

Faculty in Private Engineering Colleges and Determinants of Satisfaction with Job

M.S.Kamalaveni

Sona School of Management, Sona College of Technology, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India
E-mail: kamalaveni@sonamgmt.org

KEYWORDS HR Challenges. Job Satisfaction, Organisational Effectiveness. Retention. Talented Workforce

ABSTRACT Job satisfaction and retention of faculty are very tough and challenging in the current scenario and majority of the institutions are struggling a lot to satisfy as well as to retain talented teaching faculty. Reviews of literature supported for the study in influencing job satisfaction that leads to retention of talented pool of human resources and ultimately results into effectiveness of the institutions. Elucidating the determinants of satisfaction with job in private engineering colleges in the selected area is the prime objectives of the study. The study uses simple random sampling method for data collection. To analyse the collected information various statistical tools, such as simple percentage, factor analysis with varimax rotation, correlation, regression and logistic regression were used and the findings would help the management for enhancing faculty members' satisfaction in private engineering colleges.

INTRODUCTION

There are many approaches by various authors in defining job satisfaction and the methods differ from cognitive or affective job satisfaction. It is a mixture of emotions which made workers to share their feelings "I am satisfied with my job" (Hoppock 1935). By appraising an employee's job or his achievement or through an employee's job experiences, his satisfaction on job can be identified and it is the possible outcome resulted out of it (Locke 1976). It is also defined as expression of workers strong emotion in relation to their existing job, roles and responsibilities (Vroom 1982). SHRM reported in 2016 that there has been a shoot up in the percentage of employee satisfaction from the year 2013, that is, from eighty one percent to eighty-eight percent in the year 2016. This is the first time it has happened over these years and the reasons for shoot up in satisfaction are employers' readiness to raise salaries and benefits of their employees, improving economy, and utilising the opportunity for their development by the job chasers due to the stable labour market.

One of the important assets of an organisation is human resources, and making the employees happy and satisfied is really a tough and great challenge of the human resource professionals in the private engineering colleges now a days. Another significant challenge is retaining

knowledgeable resources after investing huge costs in them. There are so many factors why faculties stay and leave. Investigating the factors influencing staying and leaving makes the difference of effectiveness and success in the competitive environment. Frempong et al. (2018) explored in their study and concluded that the impact of job satisfaction was positive and significant on employees' loyalty and commitment, which helps in creating a strong pool of workforce as well as creating an environment of competitive advantage. Ganesan et al. (2018) in their research on job satisfaction among BSNL employees and highlighted some significant influences in their study. Salary (package), personal development (career development), peer relationships (interpersonal relations), inspiration (motivation), and training and development (skill development and expertise) are the essential factors. The study resulted that there was no job satisfaction among them and provided suggestions to improve job satisfaction of employees over there. As most of the researches have been concentrated on industrial and organisational settings, less focus was on the field of academic research on faculty members in educational institutions and hence this research is conducted.

Job Satisfaction

It is mental, physical and environmental satisfaction of workers and understood by explor-

ing at what extent they are contented in their work dimensions (Hoppock 1935). However, theoretical definition is categorised as follows:

- (i) Integral definition highlights employees' attitude towards job with respect to environment and satisfaction of an individual employee (Locke 1976; Fogarty 1994).
- (ii) The differential definition stresses on this concept and focuses on the deviations among the actual and the estimated reward received by individual employee in his/her job. If there is high deviation, it reflects dissatisfaction (Smith et al. 1969; Hodson 1989).
- (iii) The reference structure theory highlights that working attitude and behaviours of employees are influenced by a significant factor, for example, characteristics of organisations or jobs. Further, the individual employee's self-reference structures affect his emotional structure and work environment.

It is defined as an attitude perceived and carried by an individual in his work that consists of a common or universal factor of satisfaction as well as an assortment of precise dimensions connected with various source of reinforcement of work (Solly and Hohenshil 1986).

Theories on Job Satisfaction

For emphasizing several aspects of job satisfaction over these years there are number of theories on it. Many researchers debated that the foundation for this concept was established by Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory which explains five important needs to be satisfied and based on these several theories on job satisfaction arose later. Affect theory states that "what one wants and what one has in a job" determines the job satisfaction of an employee (Locke 1976). Dispositional approach recommends that this concept diverges among persons and the approach states that it is an individual attribute. Equity theory explains a person's view towards social relationship with an employer. The discrepancy theory describes the significant source of anxiety and dejection. Two-factor theory (motivator and hygiene theory) suggests in elucidating job contentment and motivation at workplace

and while discussing theories of job satisfaction this theory explains some of the factors influencing satisfaction and dissatisfaction such as motivation and hygiene factors. Hussein (2018) applied job characteristics model and the study resulted that the potential scores of motivation are less than the required level.

