

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24297/jssr.v17i.9011>

## **Pay, Promotion, Work, Supervision, and Coworker as Dimensions of Academicians Job Satisfaction at Public Research Universities in Klang Valley, Malaysia**

Aida Mehrad

Faculty of Human Ecology, Department of Social and Development Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)  
Serdang, 43400 Seri Kembangan, Selangor, Malaysia

[mehrad.aida@gmail.com](mailto:mehrad.aida@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4364-5709>

### **ABSTRACT**

Recognizing and evaluating effective and principal factors that have been affected by academicians' feelings and satisfaction are imperative. This cross-sectional study aims to examine coworker's influence, pay, promotion, supervision, and work on academicians' job satisfaction at university. Job Descriptive Index (JDI) measured these factors, which comprised 72 items and proposed by Brodke et al. (2009) amongst 440 academicians who worked in public research universities in Klang Valley, Malaysia. Descriptive Statistics analyzed the achieved data. This study has illustrated that most academicians revealed a high level of satisfaction toward their pay, coworker, promotion, supervision, and work; their universities support them regarding the main factors of work and organizational structure. Based on these consequences, the universities and any other academic institutes have to the consciousness of these five main factors to improve and enhance academicians job satisfaction, leading to high outcomes and performance at the workplace.

**KEYWORDS:** Coworker, Job satisfaction, Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Work

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

As a cultural and educational workplace, the university plays a considerable role in academicians; therefore, providing a convenient situation is important. There are numerous factors, such as promotion opportunities and income, which lead to several job satisfaction levels, impacting staff performance at universities in Malaysia (Noraani, 2013). Based on this point of view, Yeop Yunus and Ishak (2012); also, Dhanapal et al. (2013) explained that distinguishing operative factors can be valuable for staff and university. Undoubtedly, these factors have quite a lot of effects on the content of job satisfaction. Additionally, in some cases, they can cause negative feelings and attitudes toward the job at work. In general, staff's attitudes and beliefs are influenced by diverse factors that can negatively or positively modify the level of job satisfaction (Wadhwa, Verghese, & Wadhwa, 2011; Mousavi et al., 2012).

#### **1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

##### **1.1.1 Level of Job Satisfaction**

The impact of various internal and external factors, in some cases, leads to a low level of job satisfaction (Aziri, 2011). Low job satisfaction will raise major modifications in performance, behavior, reaction, and the staff feeling at university (Akintayo & Babalola, 2012; Ayodele & Olorunsola, 2012). Based on this description, Santhapparaj and Alam (2005) focused on academicians who engaged at Malaysian private universities and clarified that external factors such as salary and promotion have a considerable role in job satisfaction. Female staff likewise reported a high level of job satisfaction as compared to male staff.

Earlier investigations focused on salary, promotion, Coworker, work itself, and supervision as the main job satisfaction dimensions in different countries, populations, and workplaces. For instance, Worrell (2004) explained that 90 percent of school psychologists in the United States were satisfied with their work (itself) and its conditions. In the same vein, Wu (2004) stated the style of supervision that appears as leadership has a notable contribution to teachers' job satisfaction. A seminal study in this area is Luddy (2005), which concentrated on salary, promotion, coworker, the work itself, and supervision that change job satisfaction level

among the staff of Western Cap in Africa. In another main study in Asia, Ayan and Kocacik (2010) clarified that extrovert staff has higher job satisfaction than introverted staff. Correspondingly, in Malaysia, Noordin and Jusoff (2009) focused on job satisfaction levels that were impacted by socio-demographic factors among academicians at universities.

## 1.2 AIM OF THE STUDY

According to the prior studies that have been focused on internal and external factors on the level of academicians' job satisfaction, in the current study, the researcher focused on Pay, Promotion, Work, Supervision, and Coworker among Academician at Public Research Universities in Klang Valley, Malaysia; and evaluated the effect of these factors on the level of job satisfaction.

