



* Huda Adnan Habib (FICMS)^a
 Lujain Anwer AL-Khazrajy (FICMS)^a
 Yossra Khalaf AL-Robaiaay (FICMS)^a

Motivators and Work Environment Associated with Job Satisfaction among Teaching Staff in AL Kindy College of Medicine

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Authors addresses:

^a Department of Community
 Medicine
 Al Kindy College of Medicine
 University of Baghdad.

* Corresponding Author
 E-mail address:
 huda_adnan70@yahoo.com

Article history:

Received; November, 14, 2012.
 Revised form; November, 11, 2013.
 Accepted; November, 18, 2013.

Keywords:

Job satisfaction
 Academic staff
 Work motivators
 Work environment
 College of medicine

ABSTRACT

Background: Job satisfaction remains as an important concern for both employer and employee. A high-quality teaching staff is the cornerstone of a successful educational system. One step in developing a high quality faculty understands the factors associated with teaching quality and retention. One of these factors is job satisfaction, which has been studied widely by organizational researchers.

Objectives: To evaluate the extent of job satisfaction of teaching staff working at AL-Kindy College of medicine and to identify some work-related factors associated with job satisfaction.

Methods: A cross-sectional study was carried out. A convenient sample of 50 teaching staff, who had a teaching job at different scientific departments at AL-Kindy college of Medicine. The data was collected using a questionnaire form which includes information under three main headings: information related to the socio-demographic characteristic; the work motivators and the work environments.

Results: the study shows that 60% of the academic staff were generally satisfied with their job, the general satisfaction were more among those with age more than 50 years, males, singles, those with no children, and those living near their work place with the following percentage 68, 78, 87, 87 and 87, respectively. It also revealed that positive criticism, promotion, training, growth in work, increase income, new responsibilities, were the most motivators to work.

Conclusions: Most of the academic staff were generally satisfied with their job. Most of the academic staff were satisfied to the studied work motivator and environment factors.

Introduction:

Job satisfaction remains as an important concern for both employer and employee⁽¹⁾. The definition of job satisfaction varies from person to person and even for one person from time to time. Job satisfaction is considered as an evaluation that the employee makes of the job and the environment surrounding the job⁽²⁾. It is also defined as the feelings an employee has about the job in general⁽³⁾. Generally, job satisfaction can be defined as the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive⁽⁴⁾.

A high-quality teaching staff is the cornerstone of a successful educational system. Daily interaction between teachers and students is at the center of the educational process; attracting and retaining high quality teachers is, thus, a primary necessity for educational system⁽⁵⁾.

One step in developing a high quality faculty understands the factors associated with teaching quality and retention. One of these factors is job satisfaction, which has been studied widely by organizational researchers and has been linked to organizational commitment¹ as well as to organizational performance⁽⁶⁾.

Oftentimes it is not merely satisfaction with the job but with the career in general that is important. Satisfaction with teaching as a career is an important policy issue since it is associated with teacher effectiveness which ultimately affects student achievement⁽⁷⁾.

Because faculty are both the largest cost and the largest human capital resource of a school system, understanding factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) is essential to improving the information base needed to support a successful educational system⁽⁸⁾.

Both intrinsic and extrinsic factors affect a teacher's satisfaction. Intrinsic factors: for teachers, intrinsic satisfaction can come from classroom activities.

Daily interactions with students inform teachers' feelings about whether or not students have learned something as a result of their teaching. Student characteristics and perceptions of teacher control over the classroom environment also are intrinsic factors affecting teacher satisfaction⁽⁹⁾. Several studies have found that these factors are related to both attrition and satisfaction in teaching, as well as other professions. However, while intrinsic forces may motivate people to become teachers,

extrinsic conditions can influence their satisfaction in this position and their desire to remain in teaching throughout their career⁽¹⁰⁾.

A variety of extrinsic factors have been associated with teacher satisfaction, including salary, perceived support from administrators, school safety, and availability of school resources, among others⁽¹¹⁾.

These and other characteristics of a teacher's work environment have been targeted researchers and educators who claim that "poor working conditions have demoralized the teaching profession"⁽¹²⁾.

Aims of the study; to evaluate the extent of job satisfaction of teaching staff working at AL-Kindy College of medicine and identifies work-related factors associated with job satisfaction.