Job Satisfaction: Significance

Determinants of Satisfaction with Job are linked with various factors and leads to success of an organisation in the competitive business era. Of course, employees are the best resources of an organisation and keeping them happy and satisfied helps in so many ways. It reflects in an employee's health, that is, physically as well as mentally, and reflects in the increase in output of the work done by the employee. If an employee is constantly unhappy with his job, his/her mental health spoils and this creates tension and stresses him to act negatively, and his behaviour is maladjusted. An employee's physical health is also affected due to job dissatisfaction. The continuous stress causes various health issues to the employees. Productivity is positive when employees are happy with the job, and they can able to put extra effort in their work and increases the output, which automatically increases the profit and helps to achieve the organisational goal and they spread good will of the organisation.

Reviews of Literature

Literature review is an essential part of every research. Following is a review of some literature available on the research topic, which was referred from various research journals and books and also through e-resources.

Hoppock (1935) stated psychological, physiological and environmental factors are having an impact on the employees to stay and feel happy and satisfied with his job. As Freeman (1976) and Hamermesh (1977) emphasised that employees' personal and work attributes have a significant effect over job satisfaction. Herzberg (1957) explained in his research that only satisfied employees would have a positive commitment to the organisation. Hurst et al. (2007) highlighted some researches and discussed that job satisfaction as an essential factor used to create con-

structive work as well as to measure an employee's overall attitude. O'Reilly and Caldwell (1980) stated that a significant factor of job contentment is the task itself because when the task involves more variety, challenges and offers more growth opportunities, the employees can put more effort and they will be happy and satisfied. Sarker et al. (2003) highlighted that several studies were conducted with respect to studying the association between age of the employees and job contentment. Some have shown positive and some have shown negative effect. Jones Johnson and Johnson (2000) analysed and found that older workers' shown maximum satisfaction. This topic has been attempted by various researchers since many organisations are struggling to keep the employees happy and satisfied. One of the outcomes highlighted strong link on organizational commitment (Testa 2001).

Froeschle and Sinkford (2009) emphasized the relationship concerning productivity and satisfaction and the study conducted by Zeinabadi (2010) also affirmed the same. Wong and Heng (2009) indicated satisfaction, a predominant factor to maintain the talented pool of employees also to enhance production. According to researchers Mardanov et al. (2008) and DeConinck (2009), it is concluded that job dissatisfaction amounts to a greater rate of voluntary turnover. Later on, more focus was on contentment and it is mandatory for management in facing challenges on servants' dissatisfaction. According to Daneshfard and Ekvaniyan (2012) and Khalid (2012) influencing factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are salary, work environment, job characteristics of workers, decision making, the style of leadership, inter-personal relationships, work load, autonomy, self-respect and social recognition. Podolske (2003) specified in his research that overall performance could be boosted through increase in the satisfaction of the employee. Currall et al. (2005) indicated that to achieve better performance, job satisfaction should be improved through providing higher pay to the employees. Sweeney et al. (2005) showed in their study that job satisfaction depends on fairness of pay received when compared to their peers. Zeinabadi (2010), Austin (2012) and Lawrence and Bell (2012) showed that leadership style of superiors also influences positively and negatively on satisfaction. Ghazi et al. (2011) measured through the

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and it was found they were "Very Satisfied" with the activities and also with respect to ethical values of the organization they are attached with.

Singh (2013) in a research carried out in Manipur, India and resulted that to get constructive performance, job satisfaction matters. The study found a positive association among employee job satisfaction and factors like behaviour factors, remuneration factors and career growth factors. Out of these factors that influence job satisfaction, compensation factors correlate well. Noltemeyer (2014) while accounting for job satisfaction found four key variables, namely, responsibility, work itself, effective supervisor and recognition of employees. Gupta (2011) and Abubhashesh (2014) clearly indicated in their studies that organisational factors, work factors and personal factors have an influencing effect on employee satisfaction. Machado-Taylor et al. (2016) collected data from 4529 respondents working in HEI for analysing employee motivation and satisfaction, showed some significant differences among the genders.

Objectives of the Study

- i. To investigate the determinants of faculty satisfaction at private engineering colleges in the selected study area.
- ii. To examine the satisfaction level of faculty
- iii. To categorize the strong determinants of satisfaction with job
- iv. To investigate the influence of job satisfaction on retention of faculty in private engineering colleges in the selected study area.

