

**A DIAGNOSTIC STUDY OF EMPLOYEE DISSATISFACTION ON  
EMPLOYEE TURNOVER AND SUGGESTED RESTORATIVE  
MEASURES FOR INSTITUTIONAL AUGMENTATION  
(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ASSOSA UNIVERSITY, ETHIOPIA)**

**Dr.A.GAJENDRAN\***

**TADESSE AMARE SHUMYE\*\***

---

**Abstract**

---

***Keywords:***

Employee Satisfaction  
Dissatisfaction, Employee  
Turnover, Restorative  
Measures

Many organisations are suffering to manage their day to day operations because of existence of employee turnover in their organisation. But reasons behind employee turnover may be plentiful. Out of so many reasons, the primary reason for employee turnover is either decreased employee satisfaction or employee dissatisfaction. Even dissatisfaction also cause due to many factors. So it is inevitable to undergo a study on identifying the cause of dissatisfaction of an employee to uplift their level of satisfaction and to increase the possibility of increasing organisational strength, growth as well. That is why; this attempt was made to analyse and to identify the factors which are causing dissatisfaction among employees to find feasible solution. Appropriate statistical tools like descriptive statistics: frequency distribution, percentage analysis, one sample t-test, paired t test, chi-square test used and results are analysed at appropriate level. Qualitative and Quantitative analysis were adopted and

---

**\*Associate Professor, Department of Management, College of Business and Economics ,  
School of Post Graduate Studies, Assosa University, Assosa, Ethiopia.**

**\*\*Instructor, Department of Management, College of Business and Economics, Assosa  
University, Assosa, Ethiopia.**

---

snow ball sampling and convenience sampling method used to collect data through structured questionnaire. Pilot study conducted and reliability statistics results are observed for ensuring the validity of collected data and its output. The research paper focuses mainly on identifying employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction level. In addition cause and effect dissatisfaction which ultimately leads organisations to face employee turnover and organisational disaster. The measures to be taken to reduce cause of dissatisfaction of employees to make organisations to travel at the right path and to get success is also provided in this research paper for better prospects and possible outcomes.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Success of any institution depends on satisfaction level of their workforce. If the workforce feels satisfactory with their position, then they may contribute extra, if their contributions are more than that may leads to get quality outputs which finally cause peace, institutional harmony, focused task and then bring success to an organisation. Therefore, satisfaction should be generated among employees first. If an organization wants to create satisfaction, then appropriate kind of atmosphere should be created. Good atmosphere will be created in workspot only by taking appropriate measures from management side. But other side, the dissatisfaction leads to create unhealthy situation, collapse the entire atmosphere in an organisation. By considering all those issues, the research attempt made with 75 sample size. Duration of data collection was approximately three months. The main objective of this research is to identify the cause of dissatisfaction and to suggest possible solutions to upgrade the satisfaction level of employees. IBM SPSS Statistics software version 20 used to analyse the collected data and appropriate statistical tools were used to test hypothesis. Results presented in the following paragraph in appropriate manner. Suggestions provided to the management of Assosa University to implement those suggestions for the development of the university in future by enhancing the satisfaction level of employees to extract maximum possible output from

workforce. The relationship and influence check was also made up with paired sample t test, one sample t test, chi square test and ANOVA and the output presented in appropriate manner in the following paragraph.

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Employee dissatisfaction, employee turnover are the important cause of organisational problems and failure as well. Many researches exists in this area but it is a first attempt in Assosa University and the first attempt was made to identify the cause behind employee turnover which was the prime cause of dissatisfaction among academic staff or instructors. To the attempt was made by the researchers to check the important cause of dissatisfaction, to find possible solution and to give constructive suggestions to Assosa University to enhance their institutional growth and employee satisfaction too to reduce employee turnover. This study entirely concentrates on measuring employee level of satisfaction, dissatisfaction and cause of dissatisfaction. the main objective of this study is to find remedial measures to reduce dissatisfaction among employees.

## **2. OBJECTIVES**

- To identify dissatisfaction level of employees and its impact on employee turnover.
- To identify the relationship and influence between the independent variable and identified dependent factors of selected samples.

## **3. HYPOTHESIS**

- **H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between the age and attitude of employees.
- **H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between in-adequate salary and cause of dissatisfaction among employees which ultimately cause employee turnover
- **H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between in absence of recognition and cause of dissatisfaction among employees which at last cause employee turnover
- **H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between rigidity and cause of dissatisfaction among employees which eventually cause employee turnover
- **H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a significant relationship between no scope or absence of career development and cause of dissatisfaction among employees which finally cause employee turnover
- **H<sub>0</sub>**: There is a cumulative influence of income on dependent factors of cause of dissatisfaction of employees of Assosa University.

