IMPACT OF WORKING CLIMATE ON JOB SATISFACTION AND QUALITY EDUCATION (A CASE STUDY OF COLLEGE TEACHERS AT HIGHER EDUCATION LEVEL)

Mr. Vinay Kumar Yadav
Research Scholar
(Mewar University, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan)

Prof. (Dr.) R. L Tamboli
Prof. of Commerce & Management Deptt.
(Mewar University, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan)

Prof. (Dr.) Rekha Sharma
Prof. & Head of Management Deptt.
(Kalka Group of Institutions, Meerut)

Abstract: Working Climate and its impact on faculties' job satisfaction and quality education is emerging topic now a days at higher education level. In this research study, the researcher has taken the important factors of working climate which effect the job satisfaction of faculty members and quality education. 140 faculty members responses were taken in the study under which 15 government colleges and 10 private colleges were chosen. In this study a convenience sampling was used to collect data through a structured questionnaire. Wilcoxon signed rank test and Sandler's A-test were used as non-parametric test at 5% level of significance to know the differences between working climate of both types of colleges and to know the differences in the attitude of the faculty members for the implementation of job satisfaction practices in both the colleges. Findings were showing that there was no difference between government and private colleges working climate.

Keywords: Working Climate, Job Satisfaction, Quality Education

I.   INTRODUCTION

The great recession was a global economic downturn that devastated world financial market as well as all industries. The crisis caused millions of people lost their jobs. It's generally considered to be the longest period of economic decline since the post World War II period. The impact of financial crisis is felt by the developing economies as well. Growth is slowing down in all these countries. According to the survey conducted by the Ministry of Labour and Employment, during the three months October to December, 2008 in India more than 5,00,000 people lost their jobs as the impact of global economic crisis. This economic crisis has ebbed the confidence of many industries. Due to this crisis, industries freeze jobs and ban new vacancies. They started hiring only those students who were graduates from A – grade schools. Lakhs of graduates produces by thousands of B – Schools all over the India. Students take admission in these B – Schools not only for sake of gaining academic satisfaction and adding additional degree, but to get a better placement and handsome salary so they could not only recover the cost of education, but also lead a secure and prosperous life. Even after completing their course successfully they are not getting a good job. Fresh graduates who are new to the market faced many difficulties to get a job. More so, if they are not from A – grade schools.

Lack of Quality Education and Faculties Job Dissatisfaction has been identified as two major cause of the bias against the management fresher's. One of the ways to improve the managerial abilities of fresh students is to develop the quality in their education. What does quality means in the context of education? It includes participants who are ready to learn at any and every stage of life, adequately support by their families, communities and country. It means fostering an environment that provides sufficient resources and facilities for learning. It encompasses teaching materials, content and curricula that nurture the acquisition of skills and knowledge helping students become globally employable. Faculties' job satisfaction is the major cause for the shortcoming among the fresh management graduates. There are many factors which effects the faculties' job satisfaction like – work-itself, good pay, colleagues, healthy working environment and promotion opportunities etc. If faculties are satisfied with their institutions, they will be committed to their profession and imparting quality education at higher level. Lack of job satisfaction leads to lesser self-development, stress, burnout turn over and absenteeism.

Attracting and retaining high quality teacher is thus a primary requirement for an educational institution. For the development of quality teachers one has to understand factors associated with it. Job satisfaction is one of those important factors. Faculty members job satisfaction is a multifaceted phenomenon (Sharma and Jyoti, 2006, Bajpai, 2005) thus, the understanding of factors affecting teacher's satisfaction at the workplace is of paramount importance for a successful educational system at higher level.