Limitations of the Study

- i. Confined only to Salem District.
- ii. A more detailed study was not done due to time constraint.
- iii. Findings of the study cannot be generalised since the sample size is 150.
- iv. Findings and conclusion may not be appropriate for other industries.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Nature of the present study is descriptive and the study period falls from February 2018 to June

2018. The researcher has collected data through a questionnaire, which was a structured one. Simple random sampling was followed to select respondents. The questionnaire was administered to one hundred and eighty faculties of selected private engineering colleges in Salem District, Tamil Nadu and out of which, one hundred and fifty were successfully collected as representation of the population of faculty members. The available data has been analysed in SPSS version 17.0. Simple percentage analysis, factor analysis, correlation, regression and logistic regression were done for achieving the research objectives of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile

Table 1 exhibits the clear analysis about the demographic profile of the respondents. 58.7 percent are female and 41.3 percent are male concerned with gender. With respect to the designation of faculties, 66.7 percent are assistant professors, 24.0 percent are associate professors level and 9.3 percent belong to professor. 30.0 percent of faculties have one child and 70.0 percent of faculties have two children. With respect to edu-

cational qualification, 59.3 percent are postgraduates, 0.7 percent hold the qualification of NET/SLET, 40.00 percent hold a Ph.D. With respect to experience of the faculties, 18.0 percent are at less than one year, 24.0 percent are at 1-3 years, 54.0 percent are at 3-5 years and 4.0 percent have 5-10 years of experience.

Job Satisfaction Level of the Respondents

Table 2 shows respondents' job satisfaction level regarding their gender, designation, number of children, educational qualification and work experience. 39.6 percent of male respondents are satisfied and 60.4 percent females are satisfied. 71.9 percent of the respondents with designation of assistant professors are satisfied, 19.8 percent of the respondents with designation of associate professors are satisfied, 8.3 percent of respondents with designation of a professor are satisfied. 26.0 percent of respondents with one child are satisfied and 74.0 percent of respondents with two children are satisfied. 36.5 percent of the respondents with a postgraduate qualification are satisfied, 1.0 percent of the respondents with qualification of NET/SLET are satisfied and 38.5 percent of the respondents with a PhD qualification are satisfied. 18.8 percent are with below 1 year experience are satisfied, 26.0 percent with 1-3 years of experience are satisfied, 51.0 percent of the respondents with work experience of 3-5 years are satisfied, and 4.2 percent of the respondents with 5-10 years of experience are satisfied.

Table 1: Demographic profile

<i>Demographic factors</i>	<i>Categories</i>	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Gender</i>	Male	62	41.3
	Female	88	58.7
<i>Designation</i>	Asst. Professor	100	66.7
	Asso. Professor	36	24.0
	Professor	14	9.3
<i>No. of Children</i>	1	45	30.0
	2	105	70.0
	3 and above	0	0.0
<i>Education Qualification</i>	PG	89	59.3
	NET/SLET	1	0.7
	M.Phil.	0	0.0
	PhD	60	40.0
<i>Experience</i>	<1	27	18.0
	1-3	36	24.0
	3-5	81	54.0
	5-10	6	4.0
	>10	0	0.0

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

Demographic Details of the Respondents with Respect to Recommending Others to Apply for Job in the Current Institution

From the analysis, Table 3 describes the demographic details of the respondents who would recommend others to apply for job in the current institution. 28.9 percent of male are recommending and 71.1 percent of the female respondents are recommending others to apply for a job in their current institutions. 59.8 percent of the respondents in the assistant professor designation are recommending, 29.9 percent of the respondents with designation of associate professor are recommending and 10.3 percent of respondents with designation as a professor are recommending others to apply for a job in their current

Table 2: Job satisfaction level of the respondents

Demographic factors	Categories	Satisfaction			
		Yes		No	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Gender	Male	38	39.6	24	44.4
	Female	58	60.4	30	55.6
Designation	Asst. Professor	69	71.9	31	57.4
	Asso. Professor	19	19.8	17	31.5
	Professor	8	8.3	6	11.1
No. of Children	1	25	26.0	20	37.0
	2	71	74.0	34	63.0
	3 and above	0	0.0	0	0.0
Education Qualification	PG	58	36.5	31	57.4
	NET/SLET	1	1.0	0	0.0
	M.Phil.	0	0.0	0	0.0
	PhD	37	38.5	23	42.6
Experience	<1	18	18.8	9	16.7
	1-3	25	26.0	11	20.4
	3-5	49	51.0	32	59.3
	5-10	4	4.2	2	3.7
	>10	0	0.0	0	0.0

