



# The Relationship between Lecturer Performance Factors and Increased Insight, Strategy, and Impact on Higher Education Students

Emma Budi Sulistiarini<sup>1\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Industrial Engineering Department, Engineering Faculty, Widyagama University Of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received March 14, 2024

Accepted July 12, 2024

Available online July 25, 2024

### Kata Kunci:

Kinerja Dosen, Kepuasan Kerja, Remunerasi, Tugas, Lingkungan Kerja, Gender

### Keywords:

Lecturer Performance, Job Satisfaction, Remuneration, Duties, Work Environment, Gender



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

Copyright © 2024 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

## ABSTRAK

Permasalahan yang dihadapi para dosen di perguruan tinggi dalam mencapai kepuasan kerja yang optimal sangatlah banyak. Hal ini mendesak untuk diteliti karena ada perbedaan antara harapan dan kenyataan di lapangan lingkungan kerja para dosen perguruan tinggi. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi tingkat kepuasan kerja dosen di pendidikan tinggi, dengan penekanan khusus pada remunerasi, tugas dan bagaimana lingkungan kerja. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah kuantitatif dengan melibatkan 127 dosen pendidikan tinggi yang dipilih secara acak. Teknik pengumpulan datanya menggunakan kuesioner yang telah diuji validitasnya melalui pilot study terhadap 55 responden. Data yang dikumpulkan kemudian dianalisis dengan SPSS Versi 26.0 dengan pengujian uji t dan ANOVA dalam mengetahui perbedaan signifikan tingkat kepuasan kerja berdasarkan faktor-faktor tertentu seperti jenis kelamin, pengalaman mengajar, dan kualifikasi tertinggi. Hasilnya, ditemukan bahwa tidak terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan tingkat kepuasan kerja berdasarkan faktor remunerasi, tugas, dan lingkungan kerja berdasarkan jenis kelamin, pengalaman mengajar, dan kualifikasi di pendidikan tinggi. Kesimpulannya adalah faktor-faktor tertentu seperti remunerasi, tugas dan lingkungan kerja tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap tingkat kepuasan kerja dosen. Implikasi praktis dari temuan ini adalah pentingnya memperhatikan faktor-faktor lain yang mungkin berkontribusi terhadap kepuasan kerja dosen pendidikan khusus dan mengembangkan strategi untuk meningkatkan kesejahteraan mereka dalam mendukung siswa.

## ABSTRACT

There are many problems faced by lecturers in higher education in achieving optimal job satisfaction. This is urgent to research because there is a difference between expectations and reality in the work environment of university lecturers. The aim of this research is to analyze factors that influence the level of job satisfaction of lecturers in higher education, with special emphasis on remuneration, duties, and how the work environment. The research method used was quantitative involving 127 randomly selected higher education lecturers. The data collection technique uses a questionnaire whose validity has been tested through a pilot study of 55 respondents. The data collected was then analyzed using SPSS Version 26.0 using the t-test and ANOVA to determine significant differences in job satisfaction levels based on certain factors such as gender, teaching experience, and highest qualifications. As a result, it was found that there were no significant differences in the level of job satisfaction based on remuneration, duties, and work environment factors based on gender, teaching experience, and qualifications in higher education. The conclusion is that certain factors such as remuneration, duties, and work environment do not have a significant effect on the level of lecturer job satisfaction. A practical implication of these findings is the importance of paying attention to other factors contributing to special education faculty job satisfaction and developing strategies to enhance their well-being in supporting students.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the world, universities must have lecturers and the lecturer profession cannot be considered a career that can be undertaken by anyone, because only those who have the quality, skills, authority, qualifications, interest, high dedication, and enthusiasm for education have the right to become lecturers (García-álvarez et al., 2022; Matahela & van Rensburg, 2022). Lecturers' responsibilities in facing the challenges of the globalization era, as well as strengthening welfare and careers, also need special attention. However, to increase job satisfaction, lecturers can encourage and motivate them to continue to strive to improve their teaching skills, produce a better learning environment, and improve achievement through guidance to students. Lecturer job satisfaction is also closely related to involvement in decision-making, high autonomy in the workplace, working environmental conditions, and progress in student learning outcomes (Parcerisa et al., 2022; Arian et al., 2018; (Atmaca et al., 2020). In higher education, lecturers must educate their students to gain knowledge. They have to face the difficulties experienced by students, such as mental retardation, learning problems, emotional and behavioral problems, language and communication problems, physical and health issues, hearing problems, and vision problems. One of the challenges that lecturers in higher education need to overcome is ensuring students have strong self-management skills (Emanuel et al., 2021; Fernández-Gavira et al., 2022; Lawn et al., 2017; Nik Othman et al., 2024). This is to ensure that students are successful and have extraordinary achievements and always feel comfortable in the presence of lecturers and students must not feel embarrassed about their appearance. As much as possible, lecturers need to create a feeling of comfort in students so that the teaching and learning process can be successful (Tonguç & Ozaydin Ozkara, 2020; Leenknecht & Carless, 2023; (Selvaraj et al., 2021).

Therefore, lecturers need to have sufficient knowledge, skills, understanding, and ability to deal with these students. Apart from teaching duties, students are also burdened with clinical duties and student self-management (Carpenter et al., 2019; Jarva et al., 2021; Moxley et al., 2021). The quality and achievement of teaching objectives can be affected if this is not addressed. To ensure and protect the health of special education students while at university, special and careful care needs to be carried out periodically after every activity. Lecturers need to state important guidelines and rules that students must follow regarding personal hygiene. Students need to be given information about correct behavior to practice in everyday life. They also need to be trained to be independent and not just expect help from the people around them. This also shows the need for a deeper understanding of the difficulties faced by higher education lecturers in their efforts to educate ordinary students to gain satisfaction in their work (Arueyingho et al., 2023; Naparin & Binti Saad, 2017). Higher education lecturers must also provide teaching according to students' learning styles based on unique and diverse individual differences. Apart from that, lecturers must also be smart in detecting difficulties and disabilities that their students have. Therefore, this field requires special education lecturers to have a higher level of patience than other lecturers (Papakostas et al., 2021; Haleem et al., 2022; Hadi Mogavi et al., 2024).

