# Faculty Satisfaction In Higher Education:
# A TQM Approach

Uzma Quraishi, University of Management and Technology, Pakistan
Ishtiaq Hussain, Kohat University (KUST), Pakistan
Makhdoom Ali Syed, Preston University, Pakistan
Farah Rahman, University of Management and Technology, Pakistan

## ABSTRACT

*This paper was aimed to investigate the levels of satisfaction among faculty members in higher education in Pakistan. Five hundred faculty members were surveyed from leading public and private universities through an instrument developed by the authors and 450 were completed and returned. Percentage method was used to analyze and interpret data. The results highlighted the value of the survey as a strategy for management and human resource planning in universities.*

**Keywords:** Total Quality Management (TQM), Faculty Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction, Higher Education

## INTRODUCTION

$Q$uality in higher education is a significant area of research around the globe (Yorke, 1999). A plethora of research can be found regarding student satisfaction in education (Sirvanci, 2004). Faculty satisfaction is still an under-researched area in developing countries like Pakistan (Raouf, et al, 2007). Employees are internal customers in any organization (Sallis, 2002) and quality of that organization cannot be improved without the satisfaction of their employees (Ooi, et al, 2007). Faculty satisfaction is an important factor, particularly in the public sector in a country, like Pakistan, where faculty satisfaction is by and large ignored. This paper establishes a direct link between faculty's job satisfaction and their performance in higher education.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Quality in higher education means enabling students to achieve learning goals and academic standards in effective educational environment (Venkatraman, 2007). Research proved that faculty has a major impact on students' learning (Hill, et al, 2003) and is the main strength in an educational institution (Gary, et al, 2005). Quality in teaching and learning can only be enhanced if the faculty members are satisfied and content (Chen, et al, 2006). Faculty job satisfaction is as important as student satisfaction (Oshagbemi, 1997). Extant literature emphasized the importance of employee's job satisfaction and performance in higher education (Ooi, et al, 2007).

Universities must provide competitive levels of work environment conducive to faculty needs in order to attain faculty commitment. This can only be achieved if universities emphasize continuous improvement and identify mechanisms for quality improvement (Chen, et al, 2006). Moreover, factors such as faculty workload, salary, benefits, research and teaching can be used to enhance academic quality (Katrina, 1998).

In literature, number of areas for faculty development can be found with reference to TQM, such as teaching and research activities, administration and management support, salary and promotion, professional development, overall working environment, and decision-making (Oshagbemi, 1997b; Comm and Mathaisel, 2000; Fosam, et al, 1998; Kusku, 2001; Metle, 2003; Herzberg, 1966, as cited in Chen, et al, 2006).

**OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of the study were:

1.    To investigate the possible measures to improve faculty satisfaction in higher education.
2.    To examine maximum output in terms of improved faculty performance.

**METHOD**

In this study, the data were collected from one of the leading public sector and two private sector universities in the province of Punjab in Pakistan. The universities have separate departments for quality assurance and have a clear policy on quality in higher education.

**Instrument**

A questionnaire was developed to gather information from the faculty members at the universities, keeping in view the nature of their work and environment. The questionnaire consisted of those items that are associated with faculty satisfaction (Chen at al., 2007):

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Questionnaires were distributed to 500 faculty members at the selected institutes and 450 completed questionnaires were completed and returned.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Democratic Process in Decision-making**

The majority of the questionnaires (80%) showed that the participation of faculty members in important decisions is a very important factor in establishing a quality environment in institutions. This response highlighted the importance of policies, legitimate administrative practices, and fair accountability policies in universities.

**Support in Research**

Almost 90% of faculty members mentioned inappropriate opportunities for research. This response emphasized the need for an efficient and non bureaucratic system for research grants.

**Compensation and Benefit Schemes**

Seventy-five percent of faculty members showed concern toward compensation and fair benefit schemes. They stated that inconsistent policies and hierarchal decisions in these matters are the main reasons of stress in faculty members.