#### **4. LIMITATIONS**

- Primary and secondary data were used for the present study.
- The time taken to collect data is nearly 3 months from December 2017 to February 2018.
- The research is purely self-sponsored research; the researchers not received any financial assistance from body, body corporate, or from any other institution including Assosa University.
- The research questionnaires applicable and distributed only to Ethiopian instructors who are at the teaching and administrative positions at Assosa University.
- Snow ball sampling and Convenience Sampling method used to collect data through the designed questionnaire.
- Both qualitative and quantitative approach adopted for this study.
- Financial and time constraints was there, therefore the researchers tried to complete the research as early as possible.
- Due to page constraint, to make this paper appropriate to suit with the journal requirement's, the necessary and important analysis only provided in this research. Other SPSS calculations and results will be attached and submitted to the editor of the publication where the researchers are planned to publish journals.

#### **5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

##### **• Research Design**

Initially pilot study was conducted with the initial stage of questionnaire and later on the same was incorporated with suggestions given by the respondents. After upgrading the research questionnaire, it was distributed to the sample respondents of 75 in number. The responses were collected by using snow ball sampling and convenience sampling method. Collected data entered in to SPSS software, under descriptive statistics in SPSS, frequency distribution and percentages obtained. In addition, under compare means, paired sample t test were used to test hypothesis either to accept or reject the null hypothesis at 1% level of significance. The hypotheses were framed by the researchers and subsequently it was tested. As per the results from statistical tools, the analysis and interpretations carried out. Further findings, suggestions and conclusions

derived and presented with appropriate standards based on the requirements to make reader to understand the core concept of this paper.

- **Method of data collection and its Source**

Both primary and secondary data used to collect data for this study. Through research questionnaire the primary data collected. Through university website and from other relevant websites connected with the topic, secondary data collected.

- **Sampling Techniques**

Totally 80 questionnaires were disseminated, out of it , after eliminating defective questionnaires , at last 75 questionnaires taken in to consideration for further analysis.

- **Statistical tools used**

In order to test the framed hypothesis and to analyse the data, the frequency distribution, percentage analysis, cross tabs (Descriptive statistics) were used. Under compare means, the paired sample t test were used to ensure either the null hypothesis to accepted or not.

- **Reliability Statistics**

According to SPSS Version 20, Cronbach's alpha value is 81.7 %. Hence, it was understood that the reliability statistics proves that the collected data reliable and appropriate.

- **Components of Questionnaire**

The questionnaire has four divisions, each and every division and its components given as follows: **First division:** Demographical data about the respondent (age, sex, marital status, income, years of service, satisfaction level, dissatisfaction status of respondents). **Second division:** Identified dependent variable related to attitude of respondents towards their status of satisfaction ( Position, nature , duties and responsibilities, immediate superiors , respect, relationship with immediate superiors , styles of higher officials, infrastructure: ICT, Transport service, roads, quality of buildings , water , lavatories, cafeteria and so on., respect from students , job safety, university system administration , teaching accessories :Projectors, Desktop computers , Laptop , smart class etc., consistent promotional opportunities , possibility for career development, library and books, scope for teacher to do research, research financial

support , freedom to express ideas , views, salary hike, grievance handling system). **Third division** contains the following details: Rigidity, delayed response, delayed Salary, delayed increment and promotion, lack of timely decision, high workload, discomfort with position, communication gap, inadequate, high cost of living, absence of promotional opportunities, absence of self-satisfaction in job, absence of transparency. **Fourth division:** Grievance Redress Procedure, periodical counselling, periodical meeting , Exit Interview ,implementing Wage and Salary administration system, reasonable working conditions ,equal distribution of work, quality of benefits, employee participation in taking decision, diplomatic treatment, transparency, opportunities for free discussions, conducting faculty development program to upgrade employee skills , periodical feedback among employees to know their mentality to find solution.

## 6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

By using SPSS software version 20, the result observed and those results used for analysis and discussion. Result of statistical software given in the following paragraph. Descriptive statistics used and frequency distribution, percentages observed. In addition, one sample t test, cross tab, chi-square, ANOVA used and output presented in appropriate manner. All those output given in the coming paragraph. First, the frequency distribution given which focus demographical factors of respondents which includes age, sex, income , marital status , length of service.

