

Abdul Kadir Bin Othman, Hasfah Nurhanum Mustafa, Muhammad Iskandar Hamzah and Mohd Zulkifli Abdullah

The Influence of Flexible Work Arrangement and Remuneration on Employees' Job Satisfaction in Private Higher Education Institutions

Abdul Kadir Bin Othman¹, Hasfah Nurhanum Mustafa², Muhammad Iskandar Hamzah³ and Mohd Zulkifli Abdullah⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Faculty of Business and Management, UiTM Puncak Alam, Selangor Malaysia

abdКАДir@uitm.edu.my¹

hasfah.mustafa@cosmopoint.com.my²

iskandar68@gmail.com³

m_zulkifli@uitm.edu.my⁴

Received: 26 February 2019

Reviewed: 17 March 2019

Accepted: 12 April 2019

Abstract

Job satisfaction is the most common topic of research, but it is still relevant as most problems in the workplace are related to employees' job satisfaction. The same problem is also prevalent those working in higher educational institutions. Due to this concern, the present study was conducted among 163 academics in private colleges in Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia. Based on the result of factor analysis, it was found that job satisfaction of academics can be divided into four dimensions; career and salary satisfaction, creativity satisfaction, administration satisfaction and attitudinal satisfaction. Factors that significantly influence the dimensions of job satisfaction are flexible work arrangement, salary and promotion. All these three factors significantly influence career and salary satisfaction and administration satisfaction. Promotion on the other hand leads to creativity satisfaction. And, salary contributes to attitudinal satisfaction. The findings of the study indicate the importance of flexible work arrangement and compensation on academics' satisfaction, thus, the management should consider these aspects when planning for the work schedule and career development of the academics in the institutions of higher learning.

Keywords: flexible work arrangement, compensation, job satisfaction, academics

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction has been extensively studied by researchers around the world, but the problems related to job satisfaction has never been addressed completely because of the changes in the nature of the job, the work environment and the increasing demand from various stakeholders. Issues pertaining to job satisfaction should be addressed specifically according to certain industry or types of organization as the nature of business and the environment are unique. In higher education institutions, the job satisfaction of academics has become a growing concern due to specifically the increasing work demand with the decreasing remuneration packages. Academics are compelled to do various tasks to fulfil the requirements of the ministry, but the increase in the responsibilities is not accompanied by the increase in the remuneration packages. This issue has created the sense of job dissatisfaction among the academics.

The most common definition of job satisfaction is the one asserted by Locke (1976), "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences". A more recent definition of job satisfaction is by Hulin and Judge (2003), who mentioned that job satisfaction includes multidimensional psychological responses to an individual's job, and that these personal responses have cognitive (evaluative), affective (or emotional), and behavioral components. Affective job satisfaction reflects the degree of pleasure or happiness the job in general produces.

Cognitive job satisfaction is a more objective and logical evaluation of various facets of a job. While behavioral job satisfaction relates to actions in response to the feelings associated with the job. A lot of theories and models have been developed to address job satisfaction including Affective Theory, Equity Theory, Two-factor Theory and Job Characteristics Model with the intention to explain its significant predictors.

In higher education institutions, the nature of the work of the academics is different from the one of the other employees in business organizations. Academics are responsible to teach, to do research, to write and publish articles and some are required to do the administrative work. There is no time frame for their work as long as they can meet their performance indicators. The ability of the academics to fulfill their job requirement will determine whether they deserve advances in their career and salary increment. A lot of studies have been conducted examining factors that contribute to academic satisfaction. A study conducted at Public Universities in Kelantan, Malaysia found that financial reward contributes to job satisfaction among academics (Mustafa, 2013). Ismail and Ali (2015) conducted a study among academics at UniKL also found a similar result. Another study found that income relates positively to job satisfaction (Mehrad, 2015). Therefore, it is hypothesized that salary significantly contributes to job satisfaction among the academics in private higher education institutions.

Employee job satisfaction is an important attribute that organizations desire of their staff (Oshagbemi, 2003). Job satisfaction may be linked to performance, organizational productivity and other issues, including labor turnover. However, dissatisfied employees are prone to commit absenteeism and excessive turnover (Chen, Yang, Shiau, & Wang, 2006; Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999). Although most of the researches in employee satisfaction field have been related to profit-making industry and service organizations, there has been a growing interest in satisfaction of employees in higher education. The reason for this increasing interest is the fact that higher education institutions are labor intensive and their budgets are predominantly devoted to personnel and their effectiveness is largely dependent on their staff. Consequently, satisfaction of the employees in higher education institutions is a very important issue (Kisku, 2003).