Methods:

A cross-sectional study was carried out during the period from the end of October, 2011 till end of May, 2012, at AL-Kindy College of Medicine. A convenient sample of 50 teaching staff, who had a teaching job at different scientific departments at AL-Kindy collage of Medicine, were enrolled.

The data was collected using a questionnaire and were filled by the participants themselves or by direct interview with each academic staff regardless their age, gender or specialty.

The purpose of the study was explained to the participants prior to the interview and no one refuse to participate. The final format of the questionnaire includes information under three main headings:

- Information related to the socio-demographic characteristic; these include general information (age, gender, years of education, years of employment, specialty, scientific degree, distance from work, history of chronic disease and sick leaves).
- Information related to the work motivators (the supervisor's criticism, job promotion, job training, rewarding income i.e. salary, new job responsibilities and self ambition).
- Information related to the work environments (the work policy and administration, work overload, working hours, security at work, stability, relationship with supervisor and coworkers, work equipment, student number/stage and student behaviors).

Statistical analysis was performed by SPSS version 17.0, using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) and the collected data were analyzed using the chi-square (X^2) test to determine the association between variables. $P < 0.05$ was considered as a cut-off value for significance.

Results:

The distribution of the studied sample according to the level of general satisfaction, shows that 30 (60%) of them were generally satisfied to their job (Table 1).

Table1: distribution of the sample according to general satisfaction to their job.

General Satisfaction	Teaching Staff No. (%)
Yes	30 (60)
No	20 (40)
Total	50 (100)

Table 2 shows the data about respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. Out of the total sample of 50 respondents, half of them (50%) aged more than 50 years. The majority were males, married, having less than two children and living far from their work place with the following percentages 64, 84, 22 and 70, respectively.

Regarding the years of education, 58% completed more than 10 years of education following the secondary school, 40% were employed for more than 10 years with 52% being teaching for less than 10 years and 64% worked in basic departments.

Table 2: the distribution of the studied sample according to some socio-demographic characteristics and their association with the general satisfaction to work.

Variables	No.(%)	General Satisfaction		P value
		Satisfied No.(%)	Dissatisfied No.(%)	
Age(years)	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
<40	10 (20)	4 (40)	6 (60)	
40-50	15 (30)	9 (60)	6 (40)	
>50	25 (50)	17 (68)	8 (32)	
Gender	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	0.04
Male	32 (64)	25 (78)	7 (22)	
Female	18 (36)	5 (28)	13 (73)	
Marital status	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
Married	42 (84)	23 (55)	19 (45)	
Single	8 (22)	7 (87)	1 (13)	
No. of children	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
None	8 (16)	7 (87)	1 (13)	
1-2	7 (22)	5 (71)	2 (29)	
>2	35 (16)	18 (51)	17 (49)	
Distance from work place	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
near	15 (30)	13 (87)	2 (13)	
far	35 (70)	17 (49)	18 (51)	
No. of years of high education	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	0.001
6-10	21 (42)	19 (91)	2 (9)	
>10	29 (58)	11 (38)	18 (62)	
Department type	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
Clinical	18 (36)	11 (61)	7 (39)	
Basic	32 (64)	19 (59)	13 (41)	
Highest academic qualification	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
Diploma/ Master	9 (18)	7 (78)	2 (22)	
PhD/ Board	41 (82)	23 (56)	18 (44)	
Scientific degree	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	
Co-lecturer / Lecturer	21 (42)	9 (43)	12 (57)	
Assistant Prof./ Prof.	29 (58)	21 (72)	8 (28)	
Period of employment	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
<5 years	11 (22)	9 (82)	2 (18)	
5-10 years	19 (38)	10 (53)	9 (47)	
>10 years	20 (40)	11 (55)	9 (45)	
Period of teaching	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
<5 years	21 (42)	10 (48)	11 (52)	
5-10 years	26 (52)	19 (73)	7 (27)	
>10 years	3 (6)	1 (33)	2 (67)	

Table 2: the distribution of the studied sample according to some socio-demographic characteristics and their association with the general satisfaction to work (Continued).

