

Zh.K. Krekesheva, Zh.A. Kagazbayev

*Ye.A. Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: anaris21@mail.ru)*

Predominant factors influencing teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the university environment

The article deals with the investigation of the predominant factors influencing teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the university environment. Also, this article reveals the concept of job satisfaction, Maslow's concept of lower and high order of people's needs. Furthermore, two main factors leading to job contentment intrinsic (motivators) and extrinsic (hygiene) were also examined. Moreover, the impact of teachers' job contentment on employees' productivity and their attitude to work were considered thoroughly. In addition, different theories of job satisfaction which were introduced by Herzberg, Adam (Theory of 'Equity'), Locke (Range of Affect Theory), Hackman and Oldham (Job characteristics theory) were scrutinized in this article. This paper also examined the recommendations of teachers regarding the factors, which contribute to an increase in the general level of job satisfaction within the faculty staff in Higher Education context such as improving the rewards system, growing prospects for self-improvement and providing a wide range of facilities, satisfying expectations of working conditions.

Keywords: job satisfaction, university environment, job dissatisfaction, workload, job conditions, appraisal, motivation, extrinsic factors, intrinsic factors, lower and higher order of people's needs.

Introduction

Human resources are recognized as one of the pivotal elements of the university and the important factors for achieving institutional success and effectiveness. Thus, it is essential if the university staff is to be satisfied with their job and other factors, which can influence their degree of job contentment. Moreover, job satisfaction has a considerable impact on employees' productivity and their attitude to work. The factors influencing job satisfaction vary depending on the occupation, thus not all prevailing factors can be applicable to university organization as teachers are the particular group of employees with certain features pertaining to their job (Miller et al., 2009). According to Rose (2001) the concept of job satisfaction was introduced by Herzberg in 1959, who described it as the outcomes of personal fulfillment in terms of achievement of all benefits of a job and as a consequence enhancement of job performance, where certain factors can lead to job satisfaction or conversely, job dissatisfaction [1].

Certain authors such as De Nobile and McCormick (2005), Comber and Nixon (2009) and Oshagbemi (2003) claim that the issue of job satisfaction, as a general concept has been investigated for a long time; however in Higher Education organizations it is relatively new, therefore there is limited investigation of teacher job satisfaction available in this context. Thus, this research was carried out with the aim to understand and determine the predominant factors influencing teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the institutional department.

Another reason for carrying out this research is the outcomes that can be beneficial for the university administration and senior leadership team of the department as they demonstrate the picture of teachers' overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction with particular factors that should be considered more seriously and where improved sufficiently.

Literature Review

The issue of job satisfaction of academic staff in Higher Education is under-researched and there is a limited literature related to it in the context of university (Rice et al., 1991; Oshagbemi, 2003). As a result, the factors influencing the job satisfaction of academic staff in university have been investigated incompletely. Therefore, firstly, the basic theories of job satisfaction will be explored and then its concepts and investigations specifically in Higher Education will be examined carefully. Although, the concept of job satisfaction is deemed to have been researched a long time ago, there is still no precise and agreed definition of this term (Nias, 1989; Evans, 1998; Wess, 2002). It is worth mentioning that it varies according to profession and type of organization. Teachers in Higher Education are considered as a particular category of employees, who experience definite responsibilities, workload, working conditions and whose profession requires resistance to stress (De Nobile and McCormick, 2005; Klassen et al., 2010). As a result, such factors influencing

job satisfaction as job conditions, promotion chances, appraisal, salary, policy of organization, personal opportunities and work itself also differ (Spector, 1997). Thereby, research already carried out on job satisfaction as regards other professions might be not useful in considering the factors influencing academics' satisfaction or otherwise in the university context [2].

As was mentioned earlier the notion of job satisfaction suffers from a lack of clarity. According to Schaffer (1953) it is the meeting of personal needs, which varies depending on the extent to which these necessities are satisfied. Similarly, Sergiovanni (1968) states that job satisfaction implies that the individual needs fulfillment, which correlates with job comfort. However, such authors as Lawler (1973) and McNamara (1999) define job satisfaction as the difference between an employee's job expectations and what that employee receives in reality from that job, thereby shifting the focal point on to expectations rather than needs fulfillment. Another author Nias (1989) agrees with Lortie's (1975) explanation of job satisfaction as all rewards and remunerations experienced at work. Despite all the abovementioned definitions of job satisfaction, the most prevalent is Locke's (1969) interpretation, who characterizes it as a satisfying and positive emotional condition caused by appraisal of one's work and which as a result influences one's job performance, thus rejecting expectations and needs as job satisfaction determinants. Robbins (2005); Akehurst et al. (2009); Weiss (2002) support this statement claiming that it also implies that employees' work attitude strongly depends on their beliefs, emotions and feelings. However, this interpretation of job satisfaction is also considered controversial [3].

