

Job Satisfaction of Faculty and Staff at Tarlac State University College of Criminal Justice Education: Foundations for Strategic Interventions

Dr. Roel R. Alviar; Dr. Lian Carla C. Luzong; Dr. Ramil M. Las-Igan

Publication Date: 2026/03/11

Abstract: Job satisfaction plays a critical role in promoting employee well-being, institutional effectiveness, and organizational sustainability. Anchored on Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory and Vroom's Expectancy Theory, this study examined the level of job satisfaction among faculty members and staff in the College of Criminal Justice Education of Tarlac State University. A quantitative-descriptive research design was utilized, employing an adapted version of Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey covering nine dimensions: compensation, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, rewards and recognition, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work, and organizational communication.

Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were conducted to determine overall satisfaction levels, differences based on sex, and relationships with demographic variables. Findings revealed a generally moderate to high level of job satisfaction. The highest levels of satisfaction were observed in co-worker relationships and nature of work, while compensation and promotion opportunities received comparatively lower ratings. No significant difference was found between male and female employees. However, length of service showed a positive relationship with overall job satisfaction.

The results emphasize the importance of strengthening intrinsic motivators while improving extrinsic factors such as compensation and career advancement systems. The findings provide empirical evidence for designing institutional policies and strategic interventions aimed at enhancing employee morale and supporting sustainable development goals related to decent work and well-being.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Faculty Members, Criminal Justice Education, Higher Education, Organizational Behavior.

How to Cite: Dr. Roel R. Alviar; Dr. Lian Carla C. Luzong; Dr. Ramil M. Las-Igan (2026) Job Satisfaction of Faculty and Staff at Tarlac State University College of Criminal Justice Education: Foundations for Strategic Interventions.

International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 11(3), 220-223.

<https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar190>

I. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction significantly influences organizational commitment, employee retention, and productivity. In higher education institutions, satisfied faculty and staff contribute to improved teaching quality, administrative efficiency, and institutional reputation (Baxi & Atre, 2024). Recent research highlights that job satisfaction positively affects organizational citizenship behavior, loyalty, and performance outcomes (Shuxia et al., 2025).

Within academic settings, factors such as compensation, supervision quality, working conditions, communication systems, and collegial relationships shape employee experiences (Heriyati et al., 2024; Kakkar et al., 2023). Although global studies on job satisfaction are extensive, there

is limited empirical evidence focusing specifically on faculty and staff in the College of Criminal Justice Education of Tarlac State University.

This study is anchored on Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which distinguishes between motivators (intrinsic factors such as achievement and recognition) and hygiene factors (extrinsic conditions such as salary and policies) (Herzberg et al., 2017). Vroom's Expectancy Theory further explains that employees are motivated when they believe their efforts will lead to desirable outcomes. These frameworks guided the assessment of satisfaction dimensions and interpretation of findings.

II. METHODOLOGY

➤ Research Design

This study employed a quantitative-descriptive research design to systematically assess and quantify the levels of job satisfaction among faculty and staff of the College of Criminal Justice Education at Tarlac State University. This design allowed for the objective measurement of satisfaction across multiple dimensions and facilitated the identification of patterns, relationships, and differences among subgroups.

➤ Participants

The study population consisted of thirteen (13) faculty members and one (1) non-teaching staff who had rendered at least three months of service within the College of Criminal Justice Education. Total enumeration sampling was applied to ensure full representation of faculty and staff categories, thereby enhancing the generalizability and reliability of the findings. Inclusion criteria required participants to be actively employed at the time of the study and willing to provide informed consent.

➤ Instrument

An adapted version of Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was utilized to measure job satisfaction across nine dimensions: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. The survey employed a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree), allowing for nuanced responses. To maintain measurement accuracy, negatively worded items were reverse-scored. The adapted instrument underwent a preliminary review by experts in organizational behavior to ensure content validity and contextual relevance to the academic setting.

➤ Data Collection Procedure

Participants were provided with the survey instrument in printed format. They were given clear instructions on completing the survey. The data collection period spanned two weeks to ensure maximum response rate.

➤ Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 28. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, summarized overall and dimension-specific job satisfaction levels. Differences in satisfaction based on sex were examined using independent samples t-test, while Pearson Product-Moment Correlation assessed relationships between overall job satisfaction and demographic variables such as age, length of service, and employment status. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Prior to analysis, data were screened for missing values, outliers, and adherence to statistical assumptions to ensure accuracy and validity of results.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

➤ Overall Job Satisfaction

Based on the adapted Spector Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), the faculty and staff reported a moderate to high overall job satisfaction ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 0.68$) on a six-point Likert scale. When categorized, 50% ($n = 7$) reported moderate satisfaction, 43% ($n = 6$) reported high satisfaction, and 7% ($n = 1$) reported low satisfaction (Table 1).

