals within the group has the potential to hinder their overall performance and their ability to provide education of superior quality. This particular situation has the potential to have a negative impact on the overall reputation and status of the university.

4. Review of Literature

In the realm of job satisfaction, numerous studies have delved into the factors influencing contentment among employees in different professional settings. This review compiles and synthesizes findings from a selection of studies conducted over the years, each focusing on distinct professions and facets of job satisfaction.

Kendirkiran, Gülcan & Batur, Burcu (2022): This study investigates how job satisfaction among academicians impacts their dietary choices. It involved 147 professors and instructors from a European Istanbul university. The findings suggest that young age academicians with at least five years of experience express high job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is notably higher for men than women and there is an adverse association between eating behaviours and job satisfaction. This research was constrained to one institution due to the pandemic and it emphasizes the need for more frequent assessments of academic staffs' job satisfaction.

Ağalday, B. (2022): This study explores academic alienation, work satisfaction, and organizational deviance among Turkish academics. The research included 257 Turkish academics and employed structural equation modelling (SEM). The study concludes that academic alienation can lead to organizational deviance, and increasing job satisfaction may deter misconduct among professors.

P. D. Duty (2022): This quantitative, non-experimental research examines the relationship between a manager's sensitivity to subordinates' generational needs and their job satisfaction. The results show that managers who consider generational perspectives have happier employees. Additionally, a supervisor's involvement in a professional development series strongly affects employee satisfaction.

Durmuş, İbrahim (2022): This study investigates how Turkish academics' job satisfaction is influenced by their career advancement, financial gain, and career anxieties. The research employs convenience sampling and quantitative methods. It identifies the impact of career advancement and financial gain on happiness, while career anxieties reduce it.

M. Aboramadan, K. Dahleez, and M.H. Hamad (2021): This research examines how servant leadership influences higher education academics' professional engagement and emotional commitment through job satisfaction. The findings suggest that servant leadership enhances emotional commitment and job satisfaction among faculty members. The study emphasizes the need for leadership that engages academics and binds them to their institutions.

Miha Marić, Ivan Todorović, and Jasmina Žnidaršić (2021): This study explores work-life conflict, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction among European college teachers. It finds that work-life conflict negatively impacts job and life satisfaction. Maintaining work-life balance is crucial for academics' well-being and productivity.

Ayu & Min, Nik & Ishak, Muhammad & Yusri, Nur (2021): This research investigates how job satisfaction influences personal happiness among Malaysian public university staff. It reveals that salary, co workers, management, job characteristics, and promotion positively correlate with job satisfaction. The study highlights the need for university managers to consider policies that enhance employee satisfaction and well-being.

Monga et al., (2015): A study conducted by Monga, Verma, and O. P. Monga delved into the job satisfaction levels of employees at ICICI bank in Himachal Pradesh. Their findings emphasized the significant impact of variables such as salary, interpersonal relationships, communication, superiors' attitudes, working conditions, and teamwork on job satisfaction, surpassing other factors like training and development, rewards, and role clarity.

Rafique et al., (2014): Rafique et al. investigated factors influencing job satisfaction among employees in private organizations in Pakistan. Their findings pointed to various elements that positively impact job satisfaction, including empowerment, compensation, organizational goal clarity, appraisal systems, working environment, training opportunities, management behaviour, and motivation.

Munshi,(2012): Munshi's comparative analysis of job satisfaction among management lecturers at MBA colleges in Gujarat indicated the absence of a consistent correlation between wage levels and job satisfaction. However, certain correlations emerged, including years of professional experience, age, student intake capacity, and the satisfaction levels of educators.

Strydom et al., (2012): Strydom et al. explored variations in job satisfaction across racial groups, highlighting notable disparities while finding no statistically significant differences based on gender.

Muindi (2011): Muindi's research investigated the relationship between engagement in decision-making processes and job satisfaction among academic personnel at the University of Nairobi. The study revealed a robust positive association between individuals' job satisfaction levels and their degree of involvement in decision-making processes.