## 2. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

### 2.1 MEASUREMENT OF THE STUDY

This study has been used JDI, which Brodke et al. (2009) proposed and comprised 72 items. JDI measures the amount of job satisfaction amongst academicians with five dimensions of the job position. Based on this inventory, the academicians reported their feeling toward each of these items that reveal job satisfaction at the workplace. These five dimensions included work, pay, promotions, supervision, and coworker. The higher scores designate a high level of job satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). JDI as a three-point scale is used, which indicates how items are "satisfy, not satisfy, and no idea or not sure" with the value of Yes =3, No = 0, and No Idea or Not Sure = 1. Some items score likewise in reverse; the scoring of these items involve Yes =0, No = 3, and No Idea or Not Sure = 1 (King, 2014).

### 2.2 PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY

The present study focused on academicians (male and female) that worked at public research universities (UPM, UKM, and UM) in Klang Valley, Malaysia. Concerning the Krejcie and Morgan Table (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970), the sample population determined 440 academicians extending by 20%. The inventory (JDI) offered faces to face to the participants by the researcher via a multi-stage sampling technique.

### 2.3 Cronbach's Alpha

According to the tool of the study, the Cronbach's alpha measurement of reliability the 72 items JDI was applied to evaluate the internal consistency of the research tool.

**Table 1.** Reliability Test for Job Satisfaction Dimensions

Variables	Final test(n=440)	
	No. Items	Alpha
Overall Job satisfaction	72	.882
Work	18	.622
Pay	9	.879
Supervision	18	.859
Promotion	9	.879
Coworker	18	.768

Table 1 shows the results of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for JDI dimensions exposed that work subscale contains 18 items ( $\alpha = .62$ ), pay subscale contains 9 items ( $\alpha = .87$ ), supervision subscale contains 18 items ( $\alpha = .85$ ), opportunities for promotion subscale contains 9 items ( $\alpha = .87$ ), and coworker subscale contains 18 items ( $\alpha = .76$ ). Cronbach's Alpha for overall job satisfaction with 72 items was ( $\alpha = .88$ ). Thus, the reliability test for Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for job satisfaction dimensions was within 0.62 to 0.87, which was acceptable and

followed the Alpha coefficient ranges from 0 to 1 when a rate is close to 1. It means that the internal consistency determines at a high level. It should not be lower than 0.60 (Zinbarg, 2006).

### 3. RESULTS

#### 3.1 Descriptive Statistic

##### 3.1.1 Levels of Job Satisfaction

The results in terms of job satisfaction levels (pay, promotion, work, supervision, and coworker). This study follows the classification of job satisfaction conducted by Balzer et al. (1997) and Bond (2013). A score that shows 32 or above means there is high-level job satisfaction. The score between 23-31 displays that the respondents have neutral feelings about their jobs and the score of 22 or below specifies a low-level job satisfaction.

**Table 2.** Levels of Job Satisfaction (N=440)

Job Satisfaction Dimensions	n	%	M	SD	Min	Max
<b>Pay</b>			46.70	10.161	18	54
Satisfied (32 or above)	387	88.0				
Neutral (23-31)	33	7.5				
Low satisfied (22 or below)	20	4.5				
Overall	440	100.0				
<b>Promotion</b>			42.11	11.443	18	54
Satisfied (32 or above)	344	78.2				
Neutral (23-31)	49	11.1				
Low satisfied (22 or below)	47	10.7				
Overall	440	100.0				
<b>Work</b>			51.12	3.663	34	54
Satisfied (32 or above)	440	100				
Neutral (23-31)	-	-				
Low satisfied (22 or below)	-	-				
Overall	440	100				
<b>Supervision</b>			52.22	4.237	28	54
Satisfied (32 or above)	437	99.3				
Neutral (23-31)	3	0.7				
Low satisfied (22 or below)	-	-				
Overall	440	100.0				
<b>Coworker</b>			51.77	3.605	30	54
Satisfied (32 or above)	438	99.5				
Neutral (23-31)	2	0.5				
Low satisfied (22 or below)	-	-				
Overall	440	100.0				