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

Table 3: Demographic profile of the respondents recommending others to their current institution

Demographic factors	Categories	Recommend			
		Yes		No	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Gender	Male	28	28.9	34	64.2
	Female	69	71.1	19	35.8
Designation	Asst. Professor	58	59.8	42	79.2
	Asso. Professor	29	29.9	7	13.2
	Professor	10	10.3	4	7.5
Number of Children	1	19	19.6	26	49.1
	2	78	80.4	27	50.9
	3 and above	0	0.0	0	0.0
Education	PG	65	67.0	24	45.3
	NET/SLET	1	1.0	0	0.0
	M.Phil.	0	0.0	0	0.0
	PhD	31	32.0	29	54.7
Experience	<1	20	20.6	7	13.2
	1-3	25	25.8	11	20.8
	3-5	48	49.5	33	62.3
	5-10	4	4.1	2	3.8
	>10	0	0.0	0	0.0

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

institution. 19.6 percent with 1 child are recommending and 80.4 percent with two children are recommending. 67.0 percent of the respondents with a postgraduate degree as their educational qualification are recommending, 1.0 percent of the respondents with NET/SLET qualification are recommending, 32.0 percent of the respondents with a PhD are recommending others to apply for a job

in their current institution. 20.6 percent below 1 year experience are recommending, 25.8 percent of the respondents with 1-3 years of work experience are recommending, 49.5 percent with experience of 3-5 years are recommending, 4.1 percent with work experience of 5-10 years are recommending others to apply for a job in their current institution.

Retention Level of the Respondents

From the analysis, Table 4 displays respondents' retention level. The retention level of male respondents is 36.3 percent and female respondents is 63.7 percent, assistant professors is 57.1 percent, associate professors is 34.1 percent, and professors is 8.8 percent, respondents having one child is 19.8 percent and those with two children is 80.2 percent, respondents with postgraduate qualification is 65.9 percent, with NET/SLET qualification is 1.1 percent and PhD qualification is 33.0 percent. Retention level of respondents with less than one year experience is 25.3 percent, 1-3 years of experience is 23.1 percent, 3-5 years of experience is 45.1 percent, 5-10 years of experience is 6.6 percent.

Reliability Analysis

From the analysis, Table 5 exhibits the reliability of the expression of views and facts (statements) measured for checking consistency of the statements. In the present study faculty members' job satisfaction at the selected study area has been measured. Further, the reliability coefficient of the data set was found to be above the minimum level of 0.70, as per the previous researches. After the reliability analysis, the item-to-item correlation of the statements were checked and the one with lower coefficients were removed after which the reliability coefficient increased. Thus, statements of job satisfaction have been shortened into 28 from 31. The final coefficient for reliability was found to be increased from 0.915 to 0.925 for making the data reliable.

Table 4: Retention level of the respondents with respect to the demographic details

Demographic factors	Categories	Retention					
		Yes			No		
		Count	Column	N %	Count	Column	N %
Gender	Male	33	36.3		29	49.2	
	Female	58	63.7		30	50.8	
Designation	Asst. Professor	52	57.1		48	81.4	
	Asso. Professor	31	34.1		5	8.5	
	Professor	8	8.8		6	10.1	
Number of Children	1	18	19.8		27	45.8	
	2	73	80.2		32	54.2	
	3 and above	0	0.0		0	0.0	
Education	PG	60	65.9		29	49.2	
	NET/SLET	1	1.1		0	0.0	
	M.Phil.	0	0.0		0	0.0	
	PhD	30	33.0		30	50.8	
Experience	<1	23	25.3		4	6.8	
	1-3	21	23.1		15	25.4	
	3-5	41	45.1		40	67.8	
	5-10	6	6.6		0	0.0	
	>10	0	0.0		0	0.0	

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

Table 5: Reliability analysis

Construct	No. of items before reliability analysis	Initial reliability coefficient	Items deleted	No. of items after reliability analysis	Final reliability coefficient
Job Satisfaction	31	0.915	3	28	0.925

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

Validity Analysis

In the present study, all the observed 28 statements are found to have face validity as well as content validity. Almost all the statements were drafted based on previous literature support and expert opinion. This would enrich the content validity of the questionnaire. The thorough investigation of the items used in the questionnaire and modifications done would enhance validity.

Factor Analysis

Employee job satisfaction practices have been grouped into reliable factors through factor analysis and for further examination deduced factors have been used. The study uses factor analysis in which varimax rotation (principal component analysis) was done for further progresses in the study and to show how each variable 'loads/belongs' on other factors was demonstrated through rotated factor matrix (Hair et al. 2006).