The workload of public educators has become increasingly complex in recent years. New and senior academicians are facing a variety of internal and external challenges within the classroom environment (Cui-Callahan, 2012). Furthermore, Cui-Callahan (2012) concluded that job satisfaction is the result of employees' perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important by them and studies indicate that job satisfaction influences academicians' enthusiasm and relationships with students (Weiqi, 2007), both of which could reasonably be suggested as factors that could influence a teacher's decision to quit teaching. It can be concluded that previous studies support the importance of providing students with the most effective academicians in order to ensure their retention and student academic success (Benton-Borghi, & Chang, 2012). When academicians are satisfied in their work, their psychological well-being is enhanced and they are able to function optimally (Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000).

Several studies have focused on the relationship between job satisfaction and job commitment, which is defined as a teachers' intent to remain in teaching (Ingersoll, & Alsalam, 1997; Skaalvik, & Skaalvik, 2009; Ware, & Kitsantas, 2011; 2007). Research has demonstrated that when teachers do not feel satisfied with their work, they are less committed to remain in teaching field (Perrachione, Rosser, & Petersen, 2008; Price, & Collett, 2010; Tickle, Chang, & Kim, 2011). Teachers who have little commitment to remain in the teaching field are the most likely to leave their jobs (Perrachione, Rosser, & Petersen, 2008).

A study conducted by Toker (2011) revealed that the job satisfaction levels of the academicians in 31 foundation universities in Turkey were found to be moderately high. In another study by Faupel-Badger, Nelson and Izmirlan (2017) among academicians in different institutions around the United States indicated that slightly more than 60% were very or extremely satisfied with their careers, with more than 70% perceived their current salaries as competitive. There were some variations in career satisfaction, and perceived salary competitiveness. Besides, a previous study among 449 academicians in the US found that, respondents scored higher in the intrinsic job satisfaction than extrinsic job satisfaction consistently in all 7 institutions. In addition, on average, academicians scored the lowest subscales in pay and highest in supervision. The result of the study also highlights that work conditions and personalities of workers have an effect on job satisfaction. Expectations, feelings of

equity and different needs may contribute to the feeling of happiness in an employee (Cui-Callahan 2012).

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Career Progression or Promotion

Employers generally offer career progression scheme to their employees as a form of reward for their achievements and contributions. In return, the employees will be more responsible in getting better at what they are doing and slowly gaining the leadership momentum through higher levels of influence and authority. Promotion is objectively regarded as a symbol of career success, apart from salary increment (Seibert, Kraimer, & Liden, 2001; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2007). When the employee has higher amount of expertise and experience, he has a higher chance to get promoted (Claussen, Grohsjean, Luger, & Probst, 2014).

Seibert et al. (2001) contended that not only human capital is needed for career success, but also social capital. Social capital refers to values and resources that employees gain when they interact and network with other employees within the organization (Coleman, 1988). In essence, an employee needs to balance time and effort in shaping their personal work competencies while nurturing good social network so that one does not prosper at the expense of others. In a meta-analysis involving 140 journal articles pertaining to human capital and career success, Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman (2007) discovered that the number of hours worked, social capital, career sponsorship and skill development opportunities played important roles in assisting employees to earn their promotion. As such, this indicates that both human capital and social capital are indispensable for employees to positively progress in their career.

Within the higher learning institutions, the pathway to promotion is perhaps ambidextrous and more complex, as compared to their primary counterparts. Apart from teaching, academics are ought to involve in conducting research and publications, securing external research grants, building networks through conferences and affiliations, and performing consultations or clinical services (Sanfey, 2010; Sanfey, & Hollands, 2012). Hence, several scholars deemed academic career as a risky undertaking for PhD graduates and post-doctoral researchers in view of recent trends where European academic institutions are increasingly dependent on external funds; thus creating more temporary appointments while reducing tenure-track positions (Waaiker, 2015; Brechelmacher, Park, Ates, & Campbell, 2004). Hence, there is a need to understand in what ways promotion opportunity would help to revitalize and rebuild the confidence of both young, hardworking academicians and aspiring PhD candidates to embark on a sustainable academic career.