\*Note: SD = Standard Deviation, M= Mean, Min= Minimum, Max= Maximum

Table 2 shows the levels of job satisfaction dimensions. The range of scores for pay among respondents was from 18 to 54. The percentage of job satisfaction for pay was (88%) with a mean value of 46.70 ( $SD=10.161$ ), which means that most respondents were satisfied with their pay. Additionally, the results also demonstrated that (7.5 %) of the respondents had had a neutral feeling, followed by 4.5 percent of respondents who explained their low level of job satisfaction due to their pay at the university. Promotion is another dimension of job satisfaction. The range of scores for promotion was from 18 to 54 among respondents. For the promotion factor, 344 respondents (78.2%) presented job satisfaction with a mean value of 42.11 ( $SD=11.443$ ). Furthermore, the current study results demonstrated that (11.1 %) of the respondents had a neutral feeling. Likewise, 10.7 percent of respondents demonstrated a low level of job satisfaction toward their university promotion. Work as the next dimension of job satisfaction demonstrates a range of scores between 34 to 54. For work, all respondents (100%) with a mean value of 51.12 ( $SD=3.663$ ) were reported to have complete job satisfaction at university. In the fourth dimension, supervision demonstrates a range of scores between 28 to 54. In this dimension, 437 respondents (99.3%) designated job satisfaction with a mean value of 52.22 ( $SD=4.237$ ). In contrast, there were only three respondents (0.7 %) with a neutral feeling toward their supervision at the university. The coworker has a range of scores between 30 to 54. In this dimension, 438 respondents (99.5%) presented job satisfaction with a mean value of 51.77 ( $SD=3.605$ ). In contrast, there were only two respondents (0.5%) with neutral feelings toward their coworker at the university. This study showed that academicians have a high level of job satisfaction toward their work, followed by coworker, supervision, pay, and promotion at university.

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

The study intended to assess the influence of Pay, Promotion, Work, Supervision, and Coworker on the level of Academician job satisfaction at public research universities. According to the study results, the academicians reported a high level of job satisfaction, and they stated that they received acceptable support from the university; also, they are satisfied with external dimensions at the workplace. These results are in parallel with the results of Santhapparaj and Alam (2005); Worrell (2004); Wu (2004); Luddy (2005); Ayan and Kocacik (2010); and Noordin and Jusoff (2009) that emphasized the role of external factors on the level of job satisfaction. These researchers also reported the effect of these factors such as salary and promotion to have a considerable role in staff performance and their presentation at the workplace, specifically educational workplaces.

#### **5. CONCLUSION**

The conclusion derives from the findings of the current study. The results of this study designate that academicians have a high level of job satisfaction at university. They satisfy regards pay, promotion, work, supervision, and coworker at their workplace. These factors have a principal contribution to academicians' feelings and satisfaction. Concerning the previous studies that considered job satisfaction amongst various academic staff and workplaces in different countries, the present study was deemed to focus on Malaysian academicians in public research universities of the Klang Valley area; and evaluate the importance of job satisfaction dimensions this group of population. With these results, the study has several practical implications for the social community, organizations, educational organizations, universities, industrial and organizational psychologists, managers, employees, and academic staff. In this regard, the mentioned workplaces and managers must be aware of the importance of job satisfaction and its dimensions. They must prepare a convenient situation to satisfy staff and support them accurately.

#### **6. SUGGESTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

This study used primary data collected by the researcher from academicians who worked at public research universities (UPM, UKM, and UM) Malaysia. Certainly, the study has frequent resources that can be effective for staff and universities to improve the level of their performance and job satisfaction. This study has been used as a cross-sectional design, and data collected at one time. It is suggested that a study in this area performs longitudinal design if time and finance are sufficient for the researcher and compare the level of job satisfaction at different times based on staff situations. Also, this study only considered public research universities in the Klang Valley area; Likewise, it is suggested that future studies also focus on all universities such as private and public universities and compare these two universities together.