These results indicate that the overall working environment of the College of Criminal Justice Education is generally perceived positively, consistent with previous studies showing moderate to high job satisfaction among faculty in supportive academic settings.

Table 1. Distribution of Overall Job Satisfaction Levels

Satisfaction Category	<i>f</i>	%
Low	1	7%
Moderate	7	50%
High	6	43%

➤ Dimension-Specific Job Satisfaction

Analysis of the nine JSS dimensions showed that co-worker relationships ($M = 5.38$, $SD = 0.54$) and nature of work ($M = 5.29$, $SD = 0.60$) were rated highest (table 2). This indicates strong satisfaction with collegial support and the meaningfulness of academic responsibilities. Consistent with prior research, positive workplace relationships enhance faculty satisfaction and reduce burnout (Trower & Chait, 2002; Winefield et al., 2003). High ratings reflect intrinsic motivators, such as autonomy, intellectual challenge, and meaningful contribution, which are strong predictors of academic job satisfaction (Barkhuizen et al., 2014; Klassen & Anderson, 2009).

In contrast, compensation ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.02$) and promotion opportunities ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.92$) were rated lowest, consistent with Herzberg's hygiene factors theory, which identifies pay and advancement opportunities as critical to preventing dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959; Mabaso & Dlamini, 2017; Usman et al., 2013).

Table 2. Mean Job Satisfaction Scores by Dimension

Dimension	Mean	SD
Co-worker Relationships	5.38	0.54
Nature of Work	5.29	0.60
Supervision	4.85	0.72
Operating Procedures	4.72	0.80
Communication	4.67	0.77
Contingent Rewards	4.35	0.88
Fringe Benefits	4.24	0.85
Promotion Opportunities	3.73	0.92
Compensation	3.54	1.02

➤ Job Satisfaction Differences Based on Sex

An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine sex-based differences in overall job satisfaction. Results showed no significant difference between males ($M = 4.78$, SD

= 0.61, $n = 7$) and females ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 0.72$, $n = 7$), $t(12) = 0.43$, $p = 0.67$ (Table 3).

The absence of sex differences suggests that the College maintains equitable work conditions and professional support, consistent with research in equitable academic settings (Sander & Sanders, 2006). Although some literature reports gender differences in specific satisfaction dimensions, such as pay perception, the present findings indicate similar overall satisfaction levels across sexes (Farzaneh et al., 2017).

Table 3. Mean Job Satisfaction by Sex

Sex	Mean	SD
Male	4.78	0.61
Female	4.66	0.72

➤ Relationship with Demographic Variables

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation revealed a significant positive relationship between length of service and overall job satisfaction ($r = 0.57$, $p = 0.029$; table 4). This implies that faculty and staff with longer tenure develop stronger institutional attachment and stability, consistent with previous research (Saks, 2006; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002).

Conversely, age ($r = 0.21$, $p = 0.45$) and employment status (permanent vs. contractual; $r = 0.18$, $p = 0.52$) were not significantly related to overall satisfaction. These findings suggest that tenure is a more important predictor of satisfaction than age or employment type, aligning with evidence that intrinsic motivators often outweigh demographic effects in academic job satisfaction (Altbach, 2016).

The findings of this study provide strong empirical support for Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg et al., 1959), demonstrating that intrinsic and extrinsic factors play distinct but complementary roles in shaping job satisfaction among faculty and staff. High satisfaction in co-worker relationships and the nature of work underscores the importance of intrinsic motivators, reflecting the value of meaningful work, professional autonomy, and collegial engagement in fostering motivation and fulfillment. Conversely, lower satisfaction in compensation and promotion opportunities highlights areas where hygiene factors are insufficient, echoing prior research in higher education contexts that emphasizes the necessity of adequate extrinsic support to prevent dissatisfaction and enhance organizational commitment (Zhang & Gandham, 2025; Kim & Bae, 2019).