PCA-Principal Component Analysis

Generally, PCA is a technique, which is used for extracting factors in data set. In the study, factors have been lessened into limited factors according to the magnitude of relationship existing among the variables (Nithya 2018). Factor analysis helps in the development and validation of scales and helps to classify grouping of similar items to reduce the variables for analysis. Here, the researcher has used factor analysis to reduce factors into limited factors in influencing job-satisfaction and has established the same from the data collected from 150 respondents in the selected area and SPSS 17.0 software is used for analysis. Respondents were examined through giving their opinion on Likert scale of a 5 point scale, which is represented "1" as "very low" to "5" as "very high" and finally through this technique five factors have been generated in the study.

KMO Test and Bartlett's Test

To check the variables that are un-correlated in the population, Bartlett's test of sphericity has been done. The study has 28 variables and 0.000

is the significance value of Bartlett's test, which is shown in Table 6. For observing aptness of factor analysis, KMO test for sampling adequacy is a key test. It equates the scales of observed correlation coefficients to scale of partial correlation coefficient (Malhotra 2010; Nithya and Selvaraj 2015). Here, factor analysis is suitable for the study as the KMO value denotes 0.808.

Table 6: Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

KMO measure for sampling adequacy	0.808
Bartlett test of Sphericity: Approximate Chi-square	1860.397
Bartlett test of Sphericity: Significant Value	0.000

Source: Computed from the Collected Data through Survey

Components of Factor Analysis

From the given Table 7, components of factor analysis have been explained and the total number of factors shortened for the study are 5 and all are put together contribute to seventy-three percent of total variance which seems to be a good percentage of variance. As a result, the extracted 5 factors out of 28 variables of job satisfaction is found to be valid and reliable in nature as the reliability of all five factors has been found to be more than 0.70 and it can be inferred in terms of variables which load highly on it. Associations among observed variable and deduced factors have been exposed through factor loadings, which denote prominence. Factor loadings, which have more than 0.50, were considered under each factor for better data reduction. Fortunately, all the 28 variables are reflected as they have the factor loadings of more than 0.50.

Construct Validity

It is an aptness of inferences that is measured continuously based on the theoretical background (Bayraktar et al. 2008). As the KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity values are well above the acceptable level, the 28 variables are passable to denote to the construct of the study. From the analysis, Table 8 presents the correlations value among the factors generated through principal component analysis. Table 8 shows that almost all the factors are significantly related to each

Table 7: Components of factor analysis

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Factor loadings</i>	<i>Eigen value</i>	<i>% Variance explained</i>	<i>Cronbach alpha</i>
<i>Factor 1: Organisational Factors</i>	Human values	.827	12.089	41.174	.902
	Job description	.801			
	Other reasons	.760			
	Morale	.756			
	Recognition	.750			
	Fair treatment	.739			
	Suggestions	.667			
	Salary	.585			
<i>Factor 2: Work Environment Factors</i>	Holidays	.557	2.348	11.227	.853
	Grievance	.787			
	Environment	.671			
	Funds	.652			
	Promotion	.646			
	Expected	.636			
	Job security	.609			
	Workload	.804			
<i>Factor 3: Work Factors</i>	Welfare	.784	1.760	7.817	.844
	Support	.642			
	Appraisal	.608			
	Training	.555			
	Ethical act	.521			
	HOD	.647			
<i>Factor 4: Leadership Factors</i>	Mission vision	.645	1.595	6.502	.740
	Top mgmt.	.585			
	Responsibility	.546			
	Pay match	.513			
<i>Factor 5: Personal Factors</i>	Respect	.734	1.318	5.293	.732
	Relationship	.683			

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

Table 8: The correlations between independent and dependent variables

	<i>Organisa- tional factors</i>	<i>Work environment factors</i>	<i>Work factors</i>	<i>Leadership factors</i>	<i>Personal factors</i>	<i>Satisfa- ction</i>
<i>Organisational Factors</i>	1	.633**	.670**	.617**	.445**	.409**
<i>Work Environment Factors</i>		1	.603**	.504**	.462**	.520**
<i>Work Factors</i>			1	.549**	.405**	.490**
<i>Leadership Factors</i>				1	.447**	.428**
<i>Personal Factors</i>					1	.542**
<i>Satisfaction</i>						1

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

other. This illustrates that a variation in one factor would incur proportionate variation in the other. It is noted that all the independent variables, which are named as organisational factors to personal factors are having significant impact on dependant variables. Personal factors have highest correlation with satisfaction at 0.542, followed by Factor 2 at 0.520. Organisational factors have the lowest correlation with job satisfaction.