The theory of job satisfaction was introduced by Herzberg (1959), who explained it as the result of fulfillment of necessities and achievement of values, where individuals are motivated by certain stimuli and setting goals at work, which in turn leads to improvement in terms of their job performance. Motivation and job satisfaction are closely connected, as people are motivated by the opportunity to achieve job satisfaction that is why this theory was considered (Murage-Mwaka, 2013). Herzberg (1959) expanded further on Maslow's theory of job satisfaction (1954) and defined two main factors intrinsic and extrinsic, which lead to job satisfaction. Intrinsic factors (motivators) imply attainments, recognition, the job itself, promotion, responsibility and self improvement, whereas extrinsic factors (hygiene) involve the policy of the organization, conditions in the place of work, wage, relationships with colleagues, guidance, position, safety, private life and the impact of job on it (Morison et al., 2005). Furthermore, motivators imply the higher order in terms of people's necessities of Maslow's concept, whereas hygiene match the lower order of people's needs (McCaffery, 2004). However, Herzberg's theory (1959) unlike Maslow's (1954) has more empirical exploration and has been widely used for practical purposes by organizations for job improvement (Briggs et al., 2011). According to Herzberg (1959) motivators imply work satisfiers, while hygiene means job non satisfiers, because the purpose of the later is to prevent people's job frustration and does not provide the opportunity for self improvement. De Nobile and McCormick (2005) and Klassen et al. (2010) support this theory and add that teacher's motivation can be induced by job advancement. Herzberg's Two-Factor (motivator-hygiene) Theory (1959) was criticized by such authors as Weiss (2002) and Robbins (2005), who claimed that this theory has a limited scope and can not be applied in all cases. Furthermore, it pays insufficient attention to wage and working conditions [4].

Adam (1965) conducted the research on job satisfaction and proposed the theory of 'Equity', where he claimed that employees are motivated and satisfied with their job only if there is social equity in receiving proper remuneration for the work done. 'Inputs' imply a worker's contributions to his job such as efforts, professional skills and abilities, obligations, time, whereas 'outputs' means positive and negative outcomes, which the person can perceive in comparison with others, such as wage, job security, promotion, rewards, responsibilities (Murage-Mwaka, 2013).

Similarly, Griffin (2001) pinpoints that the sense of equity appears when proportion of personal attempts and remunerations or so-called 'inputs' and 'outputs' in terms of social relationships are equal. Falkenburg and Schyns (2007) affirm that an employee perceives unfairness and dissatisfaction when the 'inputs' and 'outputs' are not equal. The main issue in this theory is the salary, because employees want to be appreciated by their employers and thus the reason for worry about the equity or inequity mainly depends on the organization, in the event of employees not being appreciated sufficiently, their job satisfaction as well as motivation decrease (McIntyre et al., 2002). This theory was criticized by De Nobile and McCormick (2005), Klassen et al. (2010) and by Rifai (2005), who argued that not all employees may feel equity and inequity through 'inputs' and 'outputs' in comparison with other employees, but rather that there are several people who perceive these in a broader context.

Another significant research into job satisfaction was conducted by Locke (1976). He asserts that it is defined by disparity between the expectations of an employee regarding his job and what he in fact, obtains

from it. Namely, lesser disparity between these lead to greater chances of job satisfaction. Furthermore, the theory confirms that if an employee prioritizes a certain aspect of his job (for instance, autonomy) it increases the level of job satisfaction when expectations are realized and conversely, the absence of this preferred aspect causes to job dissatisfaction (Butler and Rose, 2011). This theory was supported by Spector (1997), who added that too much evaluation of specific aspects of a job can lead to deep dissatisfaction. Locke's (1976) Range of Affect Theory was criticized by Rice, Gentile, and McFarlin (1991), because the aspect of importance did not abate connection between the aspect of satisfaction and general job satisfaction. Furthermore, without close examination of personal preferences in terms of values (aspects) this theory becomes unconvincing [5].

