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ABSTRACT

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify factors which are most likely to affect job satisfaction of academic faculty and administrators in higher education. Specific recommendations were proposed for college and university administrators' application to maximize academic faculty and administrator job satisfaction. These recommendations were to improve organizational effectiveness and productivity of higher education.

Procedure

The identification of satisfaction-producing factors affecting academic faculty and administrators was accomplished by the related research and literature in the private (business and industry) and the public (higher education) sectors in relation to the motivation-hygiene theory of Herzberg. The recommendations were developed on the basis of the finding of satisfaction factors concluded in this study.

The study was divided into three chapters. Chapter one presents some basic background information of job satisfaction regarding its importance to and impact on organizational effectiveness and productivity. This chapter
also includes the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study.

Chapter two provides additional information concerning the past research and studies on job satisfaction in business as well as in educational environments. It gives the overview of the theories of Herzberg and Maslow and the review of the related information addressing the eleven factors often found in most research and studies on job satisfaction.

Chapter three consists of four sections: the summary, conclusion, recommendations for improvements in job satisfaction, and recommendations for improvements to higher education administrators. The last section consists of specific recommendations suggested for an application of college and university administrators.
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CHAPTER I
Overview of the Problem

Introduction

For decades, numerous studies and research have been conducted on employee job satisfaction. Researchers have tried to discover if there is a consistent relationship between satisfaction and other organizational facets, namely, performance, turnover, and absenteeism of employees. A number of researchers such as Vroom (1964), Hulin (1968), and Reitz (1981) supported the idea that there is a significant relationship between satisfaction and the aforementioned factors.

Many business and educational organizations have adopted the idea that job satisfaction affects performance, turnover, and absenteeism. They have attempted to increase their employee job satisfaction, hoping that it will result in higher organizational productivity and effectiveness. Consequently, the studies in this area have been continued and expedited. Reitz (1981) pointed out the following reasons why job satisfaction has been studied:

1. Managers believe job satisfaction directly affects employees' productivity. A happy worker is more efficient, innovative, careful, compliant, and exerts more effort than an unhappy worker.
2. Managers believe employee job satisfaction is a key factor in maintaining low rates of turnover and absenteeism.

3. It is more pleasant to work in a happy and satisfying climate.

4. Some managers feel morally responsible for maintaining a reasonably high level of job satisfaction among employees in the organization.

However, without being able to identify the factors which affect satisfaction, it is impossible for the administrators of the organization to increase their employees' satisfaction and to plan for improvements for the organization. There have been different theories and ideas proposed on job satisfaction; therefore, job satisfaction factors are still a controversial issue.

Herzberg's theory about job satisfaction has been widely accepted and followed by numerous researchers. Herzberg identified the factors or determinants of job satisfaction in his theory called "Motivation-Hygiene Theory". Srivastva et al. (1977, p. 69) explained the concept of this theory as follows:

Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not opposites but derive from different sources. Job satisfaction is a source of motivation that arises when the task itself provides for achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement to higher-order jobs, and growth in competence.

Dissatisfaction is related to 'maintenance' or
'hygiene' factors of company policies, supervision, working-conditions and pay. Loading a job with satisfiers leads to increase motivation, while removing sources of dissatisfaction reduces discontent without increasing motivation.

Those factors which affect job satisfaction are called motivators and those that affect job dissatisfaction are called hygiene factors. The purpose of this field experience was to identify satisfaction-producing factors in relation to those that were found in Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory.

**Statement of the Problem**

Administrators have attempted to increase employee job satisfaction. They have adopted the idea proposed by many researchers that an increase in employee satisfaction will improve employee performance and organizational effectiveness. Although there have been numerous studies and research conducted on job satisfaction, very few have been conducted in educational environments, particularly at the college and university level (Smart and Morstain cited in Neumann, 1978).

The study of Smart and Morstain (1975) indicated there is a trend that job satisfaction will play a more important role in higher education. They cited Bess's conclusion that 'the management techniques of business corporations have sufficient transferability to university operations to justify careful study by university administrators' (p. 2).
Education, as well as other types of organizations, sets goals to increase organizational effectiveness and productivity. In addition, the Nation at Risk (1983) pointed out to the nation the need for improvement in educational effectiveness and accountability.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to identify factors which are most likely to affect job satisfaction (not dissatisfaction) in higher educational environments among academic faculty and administrators. Academic faculty are referred to as "College or university staff with teaching responsibility, as opposed to administrative responsibilities (Page, Thomas, and Marshall, 1980, p. 9). Academic administrators are those who also have some responsibility in teaching as well as in administration. Examples of academic administrators are department heads who perform a dual job as a professor and administrator. The identification of satisfaction-producing factors will be accomplished by relevant literature and research in both the private (business and industry) and the public (higher education) sectors. Specific recommendations were proposed for college and university administrators' application regarding factors affecting academic faculty and administrators so as to maximize their satisfaction which, in turn, might result in higher organizational effectiveness and productivity.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Related Research and Literature

Overview of Significant Motivation Theories

Motivation has always been a major focus when the improvement of management and organizational effectiveness are concerned. Administrators try to learn and know about human nature and behaviors so as to be able to motivate employees and exploit human resources to the optimum of organization benefits. Motivation and job satisfaction have been studied and found to be related. McCormick and Tiffin (1974) cited Wernimont, Toren, and Kapell to show that analyses of the procedures implemented in the studies of motivation are quite similar to those of job satisfaction. Many researchers proposed different theories of motivation. For example, Abraham Maslow proposed the theory "Hierarchy of Needs" and Vroom developed a theory of work-motivation. Administrators have attempted to increase employee satisfaction with the belief that to some extent it will raise the employees' productivity and performance and result in less absenteeism and turnover. There are two major theories frequently referred to in most studies and research on job satisfaction: Maslow's theory, "Hierarchy of Needs"; and Herzberg's theory, "Motivation-Hygiene" or "Two-Factor Theory". Both theories present the fundamental knowledge of
job satisfaction. The following are the summaries of hierarchy of needs theory and motivation-hygiene theory.

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs**

Maslow believes that human beings’ behaviors are closely related to their individual psychological needs. He divided human needs into five categories, commencing from the very basic need called physiological need (biological need) to the highest need called self-actualization, which is the most complicated one (Maslow, 1954). The concept of the hierarchy of needs is often illustrated in a triangular form as presented in figure 1 (Kuhn, Slocum, and Chase, 1971).