Regression Analysis

Here, the dependent variable is faculty job satisfaction and organisational factors (X₁), work Environment factors (X₂), work factors (X₃), leadership factors (X₄), and personal factors (X₅) are independent variables. Association among variables is identified through regression analysis.

From the analysis, Table 9 presents the regression results that 0.855 is multiple R-value, which estimates the extent of relationship existing between the dependant and the five independent variables and it has come out positively. This indicates that the identified five independent factors have influencing effect on the dependent variable and these factors can be defined as factors responsible for having a strong impact on job satisfaction at a maximum possible level. R^2 value explains that the identified five factors would explain almost seventy-three of the job satisfaction of the faculty members. Hence, major predictors can be defined through these identified five factors and hence $Y = 0.119 + 0.193X_1 + 0.472X_2 + 0.498X_3 + 0.254X_4 + 0.479X_5$. From the analysis, it is found, that work factors, personal factors and work environment factors have significant influence over job satisfaction at the selected study area. Hence, policymaking can be done based on these variables with a view to increase the level of satisfaction as well as to perform their roles and responsibilities at their maximum efficiency.

Logistic Regression

In the study, the following questions are analysed in logistic regression by the researcher to study dichotomous outcome variable:

- (i) Job satisfaction factors influence you to stay here, that is, retention: Yes/No
- (ii) Will you recommend others to apply for job in this institution? Yes/No

From the analysis, Table 10 depicts the logistic regression of retention on independent variables. Out of 5 predictors included in the study only two variables namely work factors and leadership factors are significant. It is inferred that log-odds of retention (Yes-VS-No) increase at 0.765 for every change in work factors. Likewise, log-odds of being retained in the same organization would increase at 1.313 for every change in leadership factors.

Logistic Regression of Recommend on Independent Variable

From the analysis, Table 11 depicts the logistic regression recommended on independent variables in the study and the table clearly presents the coefficients, standard errors, Wald test statistics and odds ratios. Out of 5 predictors included in the study the variables named organisational factors and leadership factors are found to be significant. It is found that for every one unit change with respect to five factors, the log-odds of recommending (versus non-recommend-

Table 9: Regression results

Variables	Unstandardized co-efficient	SE of B	Standardized co-efficient	t value	P value
(Constant)	0.119	0.268		2.756	.311
Organizational factors	0.193	0.211	-.107	1.068	.287
Work Environment factors	0.472	0.186	.248	1.933	.005
Work factors	0.498	0.136	.222	2.015	.007
Leadership factors	0.254	0.213	.094	1.925	.174
Personal factors	0.479	.105	.343	4.561	.000

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

Table 10: Logistic Regression of retention

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Organisational factors	.628	.420	2.239	1	.135	.534
Work environment factors	.119	.405	.087	1	.769	1.127
Work factors	.765	.339	5.083	1	.024	.465
Leadership factors	1.313	.393	11.173	1	.001	.269
Personal factors	.546	.388	1.981	1	.159	1.726
Constant	5.760	1.386	17.262	1	.000	317.227

Source: Computed from the collected data through survey

Table 11: Logistic regression of recommend on independent variables

	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Exp(B)</i>
Organisational factors	1.819	.624	8.509	1	.004	.162
Work environment factors	1.375	.538	6.539	1	.011	3.956
Work factors	1.390	.381	13.285	1	.000	.249
Leadership factors	.876	.424	4.260	1	.039	.417
Personal factors	.127	.450	.080	1	.778	1.136
Constant	7.217	1.678	18.508	1	.000	1362.805

ing) increase by 1.819, 1.375, 1.390, 0.876 and 0.127 respectively.

Findings

From the study, it is inferred from the analysis that female faculty have high contentment. Assistant professors are more satisfied than associate professors and professors. Job satisfaction level of faculties having two children is higher than having one child. Job satisfaction level of faculties with PhD qualification is higher than with postgraduate and NET/SLET. Job satisfaction level of faculties with work experience of 3-5 years is higher than with less than one year or with 1-3 years. Faculties with experience of greater than 10 years are not contented. Retention level of female faculty is higher than male. Retention level of assistant professors is higher than associate professor and professor. Retention level of faculties having two children is higher than having one child. Retention level of faculties with postgraduate qualification is higher than with PhD and NET/SLET. Retention level of faculties with work experience of 3-5 years is higher than with less than one year and 1-3 years. Retention level of faculties with greater than 10 years is prone to move from one institution to other. Factors 1-5 together contribute to seventy-three percent of total variance, which makes factor analysis a suitable one. Work factors, personal factors and work environment are significant influencing variables. The five factors are one to one closely related, showing a strong association between the factors. Organizational factors were found to have high degree of variation followed by work environment factors and personal factors with least degree of variation compared to other factors with job satisfaction. Work factors and the leadership factors are statistically significant in

logistic regression of retention on independent variables out of 5 predictors. Organizational factors and leadership factors are statistically significant in logistic regression on recommendation on independent variables out of 5 predictors.