Another theory of job satisfaction was offered by Hackman and Oldham (1980), which was called Job characteristics theory and implies how specific job peculiarities influence job contentment and job results. Within these characteristics are diversity skills, task importance, job autonomy, job feedback and task identity (Murage-Mwaka, 2013). She also asserts that this theory is aimed at the job diagnosis as regards the methods of enhancing these characteristics with the purpose of further job improvement and as a result increasing employees' productivity and job satisfaction. Fuller (2006) claimed that these characteristics exert more influence over those employees who attempt to perform well in order to be rewarded and those who want to improve their professional skills and knowledge for further individual growth and career progression. Unlike, Herzberg's theory this concept has received more endorsement. However, Job Characteristics Theory was also criticized by Platsidou (2008) and Petersen et al. (2008) as it is not appropriate to all employees for instance; for those who were recently hired autonomy had a negative impact on job satisfaction.

The level of job satisfaction directly depends on and is influenced by certain factors such as teachers' demographic variables, which imply age, gender, academic degree and job experience Badri et al. (2013). Additionally, several researches such as those of Luthans (2006), Rosser (2005), Oshagbemi (2003) suggest that there are six main factors influencing teacher job satisfaction, which are the job itself (opportunity to apply their professional skills), promotion opportunities (career progress), salary, working conditions (university environment), communication with colleagues (friendly relationships), job security (confidence about not being fired) [6].

However, there are several factors that lead to job dissatisfaction among teaching staff in Higher Education such as stress, workload, problematic students, conflicts with co-workers, low wages, limited promotion chances, ambiguous university perspectives (Comber and Nixon, 2009, Watts and Robertson, 2011). Similarly, Oshagbemi (2003) asserts that insufficient recognition of teaching abilities, conflicts with students, poor conditions for carrying out investigations also cause teacher dissatisfaction. Dinham and Scott (2000) also highlights the following dissatisfaction factors: limited time for conducting research, compulsion to be published, inefficient university management, weak leadership and the lack of teacher autonomy.

Thus, in Higher Education according to Comm and Mathaisel (2003), teacher job satisfaction decreases frustration, enhances job performance and influences student results. Moreover, a positive atmosphere in the university improves teaching job satisfaction as well as the learning process and students' performance. In contrast, factors contributing to job dissatisfaction, conversely can lead to a number of problems so clearly, certain activities should be undertaken in order to exclude the existence of dissatisfaction factors.

Research Methodology

The purpose of this paper is to explore the predominant factors that influence teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction respectively in Higher Education. The literature review undertaken identifies a variety of factors (intrinsic and extrinsic) connected with existing theories of job satisfaction that could be investigated thoroughly among academic staff as well as making specific recommendations for job satisfaction improvement in the university department. In order to conduct this research different methods and strategies were examined. According to Briggs et al. (2012) the notion of methodology is broader than other notions such as methods or techniques, as methodological issues are involved in each step of any research. Moreover, it plays a pivotal role in underlying causes for the application of certain methods in carrying out the research. A quantitative approach was determined as suitable for investigation of the research questions by virtue of the use of the questionnaire method to acquire the data. This approach in comparison with qualitative is considered as an appropriate for testing concepts and theories as these are not key issues in the qualitative research, therefore it was applied in this paper. Bryman (2004) asserts that the quantitative approach implies the process where the reality may differ and contradict the theory. In this case factors influencing job satisfaction in Higher Education may vary from those that pertain in general theory on job satisfaction. Further-

more, this type of approach focuses on the generalization that allows conducting the survey within a wide group of people with the opportunity to compare their responses.

Another important aspect in conducting any research is the paradigm, which provides the important information on how to work with data obtained and how to carry out research properly [7]. In this paper a positivist paradigm was applied, as it implies the collection and evaluation of evidences for proving or refuting a hypothesis or concept (Scottet, 2006). A questionnaire studies strategy was used by means of the application of the online questionnaire method with close-ended and open-ended questions aimed at data collection. Open-ended questions in this survey provide the opportunity for respondents to insert their own variants, that in their opinion are valuable and does compel them to choose from any list of offered answer options.

