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ABSTRACT

The university autonomy mechanism has a far-reaching consequence on the transformation of universities from line agencies to their overall autonomy. As such, the organizational restructuring might influence academic staff in terms of their satisfaction and engagement to their affiliations. This study investigated which factors affect teachers’ job satisfaction and engagement with the involvement of 175 teacher participants who returned their viewpoints via an active Google form for 24 items of the researcher-made questionnaire. The results reveal that teachers’ intrinsic factors are more important than extrinsic ones. The school administrators’ support and care of the academic teachers’ professional development would create a favourable, competitive, collaborative environment for teachers to devote and sacrifice their careers. Furthermore, the outcomes confirm that leaders’ good hear, vision, and talents have a decisive impact on university’s sustainable development as well as academic teachers’ job satisfaction and engagement. This study also provides useful references for university stakeholders to invest further in not only their teaching staff, but also school administrators. Besides, regular university basics should be renovated and furnished to keep up with the requirements of current, advanced teaching and learning.
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TÓM TÁT

Co chế tự chủ trường học có tác động sâu sắc đến việc chuyển đổi mô hình trường đại học từ cơ chế chuyên sang tự chủ hoàn toàn. Như vậy, sự tăng thiết tổ chức có thể gây ảnh hưởng đến sự tham gia công việc và cam kết gắn bó với tổ chức của nhân viên. Nghiên cứu này sẽ Xem xét những nhân tố tác động đến sự tham gia công việc và cam kết gắn bó của nhân viên đối với nơi làm việc, với sự tham gia của 175 giảng viên trả lời phiếu điều tra do người nghiên cứu xây dựng, thông qua biểu mẫu Google. Kết quả cho thấy rằng các nhân tố nội tại của giảng viên quan trọng hơn các yếu tố bên ngoài. Sự quan tâm và hỗ trợ từ tổ chức đối với sự phát triển nghề nghiệp của giảng viên sẽ tạo ra một môi trường thuận lợi, cạnh tranh, hợp tác cho giảng viên cải thiện sự nghiệp của mình. Hơn nữa, kết quả cũng khẳng định rằng tâm, tầm, tài năng của lãnh đạo trường học có tính chất quyết định đối với sự phát triển bền vững của nhà trường, và cam kết gắn bó, cố gắng của giảng viên. Nghiên cứu cũng cập nhật thống kê ước cho các nhà quản trị trường học đầu tư hơn nữa vào đổi mới giảng viên và quản trị nhà trường. Ngoài ra, cơ sở vật chất trường học cần phải cải tổ và trang bị thư viện chuyên sâu đáp ứng nhu cầu dạy và học hiện đại ngày nay.
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1. Introduction

Employees’ job satisfaction and engagement are greatly affected by their working environments. In practice, unhappiness in the workplace may result in negative staff’s mental and physical health because our fatigue is not practically caused by the pressure of heavy workload, but by worry, frustration, and resentment [1]. Employees’ motivation is a great determinant that influences directly their job effectiveness and achievement. When highly motivated, employees are excited about being at work, they are willing to work hard, striving to do their best, and actively engaged in their work [2], [3]. To make it success and achievement in an organization, many necessary factors, such as human, material and monetary capitals are thought to contribute to achieve the organizational objectives and expectations. Among those required factors, human capital plays a crucial role in their efforts to accomplish the mission statement. It can be said that employee engagement concentrates on the issues of commitment, satisfaction, and organizational behavior [4]. In this regard, employee engagement refers to the physical, cognitive, and emotional devotion to one organization. It is also reflected in the form of one’s energy, involvement, and efficiency, which is demonstrated by one employee choosing to become more or less engaged in her/his work and organization. The impact of economic and socio-emotional exchanges, to a certain extent, influences the conditions of employee engagement because staff feel obliged to sacrifice themselves to work as repayment for what they receive from their organizations [5], [6].