Shabbir et al., (2011): Shabbir, Ahmed, Lawler, and Shahbaz's study highlighted the strong associations between job satisfaction and multiple parameters, including compensation and benefits, interpersonal interactions with colleagues, and working conditions.

Ghazi et al., (2011): Ghazi, Shahzad, Shahzada, and Gillani's investigation explored job satisfaction among head teachers, focusing on a range of job characteristics. The findings demonstrated that elements like educational institution rules and procedures, societal standing, remuneration, and working conditions were linked to reduced satisfaction. Nevertheless, head teachers expressed significant contentment in areas such as career prospects, creative expression, social service, recognition, job stability, and various aspects of their roles.

Olorunsola, (2010): Olorunsola's study centered on male and female administrative employees in universities in Nigeria. The research unveiled a notable degree of job satisfaction among administrative personnel across federal and state universities. However, it also pointed to a significant disparity in satisfaction levels between male and female staff within similar institutions.

Worrell, (2004): The study was examining the satisfaction level of school psychologists, it was revealed that a substantial, 90% of school psychologists expressed job satisfaction. Key drivers of their satisfaction included work security, opportunities for innovation and independence. Additionally, a significant correlation emerged between job satisfaction and two crucial variables: the intention to remain in one's current position and supervisor certification.

These studies collectively shed light on the diverse factors influencing job satisfaction across various professions and offer valuable insights for both practitioners and researchers seeking to understand and enhance employee satisfaction in different settings.

5. Objective of the study

The present study is motivated by following objectives:

1. To evaluate the overall level of job satisfaction among academicians in HEIs.
2. To evaluate the different dimensions of job satisfaction.
3. To identify potential differences in job satisfaction levels based on factors such as age, gender, and educational qualifications among academicians in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in India.

6. Hypotheses

This study establishes and examines the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There exists no significant disparity in job satisfaction levels with regard to age.

Hypothesis 2: There exists no significant disparity in job satisfaction levels with relation to genders.

Hypothesis 3: There exists no significant disparity in job satisfaction levels based on educational attainment.

7. Scope of the study

This study focuses on examining job satisfaction among academicians of higher education within India. The study will involve academicians from various job positions within the HEIs. The participants may encompass a range of demographic characteristics. The research is limited to the Higher education sector with a primary emphasis on understanding job satisfaction factors and levels within the context. The study will be conducted in Odisha. The research will explore the determinants of job satisfaction, including factors such as work conditions, pay, and relationships with colleagues, and supervisory support. The study will cover a defined period, from 2022 to 2023, to gather data and assess job satisfaction within this timeframe.

8. Research Methodology

This study utilises a cross-sectional research design, which is distinguished by its descriptive nature and the use of quantitative methodology. The subject of analysis in this study is the geographical area of Odisha, which is partitioned into five discrete divisions: central, North Odisha, Western Odisha, capital, and eastern Odisha. One university has been chosen from each of these divisions to be included in the research. The selected institutions are Utkal University, Ravenshaw University, and Fakir Mohan University.

The target population of this research consists of full-time permanent academicians who hold positions as assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, and who have been appointed by the chosen institutions. In order to get a sample that accurately represents the population, the method of proportional stratified random sampling has been used. This methodology involves dividing the population into several strata based on both institution affiliation and job categorization. The methodology used in this study included the selection of a sample size equivalent to 28.75% of the whole population.

In this particular study, the sample size included a total of 274 university lecturers. The process of data collecting involves the use of both primary and secondary sources of data. The collection of primary data involves the administration of a Job Satisfaction Questionnaire to the academicians of different university. Job satisfaction is assessed by the use of a Likert Scale consisting of five points.