Variables	No.(%)	General Satisfaction		P value
		Satisfied No.(%)	Dissatisfied No.(%)	
Resent position	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	0.027
Teaching	28 (56)	13 (46)	15 (54)	
Managerial	22 (44)	17 (77)	5 (23)	
Years at AL-Kindy College of Medicine	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	N.S
<5 years	16 (32)	6 (37)	10 (63)	
5-10 years	13 (26)	10 (77)	3 (23)	
>10 years	21 (42)	14 (67)	7 (33)	
History of chronic disease	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	0.005
Yes	12 (24)	3 (25)	9 (75)	
No	38 (76)	27 (71)	11 (29)	
History of frequent sick leaves	50 (100)	30 (60)	20 (40)	0.04
Yes	5 (10)	1 (20)	4 (80)	
No	45 (90)	29 (64)	16 (36)	

Regarding the Highest academic qualification, 82% of the sample has at least PhD or Board degree. Most respondents were assistant professors (58%); the majority (56%) was only teaching staff, 76% were with no history of chronic diseases and 90% with no history of frequent sick leaves.

Table 2, also shows the association of the studied socio-demographic characteristics and the general satisfaction to work. The general satisfaction were more among those with age more than 50 years of age, among males, singles, those with no children, and those living near their work place with the following percentage 68, 78, 87, 87 and 87, respectively. Gender was significantly associated with the general satisfaction ($p<0.05$).

General satisfaction were more among those with less years of education, those work in clinical departments, and with less academic qualifications, with the following percentage 91, 61 and 78, respectively. Years of education was significantly associated with the general satisfaction ($p<0.05$).

Table 2, also shows that general satisfaction were more among those with less academic qualifications ,among those with high scientific degree, with less years of employments, more years of teaching , those held managerial work and with those with no history of chronic diseases or sick leaves with the following percentage 78, 72, 82, 73, 77, 71 and 64, respectively. High scientific degree, managerial work, no history of chronic diseases nor sick leave were statistically significantly associated with the general satisfaction ($p<0.05$).

Table 3 shows that distribution of the staff satisfaction according to work motivations, It shows that the majority of the satisfied to most factors that could motivate them to work like, positive criticism, promotion, training, growth in work, increase income, new responsibilities, with the following percentage 76, 88, 60, 88, 64, and 84, respectively. While Self ambition was the least factor motivate work.

Table 3: distribution of sample satisfaction according to certain work motivators.

Work Motivations	Satisfaction	Dissatisfacti
	No. (%)	No. (%)
The supervisor's criticism	38 (76)	12 (24)
Job Promotion	44 (88)	6 (12)
Job Training	30 (60)	20 (40)
Possibility of Growth (in status)	44 (88)	6 (12)
Rewarding income (salary)	32 (64)	18 (36)
New job responsibilities	42 (84)	8 (16)
Self-ambition	29 (58)	21 (42)

Table 4, shows that the distribution of the staff satisfaction to certain works environments, It shows that the majority of the staff were satisfied that most environment at work consider as good environment like (the manager, work policies, work overload, interpersonal relationships with supervisor and co-workers, security, stability, work equipment, high no. of student, with following percentage 84, 72, 66, 96, 66, 88, 66 and 96, respectively. Working hours were among less accepted environment.

Table 4: distribution of sample satisfaction according to certain work environments.

Work Environments	Satisfaction	Dissatisfacti
	No. (%)	No. (%)
Work policy and Administration	42 (84)	8 (16)
Work overload	36 (72)	14 (28)
Working hours	28 (56)	22 (44)
Security at work	33 (66)	17 (34)
Stability	44 (88)	6 (12)
Relationship with supervisor	33 (66)	17 (34)
Relationship with co- workers	48 (96)	2 (4)
Work equipments	33 (66)	17 (34)
Student number/stage	48 (96)	2 (4)
Student behaviors	41 (82)	9 (18)

Discussion:

Job satisfaction is a momentous concept in any work environment so attention is paid by many researchers. An individual common thought toward his job is also called job satisfaction.

The attitude can be positive or negative. The individuals who have positive attitude towards their jobs are more satisfied than the individuals who have negative attitude⁽²⁶⁾.

Regarding the general satisfaction, the present study shows that more than half of the academic staffs were generally satisfied to their job. This finding consists with other studies like one held in Namibia which shows that approximately half of the teaching staff were generally satisfied⁽²⁷⁾.