---

**Figure 1**

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs**

![Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Diagram](image)
The five needs indicated by Maslow are (1) physiological need, (2) security/safety need, (3) social/belonging need, (4) self-esteem need, and (5) self-actualization need. These needs are in hierarchy which means that the basic need has to be fulfilled before the higher one can be achieved. Dunnette (1976, p. 1307) cited Maslow's explanation of these five basic needs as follows:

... physiological needs, including food, water, air, etc.; safety needs, including freedom from physical threats and harm as well as economic security; belongingness and love needs; esteem needs of two types: the need for mastery and achievement, and the need for the recognition and approval of others; and the need for self-actualization, which is defined as "the tendency... to become actualized in what he is potentially" or "the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming"

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Herzberg's theory distinguishes satisfaction from dissatisfaction as two different states of job attitudes. Lawless (1972) explained Herzberg's theory that satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different factors which means that lacking of the factors which cause satisfaction will not bring about dissatisfaction, and vice versa. This concept when compared to that of conventional theories is shown in figure 2. Those factors which affect satisfaction are called motivators and those which affect dissatisfaction are called
Figure 2

Herzberg’s Concept of Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers Compared to That of Conventional Theories

(Wexley and Yukl, 1977, p. 104)

---

**Conventional Bipolar Continuum**

---

+ 0 -

Strong Satisfaction Neutral Strong Dissatisfaction

---

**Herzberg’s Model**

---

+ 0 Satisfiers

Strong Satisfaction No Satisfaction

- 0 Dissatisfiers

Strong Dissatisfaction No Dissatisfaction
hygiene factors. Motivators are involved with intrinsic motivation and essentially related to job content. Hygiene factors are involved with extrinsic motivation and primarily associated with job context (McCormick and Tiffin, 1974). Herzberg categorized satisfiers (motivators) and dissatisfiers (hygiene factors) as presented in figure 3.

Related Research and Literature

Satisfaction is a feeling, an attitude of the worker toward the job in relation to the work environment. An employee's job satisfaction depends jointly upon both the characteristics of the employee and the job situation (Wexley and Yukl, 1977). Argyris (cited in Krock, 1967) defined job satisfaction as a function of an agreement of the employee's expectations or needs and the degrees to which expectations or needs are fulfilled.

Reviewing the related research and literature concerning job satisfaction factors in both business and industry, and higher educational environments, this author found that there is quite a number of researchers who agreed with Herzberg's theory though, sometimes, the results were different from that of Herzberg. The following are eleven factors found in most studies and research to have relationships with job satisfaction: (1) achievement, (2) recognition, (3) work itself, (4) responsibility, (5) advancement/growth, (6) salary, (7) interpersonal relations, (8) supervision, (9) organization policy and administration, (10) working
Figure 3

The Comparison of Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers

(Herzberg et al. cited in Blum and Naylor, 1968)
Achievement

Achievement when related to job satisfaction refers to the success or completion of work compared to one's expectations or performance standards. It has been found in numerous studies that work achievement or success in problem-solving or in accomplishing specific standards of competence is a major factor in determining job satisfaction (Locke cited in Dunnette, 1976). Locke added that the feeling of achievement does not have to come from complete success as long as the employee experiences improvement or progress toward a final goal.

It is important that the employee feel the job is challenging and want to accomplish it. The job must be attainable, or else it will relate negatively rather than positively to the employee's satisfaction. Locke (cited in Dunnette, 1976) explained, "If the degree of challenge is so great that the individual cannot successfully cope with it, he will experience a sense of failure and frustration with his work. If the challenge is moderate, in the sense that success is difficult but possible, then the individual will experience pleasure and satisfaction" (p. 1320).

An employee's perception of achievement is directly related to his or her performance outcomes, self-concept, self-expectation, self-esteem, and self-actualization. Kuhn, et al. (1977) referred to Lawler and Porter's study that
there is a tendency for self-esteem and self-actualization
needs in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs to be more closely
associated with performance than the lower needs such as
safety and physiological needs. This concept is supported by
Lopez. Lopez (1982) indicated that there is a greater
significant correlation between performance and job
satisfaction among individuals who have high self-esteem than
those who have lower self-esteem. The former group of people
attains more satisfaction when they perceive that achievement
and recognition occur. Norris and Niebuhr (1984) indicated
these higher-order needs of self-esteem and self-
actualization as internal orientation. In universities, it
is reported that among faculty and administrators,
achievement is the greatest impact factor or motivator of job
satisfaction (Wittenauer, 1980; Openshaw, 1980).

Recognition

Srivastva et al. (1977) and Wittenauer (1980) stated
that recognition is positively a source of satisfaction.
Locke (cited in Dunnette, 1976) discovered recognition to be
one of the most frequently mentioned factors affecting
satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Recognition can be
expressed by supervisors, peers, and subordinates. This
feeling is apparently associated with the hierarchy of needs
in Maslow’s theory, that is, self-esteem which is generally
stimulated by acceptance from others. Recognition functions
more than just as a motivator. It provides feedback
concerning the competence of the employee’s job performance
as well as fulfills or, at least, strengthens the desire or need for self-esteem (Locke cited in Dunnette, 1976). An employee tends to value recognition acknowledged by superiors and peers whose judgment the employee respects more than recognition by others. In addition, Solmon and Tierney (1977) found that college presidents and academic affairs officers are much more satisfied with the various aspects of their jobs than other college administrators because of the prestige they gain from those positions.

**Work Itself**

"Work itself" is defined by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) as "the actual doing of the job or the tasks of the job as a source of good or bad feelings about it" (p. 48). Srivastva et al. (1977) added that the employee’s perception of the work is not necessarily accurate.

Numerous researchers (Avakian, 1971; Dunnette, 1976, Wexley and Yuk1, 1977; and Srivastva et al., 1977) found that the nature of the work itself is consistently associated with job satisfaction. Such research has concluded that jobs should possess at least three essential characteristics which enhance job satisfaction:

1. **Variety:** The greater the variety of job activities, the less boring the job, and the less boring the job, the more interesting it can be. Nevertheless, it should not be assumed that when the job is interesting, the employee would be motivated to perform the job better because "interesting" depends upon personal interests of individual employees.
2. **Challenge**: This characteristic of the job is emphasized in numerous studies. If employees perceive that the job is relevant to their talents and skills and that it is challenging, the employees are interested in the job and are motivated. Carroll (1973) stated that purely psychological challenge is directly related to satisfaction. She also cited Giest's study that freedom and intellectual challenge are the most frequently mentioned reasons for job satisfaction among a variety of occupations. The challenge of work stimulates job involvement and job commitment to the goals the employee is pursuing (Locke cited in Dunnette, 1976).

3. **Autonomy**: Srivastva et al. (1977) investigated many research and studies in the past and found that autonomy is related to performance and job satisfaction. In most cases, the more autonomy the employee possesses, the more job satisfaction the employee gains. This is particularly true among employees with higher-order needs such as self-actualization needs (Wexley and Yukl, 1977). Nevertheless, this finding is not likely to apply to employees with lower-order needs because employees with lower-need orientation tend to prefer less independence and responsibility. This is absolutely dependent upon personal needs and characteristics. Scanlan (1976) found that there is a relationship between autonomy and satisfaction and indicated that satisfaction will increase when employees can control their own work pace as well as the method of performance. Porter (cited in
Kokkila, Slocum, and Strawer, 1972) pointed out that most business executives are satisfied with their ability to make decisions independently. Consequently, it results in increased job satisfaction and performance effectiveness. Therefore, one might presume that since administrators or executives generally have more autonomy and independence in performing the job than those people who are in lower positions, they usually experience more satisfaction with their job.