**Table – 1: DEMOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES OF RESPONDENTS**

AGE	%	SEX	%	LENGTH OF SERVICE	%
21 TO 40	92.0	Male	76.0	Less than 1 year	42.7
41 TO 60	5.3	Female	24.0	Less than 2 years	21.3
Above 60	2.7	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	Less than 3 years	9.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>			More than 3 years	26.7
INCOME ( in Birr )	%	MARITAL STATUS	%	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Less than 100000 birr	74.7	Married	26.7		

Less than 200000 birr	18.7	Single	70.7
Less than 300000 birr	1.3	Others	2.7
More than 300000 birr	5.3	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>		

**Source: Primary data**

From the above table, most of the respondents that means teaching staff age is between 21 to 40 which is 92%. Most of the respondent's salary per year is less than 100000 birr which is 74.7%. Majority is men and 24% of them are female. 70.7% of the respondents are unmarried. 42.7% of respondents experience is less than one year. From the above statistical output and from the sample size, it was observed that most of them are less experience, so their salary also at a starting level. Females are one fourth of the total sample sizes. Since the university is 6 to 7 years old. It is in the budding stage. Therefore, lot of promotions such as infrastructural facilities, training, upgrading the qualification of existing staff should also be improved.

**Table – 2: PERCEPTION OF RESPONDENTS TOWARDS THEIR PRESENT JOB AND POSITION**

<b>I. JOB SATISFACTION</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(A). IN ADEQUATE SALARY</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	<b>52.0</b>	TOP	46.7
No	48.0	MIDDLE	36.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	BOTTOM	17.3
		<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>II. REASON FOR DISSATISFACTION</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(B). ABSENCE OF RECOGNITION</b>	<b>%</b>
In adequate salary and facilities	46.7	TOP	33.3
Absence of adequate recognition	21.3	MIDDLE	40.0
Rigidity	14.7	BOTTOM	26.7

No Scope for Career Development	2.7	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>
No comments	14.7		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>		
<b>(D). RIGIDITY</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(C). NO SCOPE FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>%</b>
TOP	26.7	TOP	17.3
MIDDLE	50.7	MIDDLE	40.0
BOTTOM	22.7	BOTTOM	42.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Source: Primary data**

Almost 50% of the instructors responded that they possess job satisfaction. Now only those instructors started to work with this university, so it is assumed and expected by researchers that they are not that much familiar with this university rules and regulation. But if they are going to work for long period with the same university their satisfaction level and their perception may change to some extent. On the other side, 48% responded that they are not having job satisfaction. The people who responded not having job satisfaction, the same people responded that their cause of dissatisfaction primarily because of in adequate salary, absence of adequate recognition, rigidity and they felt it because of no scope for career development. 14.7 % of instructor's respondents said that they don't want to give any comments about their satisfaction level with their job. When we look out the four factors which cause dissatisfaction primarily which was mentioned in the above table from A to D, the respondent said that rigidity concerned is middle management has more rigidity. 46.7% of top level management people felt that they are having inadequate salary. 40% who belongs to middle level management thought that they are not that much comfortable with recognition from top authorities. 42.7% and 40% respondents from bottom level and middle level felt that there was no scope for career development. So the necessary measures to be taken to solve these issues to the maximum possible extent will cause reduction of dissatisfaction from the instructors at various departments. The same will upgrade the standard of university and may increase level of satisfaction among instructors.



**Table – 3: Table showing paired sample test results, comparing independent variable with identified dependent variables which connects with Attitude of Academic Staff at Assosa University**

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
<b>Pair 1</b>	AGE – AE1	.151	2.453	.287	-.422	.723	.525	72	<b>.601</b>
<b>Pair 2</b>	AGE – AE2	.419	2.466	.287	-.152	.990	1.461	73	<b>.148</b>
<b>Pair 3</b>	AGE – AE3	.149	2.557	.297	-.444	.741	.500	73	<b>.619</b>
<b>Pair 4</b>	AGE – AE4	-.122	2.569	.299	-.717	.474	-.407	73	<b>.685</b>
<b>Pair 5</b>	AGE – AE5	.405	2.658	.309	-.210	1.021	1.312	73	<b>.194</b>
<b>Pair 6</b>	AGE – AE6	.608	2.563	.298	.014	1.202	2.041	73	<b>.045</b>
<b>Pair 7</b>	AGE – AE7	-.122	2.488	.289	-.698	.455	-.420	73	<b>.675</b>
<b>Pair 8</b>	AGE – AE8	-1.095	2.665	.310	-1.712	-.477	-3.534	73	<b>.001</b>
<b>Pair 9</b>	AGE – AE9	-1.432	2.543	.296	-2.022	-.843	-4.845	73	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 10</b>	AGE – AE10	-.243	2.699	.314	-.868	.382	-.775	73	<b>.441</b>
<b>Pair 11</b>	AGE – AE11	-.838	2.669	.310	-1.456	-.219	-2.700	73	<b>.009</b>
<b>Pair 12</b>	AGE – AE12	-1.405	2.627	.305	-2.014	-.797	-4.602	73	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 13</b>	AGE – AE13	-1.054	2.606	.303	-1.658	-.450	-3.479	73	<b>.001</b>
<b>Pair 14</b>	AGE – AE14	-.932	2.619	.304	-1.539	-.326	-3.063	73	<b>.003</b>
<b>Pair 15</b>	AGE – AE15	-1.541	4.326	.503	-2.543	-.538	-3.063	73	<b>.003</b>
<b>Pair 16</b>	AGE – AE16	-1.054	2.729	.317	-1.686	-.422	-3.322	73	<b>.001</b>
<b>Pair 17</b>	AGE – AE17	-1.270	2.681	.312	-1.891	-.649	-4.076	73	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 18</b>	AGE – AE18	-.946	2.813	.327	-1.598	-.294	-2.892	73	<b>.005</b>
<b>Pair 19</b>	AGE – AE19	-1.041	2.604	.303	-1.644	-.437	-3.438	73	<b>.001</b>
<b>Pair 20</b>	AGE – AE20	-1.203	2.564	.298	-1.797	-.609	-4.035	73	<b>.000</b>

