Satisfaction levels related to management issues among LIS professionals
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A survey of 77 LIS professionals in higher education institutions of Dakshina Kannada districts reveals that the professionals are satisfied with management related issues such as supervision, recognition and performance evaluation and dissatisfied with autonomy by authority facet.

Introduction

The effectiveness and efficiency of the service organizations like libraries is measured in terms of quality of its service delivered or rendered to its users. The quality of its service mainly depends upon the quality of workforce, which in turn directly depends on knowledge, adaptability and satisfaction level of the professionals working in a given library. Employee satisfaction is a prerequisite for delivery of quality service and keeps the users satisfied. The service level of the LIS professionals mainly depends upon their commitment, to work which is dependent on the satisfaction that they get from their job. In industrial sectors a satisfied employee is a productive employee of the organization. Similarly, in the library, a satisfied library professional is regarded as a productive professional. A satisfied professional not only renders quality service to the users, but also ensures commitment to the library in which he/she is serving and contributes one’s might to its image building.

The level of job satisfaction of the library professionals largely depends upon many management related issues. Bullock\(^1\) defines job satisfaction as “… an attitude which results from a balancing and summarization of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with job. This attitude maintains itself in evaluation of the job and of the employing organization. ….. job satisfaction …….. is rather an evaluation of one’s job and employing company as contributing suitably to the attainment of one’s personal objective”.

Smith Kendall\(^2\) and others propose that “job satisfaction is a function of the perceived characteristics of a job in relation to an individual’s frame of reference”. The particular job conditions can be satisfier, dissatisfier or irrelevant, depending on the conditions in comparable jobs. In a narrow sense, these attitudes are related to the job and many specific factors like wages supervision, social relation on the job, besides worker’s age, family, social factors, etc. People differ markedly in the degree of job satisfaction owing to the difference in features of the job on the one hand and the differences in themselves on the other.

Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are functions of perceived relationship between what one wants to derive from one’s job and what one perceives as offering or entailing. The experience produced by the discrepancy between what one derives and what one expects may be an indicator of satisfaction or dissatisfaction from job. Thus, job satisfaction is not an absolute phenomenon but is relative to the alternatives available to the individual. In the present study, the term job satisfaction is used to represent this absolute phenomenon among library and information science professionals.

Hoppock\(^3\) in his study on job satisfaction, emphasized the combination of three factors, namely psychological, physiological and environmental. The job satisfaction / dissatisfaction is the combined result of these three factors.

Locke\(^4\), highlighted the psychological aspect of the job. According to him the job satisfaction/dissatisfaction mainly depends on the emotional feelings of an employee.

Job satisfaction is thus the result of positive emotions. These positive emotions or job satisfaction of the
employees would promote the willingness and commitment in their profession/job. It seems imminently logical that happy employee is a “better” often defined as “more productive” employee. Positive employee attitude improves the service/output quality of the employee also. The quality and timely service/output from the committed people in turn promotes the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. The cordial relation between top management and LIS professionals definitely lead to the better co-ordination and co-operation and promote the smooth running of the day-to-day activities of the library. This would contribute to the development and survival of the organization in the long run. Ultimately the organizational goal is achieved and its existence in the society is justified.

Literature review

D’Elia5 analysed 288 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaires (MSQ) completed by recent library school graduates. The author found that the supervisory, climate and other factors intrinsic to the work itself, such as opportunities for achievement, creativity, and recognition were most closely related to job satisfaction.

Etuk6 has pointed out that, the majority of staffs were found to be dissatisfied with their pay, working conditions and lack of facilities to improve their talents. The author suggested the interaction between subordinates and superiors, provision of better facilities and involvement of junior staff in decision making for higher level of job satisfaction.

Parmer and East7 conducted a job satisfaction survey among support staff in twelve Ohio libraries and found that overall these workers considered themselves basically satisfied. However they were found to be strongly satisfied in the areas of supervision, coworkers, work, benefits, and pay, and were dissatisfied with operational procedures, communication, contingent rewards (sense of appreciation and recognition), and opportunities for promotion.