In higher educational environments, work itself is also found to be a crucial factor of job satisfaction. Avakian (1971) reported there are significantly more faculty members in universities who emphasized that job content related to satisfaction than those who did not. Job content can be regarded as the work itself. Furthermore, Eckert, Stecklein, and Sagen (cited in Morris, 1972) concluded in their study that "The largest number of reasons given for liking this field centered around the nature of the work that college teachers do...." (p. 41).

Responsibility

Authority is included in responsibility. Satisfaction derived from this job dimension occurs from being given responsibility for one's own work or for other's or being given a new responsibility (Herzberg et al., 1959). Krock (1967) and Carroll (1973) concluded in their studies that job satisfaction has a fairly consistent correlation with job levels or job status. Scanlan (1976) also agreed with this
finding. He found that a high-status job which can utilize the skills and abilities of the employee leads to a higher degree of being recognized and trusted to be responsible for something, in other words, the need for self-esteem is fulfilled and the employee is motivated. Wittenauer (1980) pointed out in her study of university faculty members that responsibility is regarded as a satisfier and it has the highest percentage of responses from the subjects. Supporting this finding, Velez Velez (1980) stated that the higher the rank, the more satisfied the faculty, especially in private universities.

Growth and Advancement

Oftentimes growth and advancement are mentioned as two different factors. However, there are some researchers who do not differentiate growth from advancement. Herzberg et al. (1959, p. 46) defined the possibility of growth as "... not only the likelihood that the individual would also be able to move onward and upward within his organization but also a situation in which he is able to advance in his own skills and in his profession" and advancement as "... an actual change in the status or position of the person in the company. In situations in which an individual transferred from one part of the company to another without any change in status but with increased opportunities for responsible work, the change was considered an increased responsibility ... but not formally an advancement." Numerous researchers, namely, Scanlan (1976), Srivastva et al. (1977), Velez Velez (1980),
and Wittenauer (1980) agreed that growth and advancement are positively related to job satisfaction and are identified as intrinsic motivators. Scanlan (1976) concluded his study about growth and advancement in relation to job satisfaction as follows:

1. Jobs with potential growth, development, and advancement tend to offer more satisfaction.

2. The longer employees perceive that they have to wait before the opportunity for growth and advancement occurs, the less positive influence this factor will be on the job satisfaction. On the contrary, if the opportunity is promising and immediate, the increase in satisfaction is likely to take place.

The perception of growth and advancement is associated with the individual needs and desires. For instance, even if a promotion is granted but perceived by the employee as inadequate or unfair, that employee might not be satisfied at all. On the other hand, if the employee does not want the promotion, that employee can still be satisfied with the unfair system even if he or she misses the opportunity of advancement. Not every employee likes to accept more responsibility and more work. Mustafa and Sylvia (1975) related turnover with advancement in their study. They found that turnover results from limited chances of advancement and unfairness perceived in promotional policies. It should be noted that even if employees do not want to be promoted, they still want to feel that the opportunity does exist (Krock,
Salary/Pay

Salary refers to as all types of compensation. Numerous researchers identify pay as a job dimension which is most likely to be a dissatisfier rather than a satisfier (Lawler and E.E. cited in Wexley and Yukl, 1977). Slocum and Misshauk (1970) supported this idea, agreeing that job satisfaction is not dependent upon pay or salary. Their study showed that employees with higher skills are more concerned with their job, opportunity for advancement, and ability to use skills rather than compensation. In addition, the Hawthorne study (Todes, Mckinney, and Ferguson, 1977) showed that financial incentives or pay have little effect on the increase in job performance and that the feeling of belonging and good social relationships between the management and the employee and among employees themselves are significantly related to employee productivity.

"Equity" theory is often mentioned in numerous studies in relation to job satisfaction. Studies such as those of Locke (cited in Dunnette, 1976); Ivancevich and Donnelly, and Salinas (both cited in Carroll, 1973) were based upon this theory. Lawler (cited in Dunnette, 1976, p. 1321) explained, "... pay satisfaction is a function of obtained pay in relation to the individual's perceived inputs and outputs in relation to the other people holding similar jobs." The equity of pay can be viewed by an employee in comparison to other employees who assume the same or similar positions in
the same organization as well as in other organizations (Ivancevich and Donnelly; Salinas cited in Carroll, 1973). Nevertheless, there are other factors affecting the employee’s judgment in pay equity, namely, basic needs, security needs, and values on money and materialism (Wexley and Yukl, 1977). If an employee’s pay is sufficient for his or her basic needs, the employee will feel more satisfied than if the pay is less than necessary to insure his or her adequate standard of living (Goodman cited in Wexley and Yukl, 1977). Employees who are concerned with economic disasters will be less satisfied than employees who do not feel insecure even though they receive the same pay. Moreover, employees who value money and materials will be more affected by pay in relation to job satisfaction than those who care less about materialism (Wexley and Yukl, 1977).

Scanlan (1976) added another factor affecting satisfaction. He reported, "If wages are to contribute to job satisfaction, the rate of the increase given must be significant, given voluntarily and earned in the sense that it truly reflects high level of accomplishment. Also employees must perceive that the wage increases are in fact awarded on the basis of performance" (p. 13). Several studies (Pritchard; Dunnette and Jorgenson cited in Dunnette, 1976) indicated that subjects in the studies who are overpaid are just as satisfied with their pay, though not more satisfied than equitably paid subjects because employees who
are overpaid experience the conflict resulting in a feeling of displeasure from the knowledge that they do not perform well enough to deserve that overpaid compensation. On the other hand, Dunnette (1976) also referred to his real-life experience that this finding is not necessarily true for employees in different occupations. Neumann (1978, p. 273) advocated this notion, "... the over rewarded faculty is more satisfied than the justly treated faculty, while the justly treated faculty is more satisfied than the deprived faculty."

Beside the finding of Neumann’s study on job satisfaction among faculty in higher education, Solmon and Tierney (1977) pointed out there is a relatively high degree of satisfaction among university administrators, and particularly high among those who feel they are not rewarded for simply accepting authority. Wittenauer (1980) is the only researcher encountered in this study who identified pay as a potential satisfier rather than a dissatisfier. Other studies rarely categorized pay as a motivator. For example, Morris (1972) stated salary to be a seldom-mentioned factor of job satisfaction or no job satisfaction even when all reasons are considered. College professors showed their job satisfaction mostly with the work itself and they are less satisfied with tangible rewards such as salary and promotion (Nicholas and Miljus cited in Carroll, 1973; Aeli cited in Openshaw, 1980).
Interpersonal Relations

Interpersonal relations refers to actual interactions either by physical activities or by verbalization. Herzberg et al. (1959) divided interpersonal relations into three levels: supervisors, peers, and subordinates. Such relations can be affected by four factors (Scanlan, 1976):

1. The amount of interaction between peers.
2. The personal attitudes of each side.
3. The group acceptance.
4. The amount of interaction which is necessary in attaining goals.