II.   REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Working Climate

K. Srivastava January, 2008 The study focused on the effect of two constituents of working climate (i.e. physical and psychosocial) on employees' job satisfaction and performance, and organizational effectiveness in a sample of 360 technical supervisors and operating core personnel. The analyses revealed that participants who perceived their work climate as to be adequate and favorable scored comparatively higher on the measures of job satisfaction, performance, and perceived organizational effectiveness. The two constituents of work environment were also found causing significant variance in employees' job behaviour and their perception of organizational effectiveness. Regression analyses revealed that among the various components of work environment, working condition, welfare provisions, interpersonal relations, and trust and support predominantly contribute to employees' job behaviour and organizational effectiveness. The results also specified that psycho-social environment in work-place exert more impact on employees' job behavior and organizational effectiveness than the physical environment does. Hypothetically, whatever affects morale on the job is likely to affect job commitment. According to Yusuf and Metiboba, (2012) the third type of work environment, organizational environment includes systems, procedures, practices, values and philosophies which operate under the control of management. All these go a long way in influencing people's psych and attitude towards work. These three types of environments can

further be categorized into two basic types, based on the influence they exert on the people at work. In his study of employee personality profile at work as influenced by the working environment, Kyko (2005) posits that employee personality profile is not static. It is dynamic and changes with the working experiences in the organization environment. Hence, many authors classify the work environment into conducive and toxic environments (see Akinyele, 2010: 302; Chaddha, Ravi & Noida, 2011: 121;Yusuf&Metiboba, 2012: 37;Assaf,&Alswalha, 2013). Conducive workplace environments give pleasurable experiences to the employees and help them actualize in the dimensions of personality profile while toxic workplace environments give painful experiences and de-actualize employees' behaviour. Kyko believes that irresponsible or uncommitted employees can change to be responsible and be more committed to job in conducive work environment because such environments reinforce the self-actualizing traits in them. While reverse may be the case under toxic environment. It is these two kinds of workplace environment that serves as conceptual framework of this study. Workplace environment is thus defined in this study as sum of the interrelationship between employees and employers and the environment in which they operate which may be conducive or toxic.

Job Satisfaction

For several reasons, the teacher's job satisfaction has always been an important issue in empirical pedagogical research: First, job satisfaction is considered to have an effect on the quality of teaching and on the college achievement of people (e.g. Somech and Drach-Zahavy 2000; Nabi 1995; Menlo and Poppleton 1990). Second, it has been found to predict withdrawal cognition (Lam, Foong And Moo 1995; Hall, Pearson And Carroll 1992), and may therefore be seen as an important aspect in maintaining the stability of the teaching staff. And third, teacher job satisfaction is supposed to contribute to the quality of teacher work-life, making their professional experience an element of psychological health (Menlo And Poppleton 1990), personal fulfillment and growth. This might be perceived as an objective in itself (Garrett 1999). The teacher job satisfaction, in general, has attracted a broad range of pedagogical research, For instance, questions of higher educational infrastructure or faculties salaries could play a higher role in countries where education may happen under a tree, and where many teachers can hardly afford their living and may need second and third jobs to cover the basic needs of their families. Indeed, existing literature on teacher job satisfaction in developing countries, generally suggests a stronger emphasis on monetary aspects.(see e.g. Chivore 1988 For Zambia, Abangma 1981 For The Anglophone Part Of Cameroon, Banya And Elu 1997 For Sierra Leone, And Postlethwaite 1998 for Tanzania, Zambia and Uganda). It should be noted that most of this literature analyzes teachers' own perceptions about the factors relevant for their demonization. Results are thus subjective, may change over time and with circumstances, and do not necessarily imply that teachers working under 'improved' conditions according to some objective measure of these criteria, are indeed more motivated on their job. This problem does not arise when working with separate indicators of job satisfaction on the one hand, and teaching conditions on the other hand, as we will do in our study. The more theoretical part of the literature by educational scientists draws from the general concepts of motivation and job satisfaction typically developed in the context of the theory of organization. Apart from Maslow's (1954) well known hierarchy of needs which, in our context, also stresses the relevance of a separate analysis of teacher job satisfaction for developing countries, the most common basis of theoretical analysis is Herzberg's (1968) famous two-factor model and extensions thereof. However, no consensus has yet been found, and the literature does not offer a uniform theoretical concept of job satisfaction so far (see e.g. Evans 1997, for discussion). The general concepts of job satisfaction have been questioned in terms of their applicability to the field of teacher work (e.g. Nias 1981, Evans 1997). Following Barnabé and Burns (1994), teaching differs from other professions regarding several aspects: the job is mostly carried out isolated from other adults, and teachers are also isolated when preparing lessons. So, teachers might be different from other workforce because they spend most of their time either working alone or together with pupils. Wittmann (2002) and Garrett (1999) provide interesting literature reviews of job satisfaction and motivation theory with respect to teachers and colleges.