The online web questionnaire was carried out by virtue of the online program Survey Monkey and involved 15 respondents from the same department of one university. The population consists of the teaching staff holding different positions such as associate professors, teaching fellows, course leaders, directors of different programmes, professors, senior teaching fellows. The participants were a purposive sample, because it was important to include respondents with different demographic data. The permission to conduct the questionnaire within teaching staff was received from the head of the department. Then, the online questionnaire was sent to respondents by e-mail. The schedule of the questionnaire contains several open-ended and close-ended questions involving multiple choices, ranking order, choice of one option from a list and rating scale questions, where the total number of questions is 10. A 4-point Likert-type scale from 'Very important' to 'Not important at all' was applied in order to determine predominant factors influencing teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Also, the questionnaire comprises questions on demographic data, intrinsic and extrinsic factors in terms of teaching, university service, research facilities, management, rewards, and relationships with colleagues and job security. The piloting was made through sending the drafts to 6 teachers and then it was amended in order to distribute a final version.

Brundrett and Rhodes (2014) claim that a questionnaire is more effective method of obtaining information as it offers a quick, efficient and convenient method of data collection from a considerable number of people. Particularly online questionnaires are easy to analyze and interpret as a result of producing numerical data and processing this data as statistics are automatically dealt with the help of online programs (Briggs et al., 2012). Furthermore, according to Cohen et al. (2000) questionnaires are not time-consuming as they do not require face to face contact with respondents, instead of this all questions can be mailed. Moreover, they are economically low cost in comparison with such methods as observation, for instance.

Another advantage of questionnaires is anonymity, which allows respondents to answer the questions honestly, whereas other methods such as interviews can not necessarily afford this. Also, questionnaires do not put pressure on participants, as they can complete them in any setting (Briggs et al., 2012). Cohen et al. (2000) add that the sameness of questions provides standardization, which makes the process of analysis of obtained data in a considerable amount easier and faster.

However, questionnaires have also several disadvantages such as descriptive interpretation of data instead of in-depth analysis, shallow information provided by respondents as a result of the absence of face to face communication (Brundrett and Rhodes, 2014). Bryman (2004) highlights the risk of biased responses as a result of the respondents' attempts to provide expected answers. Cohen et al. (2000) also pinpoints the difficulties in designing, analyzing, piloting and revising a questionnaire.

Turning now to the ethical issues, which imply the reliability, validity and ethics of the questionnaire which have been carried out. The authenticity of any investigation will clearly only be achieved through the presence of these components. Wragg (2002) claim that ensuring anonymity of respondents and preserving confidentiality of obtained data for instance, are the main elements of ethics. Whereas, reliability can be increased by piloting and then testing the same group of respondents again in order to acquire the same results or to use mainly simple, closed-ended questions (Brundrett and Rhodes, 2014).

However, reliability may be reduced in the case of questions consisting of scales that may be sensitive to participants' mood (Brundrett and Rhodes, 2014). Furthermore, there is a risk of low validity as a result of obtaining biased, dishonest responses, the application of inaccurate questions or statistical tests (Thomas, 2007).

Regarding the ethical rules from BERA [8], informed consent was received from the head of the department to distribute the questionnaire among teaching staff. Additionally, all respondents were provided with the information about the details of the research and their rights to anonymity and confidentiality. Moreover, as a result of several piloting procedures the questions were revised and thus the bias was avoided, which made the questionnaire more reliable and valid. Triangulation, which is aimed at minimizing

the invalidity of the research through the application of more than one method, was not used in this small-scale investigation, as a result of the lack of time and resources. Moreover, this research includes piloting, which as Brundrett and Rhodes (2014) states targets increasing the validity of the research and its results. Thus, it was considered that the application of only one method was sufficient in this research.

Findings and Discussion

The information was obtained by means of the web based questionnaire, which was sent by email as a letter with the attached link. In order to increase response rate and still ensure anonymity the reminder message was sent again to the same respondents with words of gratitude to those who completed questionnaire and reminding those who did not. The response rate was 53,3 % equating to 8 respondents out of 15, whereas 6 people participated in piloting before. Dillman (2000) and Malaney (2002) state that permissible response rate for making statistical analysis is from 30% up to 60 %. Thus, the response rate in this research is sufficient. The questionnaire considered following aspects of job satisfaction as teaching, promotions, university facilities, relationships with colleagues and students, salary, job security, university policy and departmental management, research opportunities, working conditions, recognition. Demographic data was included and consisted of the information on current position, gender, years of experience in educational sphere and particularly in this university and in a current post, previous position held. Factors influencing teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in this department were determined. They were in certain cases affected by the peculiarities of demographic data. Furthermore, the findings of conducted questionnaire provided the answers on three research questions. A summary of acquired findings is illustrated by means of pie-charts and tables.