Saha8 examined the role of such structural factors as size of an organization, degree of specialization, supervisory levels and supervisory staff ratios in the functioning of special and academic libraries. The effectiveness of such libraries has been measured by such variables as user satisfaction, employee’s job satisfaction, group performance and organizational growth rates. The data have been collected from 203 employees, 200 users and 30 supervisors from fifteen academic and special libraries in Delhi. The result based on the inter correlation analysis between the independent and criteriables indicates that size of an organization and the degree of specialization are negatively related and the supervisory-staff ratios are positively related in the effective functioning of special libraries. No such relationship has been observed in academic libraries.

Patricia9 performed a study of professional librarians job satisfaction which found that creativity, flexibility and recognition of librarians’ skills and knowledge were sources of high satisfaction.

Edem and Lawal10 conducted a survey to find the influence of job satisfaction on the publication output of librarians in Nigerian Universities. The results of the empirical analysis indicate that out of the 6 dimensions of job satisfaction used in the study, only three dimensions (librarians’ level of satisfaction with their achievement, responsibility and recognition) had a significant influence on their publication output. Other dimensions including salary, university library policies and administration, and supervision had no significant influence on their publication output.

Payne11 shows that library support staff perceives lack of status, recognition and appreciation of their role. The longer serving staff member has the greater satisfaction in their profession. Support staff need to be involved in organizational communications and participate in policy formulation process to increase the satisfaction level and the librarians’ education, training and pay need to be improved.

Objectives of the study

The objectives of the present study are:

1. To assess the library and information science professionals perceived level of satisfaction about the supervision from the top management;
2. To know the level of recognition of library and information science professionals;
3. To find out the performance measurement and evaluation process;
4. To assess the autonomy given by the different type of educational institutes to library and information science professionals; and
5. To suggest means to improve the job satisfaction of library and information science professionals.
Study design and population

There are ninety nine higher education institutions in Dakshina Kannada (undivided) district. These include one university; one deemed university and 97 colleges/ institutions of higher education affiliated to Mangalore university, Rajiv Gandhi University of Health sciences (RGUHS), Vishweshwaraya Technical University (VTU) and Manipal Academy of Higher Education (MAHE). Out of these 97 colleges, 36 are engineering, medical, dental, pharmacy, commerce and business management, education, law, hotel management, fashion technology, interior decoration and human resource development colleges and remaining 61 colleges are imparting education in pure science, social sciences and humanities disciplines. All institutions have their own libraries. The researcher, therefore, considered library and information professionals working in all of these 97 libraries, one deemed university library and one general university library for the present study.

Sample population and sample size

Information collected through mailers from 76 institutions revealed that there are 124 library and information science professionals working in these institutions. Twenty one institutions did not respond to the mailer. Thus the total population available for the study was 124 LIS professionals from 78 institutions that included the university and deemed university.

Survey instrument

Measurement of emotional feeling of the employee is very difficult task even in the production sector. Unlike productivity, absenteeism and turnover, job satisfaction is a psychological phenomenon that cannot be measured directly. Methods for indirectly measuring job satisfaction include observing employees, interviewing them, and seeking their opinion through questionnaire. Many organizations and researchers favour questionnaire method because personal observations and interviews are very time consuming. The experts like Kalleberg\textsuperscript{12}, Ironson, et al\textsuperscript{13} Cherrington, Nyal, and McMullin\textsuperscript{14} and Robbins\textsuperscript{15} favoured the questionnaire method. In the present study too the questionnaire method was the main tool used to collect the primary data.

The second part of the survey instrument contained questions, mainly focusing on management related issues. The draft questionnaire was distributed to six library and information science professionals working in libraries of different type of institutions as a pilot study to obtain their views and suggestions about the fitness of the questionnaire. After obtaining their feedback, the questionnaire was finalised.