Quality Education:

Manatos et al., 2017, a recent review of quality management approaches also suggested that quality management routines are increasingly becoming integrated into the global management structures of higher education institutions. Higher education in India is facing lot of problems, such as, overcrowding, quality deterioration etc. but higher education is necessary for the country's economic development. (B. G. TilakJandhyala, 2003) has focused on the importance of higher education showing that countries having fewer enrollments in higher education are economically backward. Tilak has focused on a very pertinent issue, that private higher education has been growing rapidly in all countries and meeting a large part of the demand for higher education but it failed to have top quality institutes because of weak quality controls and high profit motives. Tilak, in his paper, has done a comparative study of India and Indian metro cities and concluded that no nation can develop without higher education.Quality is major concern in higher education and to maintain prevailing quality and/or its excellence, several models have been prepared. (D. S. Grewal, 2012) has provided an excellent analysis of various models and theories prevailing in higher education. Lots of emphasis nowadays has been given to total quality management in industry and each model related to managing quality has several attributes, but aim of all there models is excellence in education. According to the Education for All (Global Monitoring Report 2005) – The objective of Quality Education is to provide "Learners cognitive development, as the major explicit objective of the education system. The second emphasizes educations role in promoting values and attitude of responsible citizenship and in nurturing creative and emotional development.

(Ming Cheng, 2011) has tried to justify two concepts „transforming the learner versus passing the exam". He tried to explain the perception about quality in education from the point of faculty and students. Quality and good teaching are abstract terms and evaluated on the basis of ideology and beliefs. Since ideology and beliefs are dependent on experiences, quality means different things to different people. This research paper is based on a case study and intends to provide a snapshot to understand quality from perception of universities merit award winners and students. (Reybold and Alamia, 2008) has focused on transitional journey of faculty members. Faculty has to move through dynamic journey through promotion from entry point to movement to retirement. Academic transitions challenge the identity of faculty. Reybold has also focused on the fact that the academic transitions can be opportunities for professional growth. Paper has also highlighted that faculty promotion and tenure are all dependent on primary functions teaching, research and publication. This process of transition does not consider the phenomenological experience of becoming faculty.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The questionnaires were distributed to one hundred forty faculty members out of which ninety one faculty members were taken from government colleges and forty nine were taken from private colleges. Total twenty five self-financed colleges were taken out of which ten were private and fifteen were government colleges both were affiliated to Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut. The research design was descriptive in nature and convenience sampling was used to collect data from selected private and government colleges of Meerut. Five Point Likert scale was used to measure teachers' responses towards working climate of the private and government colleges. Wilcoxon signed rank test and Sandler's A-test were used to find out whether the differences between both the colleges working climate was similar or different from each other.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Following objectives are identified for the present study,

- To study the factors who are responsible for good working climate in government colleges and private colleges
- To compare the working climate in between government colleges and private colleges
- To examine the impact of working climate on employees job satisfaction practices and quality education
- To suggest recommendations in order to improve the working climate with a view to make the colleges faculty members more quality oriented and responsive towards their job.

V. THE PROPOSED FOLLOWING HYPOTHESIS

- Both the government and private colleges' faculty members have no difference in their attitude for the implementation of job satisfaction practices in both the colleges.
- There is no difference between the working climate of both government and private colleges.