**Source: Primary Data & Computed**

Based on the derived output, the hypotheses were tested by paired t test and it was concluded that there was a relationship between age and attitude of instructors towards level of satisfaction at 5% level of significance. The point that the researcher's what they want to confirm is , the age of instructors may differ but their attitude may not differ towards their level of satisfaction. All

instructors and their level of satisfaction may not change and it will be same, irrespective of their age.

**Table –4: Table showing paired sample t test result comparing the variable which connects with inadequate salary and Cause of Dissatisfaction of employees at Assosa University**

Comparison between inadequate salary and Cause of dissatisfaction of employees	Paired Differences						T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
				Lower	Upper				
Pair 1 IS- COD1	-.76000	1.41268	.16312	-1.08503	-.43497	-4.659	74	.000	
Pair 2 IS- COD2	-.77333	1.43859	.16611	-1.10432	-.44234	-4.655	74	.000	
Pair 3 IS - COD 3	-.90667	1.43483	.16568	-1.23679	-.57654	-5.472	74	.000	
Pair 4 IS- COD4	-.66667	1.48263	.17120	-1.00779	-.32554	-3.894	74	.000	
Pair 5 IS- COD5	-.86667	1.30832	.15107	-1.16768	-.56565	-5.737	74	.000	
Pair 6 IS- COD6	1.01333	1.33045	.15363	-1.31944	-.70723	-6.596	74	.000	
Pair 7 IS- COD7	1.02667	1.36534	.15766	-1.34080	-.71253	-6.512	74	.000	
Pair 8 IS- COD8	-.65333	1.72809	.19954	-1.05093	-.25574	-3.274	74	.002	
Pair 9 IS- COD9	-.66667	1.55384	.17942	-1.02417	-.30916	-3.716	74	.000	
Pair 10 IS - COD10	-.66667	1.35899	.15692	-.97934	-.35399	-4.248	74	.000	
Pair 11 IS - COD11	-.96000	1.56343	.18053	-1.31971	-.60029	-5.318	74	.000	
Pair 12 IS - COD12	-.90667	1.54372	.17825	-1.26184	-.55149	-5.086	74	.000	
Pair 13 IS - COD13	1.20000	1.45193	.16765	-1.53406	-.86594	-7.158	74	.000	

Source: Primary Data & Computed

### IS- Inadequate Salary / COD- Cause of Dissatisfaction

It is concluded that the null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance, out of paired sample t test results which is shown in the above table 4. It indicates that there is a significant relationship between inadequate salary and cause of dissatisfaction. So, in-adequate salary given to instructors has a considerable impact which causes the dissatisfaction among instructor.

**Table –5: Table showing paired sample t test result comparing the variable which connects with Absence of Recognition and Cause of Dissatisfaction of employees at Assosa University**

Comparison between Absence of Recognition and Cause of dissatisfaction of employees		Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
<b>Pair 1</b>	AOR – COD1	-.53333	1.25562	.14499	-.82222	-.24444	-3.679	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 2</b>	AOR – COD2	-.54667	1.28708	.14862	-.84280	-.25054	-3.678	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 3</b>	AOR – COD3	-.68000	1.25375	.14477	-.96846	-.39154	-4.697	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 4</b>	AOR – COD4	-.44000	1.32787	.15333	-.74552	-.13448	-2.870	74	<b>.005</b>
<b>Pair 5</b>	AOR – COD5	-.64000	1.21522	.14032	-.91960	-.36040	-4.561	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 6</b>	AOR – COD6	-.78667	1.25519	.14494	-1.07546	-.49787	-5.428	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 7</b>	AOR – COD7	-.80000	1.35567	.15654	-1.11191	-.48809	-5.111	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 8</b>	AOR – COD8	-.42667	1.60382	.18519	-.79567	-.05766	-2.304	74	<b>.024</b>
<b>Pair 9</b>	AOR – COD9	-.44000	1.49991	.17319	-.78510	-.09490	-2.540	74	<b>.013</b>
<b>Pair 10</b>	AOR- COD10	-.44000	1.28652	.14855	-.73600	-.14400	-2.962	74	<b>.004</b>
<b>Pair 11</b>	AOR - COD11	-.73333	1.50973	.17433	-1.08069	-.38598	-4.207	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 12</b>	AOR- COD12	-.68000	1.44409	.16675	-1.01226	-.34774	-4.078	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 13</b>	AOR - COD13	-.97333	1.39471	.16105	-1.29423	-.65244	-6.044	74	<b>.000</b>

