

Employee Satisfaction among Non-Teaching Staff in Higher Education: Evidence from Indian University

Durga Wati Kushwaha¹ and R.K.Lodhwal²

¹Research Scholar, ²Associate Professor, Faculty of Management Studies,
Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email: durga.kush@gmail.com, durga.kush@rediffmail.com, lodhwalrk@sify.com
(Received on 10 February 2013 and accepted on 15 April 2013)

Abstract – The study investigates the extent to which non-teaching staff of a University differ in various attributes and attitudes and in the level of satisfaction with the type of work they do, and further establish factors that may help explain these differences. A proportional stratified sample of 250 non-teaching staff of Banaras Hindu University is collected. The paper tries to establish the relationship between the demographic characteristics of the respondents & job satisfaction along with the relationship between the overall satisfaction level with the job motivator as well as hygiene factors discussed by two factor theory of Herzberg.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Job Motivators & hygiene Factors, Age, Experience

I. INTRODUCTION

In general, managers, supervisors, top management of the organisation is always concerned with ways of improving job satisfaction of the persons working there (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Further, Judge, Hanisch, and Drankoski (1995) also agreed with Cranny *et al.*, & advised that it is vital for human resource managers to be aware of the aspects internal to the organization which may influence most of the employees, these aspect may be job satisfaction, employee motivation etc. and enhancement of these aspects will be fruitful for both the organization and the employee. Rosnowski and Hulin (1992), discussed about having a valid measure of their overall level of job satisfaction.

The valid measure of job satisfaction, as proposed by Rosnowski and Hulin was an outcome of the motivation behind the numerous research efforts pertaining to job satisfaction. Some theories of job satisfaction included discrepancy theory (Locke, 1969), equity theory (Mowday, 1992), and the motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Discrepancy theory, as described by Lawler (1973), was the result of the difference between an

actual outcome a person received and some other expected outcome level. A comparison, in which an actual outcome level was lower than an expected outcome level, would result in dissatisfaction (Lawler, 1973). Inputs and outcomes were the premise of equity theory (Mowday, 1992). Employees evaluated their inputs/outcomes by comparing them with the inputs/outcomes of other individuals. Equity existed if the ratio of inputs to outcomes was similar to the inputs and outcomes of other individuals. Conversely, inequity existed when the ratio of inputs to outcomes was unequal to the inputs and outcomes of other individuals. Perceptions of equity were associated with job satisfaction, while perceptions of inequity were associated with job dissatisfaction

The motivator-hygiene theory was credited with propelling and advancing research on job satisfaction (Steers & Porter, 1992). The premise of the motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) was that jobs had specific factors which were related to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The five factors thought to facilitate job satisfaction were achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. The five factors identified by Herzberg *et al.*, as determinants of job dissatisfaction, were policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions

A lot of work has been done over the Job satisfaction & different people have described it variously. Yet is one of the most widely discussed and enthusiastically studied constructs among scholars in the behavioural and organizational sciences

The concept of job satisfaction consists of at least three dimensions: 1) a subjective perception of the job by the individual; 2) the degree to which the job is perceived as pleasurable; 3) the difference between what employees want out of a job and what they actually get from the job.

As a subjective perception, job satisfaction represents a worker's own evaluation of his or her job. It is how the worker feels about his or her work or about various facets of the work environment. Job satisfaction is largely a present-oriented response to the current situation or conditions at work. It reflects favourable or unfavourable views employees have toward the work itself and aspects of work such as pay, supervision, benefits and so on. It is simply the degree to which a person feels satisfied by their job.

Job satisfaction has also been defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional reaction and state of mind resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences, the tasks one has to perform at work, as well as the physical and social conditions of the workplace. It is a positive emotional and cognitive attitude that results from the pleasure a worker derives from component facets of the job. It consists of positive feelings at the end of the job, and reflects the degree to which individuals like their jobs or simply enjoy their occupations, experience a sense of self-growth and accomplishment in their work and would choose the same job again if given an opportunity.