Data collection

Nachmias & Nachmias\textsuperscript{16} and Bernard\textsuperscript{17} point out that response rate would be around 80-95\% for self administered questionnaires and 20-40\% for questionnaire distributed through post. In the present study, as most of the libraries are scattered throughout the district, the questionnaires were mailed along with self-addressed envelopes to obtain primary data from the respondents. However, the questionnaires were self-administered to the population in Mangalore City. The follow up was made through phone and personal visits to some respondents to increase the rate of response.

Response pattern

Of the 124 questionnaires administered, 77 filled in questionnaires were received with the response rate being 62.10\%. Out of the 77 respondents, 49 belong to the professional colleges and remaining 28 are from the general colleges. Table 1 presents details about questionnaires distributed and response received.

Techniques used for data analysis

In the present study, the responses received from 77 respondents were codified and data was fed to the computer using Excel spreadsheets and Fox Pro Packages. The data input was analyzed through SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) package. Techniques like frequency distribution and standard deviation have been used to analyze the data.

Respondents characteristics

Organizational characteristics and demographic features of respondents do influence their job performance and satisfaction/dissatisfaction at workplace. The organizational characteristics such as nature of parent organization, its management structure, size, location do influence the working of the respondents in the organization. Likewise demographic features such as age, gender, marital status and geographic background
of the personnel working for the organization do play an important role in achieving job satisfaction. Thus, these two characteristics are considered as important variables for the present study. The data collected from respondents are analysed and presented in succeeding sections.

For the purpose of data analysis, the respondents are classified using two parameters namely, type of parent institution and their management structure. The higher education institutions include colleges, university education institutions, and deemed university. The professional education institutions are those that are imparting higher education courses in engineering, medical, dental, pharmacy, law, education, management, hotel management etc. The general education institutions are those that are imparting education in branches other than the one mentioned under professional education institutions. These institutions are also classified into government/private aided and private unaided based on the management structure. This classification is adopted purely for the data grouping and analysis.

**Organizational characteristics**

Information relating to organizational characteristics such as the nature of education instruction, the management structure of the institutions where the respondent and library professionals are working has been obtained as a background information that supports the study of job satisfaction of library professionals. The information so obtained is analyzed and presented in Table 2.

**Nature of education**

Table 2 shows that out of the 77 respondents, 49 (63.6%) are from professional education institutions (such as medicine, engineering, law, education, management, hotel management and nursing etc.) and the remaining 28 (36.4%) are from general education institutions (such as science, arts and commerce)

Table 2 also shows that 58 (75.3%) respondents belong to the private unaided institutions whereas 19 (24.7%) are from government aided institutions.

Among these 58 respondents belonging to private unaided institutions, 41 are from professional education institutions and 17 are from general education institutions. On the other hand, of the 19 from government and private aided education institutions, 8 are from professional and 11 are from general education institutions. Thus, the representation of respondents of private unaided professional education institutions is more.

**Job status of respondents**

The LIS professionals in libraries considered for the study are working at different levels such as librarians, senior
librarians, librarians, assistant librarians and library assistants.

Table 3 exhibits that 77 respondents are designated into 4 categories viz. senior librarians, librarians, assistant librarians and library assistants. Of the 77 professional respondents, 25 are senior librarians, 29 are librarians, 10 are assistant librarians and 13 are library assistants. The average score obtained for each facet is presented in Table 4.

The mean score of the respondents ranking for each key facet is calculated as an average mean score of individual statements that form a particular facet. For example the average score for the key facet “autonomy by authority” has been computed as average of the mean score of the statement 36,3,12

\[
\text{Average mean score of the facet autonomy by authority} = \frac{3.46 + 3.54 + 3.14}{3} = 3.38
\]

Therefore, average mean score of the key facet “autonomy by authority” is: 3.38. Similarly, the average score has been computed for other key facets as stated in Table 4.