Although education has been innovated and shifted from teacher-centered teaching to learner-centered approach under academic credit systems, not previously semester-based system, the teacher role still plays a vital part in maintaining the training quality and enhancing the reputation of a higher education institution [7]. Together with the socio-economic development, the requirements for teachers to retrain themselves to keep up with student expectations in terms of state of the art knowledge have posed many challenges for teachers to meet these demands. However, higher education in Vietnam are facing many challenges, such as transnational training programs, domestic study away programs, competitive quality of training and education among school in Vietnam or even at regional and international scales, which requires to reform fast-changing state administrative policies to retain qualified and high academic teachers to engage themselves to current higher education institution [3], [4]. In reality, education inadequacy, inequality, and failed state policy have somewhat disengaged and demotivated qualified teachers to devote themselves to their teaching careers and passions due to increasing burdens of challenges they have experienced at work. Currently, more and more headhunting programmes have been implemented to seize qualified teachers to work for organizations with better incentive monetary schemes, favourable professional supports, and flexible working practices as long as qualified teachers would work under high pressures to shed light on their schooling values and fames. For the time being, universities under the forms of university autonomy and semi-autonomy along with academic freedom which confronted the insufficient supply and poor quality of education basics face significant obstacles for improving their training and retention of qualified teaching staff. To address these difficulties, universities have to reform their policies and practices to retain qualified teachers, they must create academic environments where arouse teacher motivation to yield effective and creative teaching lessons, burn out their passions to participate in doing scientific research, and encourage them to take part in non-teaching activities [3]. The fundamental responsibility of one educational setting is to make their academic teachers aware of feeling obliged and joining hands for the sake of altogether development and success.

Confronting the Industrial Revolution (commonly referred as Industry 4.0) [8], which mainly features artificial intelligence, academic teachers have to update their knowledge and retrain themselves to satisfy learners’ expectations. Many advanced techno-education applications have emerged recently which have both sides. One positive facet provides useful facilities such as e-
learning, edutainment, or hybrid education, but the other negative aspect blames for spending equipment and training costs for both teachers and learners. Clearly seen, these drawbacks cause unforeseen pressures on academic teachers. Although there have been many job satisfaction studies on other sectors, for example economy or customer services [9]-[11], research into teacher job satisfaction and engagement has been sparse until now. As a result, this study would contribute practical and useful reference information for policy makers, school administrators, and other researchers to confer to serve their own sakes. To accomplish its objectives, this study would try to highlight the following research questions:

1. What are teaching staff’s perspectives towards job satisfaction and engagement?
2. Which factors have strong influences on academic staff in regard with job satisfaction and engagement?

This paper investigated the above question by comparing academic teachers’ viewpoints on job satisfaction and engagement in terms of campus premises, relationship with other colleagues, working condition and current school administrative policies with Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs [12], which includes three groups. First, basic needs at the bottom have two components, namely physiological needs – the fifth hierarchy - like food, water, warmth or rest, and safety needs – the fourth hierarchy – such as security, safety. Second, psychological needs belonging to the middle also comprise of two needs, particularly belongingness and love needs – the third hierarchy – such as intimate relationships, friends; esteem needs – the second hierarchy – like prestige and feeling of accomplishment. Third, the utmost hierarchy refers to self-fulfillment needs which mentions self-actualization. Specifically, self-actualization can be achieving one’s full potential, including creative activities.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research design

This study is primarily designed to examine from a cross-section of lecturers at Hanoi Law University their perspectives about factors affecting job satisfaction and engagement among academic teachers. The researchers employed a primary source using Slovin’s formula to select randomly 175 out of 319 academic teachers via their email addresses with an active Google form due to the difficult access as a consequence of COVID 19 pandemic. The letter along with instruction in the questionnaire explained the objectives, the relevance, assurance of animosity, and the option of not participating in the study if they wished. The raw collected data were carefully screened and encoded before using IBM SPSS v.25 application for analyzing the data.