**REFERENCES**

1. Akintayo, D. I., & Babalola, S. S. (2012). The impact of emotional intelligence on workers' behavior in industrial organizations. *Journal of Human and Social Psychology*, 4(2), 83-90. <https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v7i2.3220>
2. Ayan, S., & Kocacik, F. (2010). The relation between the level of job satisfaction and types of personality in high school teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(1), 26-41. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n1.4>
3. Ayodele, J. B., & Olorunsola, E. O. (2012). The relationship between job satisfaction and performance of administrative staff in south west Nigeria universities. *Journal Soc Sci*, 30(3), 313-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2012.11893008>
4. Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: A literature review. *Management Research and Practice*, 3(4), 77-86.
5. Balzer, W. K., Kihm, J. A., Smith, P. C., Irwin, J. L., Bachiochi, P. D., Robie, C., Sinar, E. F., & Parra, L. F. (1997). *Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI, 1997 revision) and the job in general scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
6. Bond, T. S. (2013). *The Influence of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Employee Engagement on Intent to Leave among Public School Teachers in South Louisiana*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Luisian State University, United States.
7. Brodke, M., Sliter, M., Balzer, W., Gillespie, J., Gillespie, M., Gopalkrishnan, P., et al. (2009). *The job descriptive index and job in general: 2009 revision quick reference guide*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
8. Dhanapal, S., Alwie, S. B. M., Subramaniam, T., & Vashu, D. (2013). Factors affecting job satisfaction among academicians: A comparative study between gender and generations. *International Journal of Management Excellence*, 2(1), 128-139. <https://doi.org/10.17722/ijme.v2i1.33>
9. King, R. T. (2014). Investigating Perceptions of Job Satisfaction in Older Workers Using Item Response Theory. (Unpublished master's thesis). Boeling Green University, United States.
10. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
11. Luddy, N. (2005). *Job Satisfaction amongst Employees at a Public Health Institution in the Western Cape*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Western Cape, Cape Town, Western Cape.
12. Mousavi, S. H., Yarmohammadi, S., Bani Nosrat, A., & Tarasi, Z. (2012). The relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction of physical education teachers. *Annals of Biological Research*, 3(2), 780-788.
13. Noordin, F., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff. *Asian Social Science*, 5(5), 122-128. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v5n5p122>
14. Noraani, M. (2013). The influence of financial reward on job satisfaction among academic staffs at public universities in Kelantan, Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(3), 244-248.
15. Santhapparaj, A. S., & Alam, S. S. (2005). Job satisfaction among academic staff in private universities in Malaysia. *Journal of Social Science*, 1(2), 72-76. <https://doi.org/10.3844/jssp.2005.72.76>
16. Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
17. Wadhwa, D. S., Verghese, M., & Wadhwa, D. S. (2011). A study on factors influencing employee job satisfaction: A study in cement industry of Chhattisgarh. *International Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 1(3), 109-111. <https://doi.org/10.21013/jmss.v7.n2.p17>

18. Worrell, T. G. (2004). *School Psychologists' Job Satisfaction: Ten Years Later*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Polytechnic Virginia, United State.
19. Wu, M. (2004). A review of relationship between principal's leadership style and teacher's job satisfaction. *Journal of Meicho Institute of Technology*, 23(2), 235-250.
20. Yeop Yunus, K. N., & Ishak, S. (2012). The relationship between internal satisfaction and external satisfaction amongst hotel customers in Malaysia. *International Journal of Economics Business and Management Studies*, 1(1), 21-29. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2150994>
21. Zinbarg, R. E. (2006). Estimating generalizability to a latent variable common to all of a scale's indicators: A comparison of estimators for  $\omega_h$ . *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 30(2), 121-144. doi: 10.1177/0146621605278814