Thus, it was found that the percentage of male participated in the questionnaire was 50%, which is 4 people and female have the same number respectively. Work positions also varied as well as the years of experience, for instance within 5 options of job tenure in this university 75 % of respondents fallen under the group of more than 7 years job tenure and approximately 12,5 % of respondents were fallen under the category of 1-2 years interval and 12,5 % under the job tenure of 6-7 years respectively. However, the job tenure of respondents in educational sphere in general was more than 7 years, which turned into the percentage of 100%. Whereas, the job tenure of participants in current post varied, as 25 % answered that they work in a current post from 3 to 5 years, others chose 1-2 years interval category, which is 37,5 % and another 37,5 % of respondents indicated the option of more than 7 years. Thus, it can be seen that prevailing number of respondents are people with long experience and as a result with relatively high positions. Also from the outcomes of findings it was noticed professional growth of the majority of respondents.

Regarding the factors influencing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teacher staff in this department it was found that the highest level of satisfaction was related to relationships with students, indicated by 75%, wage is 87,5 %, workload, indicated by 87,5 %, application of professional skills, which is 85,71 %, conditions for conducting research and writing publications, which is 75% and policy of the university is 75% respectively. Surprisingly, these findings create controversy with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959) as they contradict to the main statements of this hypothesis, where extrinsic (hygiene) factors are considered as dissatisfiers, which can lead to negative feelings or result in job dissatisfaction. These factors are policy of the university, wage and workload (McCaffery, 2004). However, these findings conversely support Hackman's and Oldham Equity Theory (1980), which implies that particular job characteristics may impact on job satisfaction and job outcomes (Murage-Mwaka, 2013). In case of teaching profession these factors are the relationships with students and conditions for conducting research and writing publications and application of professional skills, which according to current findings have the highest rate as a factors influencing teacher job satisfaction.

The highest rate of teacher job dissatisfaction was related to following factors such as job security (12,5 %) and leadership on the university level (50 %) respectively. Particularly, these factors are in line with that offered by Herzberg (1959) unlike the above mentioned factors. Therefore, as these factors are extrinsic, they can cause teacher job dissatisfaction (McCaffery, 2004). Besides aforesaid factors, there were found several, which created confusion. As the questionnaire includes 4-point Likert-type scale questions from "Not satisfied at all" to "Extremely satisfied", there are certain factors that were marked as "Not satisfied" and "Satisfied", which indicate feelings but not very strong towards job satisfaction factors. One of these factors is sufficient conditions for conducting research and writing publications, which previously was mentioned as the highest rated factor of job dissatisfaction, at the same time it was marked as satisfied factor with the highest rate of 75%. Similarly, job security that was chosen by respondents as the most dissatisfied fac-

tors before, also was rated as satisfied factor (87,5 %). Thus, these findings in its turn are strongly correlated with Locke's Range of Affect Theory (1976), where employees put priority on one or more aspects of their job and this preference is different and personal, as other employees may have another aspects of prioritization [9].

Findings also revealed that predominant factors effecting on teacher job dissatisfaction in this particular department are insufficient conditions for conducting research (62,5 %), limited promotion chances and decline in job security with 50 % each respectively, conflict with colleagues (one third of the sample population). This results again proves and support Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959), as above-mentioned factors are considered as extrinsic (hygiene) factors causing job dissatisfaction.

Additionally, it was found that half of respondents marked growing prospects to improve and use professional skills and abilities, career progression, professional autonomy, wide range of facilities, satisfied expectations of working conditions, university policy and strategy and rewards as the most important factors that should be taken into consideration in case if the level of job satisfaction in the university is planned to be increased. In addition, final question disclosed pivotal aspects or factors, which have a significant impact on the general teacher job satisfaction in the investigated department such as policy of the university that was put on the first place in the ranking scale, then wage, relationships with colleagues followed by leadership on the university level. These factors were also confirmed by Judge and Church (2000) as the main factors influencing teacher job satisfaction. Thus, particularly this findings prove to some extent one aspect of Adam's Equity Theory (1965), which claims that employees who feel themselves rewarded sufficiently with their salary are supposed to experience job satisfaction (Griffin et al., 2001). However, according to findings low wage was not perceived by teachers as the crucial factor, which causes job satisfaction. However, certain factors are in line with those which were pinpointed by Comber and Nixon (2009), Watts and Robertson (2011) and Oshagbemi (2013) such as conflicts with co-workers, limited promotion chances and insufficient conditions for conducting research.