Job satisfaction has also been defined in terms of discrepancies between desires and achievements at work. It is as a combination of cognitive and affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what an employee wants to receive compared with what he or she actually receives. It is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives the job offers, or "what is expected (or desired) and what is received". Job satisfaction is determined by the difference between the amount of some valued outcome that a person receives and the amount of the outcome he feels he should receive. If one expects little and gets little, they would be satisfied. Similarly, if one expects a lot and gets a lot, they would be satisfied. If one expected a lot and got little, they would be dissatisfied.

It has been reported that many employees are not satisfied with the type of job they do. Kristiina found that six out of ten workers were planning to leave their current employer for other pursuits within the next two years. In Denmark, Pors and Johannsen found that 25% of library employees left their employment before serving three years due mainly to dissatisfaction with their jobs. Dissatisfying job conditions motivate employees to engage in behaviours aimed at reducing frustration and anxiety, and at improving working conditions, the standard of living and equality. Dissatisfied workers may be disruptive, go on strike and may even resort to violence and cause physical harm to other employees.

II. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of study was to examine factors affecting job satisfaction of non - teaching staff of Banaras Hindu University that explained by Herzberg job motivator and hygiene factors. In addition, this study seeks to determine the overall job satisfaction of non - teaching staff. To understand about this study the following research objectives are formulated.

1. To describe demographic characteristics of selected non-teaching staff of University.
2. To describe the overall level of job satisfaction among of non-teaching staff of University.
3. To describe the level of satisfaction with the job motivator factors (achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself) among non-teaching staff.
4. To describe the level of satisfaction with job hygiene factors (pay, working conditions, supervision, policy and administration, and interpersonal relations) among non-teaching staff.
5. To establish relationships between level of job satisfaction and demographic characteristics of non-teaching staff.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Instrument and Measurement

This is an exploratory study based on primary data; the data has been collected through survey. The survey instrument was devised to assess all motivators and hygiene factors of Herzberg's theory. This questionnaire was based on all the elements of motivators and hygiene factors proposed by Herzberg *et al* (1959). Five point Likert scale was used ranging from 1 Strongly Disagree to 5 strongly Agree. Personal demographic information was also collected in this survey and items were included in the survey, relevant items were also included to gather all necessary information.

B. Population and Sampling

This questionnaire was distributed amongst the administrative staff of university. The population of the study was near about 5000 non-teaching staff member working in the campus. This University offers bachelors, master's degrees & Doctoral Degrees in various disciplines. The respondents of the study were those working in the central office of university & their total strength is near about 2500.

Of those 250 respondents were selected for study using stratified random sampling technique. Out of which 202 responded back forming 80% (n=250) response rate.

IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The descriptive analysis of the demographic profile is represented in the table below & indicated clearly that major respondents were belonging to an age group of 41-50(37.6%) followed by the age group of 51-60 (35.6 %). Further the analysis based on education shows that maximum employees are graduates (84%). Similarly on the basis of experience maximum number is reflected in group of 21-30 years of experience (=43%).

TABLE I DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF THE RESPONDENTS

Demographic variables	Groups	Number of employees	Percentage (%)
Age	21-30	26	12.9
	31-40	24	11.9
	41-50	76	37.6
	51-60	72	35.6
	61-70	4	2.0
Education	8 Pass	10	5.0
	High school	10	5.0
	Intermediate	20	9.9
	Graduate	84	41.6
	Post Graduate	58	28.7
Experience	0-10	51	25.2
	11-20	32	15.8
	21-30	87	43.1
	31-40	30	14.9
	41-50	2	1.0
Organisational Position	Non-Technical A	6	3.0
	Non-Technical B	54	26.7
	Non-Technical C	99	49.0
	Non-Technical D	37	18.3

The mean of overall satisfaction level is 74.68 (=75) (Table II) which reveals that the overall satisfaction of the employees is more than the average value but less the highest range of satisfaction as expected.