**Source: Primary Data & Computed; AOR – Absence of Recognition**

In addition to table 4, from the above table, it is observed that the null hypothesis is accepted based on the significant value. The paired sample t test which was used to find the correlation between absence of recognition and cause of dissatisfaction and it was found that there is

significant relationship between the variables absence of recognition and cause of dissatisfaction. Because, the p value indicated in the last column is lesser than that of table value at 5% level of significance.

**Table -6: Table showing paired sample t test result comparing the variable which connects with Rigidity and Cause of Dissatisfaction of employees at Assosa University**

Comparison between Rigidity and Cause of dissatisfaction of employees		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
<b>Pair 1</b>	Rigidity – COD 1	-.50667	1.31902	.15231	-.81015	-.20319	-3.327	74	<b>.001</b>
<b>Pair 2</b>	Rigidity – COD 2	-.52000	1.43659	.16588	-.85053	-.18947	-3.135	74	<b>.002</b>
<b>Pair 3</b>	Rigidity – COD 3	-.65333	1.43784	.16603	-.98415	-.32252	-3.935	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 4</b>	Rigidity – COD 4	-.41333	1.47129	.16989	-.75185	-.07482	-2.433	74	<b>.017</b>
<b>Pair 5</b>	Rigidity – COD 5	-.61333	1.34459	.15526	-.92270	-.30397	-3.950	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 6</b>	Rigidity – COD 6	-.76000	1.32379	.15286	-1.06458	-.45542	-4.972	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 7</b>	Rigidity – COD 7	-.77333	1.37126	.15834	-1.08883	-.45783	-4.884	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 8</b>	Rigidity – COD 8	-.40000	1.61077	.18600	-.77061	-.02939	-2.151	74	<b>.035</b>
<b>Pair 9</b>	Rigidity – COD 9	-.41333	1.57766	.18217	-.77632	-.05035	-2.269	74	<b>.026</b>
<b>Pair 10</b>	Rigidity – COD10	-.41333	1.31615	.15198	-.71615	-.11051	-2.720	74	<b>.008</b>
<b>Pair 11</b>	Rigidity – COD11	-.70667	1.40244	.16194	-1.02934	-.38399	-4.364	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 12</b>	Rigidity – COD12	-.65333	1.42841	.16494	-.98198	-.32469	-3.961	74	<b>.000</b>
<b>Pair 13</b>	Rigidity – COD13	-.94667	1.49678	.17283	-1.29105	-.60229	-5.477	74	<b>.000</b>

**Source: Primary Data & Computed**

The above table shows the result of paired sample t test. The hypothesis has been tested and the null hypothesis is indicates that there is a significant relationship between rigidity and cause of dissatisfaction. Based on the paired sample t test, it was concluded that there is a relationship between rigidity and cause of dissatisfaction, if there is a rigidity from the management or from top authorities, surely that may cause dissatisfaction among instructors. That will also be the cause of employee turnover and organisational set back as well.

**Table -7: Table showing paired sample t test result comparing the variable which connects with No Scope for Career development and Cause of Dissatisfaction of employees at Assosa University**

Comparison between No Scope for Career development and Cause of dissatisfaction of employees		Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
<b>Pair 1</b>	NSFCD – COD 1	-.213	1.436	.166	-.544	.117	-1.287	74	<b>.202</b>
<b>Pair 2</b>	NSFCD – COD 2	-.227	1.439	.166	-.558	.104	-1.365	74	<b>.177</b>
<b>Pair 3</b>	NSFCD – COD 3	-.360	1.449	.167	-.693	-.027	-2.152	74	<b>.035</b>
<b>Pair 4</b>	NSFCD – COD 4	-.120	1.442	.167	-.452	.212	-.721	74	<b>.473</b>
<b>Pair 5</b>	NSFCD – COD 5	-.320	1.317	.152	-.623	-.017	-2.105	74	<b>.039</b>
<b>Pair 6</b>	NSFCD – COD 6	-.467	1.329	.153	-.772	-.161	-3.041	74	<b>.003</b>
<b>Pair 7</b>	NSFCD – COD 7	-.480	1.319	.152	-.783	-.177	-3.152	74	<b>.002</b>
<b>Pair 8</b>	NSFCD – COD 8	-.107	1.616	.187	-.478	.265	-.572	74	<b>.569</b>
<b>Pair 9</b>	NSFCD – COD 9	-.120	1.515	.175	-.469	.229	-.686	74	<b>.495</b>
<b>Pair 10</b>	NSFCD – COD 10	-.120	1.273	.147	-.413	.173	-.816	74	<b>.417</b>
<b>Pair 11</b>	NSFCD – COD 11	-.413	1.443	.167	-.745	-.081	-2.480	74	<b>.015</b>
<b>Pair 12</b>	NSFCD – COD 12	-.360	1.504	.174	-.706	-.014	-2.074	74	<b>.042</b>
<b>Pair 13</b>	NSFCD – COD 13	-.653	1.475	.170	-.993	-.314	-3.836	74	<b>.000</b>