Scanlan (1976) concluded that the more amount of interaction and acceptance of the group, the more cohesive the group because similar attitudes will be aroused and therefore, a greater degree of satisfaction will result. In other words, the greater the work group cohesiveness, the greater the job satisfaction. This finding is supported by numerous researchers (Krock, 1967; Blum and Naylor, 1968; Adams and Scolum cited in Carroll, 1973; and Wittenauer, 1980). The study of Scolum and Misshauk (1970) showed that the higher-skilled employees tend to attach more importance to the job itself than those who have lower skills. However, high-skilled employees with high group cohesiveness indicate less satisfaction than the lower-skilled employees with high group cohesiveness (Adams and Slocum cited in Carroll, 1973).
Supervision

It is difficult to identify a stereotype of supervisors who are the most preferred by subordinates. However, there are some common characteristics of supervisors which are indicated to have an influence on subordinates’ satisfaction. Wexley and Yukl (1977) concluded the four basic characteristics of supervisors which are reported to enhance subordinates’ job satisfaction:

1. **Considerate and supportive:** Scanlan (1976, p. 12) defined supervisors’ consideration in the following aspects:
   a. Sensitivity to the problems people face on the job that hinder accomplishment.
   b. Availability and openness to people needing help.
   c. Sensitivity to, and sympathy with things and conditions in the wide environment and job structure which are not ideally perfect.
   d. Ability to establish more than a boss-subordinate relationship with employees.

   It has been reported that there is a negative relationship between supervisors’ consideration and employees’ absenteeism, grievance, and turnover rates (Vroom cited in Carroll, 1973; Flieshman and Harris cited in Teas, 1981).

2. **Allow participation in decision-making:** Whether a supervisor will allow a subordinate to take part in decision-making or not depends greatly upon the type of subordinates, decisions, and the degree of trust the supervisor renders the
subordinate. Supervisors, when appropriate, should share problems and information, ask for assistance in identifying major problems, gathering facts, and developing and analyzing alternative solutions with subordinates (Scanlan, 1976).

3. **Task-oriented:** Subordinates prefer task-oriented supervisors.

4. **Define roles clearly:** Supervisors who can help subordinates with the jobs characterized by role ambiguity or those who can define how the work should be done are reported to have high levels of job satisfaction in subordinates (Barrett cited in Carroll, 1973; House, House and Dessler cited in Teas, 1981).

In addition to the four aforementioned characteristics of supervisors stated by Wexley and Yukl (1977), there are two general types of supervisory styles identified in the study of Srivastva et al. (1977) as the supervisors’ characteristics attributed positively to job satisfaction:

1. **Democratic supervisory style:** "Overall, it seems that democratic supervisory style is related to performance, usually positively, but the direction and strength of the relationship depends on the task, on the leader’s ability, and on the subordinate’s involvement and independence needs" (Srivastva et al., 1977, p. xvi).

2. **Supportive supervisory style:** "... though, similar to democratic style but it tends to be a facilitative or helping style while democratic concentrates on delegation of responsibilities. Supportive supervisory style is positively
related to performance" (Srivastva et al., 1977, p. xvi).

According to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, supervision is categorized as a dissatisfier. Contrary to the theory, this author found that numerous researchers (Carroll, 1973; Scanlan, 1976; Srivastva et al., 1977; Wexley and Yukl, 1977; Wittenauer, 1980; and Teas, 1981) identified supervision as a motivator or satisfier. Locke (cited in Dunnette, 1976) supported this finding by referring to another eight researchers who also pointed out a positive relationship between supervision and job satisfaction. In addition, the study of Mayo known as the Hawthorne study (Tansik, Chase, and Aquilano, 1980) indicated that employee productivity is very likely to increase if management pays special attention to employees such as allowing employee participation in decision-making and maintaining good relationship with them.

Organization Policy and Administration

In general, there are two common characteristics of an organization policy and administration involved in employee job satisfaction: one is referred to as "the adequacy or inadequacy of company organization and management"; the other is "the harmfulness or beneficial effects of the company policies" which are primarily related to personnel policies (Herzberg et al, 1959). An organization's ineffectiveness can be a result of poor communication, unclear job responsibilities, unfair pay, and other poor organizational systems. Locke (cited in Dunnette, 1976) added that there
are two characteristics of organization policies affecting employee job satisfaction:

1. **Role conflict**: "... the degree to which role expectations are incompatible or self-contradictory" (Dunnette, 1976, p. 1328). When this intrarole conflict is minimized, it results in a greater degree of satisfaction.

2. **Role ambiguity**: "... the degree to which role expectations are vague, unclear, or undefined" (Dunnette, 1976, p. 1328).

Earlier studies (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snock, and Rosenthal; House and Rizzo cited in Dunnette, 1976) supported the idea that organization policy and administration is likely to be a dissatisfier rather than a satisfier and role conflict and role ambiguity are related to job dissatisfaction. On the contrary, Wittenauer (1980) and Openshaw (1980) found in their studies on job satisfaction in higher educational environments that this factor is associated with job satisfaction.

**Working conditions**

Working conditions include physical conditions of work, the amount of work, and the facilities available for doing the work (Herzberg et al., 1959). Commonly, there are two basic preferences of working conditions among employees: one is the desire for physical comfort which depends upon the individual’s physical needs; the other is the desire for conditions which assist the accomplishment of work goals (Locke cited in Dunnette, 1976). It is reported that
sometimes complaints about working conditions result from deeper discomforts and dislikes from other factors such as management and work itself, and as soon as these discomforts are relieved the complaints no longer continue (Herzberg and Whyte cited in Dunnette, 1976).

However, there is a disagreement among research and studies in determining if working conditions are a factor of satisfaction. Eckert, Stecklein, and Sagen (cited in Morris, 1972) and Aebi (cited in Openshaw, 1980) indicated working conditions as a prime reason for dissatisfaction. On the contrary, Mustafa and Sylvia (1975), Srivastva et al. (1977), Solmon and Tierney (1977), and Wittenauer (1980) pointed out that working conditions are a factor related to satisfaction. Solmon and Tierney (1977) found that the increase in the quality of colleges where administrators work can improve their satisfaction. However, Mustafa and Sylvia (1975) advanced this idea that although the relationship between working conditions and satisfaction occurs, it does not ensure the result in higher motivation and productivity levels. Instead, satisfaction with working conditions helps in minimizing turnover rates and maintaining a content and stable work force.

**Job Security**

Job security is not referred to as a feeling of security but rather as the presence or absence of job security including tenure and organization stability (Herzberg et al., 1959). Numerous studies (Rachman and Kemp, Form and
Geschwender, Alder cited in Carroll, 1977) stated that tenure and length of time on the job are factors contributing to satisfaction and the longer the tenure, the greater the increase in satisfaction. Velez Velez (1972), Srivastva et al., (1977), and Openshaw (1980) supported this finding. Velez Velez (1972) found that his subjects in universities showed their satisfaction with all job factors when they had been on the job for twenty-one years or more. He suggested that this might be because "These professors consider university teaching as a real career, and so might have a strong sense of identity with their respective institutions, and perhaps less chance for mobility in career terms" (p. 110).
CHAPTER III
Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Summary of Job Satisfaction

Numerous researchers have attempted to identify determinants of job satisfaction. It is also reported by several researchers (Vroom, 1964; Hulin, 1968; and Reitz, 1981) that job satisfaction is related to some job dimensions, namely, performance, turnover, and absenteeism, which have an impact on organizational effectiveness and productivity. Studies such as that of Vroom (cited in Kuhn, et al., 1971) reported a positive relationship between satisfaction and performance. Though the correlation is not large (+.14), it is consistent. Adopting this concept, administrators in some organizations have tried to have control over the factors found to be associated with satisfaction so as to increase employee job satisfaction which, in turn, is expected to result in the increase in organizational effectiveness and productivity. Nevertheless, the great number of earlier studies have not reached an agreement on factors of satisfaction. The issue is still controversial.