**Equity in Organization Culture**

Eighty percent of female staff members stressed the need for equity in universities to empower female staff to take an active part in academia. This required ethical practices and social justice in university administration.

**Job Relevant Skills and Abilities**

Sixty-five percent of faculty members emphasized the need to fit jobs according to the capability and interest of faculty members for maximum output.

**Creativity and Innovation in Teaching**

Sixty percent of faculty members showed their concern for creativity and innovation in teaching and learning in higher education. For this reason, facilitation of professional development should be a top priority in the universities.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Research has proven that faculty satisfaction is central to TQM in higher Education. This study provides an insight need for constant feedback of all stakeholders in education, which is important for continuous improvement. There is need to streamline proper mechanisms, both qualitative and quantitative, for the improvement and development of institutions. The universities' administration should develop an efficient and transparent mechanism for faculty development to ensure quality in the teaching-learning process.

**AUTHOR INFORMATION**

**Dr. Uzma Qurashi** has a PhD in Educational Management & Planning from the University of Birmingham (UK). Dr Quraishi joined the Faculty of Education and technology as Associate Professor in 2006 at Schoolof Social Sciencesand Humanities.

**Dr Ishtiaq Hussain** is working as Director in Institute of Education &  Research,Kohat University of Science & Technology,Kohat,Pakistan,He did his Ph.D from Arid & Agriculture University Rawalpindi. He has 24 years teaching experience in his credit.

**Makhdoom Ali Syed**, Ph.D (Scholar) PrestonUniversityIslamabadCampus, Pakistan. He is Master in Islamic studies, English, Urdu, M.Phil in Education. He has more than 25 years teaching experience in his credit. He is working as visiting lecturer in Preston University Islamabad campus.

**Farah Rahman** serves as research associate in the department of Education at the Universityof Managementand Technology, Lahore, Pakistan. She is gold medalist in MA Education. She has also done Masters in Philosophy and Computer Science. She was awarded Outstanding Achievement Award (Teacher Convention 2007 organized by KFC in Pakistan.

**REFERENCES**

1. Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiau, J.Y. and Wang, H. H. (2006), "The Development of an Employee satisfaction model for higher education", *The TQM Magazine*, Vol.18 No. 5, pp. 484-500.
2. Gary, W., David, S., and Derek, Z. (2005), "Academic preparation, effort and success: A comparison of student and faculty Perceptions', *Educational Research Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 29-36.
3. Hill, Y., Lomas, L., and MacGregor, J. (2003), "Students' perceptions of quality in higher education", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol.11 No.1, pp.15-20.
4. Katrina, A.M. (1998), "Faculty workload studies: perspectives, needs, and future directions", *Higher Education, Report*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 45-55.
5. Ooi, B.K., Bakar, A.N., Arumugam, V., Vellapan, L., and Loke, Y.K.A. (2007), "Does TQM influence employees' job satisfaction? An empirical case analysis", *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol.24 No.1, pp.62-77.
6. Oshagbemi, T. (1997), "Job satisfaction profiles of university professors", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol.12 No. 1, pp. 27-39.
7. Raouf, A., Quraishi, U., and Kalim, R, 2007. Development of a faculty satisfaction model for higher education, In: M.H. Elwany and A.B. Eltawil, 37th international conference on computers and industrial engineering. Alexandria: Egypt, October 20-23.
8. Sallis, E. (2002). *Total Quality Management in Education*, Third edition, UK: Kogan Page LTD
9. Sirvanci, M.B. (2004), "Critical issues for TQM implementation in higher education", *The TQM Magazine*, Vol.16 No.6, pp.382-386.

10.      Venkatraman, S. (2007), "A framework for implementing TQM in higher education programs", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol.15 No.1, pp.92-112.
11.      Yorke, M. (1999), "Assuring quality and standards in globalised higher education", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol.7 No.1, pp.14-24.

## NOTES