

## **Job Satisfaction: A Study on Interpersonal Relationship and Faculty Workload** **Srivalli.P\* & Vijayalakshmi.B\*\***

\*Assistant Professor, Jagan's College of Engineering, Nellore, Andhra Pradesh, India. Email: puttasrivalli@yahoo.co.in

\*\*Professor & Head of Business Management, Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswavidyalam, Tirupathi, Andhra Pradesh, India.  
Email: rajendraw2k@yahoo.co.in

### **Abstract**

*The study is conducted to understand the influence of interpersonal relationship and faculty workload on job satisfaction among faculty members of engineering colleges in Nellore Dist, Andhra Pradesh. The data is collected from 120 faculty members from six engineering colleges; convenience sampling is followed as sample design. The data is collected through self-administered structured questionnaire. The data collected is put for analysis by employing descriptive analysis and correlation. It is found from the analysis that there is positive relationship between Interrelationship and Job satisfaction. Further, workload has negative correlation with Job Satisfaction. The organization's now days are looking to implant organizational citizenship in employees, need to consider the above variables.*

**Keywords: Job satisfaction, interpersonal relationship, workload.**

been considered as a component of

### **I. Introduction**

Job satisfaction is a significant factor related to employee physical and mental well-being. Job Satisfaction is indicator of how employees feel about their jobs and a predictor of work behaviors such as organizational citizenship, absenteeism and turnover. The understanding of the above factors related to job satisfaction is significant to enhance the happiness of workers (Okpara, Squillace & Erond, 2005). Furthermore, Job Satisfaction among faculty members is important in contributing to quality of teaching, high job commitment help in producing high quality students. Understanding academicians' job satisfaction will help the institutions to find mechanism in order to retain academic talents, lower absenteeism and turnover rate.

Research in the area of job satisfaction on faculty members was ignored as subject of study. However, in recent years, there is increase in number of studies related to job satisfaction among academicians. The faculty member's job satisfaction is center to perform job effectively, further this contributes to give quality education and enhance employability skills in students. Further, the industry is voicing that decline in quality of education in engineering colleges leading to lack of employability skills of student's, this could be the reason in increase of studies on faculty members job satisfaction.

### **II. Literature Review**

Around the globe it is an established fact that a person with a high level of job satisfaction has a positive attitude towards the job, while a person who is dissatisfied with the job has a negative attitude. When people speak of employee attitude, they usually are referring to job satisfaction (Stephen P. Robbins, Mary Coulter, 2004). Job satisfaction has been defined by Locke (1976), as ". . . a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences". The main premise of this theory is that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. An early form of job satisfaction theory held that all elements of one's work environment contributed in additive fashion to the total job satisfaction which one realized. Job satisfaction has

organizational commitment.

### **Interpersonal Relationship**

Relationship with the supervisor and peers is also an important factor influencing the employees Job Satisfaction. According to Herzberg et al. (1952), it is a hygiene factor that may lead to job dissatisfaction. Employees in organizations are often attracting their supervisors for different reasons. These relationships are called functional and entity relationships (Locke, 1976). Functional relationships between supervisor and subordinate are based on which services can be provided for each other. An employee may be attracted to his or her supervisor to a degree that he or she views the supervisor or helping to attain salient job values (Locke, 1970). These values are normally related, or are related to the rewards the employee can accrue for task performance. Again, welfare (wellness) programs including benefits, bonus, overtime, transport allowance, medical allowance, etc., have positive relationships with job satisfaction of employees (Bonner 1997).

### **Workload**

Recent calls for faculty performance accountability and productivity have placed increasing demands on faculty work. Academics are expected to teach, conduct research, and be involved in service and administrative functions of their institutions and professions (e.g., Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Boyer, 1990; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Jacobs & Winslow, 2004; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). There is a significant variation in faculty work across institutions and disciplines, but regardless of the environment, there are always too many responsibilities that are competing for faculty members' time (e.g., Fairweather, 2002, 2005; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The research on faculty productivity reveals that today's academics face growing demands that make it harder for them to achieve the balance among various functions of their work (e.g., Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Fairweather, 1993, 2002; 2005; Fairweather & Beach, 2002; Fox, 1992; Hattie & Marsh, 1996; Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006; Porter & Umbach,

2001). Faculty work long hours, but despite these long hours, they find it difficult to balance the increasing expectations of their work that are becoming "more demanding in terms of effort as well as time" (Jacobs & Winslow, 2004, p. 106).