Compensation or Salary

In the academia, academic qualifications and work experience determine the starting level of pay received by newly recruited academic staffs. Beyond that, the average salary for academicians may vary according to their scholarly experience, seniority and types of department that they are serving (Shakeel, 2017). As for the latter, professors attached with economics department may earn more than their counterparts who work in the language department. In terms of academic qualifications, Casey (2009) found that there is a small salary difference between employees who are PhD and those with Master qualification. It is also interesting to note that earning a post-doctoral degree will not significantly impact on an academicians's salary even a decade after graduation (Yang, & Webber, 2015).

Within the Malaysian context, Payscale Malaysia database (2017) indicated that the median salary for lecturers (the term used for academicians who hold teaching positions including professors) is RM 54,293. Nevertheless, Malaysian academicians received the lowest wage (quoted in US dollars) as compared to its other seven commonwealth peers, including Singapore, Hong Kong and South Africa (Falk, 2017). The comparison may be subjected to debate due to each of the countries involved have different standards of living, productivity and exchange rates with the US dollar. Nevertheless, Malaysian lecturers did not seem to be bothered by the below-than-average salary drawback.

Previous researches have linked financial reward and job satisfaction among lecturers in the local scene (Mustapha, 2013; Awang, Ahmad, & Zin, 2010). Besides, Noordin and Jusoff (2009), and Sadeghi et al. (2012) observed differences in job satisfaction from lecturers across different academic positions and age groups. As expected, older lecturers tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than their younger counterparts. Lai, Lai and Lau (2009) surveyed more than 400 lecturers across 16 universities across Malaysia, and found that they have positive attitudes towards their income. Nevertheless, lecturers from private institutions worried more about their post-retirement lives than their public universities' counterparts (Lai, Lai and Lau, 2009). This is perhaps due to the fact that lecturers from public institutions were entitled to government pension schemes that are expected to financially safeguard their post-retirement livelihood.

Flexible Work Arrangement

Despite their lower salary as compared to other professions that are highly elastic towards market forces, academicians in higher learning institutions benefit from non-monetary advantages; one of them being task autonomy (Casey, 2009). Flexibility or autonomy refers to how individuals endorse their actions (Ryan, & Connell, 1989). In most countries, lecturers have the flexibility in terms of what and how they teach and conduct research. The granted autonomy gives them the advantage of personal space needed for innovation in teaching, research and industrial networking. Without flexibility, academicians risk of developing job and mental stressors since their nature of work is more than just teaching and running administrative duties. The erosion of task autonomy among university lecturers will potentially trigger emotional labour and frustrations (Humphreys, & Hoque, 2007), thus limiting their productivity in terms of knowledge contributions and quality teaching. In a qualitative study involving six public and private universities, Da Wan et al. (2015) found that the flexible nature of academic work is one of the main drivers of lecturer's satisfaction, aside from teaching and research activities.

Several researchers have called for autonomy and flexible work culture within the academia to be upheld and protected. Da Wan et al. (2015) suggested that "academics who hold administrative positions should also be exempted from teaching or research responsibilities, which therefore would allow the academic to be more focused and productive". In addition to autonomy in executing professional tasks, lecturers are also urged to delegate their responsibility to departments and committees that will likely lead to higher intrinsic motivation and work satisfaction (Sadeghi, Pihie, Akmaliah, Elias, & Foo, 2012). Besides, Ma and Liu (2016) contended that lecturers should be given ample amount of autonomy as it serves as a basic need that can increase their intrinsic goals encompassing wellbeing, self-realization and state of happiness.

Promotion, Salary, Flexibility Work Arrangement as predictors of Job Satisfaction

Pertaining to promotional opportunities among the academics, research has found significant positive relationship between this factor and job satisfaction (Mustapha, & Zakaria, 2013). Pang, Azman, Sirat, and Koo (2016) supported the earlier findings that career trajectory contributes to job satisfaction among the academics. Arokiasamy, Tat, and Abdullah (2013) also found that there is a positive significant relationship between compensation, motivation and promotion and job satisfaction among academics at private colleges in Penang, Malaysia. The findings of another study by Nor and Hassan (2014) show that there are significant relationships between job satisfaction and the hygiene factors such as work itself, co-workers, remuneration, supervision and promotion opportunities. Therefore, it is hypothesized that promotion significantly contributes to job satisfaction among the academics in private higher education institutions.

