

EMPIRICAL STUDY ON MEASUREMENT OF FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB AND CAREER SATISFACTION

DR. GEETHA M L

Professor

Department of commerce

Govt. First grade college, Kavoor, Mangalore, India.

ABSTRACT

Proper management of human resource helps the organisation to move forward in the direction of growth and prosperity. Increasing the Job and career satisfaction of the employees accelerate the productivity and performance of the employees. In this paper an effort is made to understand and measure different factors influencing job & career satisfaction of the teaching professionals working in Government, Private Aided, Private unaided & Autonomous First grade Colleges in Mangalore, India.

Key words: Job & career satisfaction, Government, Private Aided, Private Unaided, Autonomous

I.INTRODUCTION

In order to achieve organizational objective of providing a conducive climate for the development of human resource in an organization, it is necessary for understanding of different factors essential for better job and career satisfaction that affect employee's experiences and performances. Job and career satisfaction is a qualitative concept, it is influenced by different factors. Measurement of different factors influencing Job and career satisfaction helps in improving the working conditions of the Employees. Therefore, this paper tries to measure Job and career satisfaction of teaching professionals in First grade colleges in the city of Mangalore, India. A number of scales have been developed to measure the Job & career satisfaction like questionnaire developed by Goldberg (1978), Warr Job Satisfaction scale developed by Van Laar, Easton & Bradshaw (2009), General self-efficiency scale developed by Schwarzer & Jerusalem (1995), Trait meta mood scale by Philips (2008), TMMS Emotional intelligence scale by Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey and Palfai (1995) and so on. Present study makes use of Work-Related Quality of Life scale developed by Van Laar, D.L., Easton, S. Two reasons for selecting this questionnaire are this scale is developed recently, therefore suited to present working conditions. And secondly this scale has been tested on 3792 teaching professionals and found to be of high level of construct reliability. Respondents were asked to rate each factor based on five-point Likert rating scale from strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, strongly

disagree=1. Individual factor scores are calculated by taking average of item scores contributing to respective factor.

Respondents were requested to answer all the questions.

The interpretation quality of work life will be drawn based on the mean value as below. If

Mean value is < 3 =Low quality of work life

Mean value is $3 > 4$ = Average quality of work life

Mean value is > 4 = High quality of work life

To study existence of significant differences among employees of different types of educational institutions mean, standard deviation, median, Factor analysis test is applied to measure and find the effect of factors on Job and career satisfaction

II. Research Methodology

This study is mainly based on the primary data collected from the respondents with the help of a structured questionnaire for the purpose of the present research and also from secondary data.

The required data for the research was collected through an empirical survey by personally administering the questionnaire. The stratified sampling technique was used for the present study. The respondents consisted of 520 teaching professionals in Government, Private Aided, Private Unaided, and Autonomous First Grade Colleges working in different positions like Principals, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers, and Guest Faculty in the city of Mangalore, India.

Secondary sources of data such as books, periodicals, and journals as well as internet sources like ProQuest, EBSCO, JSTOR, Sage Publications, and Emerald Publications were referred to along with published data from the University Grants Commission, Mangalore University, Department of Collegiate Education, and college souvenirs of First Grade Colleges of Mangalore for the purpose of studying the present trends of Job & career satisfaction level in First Grade Colleges.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Hydar Mohammadi and Mohsen Amiri Shahrabi (2013) made an empirical investigation to study the relationship between quality of work- life and job satisfaction of the Supreme Audit Court and the Interior Ministry, two government agencies of Iran. They examined the effect of some of the factors like healthy and good working

conditions and good leadership styles on the quality of work- life. The results of the survey confirmed some meaningful relationships between the quality of work life and job satisfaction in the organization.

Zvonimir Galic and Mara Plecas (2012) made a detailed study of the relationship between quality of working life and satisfaction of psychological needs satisfied by the job from 2008 to 2011 in Croatia. The research found that the quality of working life in Croatia had deteriorated during the recession. And this decline was attributed to extrinsic job factors like adequate and fair pay and job security.

Gomathi S. and Swapna M. (2012) studied the impact of job satisfaction on quality of work- life of professionals in Bangalore city. They found that nearly 75% of IT professionals had medium quality of working life. A psychologically healthy work environment is one of the factors in which indirect needs of the employees are fulfilled. They came to the conclusion that job satisfaction, good compensation system, and efficient training and development helped to increase the working conditions, general well-being, work- life balance, and career prospects of IT professionals.

Vignesh Shankar J. (2010) studied the relationship between quality of working life and career satisfaction of employees in information technology organizations, education institutions, and manufacturing units of Chennai in India. He concluded that career balance had a significant impact on the quality of working life. He suggested that organizations should strive hard to search for determinants of career satisfaction and try to satisfy their valuable employees in terms of such determinants.

Raduan C. Rose et al. (2006) made an empirical study to find the relationship between quality of work -life and career related dimensions. They studied quality of work life of managers working in multinational corporations and small-medium industries situated in the Malaysian Free Trade Zone. The findings revealed that three exogenous variables, career satisfaction, career achievement, and career balance significantly influenced the quality of work-life.