2.2. Sample population

After collecting raw data via the active Google form, the researchers applied the convenience sampling method for 175 participants. In particular, the majority of respondents (n = 126; equal to 72%) was female teachers, 49 male lecturers accounted for 28 per cent. Concerning their age, 19 teachers, equivalent to 10.9% were under 30 years old. 26 participants, same as 14.9% were under 40 years old, while 76 lecturers, similar to 43.4% were under 50 years old. The percentage of teachers under 60 years old was 24%, corresponding to 6.9%. As for their academic status, 14 lecturers, equal to 8.0% held bachelor academic titles. 76 teachers, similar to 43.4% got master degrees. The number of doctors was 34.3%, same as 60 teachers. Lastly, 25 associate professors, comparable to 14.3% were willing to participate in the survey. When asking the number of teaching years, 8 teachers, equivalent to 46% were under 5 years, while 25 teachers who taught under 10 years accounted for 14.3 per cent. 45 participants, akin to 25.7% had been teachers for under 15 years. Similar to 21.7%, 38 teachers claimed to be in current profession for under 20 years. Besides, 22 instructors, equal to 12.6% experienced under 30 years of teaching. For teachers who taught over 30 years were 11 instructors, just like 6.3%. Overall, the novice teachers belong to the smallest proportion compared with experienced ones [7].
2.3. Research instrument

By exploiting a researcher-made questionnaire, which was constructed basing on attitudinal criteria proposed by Dornyei and Taguchi’s theory (p. 5) [13], the researchers formulated 4 major groups, namely campus premises, relationships among colleagues, working condition, and current school administrative policies in order to compare with Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs [12]. The questionnaire included 24 items with the summated rating scales, particularly (1) strong disagreement, (2) disagreement, (3) neutral opinion, (4) agreement, and (5) strong agreement. The questionnaire was first designed with 32 items and sent to 3 socio-psychological experts for content validation. After that, a dry run with 15 separate teachers was conducted to verify its strength and weaknesses. A final version with 24 items meeting the reliable Alpha values ($\alpha = 0.84 – 0.90$) [14] was shortlisted and fine-tuned for the official research instrument.

2.4. Data analysis

After the data screened process, the quantitative data were encoded and treated with SPSS application. Specially, frequency count and percentage were used to analyze the demographic information. Descriptive mean was used to reflect the respondents’ viewpoints basing on Likert scales, namely (1.0 – 1.80) strongly disagreeable, (1.81 – 2.60) disagreeable, (2.61 – 3.40) moderate, (3.41 – 4.20) agreeable, and (4.21 – 5.0) strongly agreeable. Independent T test was used to check whether male or female teachers shared the same stances. ANOVA was also employed to determine if teachers had same or different opinions on academic status, and teaching experience.

3. Results and Discussion

The first batch of factors affecting teacher engagement and satisfaction as seen in Table 1 was about campus premises. They expressed their strong agreement on high quality of teaching staff ($M = 4.67; SD = .47$%), career promotion opportunities ($M = 4.45; SD = .83$%), and well-known university reputation ($M = 4.55; SD = .70$%). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory [12] has made a major reference to the outcomes of this research. In line with the highest level - transcendence in Maslow’s motivation model, which characterizes that a person is motivated by values transcending beyond the personal self. In this regard, the values of university are recognized highest by respondents. This reveals that teachers feel satisfaction and engagement to their institution when their university rank is widely recognized. In addition, the qualified instructors in one higher education play a decisive part in building up their university reputation. In addition, they agreed that the university had a good job security ($M = 4.07; SD = .63$%), well-paid reward and salary policies ($M = 3.97; SD = .68$%), and professional code of conduct in the organization ($M = 3.97; SD = .80$%). Similarly, basic needs [12] are also highly valued when their emotional and psychological quotients are matched. When their basic needs such as incomes, job security or culturally professional workplace are satisfied with employees, in return, working people, in other words white collars try to develop themselves in their own organizations. This accounts for the reasons why people show no desire to change their jobs when their basic needs are met. Lastly, they showed moderate perspectives towards good relationships with superiors ($M = 3.05; SD = .64$%), and well-equipped material facilities ($M = 2.89; SD = .84$%). In this angle, it indicates that well-equipped material facilities as well as the connectedness with superiors influence moderately teachers’ perceptions in terms of their job satisfaction and engagement. These extrinsic motivations are also consistent with some studies [1], [10], which demotes that instructors’ self-development or intrinsic motivations are more important for the deep-root thinking about the workplace. The extrinsic motivations somehow have a moderate impact on their perspectives, but not very distinctively.
Table 1. The descriptive stances of the respondents