VI. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Responses of faculty members towards Working Climate on a Five Point Likert Scale

1. **Encouraging Open Communication:**

Table 1.1 Encouraging Open Commutation						
Level of Agreement& Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	29	11	40	145	55	200
Some What Satisfied (4)	46	31	77	184	124	308
Neutral (3)	3	1	4	9	3	12
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	13	5	18	26	10	36
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0	1	1	0	1	1
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**364**	**193**	**557**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	**Pvt.**	**All**
Very Satisfied (5)	39.84	28.50	35.91
Some What Satisfied (4)	50.55	64.25	55.30
Neutral (3)	2.47	1.55	2.15
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	7.14	5.18	6.46
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.00	0.52	0.18
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Result Interpretation:

The faculties of government colleges were very satisfied (39.83) in comparison to private college's faculties (28.49). The faculties of private colleges were somewhat satisfied (64.24) than faculties of government colleges (50.55). If talk about neutral response then the figure shows that the faculties of government colleges were more neutral (2.47) thus faculties of private colleges (1.55). Faculties of government colleges somewhat dissatisfied (7.14) more than private colleges faculties (5.18). The ratio of very dissatisfied were almost equal to both colleges government (Nil) and private (0.51).

2. **Confrontation (Discussion without Fear):**

Table 1.2 Confrontation (Discussion without fear)						
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	22	15	37	110	75	185
Some What Satisfied (4)	51	19	70	204	76	280
Neutral (3)	3	2	5	9	6	15
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	12	10	22	24	20	44
Very Dissatisfied (1)	3	3	6	3	3	6
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**350**	**180**	**530**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	Pvt.	All
Very Satisfied (5)	31.43	41.67	34.91
Some What Satisfied (4)	58.29	42.22	52.83
Neutral (3)	2.57	3.33	2.83
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	6.86	11.11	8.30
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.86	1.67	1.13
Total	100	100	100

Result Interpretation:

Faculties of private colleges were very satisfied (41.66) than government colleges (31.42). Faculties of government colleges (58.28) were somewhat satisfied than private colleges (42.22). Faculties of private colleges (3.33) were more neutral than faculties of government colleges (2.57). According to responses of both colleges faculties, private colleges faculties were somewhat dissatisfied (11.11) than government colleges faculties (6.85). Private colleges faculties were very dissatisfied (1.66) in comparison to faculties of government colleges (0.85).

3. **Trust (Faith in Employees/Faculty Members Capability):**

Table 1.3 Trust (Faith in Employees/Faculty Members Capability)						
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	Pvt. Colleges	All Colleges	Gov. Colleges	Pvt. Colleges	All Colleges
	91	49	140			
Very Satisfied (5)	31	22	53	155	110	265
Some What Satisfied (4)	46	25	71	184	100	284
Neutral (3)	3	0	3	9	0	9
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	10	2	12	20	4	24
Very Dissatisfied (1)	1	0	1	1	0	1
Total	91	49	140	350	180	530

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	Pvt.	All
Very Satisfied (5)	42.01	51.40	45.45
Some What Satisfied (4)	49.86	46.73	48.71
Neutral (3)	2.44	0.00	1.54
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	5.42	1.87	4.12
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.27	0.00	0.17
Total	100	100	100

Result Interpretation:

Private colleges faculties were very satisfied (51.40) in comparison to government faculties (42.00). The government colleges faculties were somewhat satisfied (49.86) than faculties of private colleges (46.72). In comparison to both colleges, faculties responses, faculties of private colleges less neutral (Nil) than faculties of government colleges (2.43). Faculties of government colleges were somewhat dissatisfied (5.42) than private colleges faculties (1.86). The responses of very dissatisfied were almost equal government and private colleges subsequently (0.27) and (Nil).

4. **Providing Resources for an Adjusting Workload to Stimulated Scholarship & Research**

Table 1.4 Providing resources for an adjusting workload to stimulated scholarship & research						
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	Pvt. Colleges	All Colleges	Gov. Colleges	Pvt. Colleges	All Colleges
	91	49	140			
Very Satisfied (5)	26	19	45	130	95	225
Some What Satisfied (4)	56	24	80	224	96	320
Neutral (3)	2	0	2	6	0	6
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	7	6	13	14	12	26
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	91	49	140	374	203	577

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	Pvt.	All
Very Satisfied (5)	34.76	46.80	38.99
Some What Satisfied (4)	59.89	47.29	55.46
Neutral (3)	1.60	0.00	1.04
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	3.74	5.91	4.51
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	100	100	100

Result Interpretation:

  Private colleges faculties were very satisfied (46.79) in comparison to government colleges (34.75). Faculties of government colleges were somewhat satisfied (59.86) than the faculties of private colleges (47.29). There were no neutral faculties in private colleges (Nil) and in government colleges (1.60) faculties were neutral. If we come on somewhat dissatisfied than private colleges faculties somewhat dissatisfied (5.91) than government colleges (3.74). There were no response from both colleges for very dissatisfied.