**Source: Primary Data & Computed; NSFCD - No Scope for Career Development**

The hypothesis tested with paired sample t test to compare the relationship between absence of career development and cause of dissatisfaction at 5%. Finally the result observed and as per the result of paired t test it was concluded that there is a significant relationship between absence of career development and cause of dissatisfaction. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted because the p value is less than that of 5% level of significance. The coming table is the consolidated statement which includes cross tab between independent variable (Income) and identified dependent factors which relates with cause of dissatisfaction variables, chi-square test, one sample t test results and one way ANOVA test results too.

**Table – 8.2: Consolidated table of results checking association, combined influence between Income and dependent variables by Chi-square test, One Sample t test and ANOVA**

Cross tabulation between Income and COD 1(Rigidity in implementing rules)							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t Test	One way ANOVA Sig. value
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total				
LESS THAN 100000	14	18	14	6	4	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square df Asymp. Sig.	15.733 <sup>a</sup> 4 .003	One Sample t test Sig. (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.566</b>
LESS THEN 200000	2	6	3	1	2	<b>14</b>				
LESS THEN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>				
MORETHEN 300000	1	0	2	1	0	<b>4</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>75</b>				
Cross tabulation between Income and COD2 (Delayed response from Superiors / Higher official)							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t Test	One way ANOVA Sig. value
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total				
LESS THAN 100000	16	17	11	8	4	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	11.600 <sup>a</sup> 4 .021	One Sample t test Sig. (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.450</b>
LESS THEN 200000	3	4	2	4	1	<b>14</b>				
LESS THEN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>				
MORETHEN 300000	1	0	1	2	0	<b>4</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>75</b>				
Cross tabulation between Income and COD 3(Delayed Salary , increment and promotion)							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t Test	One way ANOVA Sig. value
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total				
LESS THAN 100000	15	11	15	9	6	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	7.333 <sup>a</sup> 4 .119	One Sample t test Sig. (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.657</b>
LESS THEN 200000	2	6	1	5	0	<b>14</b>				

LESS THAN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	1				
MORE THAN 300000	1	1	1	1	0	4				
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>75</b>				
<b>Cross tabulation between Income and COD4(Lack of Quick decision by higher officials when they deal with teachers problems )</b>							<b>Chi- Square Test</b>			
<b>Income /Opinion</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>DA</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Total</b>			<b>One Sample t test</b>	<b>ANOVA Sig. value</b>
LESS THAN 100000	20	12	12	6	6	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	16.267 <sup>a</sup> 4 .003	Sig. (2-tailed) .000	<b>0.781</b>
LESS THAN 200000	5	3	4	0	2	<b>14</b>				
LESS THAN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>				
MORE THAN 300000	0	3	0	1	0	<b>4</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>26*</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>75</b>				
<b>Cross tabulation between Income and COD5 (too much workload)</b>										
<b>Income /Opinion</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>DA</b>	<b>SDA</b>	<b>Total</b>			<b>One Sample t test</b>	<b>ANOVA Sig. value</b>
LESS THAN 100000	14	9	20	11	2	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	18.667 <sup>a</sup> 4 .001	Sig. (2-tailed) .000	<b>0.411</b>
LESS THAN 200000	1	7	5	1	0	<b>14</b>				
LESS THAN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>				
MORE THAN 300000	0	2	0	2	0	<b>4</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>25*</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>75</b>				

**Source: Primary Data & Computed**

The above table and the following tables reveals that the consolidated statement of cross tab, chi-square test, one sample t test, ANOVA test results to measure the scale of their response of respondents towards the income and cause of dissatisfaction of instructors. And chi-square,

ANOVA provides the results to confirm the relationship, cumulative influence of independent variable (Income) on identified dependent factors relates with cause of dissatisfaction. Through chi-square results and one sample t test, it was proved that there is a connection between the level of income and cause of dissatisfaction.