Thus, according to findings of the research it has been noticed the correlation between demographic variables and influential factors of job satisfaction, where adult academics with long experience in terms of extrinsic (hygiene) factors were most satisfied by policy of the University, wage and less satisfied with job security, leadership on the departmental level. Whereas in terms of intrinsic (motivators) they were more satisfied by promotion and application of professional skills and were less satisfied by rewards. However, there were a considerable number of exceptions, where certain extrinsic factors conversely causes job satisfaction instead of dissatisfaction, which creates contradiction with existing hypothesis on teacher job satisfaction theory. Gender has not significant impact on the choice of factors.

To sum up, a variety of factors, which have an impact on teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the university department were determined. Predominantly, extrinsic (hygiene) factors lead to the job satisfaction and dissatisfaction equally. Current research was correlated with all theories of job satisfaction except Herzberg's Two Factor (1959) in terms of certain factors. Furthermore, this study is limited in scope as a result of the application of only one research instrument. Therefore, in the next time the semi-structured interview method will be applied, as it allows more deep exploration of factors influencing teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as well as more proper understanding of people's perceptions about these factors. Another instrument, which can be also applied in further investigation is Job Descriptive Index (JDI), which was created by Smith (1969) and then improved by Kihm et al. (1997). It provides the opportunity to evaluate and measure more deeply the factors that impact job satisfaction and dissatisfaction such as promotion, colleagues' behavior, salary, work itself, supervision, working conditions [10].

Conclusions

This study attempted to explore and identify predominant factors affecting teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in an institutional department. Besides this, the recommendations of respondents regarding the factors, which contribute to an increase in the general level of job satisfaction within the faculty staff, were examined thoroughly. The outcomes of the research were obtained by means of conducting an online web questionnaire, which was distributed by email to the academic staff of the department. According to the findings explained and analyzed in this small-scale research, the teaching staff of the department was satisfied more with extrinsic factors (hygiene), despite the fact that these are supposed to result in job dissatisfaction according to Herzberg's Two-factor Theory (1959). Therefore, the research created disagreement and contradiction with certain aspects of this hypothesis (McCaffery, 2004). This was because such factors as policy of the university, salary, relationships with co-workers, for instance, were rated as the most satisfying factors

in the academic environment of the university. These factors are considered by Judge and Church (2000) as the dominant factors affecting teacher job satisfaction. However, in their turn job promotion and recognition and leadership at the university level were marked as the main factors posing the risk of teacher job dissatisfaction. Furthermore, current analysis revealed the dependence of job satisfaction on academics' demographic variables, with the exception of gender aspect.

The findings of the research also disclosed information about teachers' advices concerning the factors that needs to be enhanced by the governance in the university and department, such as improving the rewards system, growing prospects for self-improvement and the application of professional skills and abilities, providing a wide range of facilities, satisfying expectations of working conditions and developing university policy and strategy. Thereby, as findings demonstrate that intrinsic (motivator) factors are correlated to job dissatisfaction; coordinated efforts should clearly be expended to enhance job satisfaction in terms of each intrinsic factor.

The outcomes of study could be useful for university managers and senior administration, as was mentioned previously by means of taking into consideration the factors that cause staff job dissatisfaction in the department and trying to eliminate them. As Comm and Mathaisel (2003) state teacher job satisfaction has very positive consequences and causes teachers' high job performance, greater productivity and professional enhancement and issues of this job satisfaction should be investigated. Moreover, the results of this study may to some extent be helpful for the university and departmental management team in terms of improving work climate and enhancing teachers' attitudes towards their jobs.

Regarding the limitations of this work, it was mentioned before that the research is carried out on a small-scale base, because only one research method was applied, which is the questionnaire. Thus, the semi-structured interview should be used in further research on this topic with the aim of carrying out triangulation in order to increase the validity of the research and more thoroughly investigate this issue. In addition, the study was conducted within respondents of only one department; therefore the scope of the research should be expanded which is why the next time it will be carried out within different departments or even within different universities. Besides this, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) could be applied for more comprehensive evaluation of the factors affecting academic staff job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