5. **Pro-action:**

Table 1.5 Pro-action					
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	17	5	22	85	25	110
Some What Satisfied (4)	49	28	77	196	112	308
Neutral (3)	2	0	2	6	0	6
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	20	12	32	40	24	64
Very Dissatisfied (1)	3	4	7	3	4	7
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**330**	**165**	**495**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	**Pvt.**	**All**
Very Satisfied (5)	25.76	15.15	22.22
Some What Satisfied (4)	59.39	67.88	62.22
Neutral (3)	1.82	0.00	1.21
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	12.12	14.55	12.93
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.91	2.42	1.41
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Result Interpretation:

  Government colleges faculties were very satisfied (25.76) than private colleges faculties (15.15). If we discussed about somewhat satisfied than private colleges faculties responses (67.88) more than government colleges (59.39). There were little difference between neutral responses of both colleges faculties member in government colleges (1.82) and private colleges (Nil). The faculties of private colleges (14.55) more somewhat dissatisfied than private colleges (12.12). There were few responses from both colleges private (2.42) and government (0.91) almost nil for very dissatisfied.

6. **Clear Sense of Direction with Authenticity**

Table 1.6 Clear sense of direction with authenticity					
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	25	8	33	125	40	165
Some What Satisfied (4)	23	18	41	92	72	164
Neutral (3)	2	2	4	6	6	12
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	34	18	52	68	36	104
Very Dissatisfied (1)	7	3	10	7	3	10
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**298**	**157**	**455**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	**Pvt.**	**All**
Very Satisfied (5)	41.95	25.48	36.26
Some What Satisfied (4)	30.87	45.86	36.04
Neutral (3)	2.01	3.82	2.64
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	22.82	22.93	22.86
Very Dissatisfied (1)	2.35	1.91	2.20
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Result Interpretation:

  Government colleges faculties were very satisfied (41.95) than private colleges faculties (25.48). Faculties of private colleges (45.86) were somewhat satisfied than government colleges (30.87) and the neutral responses of government colleges (2.01) less than private colleges (3.82). According to responses of both colleges faculties members, there were very few difference between

government (22.82) and private (22.93) colleges for somewhat dissatisfied. Faculties of government colleges were very dissatisfied (2.35) than private colleges (1.91).

7. Positive/Congenial Work Atmosphere in the Department

Table 1.7 Positive/Congenial work atmosphere in the department					
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	35	11	46	175	55	230
Some What Satisfied (4)	47	33	80	188	132	320
Neutral (3)	2	1	3	6	3	9
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	7	4	11	14	8	22
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**383**	**198**	**581**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	**Pvt.**	**All**
Very Satisfied (5)	45.69	27.78	39.59
Some What Satisfied (4)	49.09	66.67	55.08
Neutral (3)	1.57	1.52	1.55
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	3.66	4.04	3.79
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Result Interpretation:

Faculties of government colleges were very satisfied (45.69) than private colleges faculties (27.78). Private colleges faculties were somewhat satisfied (66.67) more than government colleges (49.09). if we discussed about neutral responses than there were no difference between both colleges responses, both were equal (1.57). The responses of government colleges and private colleges for somewhat dissatisfied were almost equal (3.66 and 4.04). There were no responses for very dissatisfied from both colleges faculties members.

8. Treating Academic Staff Fairley and with Integrity

Table 1.8 Treating academic staff fairy and with integrity					
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	37	17	54	185	85	270
Some What Satisfied (4)	44	23	67	176	92	268
Neutral (3)	2	3	5	6	9	15
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	5	5	10	10	10	20
Very Dissatisfied (1)	3	1	4	3	1	4
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**380**	**197**	**577**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	**Pvt.**	**All**
Very Satisfied (5)	48.68	43.15	46.79
Some What Satisfied (4)	46.32	46.70	46.45
Neutral (3)	1.58	4.57	2.60
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	2.63	5.08	3.47
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.79	0.51	0.69
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Result Interpretation:

Faculties of government colleges were very satisfied (48.68) than private colleges faculties (43.15). There were no differences between both colleges faculties members responses for somewhat satisfied (46.32). If we discussed about neutral responses, private colleges faculties were more neutral (457) than the government colleges (1.58). The faculties of private colleges were somewhat dissatisfied (5.08) in comparison to government colleges (2.63). I got almost nil responses from both colleges for very dissatisfied.