| How do you evaluate your campus premises?                                      | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|----------------|
| well-equipped material facilities                                              | 175| 2.89 | .84            |
| high quality of teaching staff                                                 | 175| 4.67 | .47            |
| good relationships with superiors                                              | 175| 3.05 | .64            |
| well-known university reputation                                               | 175| 4.55 | .70            |
| career promotion opportunities                                                 | 175| 4.45 | .83            |
| good job security                                                              | 175| 4.07 | .63            |
| well-paid reward and salary policies                                          | 175| 3.97 | .68            |
| professional code of conduct in the organization                              | 175| 3.97 | .80            |

| How do you evaluate your relationship with other colleagues?                  | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|----------------|
| friendly and enthusiastic                                                     | 175| 3.98 | .55            |
| professionally supportive and job-sharing                                     | 175| 3.90 | .58            |
| fairly competitive                                                            | 175| 3.96 | .65            |
| mutually respectful                                                          | 175| 3.97 | .66            |
| well-collaborative at workplace                                               | 175| 4.10 | .64            |

| How do you evaluate your working condition?                                   | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|----------------|
| well-equipped facilities for lesson preparations                              | 175| 2.37 | .74            |
| well-equipped classroom facilities                                            | 175| 2.42 | .71            |
| modern computing devices and hi-speed Internet                                | 175| 2.45 | .74            |
| easy-accessed, varied and updated learning materials                          | 175| 3.08 | .53            |

| How do you evaluate your current school administrative policies?              | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|----------------|
| Good personnel policies                                                      | 175| 3.13 | .56            |
| Competent administrators                                                      | 175| 3.99 | .78            |
| Leadership with a good vision                                                | 175| 4.02 | .80            |
| Constructive ideas are welcome and acknowledged                              | 175| 3.33 | .88            |
| Assessing fair and transparent personnel’s contribution                       | 175| 3.24 | .74            |
| Being supportive to academic staff                                           | 175| 3.93 | .70            |
| Caring about employees’ lives                                                 | 175| 3.99 | .83            |
| Valid N (listwise)                                                           |    | 175  |                |

When examining their viewpoints on their relationship with other colleagues in Table 1, they highly accepted to develop friendly and enthusiastic rapport with one another (M = 3.98; SD = .55%), enjoy professionally supportive and job-sharing atmosphere (M = 3.90; SD = .58%), make fairly competitive (M = 3.96; SD = .65%), feel mutually respectful (M = 3.97; SD = .66%), and gain well-collaborative at workplace (M = 4.10; SD = .64%). Working environment has strong influences on employees. The previous studies [2, 10], [11] have proved that favourable working atmosphere encourages employees to work better and more efficiently. The solidarity and respect between one another empowers and promote the advancement and prosperity of one organization. Especially, the harmony and openness among teachers establish a strong and healthy academic environment, which benefits stakeholders and students as well. The sustainable development of an organization is based heavily on the quality of teachers in regard to academic and interpersonal skills [6]. As such, the higher pleasant feeling academic teachers experience in one organization, the more they want to devote and sacrifice to their workplace. When academic teachers arouse their self-actualization, their teaching efficiency is also gained and brings back many fruitful results, this state of feeling is the highest according to Maslow Hierarchy of Needs as depicted in Fig. 1.