### Supervision

The supervision is an act of co-ordination, directing and correcting the work behaviour of others in the organization. In other words, supervision involves employee relation with management, authority’s competency and nature of handling the subordinates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. no.</th>
<th>Facets of job satisfaction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Autonomy by authority</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median of overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervision is one of the key facets of job satisfaction, which received maximum satisfaction rating mean score (3.64) from the respondents in the present study. The mean score of responses of the facet supervision is given in Table 5.

The mean scores of response illustrated in Table 5 demonstrates that the LIS professionals in government and private aided education institutions (3.74) are more satisfied as compared to those of LIS professionals in private unaided education institutions (3.61). The respondents of the general (3.61) colleges appeared to be more satisfied than the respondent of professional (3.61) colleges. The professionals of government professional (3.92) colleges and private general (3.75) colleges were highly satisfied than the professionals of the government general (3.61) and private professional (3.55) colleges and the difference between the group was very significant.

### Table 5 — Mean score of responses by LIS professionals about supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of education institutions</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIS professionals in government/aided educational institutions</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS professionals in private/unalaided educational institutions</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional education institutions</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education institutions</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 — Mean score of responses by LIS professionals about their performance evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of education institutions</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIS professionals in government/aided educational institutions</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS professionals in private/unalaided educational institutions</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional education institutions</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education institutions</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance evaluation

Performance appraisal/evaluation is the systematic process of evaluation of the individual’s performance/work and assessing the need of an employee. The periodical evaluation of the performance by the authority recognizes hard worker in the organization. The respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction towards their authority’s performance appraisal pattern. Their responses are summarized in the Table 6.

The Table 6 depicts that, the performance appraisal/evaluation received somewhat favorable rating (3.48) from respondents. The library and information science professionals of the general education institutions are more satisfied (3.65) than the LIS professionals in professional education institutions (3.38). The difference in the level of satisfaction between LIS professionals working in the professional education institutions and general education institutions is significant. The LIS professionals of the government and aided private institutions have given better ratings (3.58) than the LIS professionals of the private unaided education institutions (3.44) and the level of difference is the also significant between the groups. Further, the responses of the LIS professionals in the government and aided education institutions shows higher
job satisfaction level (3.72) compared to LIS professionals in government and private aided education institutions offering general courses (3.48). As against this LIS professionals working in private unaided education institutions have expressed very low level of job satisfaction (3.31) compared to private unaided education institutions offering general courses. The level of difference of job satisfaction between these two categories of LIS professionals is also significant.

To sum up the LIS professionals working in private unaided education institutions offering general education courses and LIS professionals working in government and private aided education institutions are highly satisfied with the performance evaluation procedures they have in their respective education institutions. On the other hand LIS professionals working in private unaided education institutions are more dissatisfied with issue.

**Recognition**

The recognition of the achievement and reward is being done on the basis of the performance evaluation of the employee. The reward and recognition may be in kind or in terms of appreciation. The library and information science professionals guide the users for obtaining information from various sources like internet, databases etc. This helps the end users to save their time and effort in information retrieval. The help and guidance many times result in recognition/appreciation from the users. The user’s appreciation motivates the library and information science professionals to render better service in the future. The result of the responses of the professionals are presented in Table 7.

Table 7 reveals that the mean score of 77 respondents is 3.60, which shows favourable rating expressed by the library and information science professionals about their recognition in their respective institutions. The mean score of respondents belonging to professional education institutions including both government/aided and private unaided is 3.63 as compared to mean score of 3.55 rated by the respondents of general education institutions. In other words, the LIS professionals in professional education institutions are better recognized to that of their counter parts in general education institutions. The comparison of mean score of respondents belonging to government and private aided education institutions to that of their counterparts in private unaided education institutions reveals a significant difference, i.e., the mean score of government and private aided education institutions librarians’ response regarding their recognition is 3.54, whereas the mean score of respondents of private unaided education institutions is 3.62, which means that professionals in private unaided education institutions are better recognized compared to that of their counter parts in government and aided education institutions.