9. **Being Considerate & Discourage Favoritism**

Table 1.9 Being considerate & discourage favoritism						
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	30	17	47	150	85	235
Some What Satisfied (4)	44	21	65	176	84	260
Neutral (3)	2	3	5	6	9	15
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	10	5	15	20	10	30
Very Dissatisfied (1)	5	3	8	5	3	8
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**357**	**191**	**548**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	**Pvt.**	**All**
Very Satisfied (5)	42.02	44.50	42.88
Some What Satisfied (4)	49.30	43.98	47.45
Neutral (3)	1.68	4.71	2.74
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	5.60	5.24	5.47
Very Dissatisfied (1)	1.40	1.57	1.46
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Result Interpretation:

Faculty members of private colleges (44.50) were very satisfied than faculties of government colleges (42.02). Government colleges faculties were somewhat satisfied (49.30) than private colleges faculties (43.98). Private colleges faculties were more neutral (4.71) than government colleges faculties (1.68). Both colleges faculties responses for somewhat dissatisfied (5.60 and 5.24) were almost equal. The responses of very dissatisfied from both colleges faculties members were almost equal (1.40 and 1.57).

10. **Friendly and Stimulating Team Work:**

Table 1.10 Friendly and Stimulating team work						
Level of Agreement & Score Point	**No. of Faculty Members**			**Total Scores of the Response**		
	Gov. Colleges	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**	**Gov. Colleges**	**Pvt. Colleges**	**All Colleges**
	91	**49**	**140**			
Very Satisfied (5)	40	24	64	200	120	320
Some What Satisfied (4)	43	19	62	172	76	248
Neutral (3)	5	2	7	15	6	21
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	3	4	7	6	8	14
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**91**	**49**	**140**	**393**	**210**	**603**

	% of All Colleges Response		
	Gov.	**Pvt.**	**All**
Very Satisfied (5)	50.89	57.14	53.07
Some What Satisfied (4)	43.77	36.19	41.13
Neutral (3)	3.82	2.86	3.48
Some What Dissatisfied (2)	1.53	3.81	2.32
Very Dissatisfied (1)	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Result Interpretation:

Faculty members of private colleges (57.14) were very satisfied than faculties of government colleges (50.89). Government colleges faculties were somewhat satisfied (43.77) than private colleges faculties (36.19). Government colleges faculties were more neutral (3.82) than private colleges faculties (2.86). Faculties members of private colleges were somewhat dissatisfied (3.81) than government colleges faculties responses (1.53). The responses of very dissatisfied from both colleges faculties members were Nil.

Table 1.11 Average Scores & Differences

Contents	Government Colleges	Private Colleges	All Colleges
Encouraging Open Communication	4.00	3.93	3.97
Confrontation	3.84	3.67	3.78
Trust	4.05	4.36	4.16
Providing Resources for adjusting workload to stimulated Scholarship & Research	1.10	4.14	4.12
Pro-Action	3.62	3.36	3.53
Clear sense of direction with authenticity	3.27	3.20	3.25
Positive/Congenial work atmosphere in the department	4.20	4.04	4.15
Treating academic staff fairly and with integrity	4.17	4.02	4.12
Being considerate & discourage favoritism	3.92	3.89	3.91
Friendly & Stimulating Team Work	4.31	4.28	4.30
Average Scores	**3.64**	**3.88**	

Calculation: -

Level of Significance	=	5%	
Degree of Freedom	=	$10 - 1 = 9$	

Wilcoxon's Matched Pairs Test (Wilcoxon Test)

Calculated value of T statistics	=	13	
Table value of T statistics	=	06	

Sandler's Test

$$A = \frac{\sum D^2}{(\sum D)^2}$$

Calculated value of A statistics	=	0.2539/0.59	
	=	0.729	
Table value of A statistics	=	0.276	

Ho : No difference between the scores of private and government colleges.