Researchers whose studies are well-known, widely accepted, and have a tremendous influence on studies and theories of job satisfaction are Abraham Maslow and Frederick
Herzberg. Maslow proposed the theory of hierarchy of needs, emphasizing the effect of individual needs in relation to motivation; Herzberg stated the theory of motivation-hygiene theory or two-factor theory, explaining job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and their determinants.

The purpose of this study was to identify factors which are most likely to affect job satisfaction (not dissatisfaction) among college and university academic faculty and administrators. From the review of the related research and literature in both educational and business and industry environments, the author found that factors which are reported as associated with satisfaction in business and industry settings differ from those that are reported in higher educational settings. Herzberg’s theory is more applicable to business environments than to higher educational environments. Table 1 shows the factors reported in Herzberg’s theory as factors affecting satisfaction and dissatisfaction regardless of demographic factors, that is, characteristics of employees such as sex, age, and race. The motivators are identified as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and growth and advancement; the hygiene factors are pointed out as salary/pay, interpersonal relations, supervision, organization policy and administration, working conditions, and job security.
Table 1

Motivators/Satisfiers and Hygiene Factors/Dissatisfiers in Herzberg’s Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators/Satisfiers</th>
<th>Hygiene Factors/Dissatisfiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement</td>
<td>1. Salary/pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recognition</td>
<td>2. Interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work itself</td>
<td>3. Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responsibility</td>
<td>4. Organization policy and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Growth and advancement</td>
<td>5. Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Job security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, the author found that factors which are identified as motivators in Herzberg’s theory are also found to be motivators in higher educational environments, but some of the factors stated as hygiene factors in Herzberg’s theory are discovered to be motivators among college and university faculty and administrators. Numerous researchers who studied job satisfaction in higher educational environments identified the difference of satisfaction between business and industry settings and higher educational settings. Cohen (1974), Wittenauer (1980), and Openshaw (1980) are the contemporary researchers who pointed out this difference. Wittenauer (1980, p. 153) stated, "It seems not possible to
utilize Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Motivation intact for faculty in higher education. This may suggest that differences between business and industry in the one hand and education on the other, which have been accepted by some and denied by others, are real and do exist in fact." Openshaw (1980) cited those factors identified by Herzberg as motivators plus some other factors indicated as hygiene factors to be motivators as well. Openshaw (1980, p. 21) stated, "Salary, good interpersonal relations, effective policy and administration, and supervision contributed little to job satisfaction but when not effectively present, were highly dissatisfying to the administrators." Moreover, Cohen (1974) not only concluded his study in concert with the aforementioned researchers but also noted that "Professors do not tend to characterize themselves as 'workers'; hence, they do not look to the literature of business and industry for models or theories to use in describing their activities. And indices of productivity—the dependent variable typically applied in industry—are weak in higher education" (p. 369).

It is strongly agreed in both business and industry and educational environments that achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement are positively related to job satisfaction. Achievement is reported as the most intrinsic factor to create satisfaction among administrators whereas interpersonal relations, particularly with students, is identified as the most frequently mentioned factor in gaining satisfaction among faculty and
administrators in higher education. Achievement is essentially based upon individual standards and personal goals because achievement is a feeling occurring from a sense of accomplishment and accomplishing one thing may bring a feeling of achievement to one person but not to another person because the second person might have a higher standard to reach in order to gain some satisfaction. Employees who have high self-concept, self-esteem, and self-actualization tend to show more correlation between their performance and job satisfaction.

Recognition occurs when an employee's accomplishment or ability is accepted by others, particularly by superiors and peers. In universities, it is reported that administrators identified as presidents and academic affairs officers are the people who are generally more satisfied with their job than those in other positions (Solmon and Tierney, 1977). Prestige is involved in position levels and therefore, affects self-esteem and job satisfaction. This shows the relationship between Maslow's hierarchy of needs and satisfaction.

Work is also found to be a motivator. The general characteristics of the job as associated with satisfaction are: (1) variety of work and activities, (2) challenge and congruence with the employee's personal interests, skills, and abilities, and (3) autonomy of the work and opportunity to participate in decision-making. Work challenge is stated as the most frequently mentioned among job characteristics
which can stimulate motivation and job involvement.

Responsibility also includes authority. They are reported to have a fairly consistent correlation with job levels and job status (Krock, 1967; Carroll, 1973). It is generally true that higher-job-level employees accept more responsibility and authority than the lower-job-level employees. In universities, it is found that the higher the job level, the more satisfaction the faculty receive (Velez Velez, 1972).

Growth and advancement are indicated as satisfiers. Jobs which offer growth and advancement to the employee’s profession and skills are considered to be positively stimulating to job satisfaction. Such factors are associated with the employee’s perception of fairness of the promotional system and personal needs. Growth and advancement are found to be the reasons for job changes and turnover when it is absent from job dimensions (Mustafa and Sylvia, 1975).

The factors which are identified by Herzberg as dissatisfiers but are found in this study as satisfiers are interpersonal relations, supervision, organization policy and administration, and job security. Interpersonal relations, when applied to faculty and administrators in universities in three levels (supervisors, peers, and subordinates/students), are indicated to be a source of satisfaction, especially at a student level. University faculty derive satisfaction when they receive positive feedback from their students and they perceive this type of satisfaction as a major intrinsic
motivation (Cohen, 1974; Cohen cited in Wittenauer, 1980). University administrators also report that part of their satisfaction comes from the relationship with subordinates (Solmon and Tierney, 1977).

Supervisors who are considerate, willing to let subordinates participate in decision-making, task-oriented, and who can define job roles clearly are found to be liked and preferred by subordinates (Wexley and Yukl, 1977). In other words, democratic and supportive supervisory styles are the supervisory characteristics which positively attribute to job satisfaction (Srivastva et al., 1977). Numerous research and studies in higher education (Carroll, 1973; Scanlan, 1976; Srivastva et al., 1977; Wexley and Yukl, 1977; Wittenauer, 1980; and Teas, 1981) have shown that there is a positive relationship between supervision and job satisfaction.