The responses among the professional and general education institutions of government and private aided ones show that there is very significant difference between the responses of respondents. While, the professional government and private aided education institutions’ librarians responses mean score is 3.83. the mean score of responses of respondents from government and private aided education institutions is 3.54. As against this, the significant difference is seen between professional and general, private unaided education institutions. i.e. the mean score of the responses of LIS...
professionals working in professional private education institutions is 3.59 as against 3.62 mean score of responses of respondents working in general private unaided education institutions.

To sum up, the LIS professionals serving in government and private aided education institutions offering professional courses and those serving in private unaided education institutions are better recognized compared to their counter parts in government/aided education institutions offering general courses and those serving in private unaided professional education institutions.

Autonomy by authority

Autonomy is defined in the encyclopedic dictionary of management as “Self determination: especially; (1) the right of state to organize its affairs without external interference; (2) the discretion of an individual in an organization to make decisions without consulting other people in the organization; (3) the capability of an individual to select personal values and withstand social pressure for conformity”.

The library and information science professionals except lesser management interference and more autonomy in the routine working of the library. The level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction of the professionals regarding the autonomy is presented in the Table 10.

Table 10 shows the average mean score of 3.38 of the responses from the respondents regarding their autonomy they enjoyed in their routine job.

The mean value of responses of LIS professionals of professional education institutions is 3.28 compared to their counterparts in general education institutions whose mean score of responses is 3.55. That means the LIS professionals in professional education institutions are with the autonomy provided to them by their authorities. Where as the LIS professionals in general education institutions are moderately satisfied with autonomy they enjoying.

The comparison between the responses of respondents of government/aided education institutions and private unaided education institutions reveals that the LIS professionals in government/aided education institutions enjoying better autonomy and are moderately satisfied (mean value 3.45). Where as, their counterparts in private unaided education institutions are dissatisfied with the autonomy provided by their authorities (mean score 3.35).

The Table further reveals that the mean score of responses of the respondents in government/aided education institutions shows high degree of satisfaction (mean score 3.56) against the mean score (3.22) of responses of LIS professionals from private professional education institutions, which indicates dissatisfaction among them about the autonomy provided by their authority. As against this the LIS professionals in government/aided education institutions offering general courses are dissatisfied (mean score 3.36) where as their counter parts in private unaided education institutions offering general courses are highly satisfied (mean score 3.68) with the autonomy provided by their authorities.

When we compare the level of satisfaction of LIS professionals in government/aided professional education institutions with that of general education institutions, it is learnt that the LIS professionals in government/aided education institutions are moderately satisfied (mean score 3.56). Where as their counterparts in general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of education institutions</th>
<th>LIS professionals in government/aided educational institutions</th>
<th>LIS professionals in private/unaided educational institutions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional education institutions</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education institutions</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
education institutions are not satisfied (mean score 3.36) with the autonomy provided by their authorities. As against this the LIS professionals in private unaided education institutions are more satisfied, where as their counter parts in professional education institutions are dissatisfied (mean score 3.22)

Thus, the study of autonomy enjoyed by LIS professionals from their authorities reveals that, the LIS professionals in private unaided education institutions offering general courses are highly satisfied (mean score 3.68) with the autonomy provided by their authorities. Their counter parts on the other whole in professional education institutions are not satisfied (mean score 3.22) and the LIS professionals in government/aided education institutions offering professional courses are moderately satisfied (mean score 3.56) and their counter parts in education institutions offering general courses are not satisfied (mean score 3.36) with the autonomy provided by their authorities.

Conclusion

It is promising to note that supervision, reward and recognition and performance evaluation are the areas of satisfaction for professionals. The mean score of these facets are well above median of over all job satisfaction (3.42). Regarding the supervision facet, all the professionals, irrespective of nature of management and type of education expressed highest level of satisfaction rating among the eleven facets identified for the study. The study explored the fact that, theLIS professionals should be encouraged to participate actively in library and other related activities of the campus to increase their perception. Their opinions are to be taken seriously and implement their valid and concrete suggestion should be implemented in practice. This type of positive approach from the authority improves satisfaction level of the professionals.
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