Simultaneously, secondary data is collected by conducting a thorough examination of relevant literature, academic publications, reputable websites, and official records held by educational institutions. After the completion of the data collection phase, the acquired data undergo a thorough analysis using suitable statistical methods such as the computation of the Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation, and One Way ANOVA. This rigorous analysis aims to comprehensively examine and analyse the data.

9. Data Analysis

9.1 Measurement of Job Satisfaction Level

The findings presented in Table 1 offer insights into the measurement of job satisfaction among the participants. The arithmetic mean for the overall job satisfaction of the sample stands at 3.38, accompanied by a standard deviation of 0.49. This relatively small standard deviation suggests that a majority of the respondents' job satisfaction ratings closely align with the mean.

Turning to the various dimensions of job satisfaction assessed through the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), the arithmetic means for factors such as pay, promotion opportunities, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication span a range from 2.63 to 4.42.

From the data presented in Table 1, it is evident that academicians of HEIs express the highest levels of satisfaction with the nature of their work, with an impressive rating of 4.42. This is followed by satisfaction levels related to pay (3.75), opportunities for promotion (3.49), communication (3.35), contingent rewards (3.34), coworkers (3.30), and supervision (3.25).

Conversely, academicians of HEIs exhibit the least satisfaction with operating procedures, receiving a rating of 2.63, and fringe benefits, with a rating of 2.88. Importantly, the standard deviations for all dimensions assessed using the JSS are notably low. This suggests a remarkable degree of similarity in the responses provided by the sample participants, highlighting a shared perspective on job satisfaction dimensions.

Table-1

Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction

Subscales	Mean	Std.Deviation
Pay	3.75	1.07
Promotion	3.49	1.00
Supervision	3.25	0.79
FringeBenefits	2.88	0.86
ContingentRewards	3.34	0.76
OperatingProcedures	2.63	0.97
Coworkers	3.30	0.74
NatureofWork	4.42	0.52
Communication	3.35	0.69
Total Job Satisfaction	3.38	0.49

Source – Developed from research data

The academicians of HEIs have been categorized into three distinct levels based on their job satisfaction scores derived from the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. This categorization process hinges on the calculation of ' $M+\sigma$ ' and ' $M-\sigma$ ', where ' M ' represents the mean and ' σ ' signifies the standard deviation.

- **High Job Satisfaction Group:** This group comprises university teachers whose job satisfaction scores are at or above the threshold of ' $M+\sigma$.' In essence, these individuals exhibit high levels of job satisfaction.
- **Average Job Satisfaction Group:** Teachers falling within this category have job satisfaction scores that lie between ' $M+\sigma$ ' and ' $M-\sigma$.' Their job satisfaction levels are considered to be average or moderate.
- **Low Job Satisfaction Group:** The low job satisfaction group consists of university teachers whose scores fall below the ' $M-\sigma$ ' benchmark. These individuals report comparatively lower levels of job satisfaction.

By employing this method, the categorization of academicians into these three distinct groups allows for a nuanced understanding of the distribution of job satisfaction levels within the sample.

Table-2: Level of Job Satisfaction of Academicians of higher education.

Level	Frequency	Percentage(%)
HighJobSatisfaction	49	17.88%
AverageJobSatisfaction	179	65.33%
LowJob Satisfaction	46	16.79%
Total	274	100%

Note: Mean =3.38andStandardDeviation =0.49.

Source: Primary Data.

According to the data presented in Table 2, it is evident that a total of 49academicians, accounting for 17.88% of the sample, reported having high job satisfaction. Additionally, 179 teachers, constituting 65.33% of the sample, indicated having moderate job satisfaction. Furthermore, 46 teachers, representing 16.79% of the sample, expressed having low job satisfaction.

9.2 Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis 1: There exists no significant disparity in job satisfaction levels with regard to age.