Organization policy and administration is indicated as a motivator by several researchers (Openshaw, 1980; Wittenauer, 1980) in the field of higher education. Organizations which have a good system of communication, of personnel policy, of clear organizational structure, and are goal-oriented are found to be effective organizations because these factors enhance employee job attitudes (Locke cited in Dunnette, 1976). Clear role expectations, reduction in role conflicts, and job ambiguity are found to be associated with job satisfaction in higher educational environments but not in business and industry settings.
Job security is identified as a satisfier among the studies and research gathered in this study, both in business and higher education sectors, when job security is referred to as tenure. It has been found that the longer the faculty stay in the university, the more satisfied they are (Velez Velez, 1972). Reitz (1981) found employees with more than three years' seniority are most likely to quit the job if dissatisfied. In other word, it can be inferred that employees tend to resign from the job after the first three years if they feel dissatisfied, and if satisfied to some extent, they tend to keep the job. Numerous studies in higher education found that the longer the tenure, the greater the increase in job satisfaction.

Conclusion of Job Satisfaction Factors in Higher Education

From the review of the related research and literature, it was found that the factors identified as satisfiers in Herzberg's theory are motivators in the business and industry sector as well as in the higher educational sector. Moreover, some factors identified as dissatisfiers in Herzberg's theory are found in this study as satisfiers among faculty and administrators in higher education. Several researchers in the educational field (Cohen, 1974; Wittenauer, 1980; Openshaw, 1980) found that higher education has quite a unique structure of its own compared to other types of organizations. Besides, the characteristics of academic staff and administrators vary from those of employees in the
business and industry sector. These two differences can be taken into account that they cause the satisfaction factors in higher educational environments to differ from those in business and industry environments.

The following is a list of factors found in this study to affect job satisfaction among academic faculty and administrators in higher education. However, they are not listed in the order of importance.

1. Achievement
2. Recognition
3. Work itself
4. Responsibility
5. Growth and advancement
6. Interpersonal relations
7. Supervision
8. Organization policy and administration
9. Job security

Recommendations for Improvements in Job Satisfaction

From the investigation of numerous studies, this author found that faculty and administrators in colleges and universities are most likely to exceed the stage of lower-order needs and tend to acquire the fulfillments of self-esteem and self-actualization. Lopez (1982) found that there is a higher positive correlation between performance and job satisfaction among those who have higher self-esteem than among those who have lower self-esteem. When relating the
author's assumption with the finding of Lopez, it is evident
that college and university academic faculty and
administrators would obtain a high degree of satisfaction
when the needs of self-esteem and self-actualization are
fulfilled which, in turn, will result in more effective
performance. This section will be concerned with
recommendation for improvements in job satisfaction in
relation to the nine factors found in this study as job
satisfaction-producing factors.

Self-esteem and self-actualization can be fulfilled by a
number of means. For instance, work accomplishment and
recognition expressed by others lead to high self-esteem and
self-actualization. To increase faculty and administrator
job satisfaction through the fulfillment of these needs,
opportunities of work accomplishment must be granted first.
Clear job roles and job expectations enhance achievement.
Work assignments must be goal-oriented and related to
individual employees' interests, skills, and abilities so
that the perception of work challenge and motivation will be
greatly aroused.

Recognition can be obtained as a consequence of an
accomplishment when appreciated by others. Promotion,
rewards, special significant job assignments, and all types
of self-esteem-producing factors are means of gaining
recognition. A merit pay system is a reward system which
also brings forth a recognition of an outstanding
performance. It can be viewed as a satisfier to the person
who receives a reward and as a dissatisfier to the one who does not receive it. Fuller (1983, p. 29) suggested, "Effective incentive pay systems must provide clearly understood criteria for measuring output, established standards of performance, and a recognition by employees that they can improve performance ...." Evaluation systems must be developed and administered systematically, fairly, and with good understanding between the evaluator and the person who is evaluated. If an evaluation is not effectively carried out, it can jeopardize the organization, deteriorating faculty moral and increasing grievances. An evaluation system is often used in determining more than merit pay. It is also implemented for deciding promotion, raise, and other rewards; therefore, it must be planned and carried out systematically and effectively.

Job design is one of the crucial changes to improve the effectiveness of an organization. Job design is defined as " ... any activity that involves changing a job with the intent of increasing both the quality of the employees' work experience and on-the-job productivity" (Francis and Milbourn, 1980, p. 47). Job design, when planned, should cover four job dimensions: variety, challenge, autonomy, and feedback.

1. **Variety**: Variety develops and progresses in three different facets:
   
   a. **Teaching activities**: Designing courses on new subject matters or new methods of teaching on a familiar
subject or pertaining to skills and interests can offer a satisfying learning experience and an opportunity to be creative (Fuller, 1983). In addition, time of job assignments should also be taken into consideration to the extent that no time pressure or over-loaded work would be perceived by the faculty and administrators. Faculty exchanges, both types of interuniversity and intrauniversity, in-house lecturing, workshops or seminars, and consulting in the areas of expertise are all considered activities offering job variety in teaching experience (Fuller, 1983).

b. **Professional activities:** Research and scholarships granted in the field congruent with personal interests, skills, and professional growth or career advancement provide a variety of job dimensions.

c. **Special projects and non-academic assignments:** These types of activities keep faculty from classroom teaching. Special projects offer access to and challenge of new work experience to faculty while non-academic assignments provide occasional leaves from traditional faculty responsibilities with new learning experiences in business, government, or private enterprises (Fuller, 1983).

2. **Challenge:** Faculty and administrators will perceive the job as a challenge when the job is in harmony with their interests, skills, and capabilities. It is essential that the job must not be too easy to accomplish, but attainable. Job challenge interests employees and creates job involvement and job commitment to the target goals of the institution.
3. **Autonomy**: Freedom or work independence is valued by faculty and administrators in higher education. Baldwin and Blackburn (1983) reported that autonomy is an essential factor of satisfaction among faculty members in universities. The freedom in academic decision-making, in the control of work pace, and in the means of work accomplishments are all supportive to satisfaction. The sense of autonomy also leads faculty and administrators to the feeling of being trusted and responsible. However, autonomy of work does not imply that faculty and administrators should be treated in whatever way they prefer, in other words, autonomy is not interpreted as the laissez-faire system. Instead, autonomy means "... the optimal freedom is freedom within an organization that has goals of its own and coordinates faculty goals in ways that help to accomplish institutional goals" (Baldwin and Blackburn, 1983, p. 64).

4. **Feedback**: Feedback is an important function supervisors should provide. It helps assure the subordinates that they are performing satisfactorily and as wanted. If they are going in the wrong direction, then they can change the direction and corrective actions can take place. Although employees prefer autonomy of work, they still need some feedback to stimulate and motivate them at the right time and in the right manner.

Variety, challenge, autonomy, and feedback are job characteristics which affect employee satisfaction. It is particularly true for higher-order need employees. This
Figure 4

Job Characteristics Affecting Job satisfaction of Higher-Order-Need Employees

(Hackman, Oldham, Janson, and Purdy cited in Francis and Milbourn, 1980)

Higher-Order-Need Employees

Skill variety → Challenge → Experience of meaningfulness of the work → High internal motivation

Autonomy → Experience of responsibility for outcomes of the work → High quality work performance

Feedback → Knowledge of the actual results of the work activities → Low absenteeism and turnover
concept is shown in figure 4 (Francis and Milbourn, 1980).