Ha : There is a difference between the scores of private and government colleges as per (Table 1.11), the average scores of all the 10 elements of working climate were 3. 64 for the government college's faculty members while 3.88 for private college's faculty members on a 5 point scale. The difference between the two scores appeared almost negligible and the same had been shown as per the Wilcoxon Test and the Sander's Test at 5% level of significance. For, the calculated value of T – statistics was 13 as against its table value is 6 and the calculated value A – statistics was 0.729 as against its corresponding table value of 0.276 at 5% level of significance for a 9 degree of freedom, a condition leading to acceptance of Null Hypothesis denoting that average scores of all the 10 elements of working climate did not differ between the average scores of government colleges and private colleges at higher level.

Wilcoxon Test Result
Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The median of differences between Government and Private equals 0.	Related Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	0.386	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.

HYPOTHESIS VIEWED AS PER THE ANALYSIS

From the above discussion it is evident that -

- Both the government and private colleges' faculty members have no difference in their attitude for the implementation of job satisfaction practices in both the colleges. Thus, the first hypothesis of the study stands accepted.
- The faculty members consider working climate inevitable in both the government colleges and private colleges, and there is no difference in the working climate in government colleges and private colleges, and as such second hypothesis stands accepted.

VII. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- From the Analysis of Data (Table 1.1) it can be concluded that faculty members of government colleges have shown 80% level of agreement i.e. they have more open communication in comparison to private colleges faculty members.
- From the (Table 1.2) it can be concluded that faculty members of government colleges have shown 76.8% level of agreement for discussion without fear of criticism, whereas private college's faculty members have shown 73.4% level of agreement. It means government colleges faculty members feel less fear in face to face problem discussion to their higher authorities in comparison to private college's faculty members.
- From the (Table 1.3) it can be concluded that 87.2% level of agreement has been shown by private colleges faculty members for Trust (Faith in their own capability that can easily adopt and acquire new competency at any state of life) whereas government colleges faculty members claim only 81% level of agreement.
- From the (Table 1.4) it can be concluded that government colleges as well as private colleges faculty members have shown almost equal level of agreement i.e. 82% and 82.8% for the management tendency to help and providing resources for adjusting workload of faculty members to stimulate scholarship & research at higher level.

- Government colleges faculty members have shown 72.4% level of agreement for pro-action i.e. ready to accept the new changes and taking initiation for work and risk bearing capacity where as private colleges faculty members shown 67.2% level of agreement. It means government colleges faculty members have more risk bearing and work initiation capacity in comparison to private college's faculty members.
- Government college's faculty members have shown 65.4 level of agreement for clear sense of direction with authenticity where as 64% level of agreement which is not a big difference.
- Government college's faculty members have more positive and congenial work atmosphere the departments as comparison to private colleges. 84% level of agreement has been shown by government colleges where as 80.8% by private colleges.
- Table 1.8 clearly states that in government college's management authorities has a greater tendency to treat their academic staff fairly and with integrity as the most valuable human resources in comparison to private college's management. The level of agreement is 83.4% for government where as 80.4% level of agreement in private colleges.
- A tendency to being considerate towards faculty members and to discourage favoritism has shown almost same level of agreement in government colleges as well as private colleges. 78.4% level of agreement is shown by government colleges and 77.8% by private colleges.
- Table 1.10 states that almost same level of agreement was observed for friendly and stimulating Team Work approach and Team Spirit in government colleges as well as private colleges. Government colleges faculty members has been shown 86.2% level of agreement for Team spirit for stimulate Team work among faculty members where as 85.6% was reported by private colleges faculty members.