In terms of working condition in Table 1, the participants kept low stances when disagreed that the university provided well-equipped facilities for lesson preparations (M = 2.37; SD = .74%), well-equipped classroom facilities (M = 2.42; SD = .71%), and modern companies devices and hi-speed Internet (M = 2.45; SD = .74%). Besides, they have moderate opinions on easy-accessed, varied and updated learning materials (M = 3.08; SD = .53%). Again, these extrinsic
components are thought to be moderate, which discloses that working condition contributes greatly to the success of teacher achievements. Teaching aids and school facilities ease teachers to be able to provide best means of teaching tools for them to perform best. These factors belong to physiological needs in the Maslow Hierarchy of Needs as displayed in Fig. 1. Therefore, many universities have been trying to upgrade and renovate their working space to improve their employees’ moods [1], [2], [9]. However, school equipment does not affect much teachers in terms of their satisfaction and engagement in this study [4], [5].

![Figure 1. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs](image)

On asking for current school administrative policies in Table 1, the participants expressed moderate opinions of good personnel policies ($M = 3.13; SD = .56\%$), welcoming and acknowledging constructive ideas ($M = 3.33; SD = .88\%$), and fair and transparent personnel’s contribution ($M = 3.24; SD = .74\%$). In regard to current school administrative policies, academic staff show their neutral stances on the development of personnel policies, the acknowledgement of constructive ideas, and the fair and transparent assessment of employees’ contribution, which indicates these extrinsic factors should be reformed to meet the expectations of the high skilled labour force. Such determinants belong to psychological needs as clearly shown in Fig. 1, namely esteem needs that entail prestige and feeling of accomplishment. It is necessary to encourage promote the esteem needs of employees in order to keep them satisfied with the organizations [10]. In case of paying attention and being highly valued, teaching staff demonstrate their engagement and their work efficiency are more effective. Besides, the respondents held agreeable views on competent administrators ($M = 3.99; SD = .78\%$), leadership with a good vision ($M = 4.02; SD = .80\%$), being supportive to academic staff ($M = 3.93; SD = .70\%$), and caring about employees’ lives ($M = 3.99; SD = .78\%$). From above details, it can be concluded that school administrators’ hearts, vision, and talents play essential parts in winning academic staff’s admiration. The role of leadership in every organization are very important in mobilizing and directing their employees’ contribution to build up and develop one organization. The leaders’ characteristics, talents, and charisma are likened to a magnet that seize teacher involvement in a higher education institution [3], [5]. As a result, the stability and development of an educational institute are mostly dependent on the quality of the leadership.

Table 2 presents the contrastive differences between male and female teachers in comparison with four major batches affecting the choice of instructors’ satisfaction and engagement with their organization. The Sig. in Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances are all bigger than 0.05 and Sig. (2-tailed) in t-test for Equality of Means are also bigger than 0.05, too. These figures point out that male or female teachers share the similarity in their choices among these viewpoints.
In order to investigate if teachers with different academic status have the same or different opinions on the four major aspects of job satisfaction and engagement. Table 3 discloses their stances, and the results come out that Sig. in the four groups are all bigger than .05, which means that there is no difference among teachers with different academic status [3],[4].