In the present study, five factors were taken to analyse the determinants of job satisfaction. Female have high satisfaction than male and it was supported by the research conducted by Machado-Taylor et al. (2016) that some dimensions of satisfaction such as teaching climate, administration and management, peers, career development, work environment, culture, values, employment conditions, reputation of institution and scope for research in the campus were considered and analysed, and it was found that there was significant differences among the genders relating to the facets of satisfaction and it was also found that women are more motivated than men. Also, it is found in the present study that the five factors are one to one closely related, showing a strong association between the factors. Gupta (2011) and Abuhashesh (2014) also clearly indicated in their studies that institutions' policies and practices have some impact on job satisfaction. Practices followed in institutions such as internal promotion and reward for the best employees result in improved performance of the employees, and trainings offered by the management to their employees help to develop the required skills for the employees, and have significant effect towards satisfaction. Therefore, these independent variables are closely correlated with each other and influencing the dependent variable. Singh (2013) also supported this study that behavioural factors, compensation factors and career growth factors have some influencing effect on job satisfaction and here, all these variables have been included as factors and have significant influence.

CONCLUSION

Determinants of satisfaction with job can be encompassed through various factors and work factors, personal factors and work environment factors are significant determinant of faculty satisfaction with job in the study. Some faculty are dissatisfied at their workplace and therefore, Human Resource Department need to focus on the factors that dissatisfy the faculty members to improve the satisfaction of the faculty. Human Resource policymaking with respect to the recommendations stated in the study would help to improve faculty members' satisfaction towards their job and this would also support in improving the retention rate of faculty in private engineering colleges.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study recommends that providing clear-cut roles, responsibilities, and avoiding over-workload to faculties can be helpful in balancing their professional as well as personal life. Hike in salary and complying with welfare aspects, recognition, and fair treatment of faculty are the areas need to be concentrated. Management can sponsor funds for the career development of faculty members to attend conferences and workshops, which would help them, develop personally, and help in achieving the organizational objectives. It is further recommended that management can encourage faculties to take part in decision-making, which would be very helpful to make them feel that they are a part of the institution and make them take ownership. Simultaneously this would make them feel that they are responsible and it will improve the morale of the faculty.

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The scope to explore further is identified as follows:

- (i) Sample size may be increased to give generalised findings
- (ii) Each factor in job satisfaction may be explored
- (iii) Few other factors can also be considered for the study
- (iv) Future research can be done in other districts

- (v) All districts in Tamil Nadu may be covered to understand the current scenario.

REFERENCES

- Abuhashesh MY 2014. Integration of social media in businesses. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(8): 202-209.
- Austin AE 2012. Challenges and visions for higher education in a complex world: Commentary on Barnett and Barrie. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 31(1): 57-64.
- Bayraktar E, Tatiglu E, Zaim S 2008, An instrument for measuring the critical factor of TQM in Turkish higher education. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 19(6): 551-574.
- Currall SC, Towler AJ, Judge TA, Kohn L 2005. Pay satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Personnel Psychology* 58(3): 613-640.
- Daneshfard C, Ekvaniyan KE 2012. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Islamic Azad University. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(9): 168-181.
- DeConinck JB 2009. The effect of leader-member exchange on turnover among retail buyers. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(11): 1081-1086.
- Fogarty R 1994. *How to Teach for Metacognition*. Palatine, IL: IRI/Skylight Publishing
- Freeman Richard 1976. Individual mobility and Union voice in the labor market. *American Economic Review*, 66(2): 361-368.
- Frempong LN, Agbenyo W, Darko PA 2018. The impact of job satisfaction on employees' loyalty and commitment: A comparative study among some selected sectors in Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 10(12): 95-105.
- Froeschle ML, Sinkford JC 2009. Full-time dental faculty perceptions of satisfaction with the academic work environment. *Journal of Dental Education*, 73(10): 1153- 1170.
- Ganesan M, Durgamani MK, Renuka R 2018. A study on job satisfaction of employees in BSNL, Thiruvapur. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 119(7): 2429-2443.
- Ghazi RS, Shahzad S, Shahzada G, Gillani US 2011. Job satisfaction of head teachers for the selected twenty dimensions of job. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(1): 651-654.
- Gupta CB 2011. *Human Resource Management*. 19th Edition. New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons.
- Hair JF, Black B, Babin B, Anderson RE, Tatham RL 2006. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 6th Edition. New York: Pearson.
- Hamermesh DS 1977. Economic aspects of job satisfaction. In: OC Ashenfelter, WE Oates (Eds.): *Essays in Labor Market Analysis*. New York: Wiley, pp. 53-72.
- Herzberg F, Mausnes B, Peterson RO, Capwell DF 1957. *Job Attitudes: Review of Research and Opinion*. Oxford, England: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Hodson R 1989. Gender differences in job satisfaction: Why aren't women more dissatisfied? *Sociological Quarterly*, 30: 385-399.