Table 3 provides crucial insights into the examination of age-related disparities in the job satisfaction levels of academicians. Here's a breakdown of the findings:

The 'F' value, which stands at 9.410, pertaining to the mean job satisfaction scores of academicians across different age categories, demonstrates statistical significance at the 0.01 level (indicated by $p < 0.01$). Consequently, the null hypothesis, positing that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction levels among university teachers based on age, is decisively rejected.

Further exploration reveals that university teachers within the '35-44 years' age category exhibit the highest degree of job satisfaction, reflecting a mean score of 3.51 alongside a standard deviation of 0.54. This is followed by academicians categorized within the '45-54 years' age bracket, who attain a mean score of 3.44. Subsequently, university teachers in the 'below 35 years' age category display a mean job satisfaction score of 3.27.

In contrast, academicians classified within the '55 years and above' age group demonstrate the lowest levels of job satisfaction, as indicated by a mean score of 3.09, along with a standard deviation of 0.47.

These findings illuminate noteworthy variations in job satisfaction among academicians concerning their respective age categories, underscoring the significance of age as a contributing factor to job satisfaction levels within the sample.

Table-3: ANOVA to Determine Age Differences in Job Satisfaction.

Age	N	Mean	Std.Deviation
Below35 years	49	3.27	0.44

35-44years	113	3.51	0.54		
45-54years	69	3.44	0.35		
55yearsandabove	43	3.09	0.47		
Total	274	3.38	0.49		
ANOVA					
	SumofSquares	Df	MeanSquare	F	Sig.
BetweenGroups	6.269	3	2.090	9.410	0.000*
Within Groups	59.962	270	0.222		
Total	66.231	273			

*p <0.01

Source Developed from research data

Hypothesis 2: There exists no significant disparity in job satisfaction levels between genders.

The outcomes derived from Table 4 shed light on the investigation of job satisfaction levels among male and female academicians. Here's an interpretation of the findings:

The 't' value, computed at -1.535, in relation to the mean job satisfaction scores of male and female, academicians does not attain statistical significance at the 0.05 level (indicated by $p > 0.05$). Consequently, the null hypothesis, which posits that there is no noteworthy difference in job satisfaction levels between academicians based on gender, is upheld.

Further examination reveals that the mean job satisfaction score of female academicians stands at 3.45, slightly surpassing the mean score of male academicians which is 3.35. However, it is important to note that this disparity in means does not reach statistical significance.

In sum, the analysis indicates that there is no substantial gender-based discrepancy in job satisfaction levels among academicians, with both male and female educators reporting similar levels of job satisfaction.

Table-4:T-Test to Determine Gender-Based Job Satisfaction

	Gender	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	t	Sig.(2-tailed)
JobSatisfaction	Male	199	3.35	0.47	-1.535	0.126
	Female	75	3.45	0.53		

Source Developed from research data

Hypothesis 3: There exists no significant disparity in job satisfaction levels based on educational Attainment.

The findings in Table 5 provide insights into the relationship between educational level and job satisfaction among academicians. Here's a breakdown of the results:

The 't' value computed, which stands at 2.937, in regard to the mean job satisfaction scores of academicians with and without Ph.D. qualifications, demonstrates statistical significance at the 0.01

level (as indicated by $p < 0.01$). Consequently, the null hypothesis, positing that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction levels among university teachers based on their educational level, is decisively rejected.

Upon further examination, it becomes evident that university teachers without a Ph.D. attain a mean job satisfaction score of 3.56, surpassing the mean score of university teachers holding a Ph.D., which is 3.33. This difference in means is not only statistically significant but also underscores the distinction in job satisfaction levels between these two groups.

In summary, the analysis reveals that educational level plays a significant role in shaping job satisfaction among academicians, with those without a Ph.D. reporting higher levels of job satisfaction compared to their Ph.D.-holding counterparts.