VIII. SUGGESTIONS OF THE STUDY

- Top management authorities should give importance to more openness, transparency in their interpersonal relations, give high value to human dignity, implements people oriented management system, creative belongingness and trust and two way communication.
- Management of the educational institutions should seriously consider the needs of the faculty members and take initiative to meet them so that they can easily cultivate the satisfaction of the faculty members and enhance the quality education. Institutions must provide a healthy working environment and facilities to their faculty members such as proper physical facilities, adequate salary, proper teaching support, training & development in service, research related facilities, personal attention, job security, recognition for work etc. When faculty members perceived support from administrators than only they are motivated to do their best in the classrooms, and when faculty members are not satisfied with their working climate they are more likely to change the institution or to leave the profession altogether so good working climate influence them and their desire to remain in teaching throughout their career.
- Timely and Appropriate recognition & treat staff fairly with integrity, this treatment will act as motivating factor for teachers to keep on giving good performance and enhance their level of job satisfaction. Everyone appreciates getting credit when it is due. The occasions to share the success of employers with others are almost limit less. The work of meritorious teachers should be given the recognition in form of publicized recognition and financial and non-financial rewards socializing and interaction at personal level could enhance the bonding.
- Faculty members should be given proper orientation regarding team work and they should be encouraged to take joint projects. The Heads should identify teachers with same aspiration and often put them in situation when they are required to work together. This will increase the intimacy among the teachers and in future they will not be reluctant to work in teams.
- There should be balanced compromise between educational institutions need and individual need. Total insensitiveness to individual preference gives rise to frustration at some point of time, which as a consequence has a real damage effect on the institutions growth as well it effects the student achievement also.
- There should be uniform, balanced and impartial teacher's performance review system based on feedback of students, their academic performance in a year. This system in fact needs a total review.

IX. REFERENCES

- A.K.Srivastava, "Effect of Perceived Work Environment on Employees Job Behavior and Organizational Effectiveness, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi © Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, January 2008, Vol. 34, No.1, 47-55
- Akintayo, D. (2012). Working environment, workers' morale and perceived productivity in industrial organizations in Nigeria. Education Research Journal, 2 (3), 87-93, retrieved from http://resjournals.com/ERJ/Pdf/2012/Mar/Akintayo.pdf
- Akinyele S. T. (2010). The influence of work environment on workers' productivity: A case study of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. African Journal on Business Management, 4(3),299–307.
- Barnabe. C. and Burns, M. (1994). Teachers' job characteristics and motivation, Educational Research, Vol. 36, pp. 171 – 185
- Chaddha, V., Ravi P. G. & Noida, G. (2011) Analysis of factors influencing employees' productivity in relation to workplace environment. International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management2 (5) Retrieved from http://ijrcm.org.in/uploaddata/11304738350.pdf
- Chivore, B.R.S. (1988). FACTORS Determining the Attractiveness of the Teachers Profession in Zimbabwe. International Review of Education, Vol. 34,No1, pp. 59-78
- Clement, A. (2000) Correlates of workers improved morale and productivity in organizations. Journalof Economic Studies 8(2), 40-52.
- Grewal D.S. 2012. "Theories and Models for Managing Excellence in Higher Technical Education among Disparities in India."*International Conference on Technology and Business Management,* pp. 301-312
- Maslow. A.H. (1954). Motivation and Personality, Harper & Row Publishers, New York, NY.
- Nabi S. R., (1995). The impact of an educational innovation on students' performance classroom practice and teacher's behaviour in chitral, Pakistan, unpublished Edu thesis, university of Bristol, Bristo.

- Reybold L. Earle and Alamia J. Jennifer 2008."Academic Transitions in Education."*Journal of Career Development*, Vol. 35, No. 2:107-126 (Reybold and Alamia, 2008)
- Somach, A., & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2000). Understanding extra-role behaviour in colleges: The relationship between job satisfaction, sense of efficacy, and teachers' extra-role behaviour. Teachers and Teachers Education, 16, 649-659.
- Stanley, B. (2003). Middle level manpower development, skill acquisition and utilization in industries. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 8(2), 47-53.
- Tilak Jandhyala B G 2003."Vocational Education and Training in Asia."*Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol. XVII No. 1:53-67 (Tilak, 2003)
- Yusuf N. & Metiboba S. (2012)Work environment and job attitude among employees in a Nigerian work organization. Journal of Sustainable Society, 1(2), 36-43