Job design also includes the amount of work assigned which should never exceed the capability of individual employees. The amount of work load is more important to the employee's perception when it comes to the fairness in work load assignment. Reeves (cited in Toombs, 1973) stated that equalizing work load is one of the most difficult problems facing higher education administrators.

The sense of responsibility enhances the fulfillment of the self-esteem need. Job enlargement and and job enrichment can serve this need. It is, sometimes, confused that job enlargement is the same factor as job enrichment. Job enlargement is involved in horizontal work loading; it expands job duties without necessarily granting more control over the job to the employee. Job enrichment is referred to vertical job loading; it includes a greater work content with a requirement of higher level of skills and knowledge, offering more responsibility and autonomy in planning, directing, and controlling as well as providing opportunity for personal growth and meaningful work experience (Luthans, Fred and Reif cited in Francis and Milbourn, 1980).

Job enrichment, when related to motivation, is more productive than job enlargement since it offers more to self-esteem and self-actualization. This is because job enrichment gives employees more responsibility, professional growth, and skills as well as autonomy of work, whereas job enlargement emphasizes only the greater amount of work load
and responsibility. Faculty and administrators tend to accept responsibility with higher satisfaction when the responsibility is granted on the basis of past performance outcomes, not merely through the line of job level or position power. Clearly defined responsibility and perceived relatively equity between the inputs (e.g., time, effort, and responsibility) and outputs (e.g., pay, recognition, the sense of accomplishment, and professional growth) also affect employee job satisfaction.

Job enrichment does not only give employees an opportunity to fulfill the needs of self-esteem and self-actualization through the sense of being responsible for a higher-level job but also advances and improves professional skills and abilities. Academic faculty need professional growth in both teaching and research fields. Perception of the availability of growth and advancement is as important as the actual growth and advancement itself. Equal opportunity and fairness of promotion systems are desired by faculty and administrators. As Krock (167) reported, even if employees do not actually want to be promoted, they want to feel that the opportunity exists.

Interpersonal relations in an organization can be enhanced by improvement in the communication system in that organization. Lines of communication must be made clear and available. Generally, there are two types of communication in an organization: vertical and horizontal. Vertical communication may operates in two directions: downward and
upward. To be of maximum effectiveness, it must be operated in both directions. Downward vertical communication may be defined as the transmission of information from superiors to subordinates, whereas upward vertical communication occurs in the opposite direction (Price, 1968). Upward communication is as important as downward communication in order to maintain organizational effectiveness. Downward communication usually happens when commands, orders, and assignments are given to subordinates. Upward communication takes place when reports, information, inquiry, and accomplished work assignments are required or needed to be acknowledged. In fact, upward communication should be encouraged to occur more than just a path of communication of work-related matters from subordinates to superiors; it should be conducted for the purpose of obtaining information and feedback from subordinates as an input for organizational improvements regarding employee attitudes, opinions, morale, and creativity. Francis and Milbourn (1980, p. 237) suggested, "... one best way to accomplish an upward communication flow is to develop an organizational climate that invites employee input and provides no deterrents to participation."

Horizontal communication is referred to as the transmission of information among peers, and it affects the effectiveness of routine work flow when there is a block of communication line (Price, 1980). The following is an explanation of the effect of communication effectiveness on
job dimensions (Price, 1980, p. 181):

A high degree of communication increases coordination, which, in turn, increases effectiveness. A high degree of vertical communication increases visibility; increased visibility makes it possible for the sanction system to increase conformity. A high degree of horizontal communication decreases misunderstandings and disagreements which, in turn, increases conformity.

Interpersonal relations can also take place in two manners: formal and informal, both in vertical and horizontal communications. Formal communication is generally involved directly with job context and job content, whereas informal communication can occur either within or outside job context and job content. Informal communication usually can help strengthen interpersonal relations in an organization more than formal communication since informal communication offers an informal climate which is more conducive to closeness of relationships. Communication which takes place as interactions implies that feedback also occurs simultaneously, that is, a two-way communication. Faculty are reported to have satisfaction when they interact with their students and receive positive feedback from them, and this type of satisfaction brings forth intrinsic motivation (Cohen, 1974; Cohen cited in Wittenauer, 1980). Therefore, to increase academic faculty and administrator satisfaction,
environments which enhance interactions between faculty and administrators and students must be encouraged in academic as well as in non-academic settings, and informal as well as formal manners. Departmental orientations, class meetings or seminars, and departmental trips or excursions are examples of non-academic activities. Such activities will strengthen interpersonal relationships among faculty and administrators and students. Positive results from such interactions happen not only to faculty and administrators but also to the students. As Bess (1980, p. 215) stated, "For students who encounter primarily those faculty who strongly desire to be engaged with them (and not to be involved with faculty who are reluctant and perhaps resentful teachers) the interaction will make a great difference in their excitement about the educational process and in their willingness to learn and grow."

Immediate supervisors or superiors usually have a great influence on their subordinates' satisfaction. Srivastva et al. (1977) and Scanlan (1976) reported that supervisory styles of supervisors affect subordinates' job satisfaction and that subordinates prefer democratic and supportive supervisors. This can be linked to the hierarchy of needs of Maslow since democratic and supportive supervisory styles offer subordinates the sense of autonomy and responsibility of work which help to increase their self-esteem and self-actualization. In addition, these types of supervisory styles allow opportunities for professional growth and
advancement to take place.

It is suggested that supervisors let subordinates know the organization's goals, role expectations, and performance expectations as well as help subordinates identify their personal goals so that supervisors will be able to match those goals with the nature of work and assignments. In setting goals, supervisors should allow subordinates to participate in the process. As Francis and Milbourn (1980, p. 12) clearly explained as follows:

Allowing individuals to set work related goals and making sure that goals are compatible with the organization's goals is a critical managerial task. When this task is accomplished in a way that makes the individual feel like an important part of the organization, there is generally a noticeable positive impact upon the employee's work behavior. Thus, a behavioral orientation by a manager will not only help to satisfy employee needs but will also lead to greater organizational effectiveness.

Role expectations give employees an idea about their job content. Subordinates should understand as precisely as possible what their job is and what is expected to be accomplished. Role clarity itself does not necessarily improve performance, but if it exists and is accepted by the subordinate, it is very likely that goal commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction will be enhanced (Francis and Milbourn, 1980).
Performance expectations are crucial to the organizational effectiveness. Without performance expectations, employees can easily be directionless and unproductive to the organization. Bess (1980) concluded, "... the inadequate specification of performance expectations has had a deleterious effect on faculty satisfactions. Moreover, lowered satisfactions, in turn, have resulted in lowered levels of performance" (p. 207).

Another two characteristics of superiors often mentioned as factors affecting subordinates’ satisfaction are supervisors’ allowance of subordinates’ participation in decision-making and ability to allocate sufficient resources. Resources are referred to as financial resources. Financial allocation such as research funds, compensation, and instructional equipment funds are examples of resources which faculty expect supervisors to sufficiently allocate (Budig and Rives, 1973). Subordinates who have opportunities to participate in decision-making will perceive the sense of belonging to the organization, and of being an important part of it.