Flexible work arrangement is a unique factor for academics as the work of academics has no time frame or limit. They have to work sometimes at night to fulfill the job requirements. A study conducted by Da Wan, et al. (2015) found that the major sources of satisfaction are related to the nature of academic work include supervising, mentoring, teaching and interacting with students, as well as conducting research and disseminating knowledge through publication. However, the major sources of frustration are predominantly related to the governance of higher education, resulting from

unrealistic expectations, lack of transparency of the promotion and reward system, and a strong bureaucratic culture. A study conducted by Kok (2015) found that there is a significant and positive relationship between salary, job stress, career promotion, working environment and job satisfaction. Therefore, it is hypothesized that flexible work arrangement significantly contributes to job satisfaction among the academics in private higher education institutions..

METHODOLOGY

The present study used a correlational design with the intention to examine the relationship of flexible work arrangement, salary and promotion with job satisfaction of academics from selected private colleges in Kuantan, Pahang, Malaysia. A total of 163 academics participated in the survey. The instrument measuring the variables involved in the study was developed based on the related items used in the previous studies. Eight items were used to measure satisfaction with promotion, six items were used to gauge respondents' satisfaction with salary and six items were chosen to measure satisfaction with a flexible work arrangement. The items measuring the intended variables were highly reliable with the Cronbach alpha values in the range of .818 and .912. Data were analyzed using SPSS version 20 for descriptive and inferential statistics pertaining to answering the research objectives.

Table 1 Respondents' Profile

Variable	Descriptive	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	50	30.7
	Female	113	69.3
Age	21-25 years old	18	10.8
	26-30 years old	47	28.3
	31-35 years old	30	18.1
	36-40 years old	47	28.3
	41-45 years old	9	5.4
	>45 years old	15	9.0
Education	PhD	3	1.8
	Master Degree	67	40.4
	Bachelor Degree	89	53.6
	Others	7	4.2
Marital Status	Single	48	28.9
	Married	111	66.9
	Others	7	4.2
Monthly Salary	RM1500-RM2000	26	15.8
	RM2001-RM2500	37	22.4
	RM2501-RM3000	46	27.8
	RM3001-RM3500	26	15.8
	RM3501-RM4000	30	18.2
Working Experience	<1 year	15	9.0
	1-5 years	45	27.1
	6-10 years	45	27.1
	11-15 years	38	22.9
	>15 years	23	13.9
Job Level	Tutor	15	9.1
	Lecturer	131	79.4
	Senior Lecturer	17	10.3
	Others	2	1.2
Distance	1-10KM	98	59.0
	11-20KM	40	24.1
	>20KM	28	16.9

Respondents were asked questions pertaining to their personal information and the results are shown in the above table. A total of 50 male respondents and 113 female respondents participated in the study, reflecting a true distribution of gender distribution of academics. Most respondents aged between 26 to 40 years old, indicating that they have enough experience to provide the required input

for the study. In terms of education, majority of respondents had bachelor (98 respondents) and master degrees (67 respondents), representing the actual distribution of academic qualification in private colleges. Majority of the respondents were married (111 respondents). Regarding monthly salary of the academics, there is a balance representation of respondents across different salary ranges. Similarly, the distribution of respondents according to working experience is balance for those who have worked between 1 to 15 years. Majority of the respondents were lecturers (131 respondents). 98 respondents lived within 10km from the campus, 40 respondents lived between 10 to 20km from campus and 28 of them lived more than 20km from the campus.

RESULTS

Table 2 Results Of Factor Analysis For The Independent Variables

		Component		
		1	2	3
P8		.793		
P6		.788		
P4		.763		
P1		.750		
P7		.700		
P5		.690		
P2		.687		
P3		.683		
S2			.855	
S1			.855	
S4			.816	
S6			.706	
S5			.703	
S3			.677	
F5				.792
F2				.729
F6				.729
F4				.712
F3				.696
F1				.668
% variance explained		25.189	20.549	17.681
MSA				.801-.938
KMO				.889
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square			2080.486
	Df			190
	Sig.			.000

A Principle Component factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed to analyze the dimensionality of items measuring the independent variables in the study (promotion – eight items, salary – six items and flexible work arrangement – six items). The KMO value of .889 indicates that the correlation matrix is sufficient to proceed with the analysis. The MSA values ranging from .801 to .938 also show the adequacy of sampling for each item measuring the studied variables.