**Table – 8.1: Consolidated table of results checking association, combined influence between Income and dependent variables by using Chi-square test, One Sample t and ANOVA**

Cross tabulation between Income and COD6 (Un easy feeling or discomfort with present position)							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t test Sig (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.346</b>		
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	17.467 <sup>a</sup> 4 .002				
LESS THAN 100000	13	13	19	5	6	<b>56</b>					Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	17.467 <sup>a</sup> 4 .002
LESS THEN 200000	0	4	7	2	1	<b>14</b>						
LESS THEN 300000	0	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>						
MORETHEN 300000	0	1	1	1	1	<b>4</b>						
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27*</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>75</b>						
Cross tabulation between Income and COD7 (Too much communication gap with fellow teachers / higher officials)							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t test Sig. (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.899</b>		
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	12.933 <sup>a</sup> 4 .012				
LESS THAN 100000	11	11	19	11	4	<b>56</b>					Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	12.933 <sup>a</sup> 4 .012
LESS THEN 200000	1	6	2	5	0	<b>14</b>						
LESS THEN 300000	0	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>						
MORETHEN 300000	1	1	1	1	0	<b>4</b>						
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>22*</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>75</b>						
Cross tabulation between Income and COD8 (Lack of facilities)							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t	ANOVA Sig.		



Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total			test	value
LESS THAN 100000	25	10	5	8	8	56	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	27.867 <sup>a</sup> 4 .000	Sig. (2-tailed) .000	<b>0.814</b>
LESS THEN 200000	6	1	3	2	2	14				
LESS THEN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	1				
MORETHEN 300000	1	2	0	1	0	4				
<b>Total</b>	<b>33*</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>75</b>				
<b>Cross tabulation between Income and COD9 (Too much Cost of living)</b>							<b>Chi- Square Test</b>			
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	20.67 <sup>a</sup> 4 .000	<b>One Sample t test</b> Sig. (2-tailed) .000	<b>ANOVA</b> <b>Sig. value</b> <b>0.650</b>
LESS THAN 100000	20	17	5	9	5	56				
LESS THEN 200000	4	4	2	1	3	14				
LESS THEN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	1				
MORETHEN 300000	0	3	0	1	0	4				
<b>Total</b>	<b>25*</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>75</b>				
<b>Cross tabulation between Income and COD10 (Lack of promotional opportunities)</b>							<b>Chi- Square Test</b>			
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Chi-Square Df Asymp. Sig.	16.00 <sup>a</sup> 4 .003	<b>One Sample t test</b> Sig (2-tailed) .000	<b>ANOVA</b> <b>Sig. value</b> <b>0.483</b>
LESS THAN 100000	19	14	12	7	4	56				
LESS THEN 200000	2	5	6	1	0	14				
LESS THEN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	1				
MORETHEN 300000	0	2	0	2	0	4				
<b>Total</b>	<b>22*</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>75</b>				

**Source: Primary Data & Computed**

Table 8.1 is the continuation of the previous table 8. In this table 8.1 , the result of chi-square, one sample t test and ANOVA which is indicated in this table ensure that there was a relationship between income and cause of dissatisfaction. In addition, there was a cumulative influence of income on cause of dissatisfaction of employees. Cross tab indicates that the level of response of instructors towards their level of income based on different variables of cause of dissatisfaction.

**Table – 8.2: Consolidated table of results checking association, combined influence between Income and dependent variables by using Chi-square test, One Sample t test and ANOVA**

Cross tabulation between Income and COD11(Lack of self – job satisfaction )							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t test Sig. (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.393</b>
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Chi-Square Df	Asymp. Sig.		
LESS THAN 100000	13	19	10	6	8	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square Df 4	Asymp. Sig. .012		
LESS THEN 200000	1	6	2	3	2	<b>14</b>				
LESS THEN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>				
MORETHEN 300000	0	2	0	1	1	<b>4</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>27*</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>75</b>				
Cross tabulation between Income and COD12 (Lack of transparency in operations )							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t test Sig. (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.097</b>
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Chi-Square Df	Asymp. Sig.		
LESS THAN 100000	15	17	9	12	3	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square Df 4	Asymp. Sig. .032		
LESS THEN 200000	2	3	4	4	1	<b>14</b>				
LESS THEN 300000	1	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>				
MORETHEN 300000	0	1	0	2	1	<b>4</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21*</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>75</b>				
Cross tabulation between Income and COD13 (Lack of Research opportunities)							Chi- Square Test		One Sample t test Sig. (2-tailed) .000	ANOVA Sig. value <b>0.086</b>
Income /Opinion	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Chi-Square Df	Asymp. Sig.		
LESS THAN 100000	.13	14	12	10	7	<b>56</b>	Chi-Square Df 4	Asymp. Sig. .463		
LESS THEN 200000	0	4	3	6	1	<b>14</b>				

LESS THEN 300000	0	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>				
MORETHEN 300000	0	1	0	2	1	<b>4</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19*</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>75</b>				

**Source: Primary Data & Computed**

In the above table 8.2, chi-square, one sample t test and ANOVA results, it was concluded that there was a significant relationship between income and cause of dissatisfaction and combined influence also exists from independent variable on dependent factors.