Table5: T-Test to Analysis of Educational Level and Job Satisfaction

	Educational Level	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Job Satisfaction	Non-Ph.D.	53	3.56	0.55	2.937	0.004*
	Ph.D.	221	3.33	0.46		

* $p < 0.01$

Source – Developed from research data

10. Conclusions

The Academicians in HEIs exhibit the highest level of job satisfaction in relation to the nature of their work, while they express the least satisfaction with operating procedures. A predominant proportion of report having a moderate level of job satisfaction. Age is a significant determining factor in the job satisfaction levels of academicians, as substantial differences were observed across different age groups. Gender does not emerge as a significant influencer of job satisfaction among academicians with no noteworthy differences detected between male and female academicians. Educational level significantly impacts job satisfaction levels among academicians, with those of without a Ph.D. Degree expressing higher satisfaction than their Ph.D.-holding counterparts.

These conclusions underscore the multifaceted nature of job satisfaction among academicians and provide valuable insights into the factors that contribute to their contentment or discontentment in their professional roles.

References

- [1] Bholane K. P. and Suryawanshi J. R. (2015). A Study of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of University Teachers in Maharashtra State. Management Today – An International Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 5 (3), pp. 113- 116.
- [2] Rama Devi V. (2006). Job satisfaction among university teachers. SCMS Journal of Indian Management, pp.87-94 cited in Bholane
- [3] K. P. and Suryawanshi J. R. (2015). A Study of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of University Teachers in Maharashtra State. Management Today –

- An International Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 5 (3), pp. 113-116.
- [4] Kniveton B. (1991). An investigation of factors contributing to teachers' job satisfaction. *School Psychology International*, Vol. 12, pp. 361-370.
 - [5] Steyn G. M. & Van Wyk J. N. (1999). Job satisfaction perceptions of the principals and teachers in urban black schools in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, Vol. 19 (1), pp. 37-43.
 - [6] Hagedorn L. S. (1998). Implications to postsecondary faculty of alternative calculation methods of gender-based wage differentials. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 39, pp. 143-162.
 - [7] Bholane K. P. and Suryawanshi J. R. (2015). A Study of the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of University Teachers in Maharashtra State.
 - [8] Management Today – An International Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 5 (3), pp. 113- 116.
 - [9] Worrell T. G. (2004). School psychologists' job satisfaction: Ten years later. A Ph. D. thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia.
 - [10] Olorunsola E. O. (2010). Job satisfaction and gender factor of administrative staff in South West Nigeria Universities. EABR & ETLC Conference Proceedings, Dublin, Ireland, pp. 91-95.
 - [11] Ghazi S. R., Shahzad S., Shahzada G. & Gillani U. S. (2011). Study on job satisfaction of head teachers for the selected twenty dimensions of job. *International Journal of Academic Research*, Vol. 3(1), pp. 651-654.
 - [12] Wadhwa Daljeet Singh, Verghese Manoj & Wadhwa Dalvinder Singh (2011). Factors influencing employee job satisfaction - a study in cement industry of Chhattisgarh. *International Journal of Management & Business Studies*, Vol. 1 (3), pp. 109-111.
 - [13] Shabbir M. S., Ahmed K., Lawler J. J. & Shahbaz M. (2011). Affect of working environment on job satisfaction in Pakistan. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 7 (1), pp.52–61.
 - [14] Muindi F. K. (2011). The relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction among academic staff in the School of Business, University of Nairobi. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, pp. 1-34.
 - [15] Strydom L., Nortje N., Beukes R., Esterhuyse K. & Westhuizen J. (2012). Job satisfaction amongst teachers at special needs schools. *South African Journal of Education*, Vol. 32,
 - [16] pp. 255-266.
 - [17] Munshi N. M. (2012). A comparative analysis of job satisfaction level of management teachers of MBA colleges in Gujarat State. A Ph. D. thesis, Saurashtra University, Rajkot.
 - [18] Rafique T. and et. al. (2014). Factors Effecting Job Satisfaction of Employees working in Private Organizations: A Case of Pakistan. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, Vol. 7(7), pp. 1149-1157.