The results of factor analysis indicate the existence of three factors; promotion, salary and flexible work arrangement explaining 63.419% of the variance (25.189% for promotion; 20.549% for salary; 17.681% for flexible work arrangement), which is considered good. Promotion is represented by eight items with loadings ranging from .683 to .793. Salary has six items with the loadings in the range of .677 and .855. Flexible work arrangement also has six items with the loadings from .668 to .792. All items loaded under respective factors signifying their content validity.

Table 3 The Results Of Factor Analysis For The Dependent Variable

		Component			
		1	2	3	4
J19		.758			
J17		.743			
J16		.686			
J21		.621			
J15		.588			
J18		.527			
J11			.815		
J12			.814		
J13			.758		
J10			.740		
J5				.807	
J3				.769	
J4				.715	
J1				.578	
J23					.860
J22					.858
J24					.735
% variance explained		18.175	17.939	16.628	14.266
MSA					.759-.943
KMO					.888
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square				1410.887
	Df				136
	Sig.				.000

A Principle Component factor analysis with Varimax rotation was also performed to examine the dimensionality of items measuring the dependent variable. The value of KMO of .888 indicates the adequacy of sampling and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity denotes that the correlation matrix is sufficient for factor analysis to be conducted. A total of 24 items were developed to measure job satisfaction. However, only 17 items remained and formed four factors of job satisfaction and explained 67.008% of the variance in the model.

Close examination of the item loadings revealed that the factors are distinctive and should be considered separately in the analysis. The first factor explained 18.175% of the variance and contained six items measuring career and salary satisfaction, therefore the name was used. The loadings ranged from .527 to .758. The second factor explained 17.939% of the variance with four items related to creative satisfaction, thus the name was adopted. The factor loadings were in the range of .740 and .815. The third factor contained four items related to administrative satisfaction therefore it was named as such. The factor explained 16.628% of the variance with the item loadings from .578 to .807. The fourth factor had three items related to attitudinal satisfaction therefore it was named accordingly. This factor explained 14.266% of the total variance with item loadings from .735 to .860.

Due to the results of factor analysis of the dependent variables, the hypotheses were restated as follows:

H1: Flexible work arrangement significantly contributes to career and salary satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H2: Salary significantly contributes to career and salary satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H3: Promotion significantly contributes to career and salary satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H4: Flexible work arrangement significantly contributes to creative satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H5: Salary significantly contributes to creative satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H6: Promotion significantly contributes to creative satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H7: Flexible work arrangement significantly contributes to administrative satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H8: Salary significantly contributes to administrative satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H9: Promotion significantly contributes to administrative satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H10: Flexible work arrangement significantly contributes to attitudinal satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H11: Salary significantly contributes to attitudinal satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

H12: Promotion significantly contributes to attitudinal satisfaction of academics in private higher education institutions.

Table 4 Results Of Reliability Analysis And Correlation Analysis

No	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Flexible Work Arrangement	3.28	.84	(.844)						
2	Salary	2.52	.89	.359**	(.907)					
3	Promotion	2.66	.80	.472**	.597**	(.912)				
4	Career & Salary Satisfaction	2.83	.85	.436**	.791**	.599**	(.840)			
5	Creative Satisfaction	3.65	.72	.333**	.375**	.446**	.514**	(.853)		
6	Administrative Satisfaction	3.09	.74	.455**	.490**	.602**	.661**	.521**	(.834)	
7	Attitudinal Satisfaction	4.11	.60	.231**	.295**	.241**	.363**	.366**	.344**	(.818)

Based on the descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) of the variables, it was found that the highest mean score for the dependent variables is attitudinal satisfaction whereas the lowest mean score is for administrative satisfaction. Generally, academics are satisfied with their job. However, their administrative satisfaction is moderate as their main role is teaching and not doing the administrative functions. Besides, among the independent variables, flexible work arrangement receives the highest score and the lowest score is for salary. It actually reflects the truth, since academics receive a fair amount of salary however they enjoy having flexible work arrangement as their job does not require them to be in the office for 8 hours daily.

