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ABSTRACT
As the completion in different industries is increasing the level of job satisfaction among the employees in respective industries is decreasing due to a number of reasons, a view of the same can be seen in the recent past like in the case of kingfisher airlines, Air India, some of the government corporations, and in many of the agitations by different labor unions affiliated to different political parties. Same can also be seen in the case of technical education sector. If we spare the top 40 to 50 management and engineering colleges of India, where there are all kind of facilities and systems for the faculties and also there is a strong and full proof system is recruitment as well, in rest of the colleges a common unrest is being felt among the faculties, which can be seen in the form of high employee turnover. This present study is a fair trial to study the factor affecting the level of job satisfaction among employees specially in the educational sector, i.e. Technical Education, the target sample were the faculties working in the different colleges of management and engineering running in Lucknow and Agra which are affiliated to UPTU (Uttar Pradesh Technical University), in this paper it has also been tried to examine the effects of the dimensions of the job on levels of satisfaction among them. As the results of this study certain suggestions were also being made so as to improve the level of job satisfaction of the employees. This study also gives suggestions to maintain or improve faculty members’ job satisfaction level.
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INTRODUCTION
Education is the hallmark of the developmental index of a country. The provisions for higher education are seen, as a crucial investment in creating a workforce which is more knowledgeable, produces extensive benefits to the nation and also enhances the personal fulfillsments for our society. Education has a holistic impact on the individual’s life providing him with a greater opportunity to eke a living and contribute positively to the organization and nation alike. The government also understands this and it is visible through its policy initiatives and regulatory mechanism. The standards for quality education are dependent on the stakeholders and primarily on its management, faculty and students, states that the status of the institution is dependent on its ability to attract, recruit, develop and retain talented faculty. It is opined that satisfied faculty contributes positively to teaching and research, leading to positive educational experience of the students.

[16]Colleges and universities which are willing to experiment, invest resources, accept criticism and risk failure in order to motivate real professional development would be at the fore front.

Reports suggest that technical institutions across the country are coming to terms with a new problem of shortage of faculty, with the business schools admitting that the faculty vacancies have moved up to as high as 50%. Though institutions have short term solutions to these problems in the form of visiting faculty or guest faculty, but long run concrete measures to build a strong cadre of faculty needs to be addressed. Hence it becomes imperative for institutions to take better care of this scarce resource lest they lose them to their competitors. Employee job satisfaction is a necessary factor that organizations desire in their Staff. [4] If employees are not satisfied then it may lead to absenteeism and excessive turnover [4]. The costs attached with job dissatisfaction include training, recruiting, as well as reduction in the student enrolment base. If employees are satisfaction then it can improve productivity, reduce staff turnover and enhance creativity and commitment. So, job satisfaction must be considered, but very few organizations seriously consider job satisfaction. [5] As salaries is having role, in the same way working conditions also play an important role in determining the supply of qualified faculty members and in influencing their decisions about remaining in the profession. Some research on teachers says that safe environments, firmed administrative leadership, colleague’s cooperation, high parent involvement, and necessary learning resources can have role in effectiveness, enhance their commitment to school, and promote their job satisfaction [6]. Several researches have been taken place for supervision and job satisfaction and finding shows significant relationship. Hawthorne studies shows that attitude of the employees can be change by developing cooperative spirit between employees and their bosses.

[7]Decentralized organization may provide each individual more freedom and opportunities. [8] Many researchers say
that colleagues’ cooperation and job satisfaction are positively related. Colleagues who were rated high by their co-worker were more satisfied with their work. [9]

Good interpersonal relation as one of the most important factor for job motivation. In one other study, Job satisfaction of social workers in which he found prominent role of co-worker relation in the job satisfaction. [10] Majority of male teachers were very much satisfied with classroom teaching when we talk about teacher-pupil relationship.[11] Teachers feel students as their child. [12] Security play a role in job satisfaction, [13] and women workers treat security as most important factors. [14]

There is a serious shortage of engineering faculty in the India and demand for talented teachers has been increased. Engineering colleges/Universities are now looking for talented teachers and willing to pay them attractive salary. In this scenario to reduce the retention rate and to attract new talent are some challenges. Safe environments, firm administrative leadership, colleagues’ cooperation, and necessary learning resources have on role in increasing effectiveness, enhancing their commitment to school, and promoting job satisfaction of teachers. [6] [17] [18] The factors of faculty satisfaction are morale, institutional fit, institutional support, autonomy, promotion and tenure. [19] [20] [21] [22] Positive institutional characteristics, such as institutional climate, academic rank/tenure, and academic discipline have shown to impact the job satisfaction of faculty of color, at doctoral institutions. For many faculty of color, intrinsic rewards such as service to students, continual learning, and autonomy provided the greatest satisfaction. [24] [25]

These sources impact faculty satisfaction positively but there are several factors that contribute to the dissatisfaction of faculty. A sense of personal control over one’s career and the intrinsic satisfaction of academic work also depicted a significant direct influence on job satisfaction. [25]

Work load, working environment and pay & benefits to be the key factors of employees’ satisfaction in higher education. [26] [27] Faculty is most concerned with salaries and wishes to have stable job and salary with fair promotion, Work itself, pay, supervision, co-workers, and promotion as factors impacting job satisfaction. [4] Teachers’ commitment to the workplace which can be measured by their disaffection, absenteeism, and defection, is highly correlated to turnover. The following factors negatively impact faculty satisfaction: morale, rank, tenure status, increased work hours on administrative tasks, lack of university support, university structure, and the institutional reward system. In addition, the literature has revealed that institutional leadership low salaries, lack of recognition for professional achievement, and a lack of personal development may be some of the sources of faculty dissatisfaction. [27] [28] The faculty across institutional types who were dissatisfied with their jobs expressed a greater intention to leave the institution. [22] [29] Faculty members leave or intend to leave their institutions. [22] [30] Intention to leave refers to the likelihood extent to which an employee would terminate his or her association in an organization while intention to stay refers to the extent to which an employee plans to continue membership with his or her employer.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this are-

- To ascertain level of satisfaction among the academic staff with their working environment
- To find the levels of job satisfaction among engineering and management faculty members in the engineering and management colleges affiliated to UPTU (Uttar Pradesh Technical University).
- To identify the prominent factors that affect the level of satisfaction related to the job of the individual.
- To identifies ways to improve the satisfaction level of the employees.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology which was exercised for this present study was divided in to two part, i.e. Exploratory and Descriptive.