### III. Research Methodology

The objective of this study is to understand the relationship of Interpersonal Relationship of employees and Workload assigned with Job Satisfaction. This study is conducted among the faculty members of engineering colleges in Nellore Dist of Andhra Pradesh. The study collected data through self administered questionnaire. Convenience sampling was used to collect data. The study has collected opinions from 120 faculty members from various Engineering Colleges. The respondents were asked to rate on 5-point Likert scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The questionnaire consists of two sections, in the first section the questions were asked to measure demographic factors like Age Group, Gender, Year of Experience, and Qualification, Designation. In the second section, the questions related to Interpersonal Relationship, Workload and Job Satisfaction were presented.

### IV. Analysis

#### Hypothesis

**H1** Interpersonal Relationships have positive relationship with Job Satisfaction.

**H2** Workload of employees has negative relationship with Job Satisfaction.

The Table 1 explains the statistic details of demographic factors like Age Group, Gender, Year of Experience, Qualification and Designation. It is observed from the data, there are 54 (45%) of respondents are in the age groups of 25-30 years, 39(32.5%) of 31-40 Years, 15(12.5%), 8(6.6%) and 4(3.3%) of years. The sample comprised 74(61.6%) male and 46 (38.3%) female faculty. Around 63(52.5%) faculty members have 0-5 Years of Experience, 30(25%) faculty have 6-10 Years, 17(14%) faculty have 11-15 Years, 7(5.8%) faculty have 15-20 Years and 3(2.5%) faculty have 20 and above years of experience.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Demographic factors of Faculty**

S. L. No	Demographic Factors	Number of Respondents	Percent age
1	Age Group	25-30 Years	45
		31-40 Years	32.5
		41-50 Years	12.5
		51-60 Years	6.6
		60 and Above Years	3.3
2	Gender	Male	61.6
		Female	38.3

3	Year of Experience	0-5 Years	63	52.5
		6-10 Years	30	25
		11-15 Years	17	14
		15-20 Years	7	5.8
		20 and above Years	3	2.5
4	Qualification	Graduation	16	13.3
		Post Graduation	62	51.6
		NET/SLET (CSIR)	25	20.8
		M. Phil	10	8.33
5	Designation	Ph. D	7	5.8
		Assistant Professor	76	63.3
		Associate Professor	19	15.8
		Professor	15	12.5
	Others	10	8.33	

Around 16 (13.3%) faculty have graduation degree, 62(51.6%) have Post Graduation, 25(20.8%) faculty have NET/SLET. 10 (8.33%) have M. Phil and 7(5.8%) faculty have PhD degree. 76(63.3%) faculty are Assistant Professor, 19(15.8%) faculty are Associate Professor, 15(12.5%) faculty are Professor and 10(8.3%) faculty have other designation like visiting and guest faculty.

Correlation analysis was employed to analyze the direction of relationship between the antecedents and Job Satisfaction variables. Regression analysis is employed to understand the magnitude of variance explained by the antecedents on Job Satisfaction.

In Table 2 weighted means and Cronbach's alpha of variables are been detailed. It can be observed that Interpersonal Relationship has weighted mean of 2.8. It reveals the faculty doesn't have quality relationships with their superiors and peers. The weighted means of workload variable is observed at 1.8, can be understood that faculty perceive the workload too high. Job Satisfaction of faculty members is observed to be 2.8, can be interpreted as marginally satisfied. Cronbach's alpha is concerned with the degree of interrelatedness among the set of items designed to measure a single construct. Table 2 depicts the reliability alphas for various constructs. As can be seen, the coefficient alphas for all variables are above 0.60 which is an acceptable limit according to the research standards.

**Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha and Weighted Means**

S. No	Variables	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha	Weighted Means
1	Interpersonal Relationship	4	0.601	2.8
2	Workload	5	0.772	1.8
3	Job Satisfaction	6	0.819	2.8

Table 3 represents correlation and regression analysis. To understand the direction and significance of relationship between the antecedents and Customer Loyalty, Correlation analysis is performed. To understand the magnitude of variance explained by antecedents on Customer loyalty, regression analysis is employed.

**Table 3: Correlation and Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction**

Relation ship	Correla tion Coeffici ent r	Sig	Regres sion Coeffici ent R <sup>2</sup>	Sig	Hypothe sis (Support ed/ Not Support ed)
IR → JS	.48	.003	.22	.006	H1 Support ed
WL → JS	-.67	.000	.43	.000	H2 support ed

IR = Interpersonal Relationship, WL = Work Load and JS = Job Satisfaction

**H1:** Interpersonal Relationships have positive relationship with Job Satisfaction. Correlation analysis reveals that Interpersonal Relationship has positive relationship with Job Satisfaction ( $r = 0.48$ ,  $p < .000$ ). Interpersonal Relationship is able to explain 22% of variance in Job Satisfaction ( $r^2 = 0.22$ ,  $p < .000$ ). It can be understood that Interpersonal Relationship is a good predictor of Job satisfaction. Hence H1 is accepted.

**H2:** Workload of employees has negative relationship with Job Satisfaction. Correlation analysis reveals that workload has negative relationship with Job Satisfaction ( $r = -0.67$ ,  $p < .000$ ). Workload is able to explain 43 % of variance in Job Satisfaction ( $r^2 = 0.43$ ,  $p < .000$ ). It can be understood that workload is a good predictor of Job satisfaction. Hence H2 is accepted

## V. Conclusion

Interpersonal Relationship and workload assignment of faculty are understood to be good predictors influencing Job Satisfaction of faculty members. It is understood that faculty have very weak interpersonal relationship and high workload contributing to marginal job satisfaction of faculty. Hence, the management of engineering colleges need to look to improve interpersonal relationships of faculty members by organizing informal meetings like annual day meets, get together and outside tours. Further, Managements need to direct the faculty with reasonable workload in purview of UGC guidelines. The administrative work need to be assigned on team basis, so as to decrease the burden on individual. However, there is need to do more studies in engineering college context to understand other variables influencing Job Satisfaction.

## References

- Bellas, M.L., & Toutkoushian, R.K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race and family effects. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(4), 367-390.
- Blackburn, R.T., & Lawrence, J.H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins university Press.
- Bonner, m. (1997). *Stages of Change, Job Satisfaction, Weight, and Activity at Two Work-Site Wellness Programs*, Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi, USA.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Fairweather, J.S. (1993). The nature of tradeoffs. *Change*, 25(4), 44-49.
- Fairweather, J.S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 26-48.
- Fairweather, J.S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 401-422.
- Fairweather, J.S., & Beach, A.L. (2002). Variations in faculty work at research universities: Implications for state and institutional policy. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 97-115.
- Fox, M.F. (1992). Research, teaching, and publication productivity: Mutuality versus competition in academia. *Sociology of Education*, 65(4), 293-305.
- Gappa, J.M., Austin, A.E., & Trice, A.G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H.W. (1996). The relationship between research and teaching: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 507-542.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Houston, D., Meyer, L.H., & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workloads and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in

academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 28(1), 17-30.

Jacobs, J.A., & Winslow, S.E. (2004). Overworked faculty: Job stresses and family demands. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 596, 104-129.

Locke, (1976), A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2001). *organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace*. Annual Review of Psychology, 53, 279-307, p. 282.

Locke, E.A. (1970). *Job satisfaction and job performance: Atheoretical analysis*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 484- 500 (b).

Porter, S.R., & Umbach, P.D. (2001). Analyzing faculty workload data using multilevel modeling. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(2), 171-196.

Schuster, J.H. & Finkelstein, M.J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Stephen P. Robbins, Mary Coulter, (January 14, 2004). *Management*, Eight edition, Pearson Prentice Hall.