Based on the results of reliability analysis, all items measuring the intended variables are highly reliable. This can be seen from the Cronbach’s alpha values where the highest score is for promotion ($\alpha=0.912$) and the lowest score is for attitudinal satisfaction ($\alpha=0.818$). The findings indicate that the items used to measure the respective variables reliably measure what they are supposed to measure. Correlation analysis was performed to examine the potential relationship between two variables. The results show that the correlation between the independent variables ranges from low to moderate, indicating that the variables are somewhat related. The correlation values between the dependent variables range from low to high, indicating some degree of convergent validity. Looking at the correlation between the independent and the dependent variables, it shows the values ranged from low to high, which signify the potential direct significant relationship between the variables or concurrent validity of the constructs. To confirm the results, a series of multiple regression analyses were performed.

Table 5 Results Of Regression Analyses

	Career & Salary Satisfaction	Creative Satisfaction	Administrative Satisfaction	Attitudinal Satisfaction
Variables	Standardized β Coefficients	Standardized β Coefficients	Standardized β Coefficients	Standardized β Coefficients
Flexible Work Arrangement	.117*	.142	.207**	.084
Salary	.660**	.152	.177*	.219*
Promotion	.163**	.287**	.419**	-.015
R	.823	.482	.668	.251
R ²	.678	.233	.446	.063
F value	112.897	16.359	43.194	3.512
Sig. F value	.000	.000	.000	.017
Durbin Watson	1.823	1.975	1.926	1.894

Four multiple regression analyses were performed and the results were divided into four parts. The first part of multiple regression analysis was performed with career and salary satisfaction as the dependent variable. The results show that the independent variables explained 67.8% of the variance in the regression model. All three independent variables (flexible work arrangement, salary and promotion) significantly influence career and salary satisfaction of academics in the private higher education institutions with salary as the strongest predictor. H1, H2, and H3 were supported.

The second part of the regression analysis involved creative satisfaction and the dependent variable. The results show that the independent variables explained only 23.3% of the variance in the model. From the three independent variables, only promotion significantly influences creative satisfaction of academics working in private higher education institutions. Therefore, H6 was supported, but H4, and H5 were not supported due to lack of evidence.

The third part of the regression analysis was conducted with administrative satisfaction as the dependent variable. The three independent variables explained 44.6% of the variance in the model. All three independent variables were found significant to influence administrative satisfaction of academics working in private higher educational institutions with promotion as the strongest predictor. Therefore, H7, H8 and H9 were supported.

The fourth part of the regression analysis was run involving attitudinal satisfaction as the dependent variable. The independent variables only explained 6.3% of the variance in the regression model but the model is still significant. Out of three independent variables, only salary was found to be significant predictor of attitudinal satisfaction of academics in private higher educational institutions. Thus, only H11 was supported but H10 and H12 were not supported due to lack of evidence.

DISCUSSION

The present study found that all three factors (salary, promotion and flexible work arrangement) act as significant predictors of career and salary satisfaction and administrative satisfaction. Promotion is a single predictor of creative satisfaction and salary acts as a single significant predictor of attitudinal satisfaction. These findings are consistent with previous studies as these three factors are the most common predictors of job satisfaction. The difference between the present findings and those from the previous studies is that the present study breaks job satisfaction into four distinct dimensions based on the results of factor analysis. These findings provide detailed explanation on how each predictor contributes uniquely to explaining the variance in each dimension of job satisfaction of academicians.

For the first and third dimensions of job satisfaction, which are career and salary satisfaction and administrative satisfaction, the management must continue providing fair and equitable compensation packages, opportunity for promotion and flexible work arrangement as the academicians chose this career because they enjoy the privileges they received from the job. Having the opportunities to attend

conferences, seminars and training programs, having the chances to apply for higher levels in the academic field, and having the privileges to adjust the work schedule to fit the formal and personal requirements make the profession attractive.

However, to inculcate creativity among the academicians, promotion serves as the right driver. When there is an opportunity for them to be promoted to a higher academic level, academics will be creative to contribute to their career, for instances, involving in research and publication activities, using advanced methods in teaching, contributing ideas in improving the overall administration of the universities and others. For, attitudinal satisfaction, which refers to the feeling of general satisfaction, having a fair and equitable salary is enough to generate this feeling. Although the salary received by academics is not lucrative, but getting other perquisites such as sponsorship to attend conferences makes them satisfied with their job.