The mean of overall satisfaction level with Job motivator Factor (achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, and work itself) is 40.39 (=41) (Table III) which reveals that the overall satisfaction with Job motivator Factor of the employees is more than the average value but less the highest range of satisfaction as expected.

TABLE II ONE-SAMPLE STATISTICS

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total satisfaction	202	74.6832	9.60818	.67603

TABLE III ONE-SAMPLE STATISTICS

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Job Motivator	202	40.3960	4.92749	.34670

The mean of overall satisfaction level with Job Hygiene Factor (pay, working conditions, supervision, policy and administration, and interpersonal relations) is 38.17 (=38) (Table IV) which reveals that the overall satisfaction with Job hygiene Factor of the employees is more than the average value but less the highest range of satisfaction as expected.

TABLE IV ONE-SAMPLE STATISTICS

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Job hygiene	202	38.1782	6.26353	.44070

Further the co relational study between Total satisfaction & Job motivator & hygiene factor reveals that the Total satisfaction is highly co-related by Factor of .876 with motivators & by factor .906 with hygiene Factors (Pearson correlation) & this relation is highly significant as indicated by the value in the table . In turn it can be concluded that with increase in motivator & hygiene factor there is increase total satisfaction level & converse may also be true.

TABLE V CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TOTAL SATISFACTION, JOB MOTIVATOR & JOB HYGIENE FACTOR

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Pearson correlation	Significance Level
Total satisfaction	Job Motivator	.876**	.000
	Job hygiene	.906**	.000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

TABLE VI CORRELATIONS

Dependent variable	Independent variable	Pearson correlation	Significance Level
Total satisfaction	Age group	.237**	.001
	Education	-.159*	.024
	Experience group	.164*	.020
	Organizational position	.011	.877

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In order to study the relationship between various demographic profile of the respondents Pearson correlation was used. The results indicated that the demographic factor such as age, & experience are positively correlated with each other which means that as the person become older the satisfaction increases with various aspects of the job. One of the most probable reason for this may be the increase in the

sense of belongingness with the organisation or may be the closures of the opportunities at other avenues after a certain time span.

Further, there is a negative correlation with the education & job satisfaction; it can be attributed to the fact that more qualified person generally do not take the job which are not matching to their qualification but in case he/she takes a job not resembling the qualification becomes dissatisfied. However the person may be efficient performer for the organisation.

Coming up to the relationship with the organisational position, job satisfaction has no significant relationship with it.

V. CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to test the Herzberg two factor theory of motivation i.e. the motivator & hygiene factor having an influence over the satisfaction level of the non academic staff of Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. The study concludes that the overall satisfaction of non academic staff is more than average value. Further the satisfaction of employees is influenced by the job motivators as well as hygiene factor & a high degree of correlation exists between the two factors as proposed by Herzberg. Moreover significant relationship is observed between satisfaction, age group & Experience.

REFERENCES

- [1] C J. Cranny, P C. Smith and E F. Stone, Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. Lexington Books: New York, 1992.
- [2] F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, & B. B. Snyderman, The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- [3] E. E., Lawler, III, Motivation in work organizations. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company: Monterrey, CA, 1973.
- [4] E. A. Locke, What is job satisfaction? Organizational behaviour and human performance. In E. E. Lawler, Motivation in work organizations. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company: Monterrey, CA, 1973.
- [5] R. T. Mowday, Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In R. M. Steers & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Motivation and work behavior, New York: McGraw-Hill, 5th ed., pp. 111-131, 1991.
- [6] N. O. Pors and C. G. Johannsen, "Job satisfaction and motivational strategies among library directors," *New Library World*, Vol. 103, No. 1177, pp. 199–208, 2002.
- [7] M. Roznowski and C. Hulin, "the scientific merit of valid measures of general constructs with special reference to job satisfaction and job withdrawal". In Cranny C J, Smith P C and Stone E F (Editors). Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance. Lexington Books: New York, pp.123-163, 1992.
- [8] R.M. Steers, & L.W. Porter, Motivation and work behaviour. McGraw Hill: New York. 4th ed., pp. 144- 164, 1992.