References

- 1 Judge, T., Church A.H. Job satisfaction: research and practice. In C.L. Cooper and E.A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice*. — Oxford, UK: Backwell, 2014. — P. 166–198.
- 2 Badri M, Mohaidat J, Ferrandino V, Mourad T. The social cognitive model of job satisfaction among teachers: Testing and validation // *International Journal of Educational Research*. 2013. 57: — P. 12–24.
- 3 Briggs A., Coleman M. and Morrison M. *Research methods in educational leadership and management*. — London [etc.]: Sage Publications. — 2012. — 352 p.
- 4 Brundrett M. and Rhodes C. *Researching educational leadership and management*. — London: Sage, 2014. — 429 p.
- 5 Butler M. and Rose E. *Introduction to Organizational Behaviour*, Edited London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, 2011. — 112 p.
- 6 Cohen L., Manion L. and Morrison K. *Research methods in education*. — London: Routledge Falmer, 2000. — 278 p.
- 7 Bryman A. Qualitative Research on Leadership: A Critical But Appreciative Review'. — *Leadership Quarterly* 2004. 15: — P. 729–769.
- 8 Bera B. *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. Association, BER. — London, 2011. — P. 1–11.
- 9 Bush T., Middlewood D. *Leading and Managing People in Education*. — London: Sage, 2006. — 112 p.
- 10 Comm C. and Mathaisel D. A case study of the implications of faculty workload and compensation for improving academic quality // *The international Journal of Educational Management*. — 2003. — Vol. 17. — No. 4/5. — P. 200–210.

Ж.К. Крекешева, Ж.А. Кагазбаев

Университет аясында оқытушының өз қызметімен қанағаттануына немесе қанағаттанбауына әсер ететін негізгі факторлар

Мақалада университеттік ортада оқытушылардың өз жұмысымен қанағаттанушылық және қанағаттанбаушылық деңгейіне әсер ететін негізгі факторлар қарастырылды. Сонымен қатар Маслоудың «Игіліктер және әр түрлі деңгейдегі қажеттіктер» атты тұжырымдамасына сәйкес қызметкерлердің жұмысымен қанағаттануына әсер ететін екі негізгі фактор тілге етілді, олар: ішкі (мотиваторлар) және сыртқы (демотиваторлар) факторлар. Авторлар Герцберг және Адам (әділеттілік теориясы), Локк (аффект және сезім теориясы), Хэкмен және Олдхэм (жұмыстарды сипаттау теориясы) ұсынған қызметкерлердің мотивация жүйесінде өз еңбегімен қанағаттану жағдайына байланысты әр түрлі теорияларды талдады. Сондай-ақ жоғары білім беру аясында профессор-оқытушылар құрамының жалпы қанағаттанушылық деңгейін көтеру мақсатымен қолданылатын, еңбек жағдайына үмітпен қарауға мүмкіндік беретін кең көлемде қызметтер ұсыну, біліктілікті көтеру болашағы, материалды және моральдік көтермелеу жүйесін жетілдіру сияқты факторларға байланысты ұсыныстар да келтірген.

Кілт сөздер: жұмыспен қанағаттанушылық, университеттік орта, жұмыспен қанағаттанбаушылық, жұмыс жүктемесі, жұмыс шарттары, бағалау, мотивация, сыртқы факторлар, ішкі факторлар, адамдар мұқтаждықтарының төменгі және жоғары деңгейлері.

Ж.К. Крекешева, Ж.А. Кагазбаев

Ключевые факторы, влияющие на уровень удовлетворенности и неудовлетворенности своей работой преподавателей в университетской среде

В статье выделены ключевые факторы, влияющие на уровень удовлетворенности и неудовлетворенности своей работой преподавателями в университетской среде. Кроме того, наряду с концепцией Маслоу «Блага и потребности разных порядков», рассмотрены два основных фактора, приводящих к удовлетворенности работой сотрудниками: внутренние (мотиваторы) и внешние (демотиваторы). Также приведен анализ различных теорий удовлетворенности трудом в системе мотивации персонала: Герцберга, Адама (теория справедливости), Локка (теория аффектов и эмоций), Хэкмена и Олдхэма (теория характеристик работы). Предложены рекомендации относительно факторов, способствующих повышению общего уровня удовлетворенности работой профессорско-преподавательским составом в системе высшего образования, таких как совершенствование системы поощрений, перспективы повышения квалификации, предоставление широкого спектра услуг, соответствующих ожиданиям условий труда.

Ключевые слова: удовлетворенность работой, университетская среда, неудовлетворенность работой, объем работы, условия работы, поощрение, мотивация, внешние факторы, внутренние факторы, потребности высшего и низшего порядка.