Under the exploratory study we had gone through a large amount of secondary data available from different sources like Reports on higher education published by the Govt., different research papers published by different researchers in the previous years and different articles and other material available online. A brief detail of the same is given under the heading of Introduction in this paper. After identifying the research gaps and choice of appropriate sample i.e. 200 faculties of different colleges, a questionnaire was prepared which includes the question of different types like the dichotomous questions, questions on different types of scales and open ended questions. The detail of the open ended questions was used in making the suggestions at the end of this paper. The question based on scale have a point rating of 1 to 5, where 1 is Very Satisfied, 2 is Satisfied, 3 is Neutral, 4 is Dissatisfied and 5 is Very dissatisfied following the Herzberg’s theoretical framework, was developed. Data collection was done by the way of one to one interaction with all the 200 respondents. The population from where the sample is being selected was all the engineering and management faculty members in the engineering colleges of technical university in Uttar Pradesh.

For this research study the method of random sampling was used and the formulation for choosing the sample was as under

\[
n = \frac{Nt^2pq}{Nd^2+ t^2pq}
\]

Whereas,  
- \(n\) - Sample size 
- \(N\) - Population  
- \(t\) - 1.96 at five per cent level of significance  
- \(p\) - Probability of respondent = 0.5  
- \(q\) - Probability of non-respondent= 0.5  
- \(d\) - 5 / 100 (95% level of accuracy)

The collected data were entered in SPSS 14 and analysed using descriptive statistical methods Mean and Standard Deviation.

DATA ANALYSIS (Descriptive)

The analysis of data shows that

- 56% of the sample holds the designation of Lecturer/Asst. Professors, and 34%, in the category of Readers/Associate Professors and 10% comprising of Professors.
• The data on the employment history reveals that 66% of the respondents have worked from 0-less than 5, 18% of the respondents worked 4 or less than 8 years and the employees worked for 8 or more than 8 years are tenure and employee’s having 8 greater than 8 years of tenure is 16%.

• As far as the total experience of the respondents is concerned it was found that it was observed that 47% have experience less than 6 years, 32% of the respondents having less than 12 years of experience and 21% of employees have 12 years or more of experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sub factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>Nature of Fellow Employees</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambience of Workplace</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Measures</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Load</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Load</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Remuneration Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular increments</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Payment</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of Remuneration system</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund/Paid Leave for Research</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary incentives</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Results of Descriptive Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sub factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Opportunity</td>
<td>On Job training</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development of Professional Skills</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Monetary Provision for training</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Application</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Institutional Pedagogical Approach</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open appreciation</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent System of feedback</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for good work</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with personal Issues</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely redressal of problem</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results of Descriptive Analysis

**DATA ANALYSIS (Scales)**

• Faculty members were found neutral with organizational policies (M=3.29), independence (M=2.67) and promotion opportunities (M=2.54).

• Faculty members were found satisfied with work variety (M=3.79), creativity (3.78), compensation (M=3.59), work itself (M=3.66), colleagues’ cooperation (M=3.87), responsibility (M=3.72), social status of job (M=3.76), job security (M=3.77), achievement (M=3.88) and students’ interaction (M=3.98).

• Faculty members were found dissatisfied working conditions (M=2.36) and recognition (M=2.43).

• As faculty members were found to be neutral with organizational policies, independence and promotion opportunities. Participation of faculty members in making organizational policies should be ensured. They should get independence in their work and better promotion opportunities should be provided.

• As most of the faculty members were found to be satisfied with work variety, creativity, compensation, work itself, colleagues’ cooperation, responsibility, and social status of job, job security, achievement and students’ interaction. So there should be continuously feedback from faculty members for these factors.

• The working conditions should be improved. Their participation in decision-making, revision of curricula, administrative matters and other academic matters must be ensured. The authority should try to establish trust with faculty members.

**IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The findings of this study provide an insight into various issues that contribute significantly in the dissatisfaction towards the job among the management and engineering
Faculty members. The more one understands the reasons for the dissatisfaction, the better one can find solutions to reduce the impact of these factors. Faculty members and the management need to work collectively in this direction. As job satisfaction is subjective in nature, if they understand these issues they can change cognitively or behaviorally in the manner which may reduce the feeling of dissatisfaction and enhance work efficiency. Being assertive may reduce the feeling of role conflict. They also need to be clear in their priorities and understand that as faculty members they have more responsibilities than as management graduates or engineers. The authorities also need to understand that if there are conflicting opinions, they need to be discussed in a positive manner for resolution of the same. There should be ample opportunities for their professional growth within the organization and their efforts need to be rewarded when they deserve. This will help in enhancing their self-esteem, especially among engineering faculty members as they reported feeling of low status more than the medical faculty. These measures will also help in developing good rapport between the faculty members and the authorities, which indirectly contributes towards commitment and better performance.
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