Supervisors should regard subordinates’ professional growth as a part of their responsibilities since effective human resources of the organization result in organizational effectiveness. Training is an effective way to offer professional growth to subordinates. Training, as explained by Carroll (1973), has an impact on employees in the way that it must offer employees an opportunity to develop their
skills as well as to use those skills because if employees are not provided any chance to grow, they might experience frustration and dissatisfaction.

Organization policies and administration in higher education should be strengthened so as to improve organizational effectiveness. Clear, precise, and understandable policies should be established. Policies are taken as guidelines for administrators to exercise and faculty to follow. Fair and just policies are as important as fair and just exercises of management. A systematic structure of an organization enhances the organization's communication and work flow which, in turn, improves the organization's administration. Bess (1982) reported that faculty want fair and just treatments, if not exceptional, from the organization. The policy and administration of an organization should ensure equal opportunities and rights to employees when decision-making is executed. Participation from employees in the organization should always be welcomed and feedback should also be provided, or else they will be likely to adversely affect employee morale. Lines and spans of authority must be made clear so that no overlapped authority and job ambiguity exist. Job descriptions are very useful in preventing role ambiguity if they have been well prepared. Administrative teams should always be accessible and available when needed.

Job security is viewed by faculty and administrators as a form of tenure. The American Federation of Teachers
Advisory Commission on Higher Education (1979) stated that an advantage of the tenure system is that it ensures the freedom of inquiry, research, and professional opinion through guarantees of continuous employment and that it encourages participation in the organization because of the sense of belonging. However, tenure should not be granted only on the basis of the length of service but also the quality of job performance as well.

Recommendations for Improvements to Higher Education Administrators

Since a correlation between job satisfaction and performance (Vroom cited in Kuhn et al., 1971; Srivastva et al., 1977), absenteeism (Muchinsky, Porter, and Steers; and Steers and Rhodes cited in Heneman et al., 1980), and turnover (Hulin, 1968; Reitz, 1981) have been found in numerous research and studies, administrators should try to increase employee satisfaction to improve performance and reduce absenteeism and turnover rates which, in turn, is most likely to increase organizational effectiveness. To be able to have an influence on employee satisfaction, administrators must have control over factors of satisfaction. Factors of job satisfaction regarding job context and job content can be influenced by administrators; therefore, it is crucial that administrators possess administrative knowledge and skills in management of employee behavior and satisfaction. Kokkila et al. (1971, p. 5) explained, "If executives who make policy
level decisions were more knowledgeable with regard to the psychological aspects of managerial positions and how these factors affect job satisfaction, then errors in recruitment, promotion, training, and other personnel decisions might be significantly reduced and organizational effectiveness might be increased accordingly." Concerning the productivity and effectiveness of the organization, it is wise for administrators to understand and realize that the degree of their employees' satisfaction has an impact on the organizational productivity and effectiveness. It is also a part of administrative responsibilities to increase employee satisfaction since organizational effectiveness is an ultimate goal of most organizations.

Higher educational organizations are under increasing pressure to improve the effectiveness and productivity of the organization, for the purpose of improving the quality of education as well as increasing their accountability. An effort to fulfill this need must be carried out in a way that a system will be developed to implement the concepts presented in the section dealing with conclusion of job satisfaction factors in higher education. To provide a desirable climate to enhance the greatest possibility for job satisfaction in institutions of higher education, the following recommendations are proposed to college and university administrators:

1. It is advantageous that administrators recognize that faculty and administrator job satisfaction is affected
by certain job factors which are most likely to affect their performance and that it is a part of administrative responsibilities to increase employee job satisfaction.

2. Administrators should be aware that academic faculty and administrators possess some characteristics which are different from the employees in business enterprises. In addition, individual needs and characteristics of employees cause a substantial difference in priority of factors of job satisfaction and means of motivation of individual employees.

3. It is an advantage to the organization that factors which are recognized as affecting job satisfaction be controlled and changed to the extent that the organization will gain the most productivity from its human resources.

4. It is essential that administrators be trained to possess abilities, skills, and knowledge needed and relevant to the job before assuming the position. Administrators themselves need to be effective so they may be able to create effective employees.

5. It is important that administrators develop a systematic organizational structure and system pertaining to (1) lines of authority, (2) job descriptions, (3) role clarity, (5) communication lines, (6) promotion, (7) compensations and rewards, (8) tenure, and (9) evaluation.

6. It is important that administrators be goal-oriented and let academic faculty and administrators know and acknowledge their goals and performance expectations.

Participation of academic faculty and administrators in goal-
setting and agreement of performance expectations by them are strongly recommended.

7. Job design provides a chance for improvements in work quality. Administrators should design and assign the job to academic faculty and administrators according to (1) the individual's characteristics, skills, abilities, and interests; and (2) the needs of the individual and the organization. It is prudent to provide variety, challenge, autonomy, and feedback to the characteristics of work dimensions.

8. Job enrichment and job enlargement enhance academic faculty and administrator job satisfaction, providing more responsibility, professional growth and advancement, and recognition. These factors raise self-esteem and self-actualization of employees and therefore, employees are motivated. Thus, whenever possible, administrators should always apply job enrichment and job enlargement to the extent that individual employees' interests, skills, abilities, and needs are compatible with the organization's goals. Training is another task of administrative responsibilities in offering employees professional growth and advancement.

9. It is advantageous that administrators try to create an atmosphere which is conducive to positive interpersonal relations. Effective communication flow is the key word to positive interpersonal relations. This means that effective upward and downward vertical communications as well as horizontal communication, both in formal and informal manners
are to take place.

10 Administrators, particularly those who perform as immediate supervisors, should always demonstrate support and democracy to their subordinates. Feedback is another factor that administrators should provide their subordinates, but it should be given at a right time and in an appropriate manner or else it might become a negative rather than a positive motivator.

11. It is important that administrators should always try to operate the organization with fairness. Equal opportunity and rights should be perceived by academic faculty and administrators.

12. It is advantageous that administrators encourage academic faculty and administrators to develop a sense of belonging to the organization. Participation in the organization's activities and administration (i.e., decision-making) and tenure system are very supportive to bring about the sense of belonging. Providing true and accurate information about the organization to faculty and administrators is also essential. An orientation to new members of the organization brings about a positive initial attitude and a sense of belonging to them.

13. When recruiting or promoting a faculty member or an administrator, the administrators who conduct the process should plan, organize, and administer it in such a way that the right person will be selected and assigned to the right job in accordance with his or her abilities, skills,
interests, needs, attitude, and the organization’s goals. This is considered as a preventor of absenteeism, turnover, and poor performance which might result from resentfulness, dissatisfaction, or low satisfaction of faculty members or administrators affected by the ineffectiveness of recruitment or promotion.

14. It is essential that administrators recognize that the improvement of academic faculty and administrator job satisfaction is an on-going process and needs to be planned, organized, and carried out effectively. If possible, evaluation of faculty and administrator job satisfaction is strongly recommended to be developed and undertaken so that administrators will be able to continually improve the existing plan.
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