## 7. FINDINGS

- It was found that there is a significant relationship between age and attitude of instructors towards level of satisfaction at 5% level of significance. The researcher's concluded out of paired sample t test is that, the age of instructors may differ but their attitude may not differ towards their level of satisfaction.
- It was found that that out of paired sample t test results at 5% level of significance, there is a significant relationship between inadequate salary and cause of dissatisfaction.
- It was found that there is significant relationship between absence of recognition and cause of dissatisfaction.
- As per the result of paired sample t test, it was concluded that there is a relationship between rigidity and cause of dissatisfaction.
- It was concluded that there is a significant relationship between absence of career development and cause of dissatisfaction. It tries to explain that, if there is no scope for future development then there may a possibility of getting dissatisfaction by instructors.
- It was found that from table 8, 8.1, 8.2, out of the result of one sample t test, Chi-square and ANOVA ensures that there is a relationship, cumulative influence of independent variable (Income) on dependent factors relates with cause of dissatisfaction.

## 8. SUGGESTIONS

- It is recommended that the university should try to satisfy instructors within their jurisdiction, rules and regulation which permits them to extent their facilities and perquisites to increase the level of satisfaction and to reduce dissatisfaction among instructors for the growth of the organisation.

- It is suggested that the concerned authorities to take measures to provide adequate salary based the instructor's qualification, experience and performance when they take decision with regard to wage and salary structure and at the time of planning to hike in salary or to do any modification with those things.
- It is endorsed that, there should be a suitable recognition should be maintained by top authorities among instructors. If not, it may cause dissatisfaction which ultimately leads to employee turnover in the institution finally. So protective steps to be taken to identify the right candidate / instructors and those people properly recognised otherwise the organisation may lose talented instructors. Due to this reason either they may quit from the present institution otherwise they may not be that much attentive or show their interest for the growth of that organisation. Hence necessary remedial measures required at the earliest.
- It is advisable to the management to take instantaneous steps to eliminate unnecessary and meaningless rigidity which is the output of egoistic character of higher officials, ultimately leads to organisational failure. Some kind of counselling, training or workshop required to counsel higher officials to make their minds to deal their subordinates diplomatically and respectfully to maintain good relationship to achieve organisational outcomes.
- It was also recommended that the certain corrective steps to be taken to provide career development for instructors to enhance their satisfaction level by enhancing their academic qualification to uplift their organisation to upgrade the standard of education in the coming years at a larger extent.
- As per the result of analysis of variance, it was proved that there is a cumulative influence of income on variables connected with cause of dissatisfaction. it indicates that the fluctuations in the level of instructors income surely creates impact or effect on all variables relates with cause of dissatisfaction.

## 9. CONCLUSION

Out of findings and discussions, the researchers finally concluded that the employee turnover may arise mainly because of one of these four factors such as in-adequate salary and facilities, absence of adequate recognition, rigidity and no scope for career development. So first, these factors should be given due consideration to upgrade the satisfaction level and to reduce dissatisfaction among employees. In researchers point of view , reasonable salary, unbiased

treatment, reasonable workload, proper timely recognition, adequate performance appraisal system, timely financial assistance, job security , adequate infrastructure, exit interview , effective grievance redressed system , periodical counselling , good working conditions, reasonable perquisites , open discussions, diplomatic approach between superior and subordinate, maintaining transparency , collecting periodical feedback report at all levels and discussing those feedback in meeting to make constructive decisions may leads to job satisfaction among instructors. On the other side delayed response, delayed salary, increment, promotion, lack of quick decisions, high work load, discomfort feeling, lack of self-job satisfaction, hiding information's, lack of freedom of expression, speech, intentional punishments from management side may leads to high dissatisfaction among instructors. It is up to the management, higher officials or higher educational institutions to decide, what kind of approach they have to maintain to deal with their subordinates. The former one leads to satisfaction, later one leads to dissatisfaction, dis satisfaction leads to employee turnover. Therefore the final conclusion is that unless otherwise, if there is no positive thinking, attitude or positive approach from higher officials or from top management then there is no solution for dissatisfaction and reduction of employee turnover in any organisation at any time. It's quite impossible.

## REFERENCES

- <https://study.com>
- <https://mba-lectures.com>
- <https://www.slideshare.net>
- <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in>
- <http://journals.sagepub.com/>
- <http://ajbmr.com/>