- Hoppock R 1935. *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper Brothers.
- Hurst JP, Blackman DA, Lee-Kelley L 2007. An Exploration of the Relationship Between Learning Organizations and the Retention of Knowledge Workers. 8th Conference on International Human Resource Management "Making a Difference in a World of Differences" Cairns, Australia, 14-17 June 2005.
- Hussein A 2018. Test of Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model at general media sector. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(1): 352-371.
- Jones Johnson G, Johnson WR 2000. Perceived over qualification and dimensions of job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Psychology*, 134(5): 537-555.
- Khalid S, Irshad Z, Mahmood B 2012. Job satisfaction among academic staff: A comparative analysis between public and private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1): 126-136.
- Lawrence J, Ott M, Bell A 2012. Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(3): 325-352.
- Locke E.A 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In: MD Dunnette (Ed.): *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1: 1297-1343.
- Machado-Taylor Maria de Lourdes, Soares Virgílio Meira, Brites Rui, Ferreira José Brites, Farhangmehr Minoo, Gouveia Odília Maria Rocha, Peterson Marvin 2016. Academic job satisfaction and motivation: Findings from a nationwide study in Portuguese higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(3): 541-559.
- Malhotra NK 2010. *Marketing Research an Applied Orientation*. 6th Edition. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Mardanov IT, Heischmidt K, Henson A 2008. Leader member exchange and job satisfaction bond and predicted employee turnover. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(2): 159-175.
- Nithya N 2018. Factors influencing TQM practices in Indian Hospital Industry-An empirical study through principal component analysis. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 13(17): 13085-13092.
- Nithya N, Selvaraj M 2015. Patient's perception on services of Indian Multispecialty Hospitals-A Tqm approach. *Iran J Public Health*, 44(10): 1422-1423.
- Noltemeyer JP 2014. *Job Satisfaction of Professional Staff and Administrators within the Associated Colleges of the South: A Study of Herzberg's Duality Theory of Motivation in Higher Education*. PhD Thesis. Kentucky, USA: University of Louisville.
- O'Reilly C, Caldwell D 1980. Job choice: The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65: 559-565.
- Podolske A (Ed.) 2003. What motivates frontline staff and how the best companies deliver it. *IOMAs Report on Customer Relationship Management*, 2-4.
- Sarker Shah-Jalal, Crossman A, Chinmeteeptuck P 2003. The relationship of age and length of service with job satisfaction: An examination of hotel employees in Thailand. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18: 745-758.
- Singh Rajkumar Giridhari 2013. Factors explaining job satisfaction among hospital employees. *OPUS: Annual HR Journal*, [S.l.]: 29-43.
- Smith PC, Kendall LM, Hulin CL 1969. *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Society for Human Resource Management 2016. Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement: Revitalizing a Changing Workforce. From <<https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/research-and-surveys/Documents/2016-Employee-Job-Satisfaction-and-Engagement-Report.pdf>> (Retrieved on 24 December 2017).
- Solly DC, Hohenshil TH 1986. Job satisfaction of school psychologists in a primarily rural state. *School Psychology Review*, 15(1): 119-126.
- Sweeney PD, McFarlin DB 2005. Wage comparisons with similar and dissimilar others. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(1): 113-131.
- Testa MR 2001. Organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and effort in the service environment. *Journal of Psychology*, 135(2): 226-237.
- Vroom VH 1982. *Work and Motivation*. Revised Edition. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.
- Wong E, Heng T 2009. Case study of factors influencing job satisfaction in two Malaysian universities. *International Business Research*, 2(2): 86-98.
- Zeinabadi H 2010. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 5: 998-1003.

Paper received for publication in December, 2019
 Paper accepted for publication in December, 2019