To ensure that academicians are satisfied with their job, all three predictors must be provided by the private higher learning institutions. They are career progression or promotion, compensation or salary and flexible work arrangement.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion, the present study has provided the evidence on the importance of three factors; career progression or promotion, compensation or salary and flexible work arrangement, in ensuring high levels of academics' job satisfaction especially among those who are working in private higher learning institutions. In fact, the findings can also be applied to the public higher learning institutions as the nature of job as academics as similar. These findings give implications to the management of higher learning institutions to continue ensuring the provision of all these three factors so that academicians are happy executing their honorable responsibilities.

This study serves as a starting point for future studies in the area of education management. For future studies, researchers are recommended to look into factors that contribute to stress among academicians as most of them are reported of having high levels of stress due to the changing nature of the profession and also the changing landscape or higher learning institutions. Future studies might also be beneficial as they are able to come out with solutions to these intriguing issues by focusing on physical, mental and emotional management strategies.

REFERENCES

- Arokiasamy, A.R.A., Tat, H.H. & Abdullah, A. (2013). The Effects of Reward System and Motivation on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from the Education Industry in Malaysia". *World Applied Sciences Journal*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 1597-1604.
- Awang, Z., Ahmad, J.H. & Zin, N.M. (2010). Modelling job satisfaction and work commitment among lecturers: a case of UiTM Kelantan. *Journal of Statistical Modeling and Analytics*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 45-59, 2010.
- Benton-Borghi, B.H. & Chang, Y.M. (2012). Critical examination of candidates' diversity competence: rigorous and systematic assessment of candidates' efficacy to teach diverse student populations. *The Teacher Educator*, 47(1), pp. 29-44.
- Brechelmacher, A., Park, E., Ates, G. & Campbell, D.F. (2004). The Rocky Road to Tenure-Career Paths in Academia. In T. Fumasoli, G. Goastellec & B. M. Kehm (Eds.), *Academic Work and Careers in Europe: Trends, Challenges, Perspectives* (pp.13-40). Lausanne, Switzerland: Springer.
- Casey, B.H. (2009). The economic contribution of PhDs". *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 219-227.
- Chen, S.H., Yang, C.C., Shiau, J.Y. & Wang, H.H. (2006). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education". *The TQM Magazine*, 18(5), pp. 484-500.
- Claussen, J., Grohsjean, T., Luger, J. & Probst, G. (2014). Talent management and career development: What it takes to get promoted. *Journal of World Business*, 49(2), pp. 236-244.

- Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, pp. S95-S120.
- Cui-Callahan, N.A. (2012). *An examination of job satisfaction among urban high school teachers*. University of Nevada, Reno.
- Da Wan, C., Chapman, D.W., Zain, A.N.M, Hutcheson, S., Lee, M. & Austin, A.E. (2015). Academic culture in Malaysia: Sources of satisfaction and frustration. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp.517-526.
- Falk, E. (2017). Academic staff salary survey 2012-2013". 2013. <https://www.acu.ac.uk/publication/download?id=514>, accessed on 13th May 2017.
- Faupel-Badger, J.M., Nelson, D.E. & Izmirlian, G. (2017). Career Satisfaction and Perceived Salary Competitiveness among Individuals Who Completed Postdoctoral Research Training in Cancer Prevention. *PloS one*, vol. 12, no. 1, e0169859.
- Hulin, C.L. & Judge, T.A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Igen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, pp. 255-276.
- Humphreys, M. & Hoque, K. (2007). Have the lecturers lost their voice? Involvement and participation in the devolved Further Education sector". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 1199-1213.
- Ingersoll, R. & Alsalam, J. (1997). Teacher professionalization and teacher commitment: A multilevel analysis". Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Ismail, M.H. & Ali, S.N.D.H.M. (2015). The impact of reward structures on job satisfaction among academic staff in Universiti Kuala Lumpur. In *Advances in Business Research International Conference 2015 17th –18th November 2015 Langkawi, Kedah, Malaysia*.
- Kok, S.Y. (2015). A study on the factors that influence job satisfaction among lecturers in Universiti Utara Malaysia. (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).
- Kusku, F. (2003). Employee satisfaction in higher education: The case of academic and administrative staff in Turkey". *Career Development International*, 8(7), pp.347-56.
- Lai, M.M., Lai, M.L. & Lau, S.H. (2009). "Managing money and retirement planning: Academics' perspectives." *Pensions: An International Journal*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 282-292.
- Lee, T., Mitchell, T., Holtom, B., McDaniel, L. & Hill, J. (1999). The unfolding model of voluntary turnover: A replication and extension. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, pp. 450-462.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* Chicago: Rand McNally, pp.1297-1349.
- Ma, W. & Liu, X. (2016). Understanding lecturers' well-being from the aspects of self-determination theory". *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 203-208.
- Mehrad, A. (2011). The impact of income on academic staff job satisfaction at public research Universities, Malaysia". *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, 3(2), pp.23 – 27.
- Mustapha, N. & Zakaria, Z.C. (2013). "The effect of promotion opportunity in influencing job satisfaction among academics in higher public institutions in Malaysia". *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 3, p. 20.
- Mustapha, n. (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*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 244-248.
- Ng, T.W., Eby, L.T., Sorensen, K.L. & Feldman, D.C. (2007). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis". *Personnel psychology*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 367-408.
- Noordin, F. & Jusoff, K. (2009). Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff. *Asian Social Science*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 122-128.
- Nor, N.M. & Hassan, R. (2014). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction And Motivator-Hygiene Factors Among Academics Staff In XYZ College". *International Journal of Science Commerce and Humanities*, vol. 2, no. 7, pp. 163-171.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities". *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(12), pp. 1210-32.