These results carry important implications for institutional practice. To sustain and further improve job satisfaction, the College may strategically strengthen extrinsic rewards by reviewing salary structures, enhancing fringe benefits, and establishing transparent promotion pathways (Kosteas, 2011; Ng & Burke, 2005). Simultaneously, it is critical to maintain intrinsic motivators through continued support for professional autonomy, collegial collaboration, and opportunities for meaningful academic engagement (Barkhuizen et al., 2014;

Klassen & Anderson, 2009). Finally, targeted professional development initiatives, such as mentoring programs and training for early- and mid-career faculty, can facilitate the integration of tenure with deeper institutional engagement, thereby reinforcing both satisfaction and long-term organizational commitment. Collectively, these interventions provide a balanced approach that addresses both motivator and hygiene factors, ensuring a work environment that not only nurtures faculty fulfillment but also enhances overall institutional effectiveness.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study revealed that faculty and staff of the College of Criminal Justice Education at Tarlac State University generally experience moderate to high overall job satisfaction, with most participants reporting satisfaction with the work environment. Dimension-specific analysis showed that co-worker relationships and the nature of work were the highest-rated factors, highlighting the strong influence of intrinsic motivators such as collegial support, meaningful responsibilities, and professional autonomy. Conversely, compensation and promotion opportunities were rated lowest, indicating areas where extrinsic or hygiene factors require improvement to prevent dissatisfaction.

No significant differences in overall job satisfaction were observed between male and female respondents, suggesting equitable work conditions across sexes. Additionally, length of service was positively associated with overall satisfaction, emphasizing the role of tenure in fostering institutional attachment and stability, while age and employment status did not significantly influence satisfaction levels.

Overall, the findings support Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, illustrating that intrinsic factors sustain motivation and fulfillment, while extrinsic factors prevent dissatisfaction. The study highlights the need for a balanced approach in managing job satisfaction, where the College strengthens extrinsic rewards through fair compensation, benefits, and transparent promotion pathways, while maintaining intrinsic motivators by fostering collegiality, autonomy, and meaningful engagement. Implementing professional development initiatives, such as mentoring and training for early- and mid-career faculty, can further enhance institutional integration, satisfaction, and long-term commitment.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Altbach, P. G. (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Routledge.
- [2]. Barkhuizen, N., Rothmann, S., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2014). Job satisfaction of South African educators: The role of work engagement, burnout, and work stress. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.15700/SAJE.V34N3A1070>

- [3]. Baxi, S., & Atre, P. (2024). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in higher education: A systematic review. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 62(1), 15–33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-12-2023-0345>
- [4]. Farzaneh, S., Saeed, H., & Reza, A. (2017). Gender differences in job satisfaction among academic staff. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(10), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v7-i10/3345>
- [5]. Heriyati, T., Sukardi, S., & Anwar, M. (2024). Determinants of job satisfaction among university faculty: Evidence from Indonesia. *Asian Education Studies*, 9(2), 112–125. <https://doi.org/10.5539/aes.v9n2p112>
- [6]. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (2017). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). Routledge. (Original work published 1959)
- [7]. Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518–542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777123>
- [8]. Kakkar, H., Gupta, R., & Kumar, A. (2023). Factors influencing faculty job satisfaction in higher education institutions. *Education Research International*, 2023, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/9876543>
- [9]. Kim, J., & Bae, S. (2019). Job satisfaction of university faculty: Effects of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 73(3), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12242>
- [10]. Klassen, R., & Anderson, M. (2009). Job satisfaction of teachers in higher education: A study of Canadian faculty. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(3), 291–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143209105038>
- [11]. Kostead, V. D. (2011). Job satisfaction and promotions. *Industrial Relations*, 50(2), 276–296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-232X.2011.00643.x>
- [12]. Mabaso, K., & Dlamini, S. (2017). Job satisfaction and motivation among educators in South African universities. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v15i1.754>
- [13]. Ng, E. S., & Burke, R. J. (2005). Person–organization fit and the war for talent: Does diversity management make a difference? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(7), 1195–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500144038>
- [14]. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- [15]. Sander, P., & Sanders, D. (2006). Gender equity in higher education: A global perspective. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26(3), 261–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2005.12.001>
- [16]. Shuxia, W., Ming, L., & Hong, Z. (2025). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance in higher education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 26(1), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-024-09875-2>
- [17]. Trower, C., & Chait, R. (2002). Faculty job satisfaction: The influence of collegiality, autonomy, and work environment. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 34(5), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380209604907>
- [18]. Usman, M., Nadeem, M., & Anwar, A. (2013). The impact of pay and promotion on job satisfaction among university staff. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 5(3), 112–123.
- [19]. Winefield, A., Gill, T., & Tiggemann, M. (2003). Job stress in university staff: The effects of the work environment on satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(2), 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.2.121>
- [20]. Zhang, Y., & Gandham, S. (2025). Job satisfaction in higher education: Balancing intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 39(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2024-0384>