Kaye, A. R. and Sutton, M. J. D. (1985) tried to develop models for productivity and quality of working life. Their study found that job satisfaction was an important sociological factor in increasing productivity and quality of working life of professional and management employees. Job satisfaction had direct relation with sense of autonomy and achievement. They concluded that productivity and quality of working life were complimentary objectives that could be achieved together. They recommended precautions to be taken during the earlier stages of developing

objectives. As a next step to planning of automation, needed levels of job satisfaction that were important for employees should be developed with help of technology.

IV.MEASUREMENT OF JOB AND CAREER SATISFACTION

Job or career satisfaction is measure by analysing the perceptions of the respondents towards clear idea of job, encouragement by the superior to develop skill, opportunity for development etc.

TABLE 1: Measurement of job and career satisfaction

	Institution	S. D	D	N	A	S. A	Mean	S. D	Median	Kruskal wallis test value	d.f	p	
I have a clear set of goals and aims to enable me to do my job	Government	2 1.5%	2 1.5%	10 6.2%	85 56.9%	51 33.8%	4.20	0.75	4.00	2.269	3	0.518	
	Private Aided	1 0.8%	4 2.3%	21 13.1%	81 50.8%	53 33.1%	4.13	0.78	4.00				NS
	Private Unaided	2 1.5%	3 2.3%	20 15.4%	66 50.8%	39 30.0%	4.05	0.83	4.00				
	Autonomous	4 5.4%	2 2.3%	4 5.4%	45 55.4%	25 31.5%	4.05	0.97	4.00				
	Total	12 2.3%	11 2.1%	52 10.0%	278 53.5%	167 32.1%	4.11	0.84	4.00				
I have opportunity to use my abilities at work	Government	1 0.8%	9 6.2%	20 13.1%	98 65.4%	22 14.6%	3.87	0.76	4.00	8.048	3	0.045	
	Private Aided	5 3.1%	5 3.1%	13 8.5%	91 56.9%	46 28.5%	4.05	0.88	4.00				Sig
	Private Unaided	3 2.3%	8 6.2%	15 11.5%	81 62.3%	23 17.7%	3.87	0.86	4.00				
	Autonomous	2 2.3%	3 3.1%	19 23.8%	39 49.2%	17 21.5%	3.85	0.88	4.00				
	Total	11 2.1%	24 4.6%	74 14.2%	304 58.5%	107 20.6%	3.91	0.85	4.00				
When I have done good job, it is acknowledged by my superior	Government	7 4.6%	32 21.5%	36 23.8%	62 41.5%	13 8.5%	3.28	1.04	3.50	9.206	3	0.027	
	Private Aided	4 2.3%	14 8.5%	41 25.4%	79 49.2%	22 14.6%	3.65	0.91	4.00				sig
	Private Unaided	6 4.6%	18 13.8%	34 26.2%	51 39.2%	21 16.2%	3.48	1.07	4.00				
	Autonomous	4 4.6%	6 6.9%	23 29.2%	36 45.4%	11 13.8%	3.57	0.97	4.00				
	Total	21 4.0%	66 12.7%	136 26.2%	228 43.8%	69 13.3%	3.50	1.01	4.00				
I am encouraged to develop new skill	Government	0 0.0%	20 13.1%	23 15.4%	90 60.0%	17 11.5%	3.70	0.84	4.00	9.132	3	0.028	
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	9 5.4%	20 12.3%	105 65.4%	25 15.4%	3.88	0.79	4.00				Sig
	Private Unaided	1 0.8%	8 6.2%	22 16.9%	73 56.2%	26 20.0%	3.88	0.82	4.00				
	Autonomous	2 2.3%	6 6.9%	25 31.5%	34 42.3%	13 16.9%	3.65	0.92	4.00				
	Total	6 1.2%	41 7.9%	99 19.0%	291 56.0%	83 16.0%	3.78	0.85	4.00				
I am satisfied with career opportunities available for me	Government	7 4.6%	24 16.2%	29 19.2%	70 46.9%	20 13.1%	3.48	1.06	4.00	10.303	3	0.016	
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	17 10.8%	33 20.8%	82 51.5%	25 15.4%	3.68	0.92	4.00				Sig
	Private Unaided	10 7.7%	18 13.8%	33 25.4%	60 46.2%	9 6.9%	3.31	1.05	4.00				
	Autonomous	0 0.0%	9 11.5%	30 36.9%	37 46.9%	4 4.6%	3.45	0.76	4.00				
	Total	18 3.5%	68 13.1%	133 25.6%	249 47.9%	52 10.0%	3.48	0.96	4.00				
I am satisfied with the training I receive in order to perform my present job	Government	6 3.8%	33 22.3%	24 16.2%	81 53.1%	7 4.6%	3.32	1.00	4.00	11.003	3	0.012	
	Private Aided	5 3.1%	17 10.8%	36 22.3%	86 53.8%	16 10.0%	3.57	0.92	4.00				sig
	Private Unaided	5 3.8%	16 12.3%	37 28.5%	62 47.7%	10 7.7%	3.43	0.94	4.00				
	Autonomous	4 4.6%	12 14.6%	33 40.8%	26 33.1%	5 6.9%	3.23	0.94	3.00				
	Total	20 3.8%	78 15.0%	140 26.9%	244 46.9%	38 7.3%	3.39	0.96	4.00				