- Pang, V., Azman, N., Sirat, M. & Koo, Y.L. (2016). Personal Characteristics, Career Trajectory and Job Satisfaction of Academics in Malaysia". In *Biographies and Careers throughout Academic Life* (pp. 47-65). Springer International Publishing.
- Payscale (2017). Lecturer's salary in Malaysia. Retrieved from http://www.payscale.com/research/MY/Job=Lecturer_%2F_Speaker/Salary on 13th May 2017.
- Perrachione, B., Rosser, V. & Petersen, G. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and retention. *The Professional Educator*, vol. 32, no. 2.
- Price, H. & Collett, J. (2010). "The role of exchange and emotion on commitment: A study of teachers". Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Reis, H.T., Sheldon, K.M., Gable, S.L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 26(4), pp. 419-435.
- Ryan, R.M. & Connell, J.P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization": Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 57, pp. 749-761.
- Sadeghi, A., Pihie, L., Akmaliah, Z., Elias, H. & Foo, S.F. (2012). Demographic analysis on academic staff's job satisfaction in Malaysian Research Universities". *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, vol. 20, (S), pp. 1-20.
- Sanfey, H. & Hollands, C. (2012). Career development resource: promotion to associate professor. *The American Journal of Surgery*, vol. 204, no. 1, pp. 130-134, 2012.
- Sanfey, H. (2010). Promotion to professor: a career development resource". *The American Journal of Surgery*, 200(4), pp. 554-557.
- Seibert, S.E., Kraimer, M.L. & Liden, R.C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 219-237, 2001. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3069452>
- Shakeel, A. (2017). UC Berkeley professors paid 2nd-highest salaries among all public doctoral institutions, 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.dailycal.org/2017/05/11/uc-berkeley-professors-paid-2nd-highest-salaries-among-public-doctoral-institutions/> on 13th May 2017.
- Skaalvik, E. & Skaalvik, S. (2009). Does school context matter? Relations with teacher burnout and job satisfaction.. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 518-524.
- Tickle, B., Chang, M. & Kim, S. (2011). Administrative support and its mediating effect on US public school teachers". *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 27, pp. 342-349.
- Toker, B. (2011). Job satisfaction of academic staff: an empirical study on Turkey. *Quality Assurance in Education*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 156-169.
- Waaijer, C.J. (2015). "The coming of age of the academic career: Differentiation and professionalization of German academic positions from the 19th century to the present". *Minerva*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 43-67.
- Ware, H. & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Teacher and collective efficacy beliefs as predictors of professional commitment". *Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 100, no. 5, pp. 303-310.
- Ware, H. & Kitsantas, A. (2011). Predicting teacher commitment using principal and teacher efficacy variables: An HLM approach". *The Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 104, pp. 183-193.
- Weiqi, C. (2007). The structure of academician's job satisfaction and its relationship with attrition and work enthusiasm. *Chinese Education and Society*, 40(5), pp. 17-31.
- Yang, L. & Webber, K.L. (2015). A decade beyond the doctorate: The influence of a US postdoctoral appointment on faculty career, productivity, and salary. *Higher Education*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 667-687.