Table 2. Comparison between four components in regards with gender

|                  | Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
|------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                  | F  | Sig.  | t   | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| campus premises  |    |       |     |    |               |                |                    | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed | 2.3 | .13  | 1.8 | 173 | .08            | -.591           | .338               | -1.26 | .075  |
| Equal variances not assumed | -1.9 | 101.4 | .06 | 173 | .591           | .316            | -1.22             | .034  |
| relationship with other colleagues | 2.4 | .13  | -0.2 | 173 | .98            | -.005           | .241              | -1.27 | .049  |
| Equal variances assumed | -0.2 | 75.4 | .98 | 173 | -.005          | .261            | -1.53             | .514  |
| Equal variances not assumed | -0.2 | 75.4 | .98 | 173 | -.005          | .261            | -1.53             | .514  |
| working condition  | 6  | .45  | 1.2 | 173 | .23            | -.272           | .226              | -1.72 | .175  |
| Equal variances assumed | -1.2 | 93.5 | .22 | 173 | -.272          | .220            | -1.71             | .164  |
| Equal variances not assumed | -1.2 | 93.5 | .22 | 173 | -.272          | .220            | -1.71             | .164  |
|  current school administrative policies  | 2  | .69  | 9   | 173 | .36            | -.345           | .373              | -1.08 | .390  |
| Equal variances assumed | -9  | 83.7 | .37 | 173 | -.346          | .381            | -1.10             | .413  |
| Equal variances not assumed | -9  | 83.7 | .37 | 173 | -.346          | .381            | -1.10             | .413  |

Table 3. The difference among respondents in terms of academic status

|                     | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F  | Sig. |
|---------------------|---------------|----|-------------|----|------|
| campus premises     |               |    |             |    |      |
| Between Groups      | 25.059        | 3  | 8.35        | 2.09| .10  |
| Within Groups       | 684.279       | 171| 4.02        |    |      |
| Total               | 709.337       | 174|             |    |      |
| relationship with other colleagues |               |    |             |    |      |
| Between Groups      | 14.769        | 3  | 4.92        | 2.48| .06  |
| Within Groups       | 338.946       | 171| 1.98        |    |      |
| Total               | 353.714       | 174|             |    |      |
| working condition   |               |    |             |    |      |
| Between Groups      | 1.537         | 3  | .512        | .279| .84  |
| Within Groups       | 314.177       | 171| 1.84        |    |      |
| Total               | 315.714       | 174|             |    |      |
| current school administrative policies |               |    |             |    |      |
| Between Groups      | 3.812         | 3  | 1.27        | .256| .86  |
| Within Groups       | 849.046       | 171| 4.97        |    |      |
| Total               | 852.857       | 174|             |    |      |

Table 4 indicates the hypothesis that instructors with different teaching experiences have the different opinions regarding the four batches of perspectives. The outcomes figure out that novice or experienced teachers [15], who suggest novice teachers have under 5 teaching years and experienced teachers have over 5 teaching years, share the similarity in expressing their opinions as shown by the values of Sig. in the four groups of the questionnaire, which are all bigger than .05 indicating that there is no difference among novice and experienced teachers regarding these four factors [4].
4. Conclusion

Examining academic teaching staff’s viewpoints on job satisfaction and engagement under intrinsic and extrinsic views, the results come out that teachers need to develop their own strengths under favourable environments to upgrade themselves, not just totally basing on their organizations [5]. The condition of campus premises which are regarded as extrinsic needs are received neutral opinions by the participants. In this circumstance, working condition share the same evaluation, that means the respondents value moderate to it. The relationship with other colleagues, relating to the intrinsic feeling prove that these factors are very necessary to the decision made by the respondents to settle their jobs [3]-[5]. In other words, when the harmony of interpersonal relationships is focused, academic staff feel satisfied, engaged, and eager to devote and sacrifice themselves to the organization, so the quality of work is improved and effective. In addition, employees also expect their leaders to have a warm heart, clear vision, and brilliant talents to set a good example for them to follow. Academic teachers have a high and very high expectation towards their leaders because they play decisive roles in sustainable development of an organization which brings back all necessities that academic teaching staff need to show their satisfaction and engagement to their affiliations.

Some limitations this study failed to cover are that the participants are not varied, that is, this study was conducted at only one university, so the results might be not very prevalent. Besides, the meta-analysis between public and private sector universities should be carried out to get more dependable and overall contrastive results [5]. These constraints are, therefore, expected to be implemented for the future studies.
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