Source: primary data

Table 1 depicts measurement of Job and career satisfaction of respondents. In order to know job & career satisfaction of respondents' six questions were posed to respondents. First statement enquires about the setting up of goals and aims to execute their teaching job. It is very interesting to note that among all statements this statement received more than 4 mean value and all respondents confirmed that they have clear idea about goals before starting their teaching career with 4.11 ± 0.84 . There is no significant difference among respondents as $p=0.518 > 0.05$. 3.91 ± 0.85 accepted that they have opportunity to use their abilities at work place and there is significant difference among respondents of different educational institutions as $p=0.045 < 0.05$. On an average all respondents agreed to second statement with mean value exceeding 3. 3.70 ± 0.84 are happy that their superior acknowledged their good work. There is a significant difference between respondents of different institutions with $p=0.27 < 0.05$. 3.48 ± 0.96 said that they were satisfied with career opportunities available to them. There is a significant difference among respondents of different Colleges as $p=0.016 < 0.05$. All agree that they get career opportunities in their institutions as mean value is more than 3. 3.39 ± 0.96 were satisfied with training received to perform their job efficiently. There is high significant difference among respondents working in different Colleges as $p=0.12 > 0.05$.

TABLE 2: Measurement of overall job career satisfaction of the respondents

	Institution	N	Mean	S. D	Median	Kruskal wallis test value	d.f	p
Job career satisfaction	Government	150	3.64	0.52	3.67	11.984	3	0.007
	Private Aided	160	3.83	0.61	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	130	3.67	0.62	3.83			
	Autonomous	80	3.63	0.58	3.50			
	Total	520	3.69	0.59	3.83			

Source: primary data

As per table 2 Measurement of Job & career satisfaction shows that the Job & career satisfaction is average among respondents 3.69 ± 0.59 . job & career satisfaction among Government College respondents is 3.64 ± 0.52 , Private Aided Colleges 3.83 ± 0.61 , Private Unaided Colleges 3.67 ± 0.62 , and Autonomous Colleges 3.63 ± 0.58 . There is high significant difference in the level of job & career satisfaction of different respondents $p=0.007 < 0.01$. Job & career satisfaction is more in Private Aided Colleges and less in Autonomous Colleges. There is average job career satisfaction among respondents as mean value is more than three and less than four.

V.CONCLUSION

Measurement of factors affecting job & career satisfaction helps Educational Institutions to identify areas of good practices and factors needing special attention. Lower range of scores with mean value less than three indicates employees are substantially less satisfied. When score fall into the mid-range of more than three and less than four mean value, it may indicate working life as whole does not provide high level of satisfaction at the same time employees are not totally dissatisfied with their work. Higher score means of more than four indicates that generally Job & career satisfaction is good and employees are satisfied. This type of scoring can help in finding out issues needing special attention and solving the problem at the earliest. It helps employers to understand employees view point with the objective of fulfilling aims and objectives of the organization. Accordingly, action plan can be prepared. It also helps employees to understand their level of satisfaction and they can take necessary actions to increase their satisfaction level.

REFERENCES

- Baba V.V. & Jamal M. (1991). "Routinisation of job context and job content as related to employee, quality of working life: a study of Canadian Nurses". *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, Vol. 12, pp. 379-386.
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). "Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between effect and employee Citizenship". *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, pp.587-595.
- Bruce W. M. & Blackburn J. W. (1992). "Balancing job satisfaction and performance: A guide for human resource professional". USA, Westport: Quorum Books.
- Conway, J. A. (1976). "Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 21, Issue1, pp. 130-139.
- Edward E. Lawler, III & Gerald E Ledford, Jr. "Productivity and quality of working life".
- Fred Luthans. *Organisational Behavior*. 7th edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995, p.182.
- Guest, R. H. (1979). "Quality of work life-Learning from Terry Town". *Harvard Business Review*, July – August 1979, pp.28-39.
- Herzberg, F. (1969). "Work and the nature of man". World Publishing Company, Cleveland, pp. 139-142.
- Marcy B. A. & Mirvis P. H. (1976). "A methodology for assessment of quality of work life and organizational effectiveness in behavioral economic terms". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 21, Issue 1, pp.212-216.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). "A theory of human motivation". *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50, Issue 3, pp.370- 396.
- Saklani, D. R. (2004). "Quality of work life in Indian context: An empirical investigation decision". Vol. 31, Issue 2,
- Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (1979). "Motivation and work behavior. McGraw Hill, Tokyo, pp.394-395.

- Takezawa Shin-Ichi. “The quality of working life trends in Japan”. Research Series No.11, International Institute of Labour Studies, 1976, p.1.
- Van Laar, D.L., Easton, S. (2012). User Manual for the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQOL) scale: A measure of Quality of working Life. University of Portsmouth.
- Van Laar, D.L., Easton, S. (2013). QOWL (Quality of working life)- What, How, and why? *Psychology research*. 3(10), 596-605.