In relation studying the association of certain socio-demographic factors and the general satisfaction, no significant effects were found of the factors of age, marital status, No. of children, distance from work place, academic qualification, Period of employment or period of teaching on the overall job satisfaction but the satisfaction was highest among oldest staff while less among youngest, while other study shows the very youngest and very oldest teachers had the highest levels of satisfaction^(20,27).

Reason for the youngest dissatisfaction is that they do not have proper rank according to their qualification, their work experience is low and they are younger in age they think that they have enough potential to acquire a better position as compared to it⁽²⁸⁾.

Another statistical significant difference was reported between general satisfaction and gender, as male staff were more satisfied than female, most researches shows some gaps in job satisfaction (all with men as happier than women) were evident across several disciplinary categories.; the way staff spend their time as faculty members; the number of hours they work as faculty members; the amount of time they have to conduct research; their ability to balance work and home responsibilities; poor family-related policies and whether their institutions make raising children and the work compatible⁽²⁹⁻³¹⁾. Inconsistent to our finding a study held in Kuwait and Greek shows that showed that there was no significant satisfaction difference between genders^(23,33,34).

Regarding the statistical significant satisfaction among the scientific degree in our research, Most of that research consistently reports that age and academic rank are strong predictors of the academics job satisfaction, with individuals of older age and higher rank being generally more satisfied with their job⁽³⁵⁻³⁷⁾.

Another study shows that academic rank was not found to have any significant effect on faculty job satisfaction, although Lecturers reported a somewhat higher satisfaction with their job compared to the assistant professors and the associate/full professors^(38,39).

Regarding the significant statistical association of staff health and number of sick leave days was inconsistent to a study that reports that physician's health and number of sick leave days have no relation to job satisfaction⁽⁴⁰⁾.

The present study shows that high satisfaction among staff with a long period of employment, this can be explained by the fact that most of the teachers are in this profession from more than 10 years so they have become used to the working environment and understand the things well⁽²⁸⁾.

Regarding work environments factors that influences the job satisfaction level of the academic staff survey it was clear that a large number of the teachers i.e. 68% are pleased with their working conditions. This finding consistent with a study held Pakistan in which he reported that Working conditions as a factor that influences the job satisfaction level of the teachers was reported by a large number of the teachers (68%) are pleased with their working conditions⁽²⁸⁾.

Another factor that affects the satisfaction of the academic staff is job security. This can be explained that the Reason for their satisfaction is that most of them are in this profession for more than 25 years, they have enough experience in this field and they do not have any threat of being terminated by the management of the college .Another major reason for their satisfaction is, they are the government employees. Once they have avail this opportunity now they feel secure their future due to the permanent nature of their job^(26,28).

Relationship with the coworkers is also a factor of satisfaction for the teachers. Teachers are satisfied with

their coworkers because they cooperate with them and also provide them sufficient support whenever they need⁽²⁸⁾. A study held in the United Kingdom, reported that job satisfaction amongst teachers was influenced by factors such as student learning and achievement, professional development, relationships with colleagues'.

Conclusions:

- 1-Most of the academic staff was generally satisfied with their job.
- 2-General satisfaction were associated with certain socio-demographic variables like male gender, less Years of education, high Scientific degree, Managerial position of work, negative history of chronic disease, negative history of frequent sick leaves.
- 3-Most of the academic staff was satisfied to the studied work motivator and environment factors.

References:

1. M Arab, A Pourreza, F Akbari, N Ramesh, S Aghlmand . Job Satisfaction on Primary Health Care Providers. Iranian J Publ Health, Vol. 36, No.3, 2007, pp. 64-70.
2. Locke EA. What is Job Satisfaction? Organ Behav Hum Perf, 1969, 4: 309-36.
3. Smith PC, Kendall LM, Hulin CL. The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Rand McNally, USA, 1975, pp. 5-20.
4. Robbins SP. Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications. 9th ed. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 2000, pp. 139-43.
5. Ostroff C. The Relationship between Satisfaction, Attitudes, and Performance: An Organizational Level Analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1992, 77: 963-974.
6. Mathieu JE. A Cross-Level Nonrecursive Model of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment and Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1991, 76: 607-618.
7. Ashton PT, Webb RB. Making a Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement. New York: Longman 1986.
8. Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.
9. Lee VE, Dedrick RF, Smith JB. The Effect of the Social Organization of Schools on Teachers' Efficacy and Satisfaction. 1991, 64:190-208.
10. Boe EE, Gilford DM. National Research Council. Teacher Supply, Demand, and Quality. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1992.
11. Bobbitt SA, Leich MC, Whitener SD, Lynch HF. Characteristics of Stayers, Movers, and Leavers: Results from the Teacher Follow up Survey. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES, 1994:94-337.
12. Choy SP, Bobbitt SA, Henke RR, Medrich EA, Horn LJ, Lieberman J. America's Teachers: Profile of a Profession. Washington, 1993: 93-025.
13. Rice PT, Gentile A, Mcfalin ST. Turnover: The Role of Productivity. Public Personnel Management, 1991:32, 371-387.
14. Akpofure RR, Ikhifa OG, Imide OI, Okokoyo IE. Job Satisfaction Among Educators in Colleges of Education in Southern Nigeria. Journal of Applied Sciences, 2006: 6(5), 1094-1098.
15. Locke EA. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Rand-McNally, Chicago, IL, 1976.
16. Spector P. Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause and Consequences, Sage Publications, London. Job satisfaction and employee performance, 1997:375.

17. Robbins P. Stephen. "Organizational Behavior" 10th edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2003.
18. Lawler EE, III. "Motivation in work organizations". Brooks/Cole Publishing Company: Monterrey 1973.
19. Smith PC, Kendall LM, Hulin CL. Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL. 1969.
20. Locke EA. "What is job satisfaction? Organizational behavior and human performance", 1969.
21. Mowday RT. "Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations". McGraw Hill: New York, 1992.
22. Siddique A, Malik NH, Abbass N. "Determining Teacher's Level of Job Satisfaction in Faisalabad City". International journal of agriculture & biology, 2002: 372-374.
23. Trabue MR. Educational Psychology, Prentice Hall of India, Ltd., New Delhi. 1993.
24. Santhepparaj AS, Alam SS. Job satisfaction among academic staff in private universities in Malaysia. Journal of social sciences, 2005, 1 (2):72-76.
25. Herzberg F, Mausner B, Snyderman BB. "The motivation to work". New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
26. Robbins P Stephen. "Organizational Behavior" 10th edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2003.
27. Evy George, Daniël Louw, Gerhard Badenhorst. "Job satisfaction among urban secondary-school teachers in Namibia", 2008.
28. Irum saba. "Measuring the Job Satisfaction Level of the Academic Staff in Bahawalpur Colleges". The Islamic University of Bahawalpur, Bahawalpur, Pakistan. 2011.
29. Job Satisfaction and Gender. Mrch 12, 2011 - 3:00am. By Scott Jaschik.
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/03/12>.
30. Study Measures Faculty Job Satisfaction by Gender and Field.
http://education.portal.com/articles/Study_Measures_Faculty_Job_Satisfaction_by_Gender_and_Field.html.
31. Bilimoria D, Perry SR, Liang X, Stoller EP, Higgins P, Taylor C. How do female and male faculty members construct job satisfaction? Journal of Technology Transfer, 2006, 31, 355.
32. Hult C, Callister RR, Sullivan K. Is there a global warming toward women in academia? Liberal Education, 2005, 91, 50-57.
33. Sabharwal M, Corley EA. Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. The Social Science Journal, 2009, 46, 539-556.
34. Eker L, Tuzun EH, Daskapan A, Surenkok O. Predictors of job satisfaction among physiotherapists in Turkey. J Occup Health. 2004 Nov; 46 (6): 500-5.
35. Holden EW, Black MM. Psychologists in medical school-professional issues for the future: how are rank and tenure associated with productivity and satisfaction? Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 1996, 27 (4), 407-414.
36. Near JP, Rice RW, Hunt RG. Work and extra work correlates of life and job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1978, 21, 95-114.
37. Oshagbemi T. Job satisfaction profiles of university teachers. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 1997, 12 (1), 27-39.
38. Oshagbemi T. Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. International Journal of Social Economics, 2003.30 (12), 1210-1232.
39. Eyupoglu SZ, Saner T. The relationship between job satisfaction and academic rank: A study of academicians in Northern Cyprus. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2009, 1, 686-691.
40. Richards C. The Health of Doctors. King's Fund project paper no. 78. London: King's Fund, 1989.