The problem formulation focuses on the critical issue of job satisfaction among college lecturers. Although their role in educating students with various special needs is demanding, ensuring a high level of job satisfaction is essential to the well-being of lecturers and the effectiveness of the educational process in the work environment (Nwoko et al., 2023; Karakus et al., 2024; (Burić & Moè, 2020). Various faculties are currently facing problems in higher education, lecturers face unique challenges, including managing students with various disabilities and ensuring a conducive learning environment. However, factors such as salary, duties, and work environment have a significant influence on their level of job satisfaction (Alrawahi et al., 2020; Fazal et al., 2022; Li et al., 2020). Research shows that job satisfaction is closely related to faculty retention, motivation, and overall performance. Although experience and qualifications play a role in job satisfaction, the support and recognition provided by college administrators and educational institutions are critical in maintaining high levels of satisfaction among higher education faculty.

Additionally, the need for ongoing professional development and training to improve skills and competencies is critical to job satisfaction and teaching quality. Addressing the problem of job satisfaction among higher education lecturers requires a comprehensive approach that includes improving working conditions, providing adequate support, and offering opportunities for growth and advancement. By understanding and addressing the factors that influence job satisfaction, educational organizations can create a more supportive and satisfying environment for higher education lecturers, ultimately leading to improved outcomes for faculty and students. Determining job satisfaction among lecturers is a complex endeavor. Lecturer job satisfaction is positively related to problems that often arise in Colleges, namely lecturer professionalism, involvement in decision-making, lecturer development, lecturer abilities, perceptions of College climate, cohesiveness, and work atmosphere (Nordgren et al., 2021; Yuhertiana et al., 2024; Briones et al., 2022). Research finds that workplace atmosphere influences lecturers' job

satisfaction. In the college environment, faculty evaluate their job roles by determining how they feel when they come to work each day (Ismael & Yesiltas, 2020; Karami et al., 2020; Fatimah et al., 2022). Certain variables such as age, race, and gender are related to lecturer job satisfaction. In addition, workplace atmosphere, autonomous power in the classroom, support from administrators, and opportunities to lead, have significance in explaining differences in lecturers' job satisfaction levels. Lecturer involvement in the field of Special Education is caused by several factors. These include family pressure, no other choice, interest, wanting to find new experiences, and so on. However, it was found that some of them did not feel job satisfaction (Fütterer et al., 2023; Luque-Reca et al., 2022).

Previous research found that female lecturers were more satisfied than male lecturers. In terms of education level, graduate lecturers are more satisfied with their careers compared to lecturers who have or have not graduated from college. Meanwhile, less experienced lecturers feel less satisfied with their profession as lecturers compared to experienced lecturers (Salminen et al., 2021; Sulistiarini, 2021). Research on Chinese National Primary College (SRJKC) lecturers in Kelantan found that there were no significant differences in job satisfaction based on gender, level of education, and experience, but there were significant differences in job satisfaction based on class and College. Other research shows that one of the factors causing lecturer dissatisfaction with the teaching profession is the way salary increases are implemented (Arian et al., 2018). Rank, salary factor, workload that is not equivalent to other positions with the same qualifications, limited opportunities to increase knowledge and experience, work supervision, and administrative workload (Bousinakis & Halkos, 2021; Tao et al., 2015; Muluneh et al., 2022). In this regard, certain mechanisms were established to strengthen the teaching profession. Certain parties also need to take the initiative to encourage the younger generation to become lecturers and motivate experienced lecturers to continue pursuing this profession. Because the mission of education depends on how lecturers handle their work and how satisfied they are with their work.

The urgency of this research is the gap between theory, expectations, and reality in the higher education environment. Starting from the fact that in the world of education, lecturers have a very important task in supporting the development of students in higher education. However, there are challenges faced by these lecturers, such as limited resources, lack of support, as well as stigma and misunderstandings surrounding higher education. This can have an impact on the level of job satisfaction of lecturers in higher education. With this research, it is hoped that the factors that influence the job satisfaction of special education lecturers will be known, such as salary, duties, and work environment. So there is a gap between expectations, theories, and the reality experienced by college lecturers in their work environment. Through a deeper understanding of these factors, strategies can be developed to improve the welfare of these lecturers. The novelty of this research must be conducted to support increasing job satisfaction of special education lecturers, which will ultimately have a positive impact on the development of students with special needs and the retention of lecturers in this field. So this research aims to analyze factors that influence the level of job satisfaction of lecturers in higher education, with special emphasis on remuneration, duties, and how the work environment.

## 2. METHOD

The method used in this research is a quantitative research method with the type of regression (Bauer et al., 2021). This research is quantitative. In this research there are two variables; (a) the dependent variable is job satisfaction, and (b) the independent variables are gender, length of teaching experience, and the highest special education qualification obtained by the special education lecturer. Special education faculty play an important role in meeting the diverse learning needs of students with disabilities, including mental retardation, learning difficulties, emotional and behavioral problems, and physical impairments. The research sample was limited to 127 university lecturers who worked in the field of special education. Respondents in this research consisted of 127 lecturers in special higher education in Indonesia. These lecturers are actively involved in the Special Integration Program for Learning Disabilities at their respective universities. The selection of these lecturers as respondents is very important because they have direct experience and insight into the challenges and dynamics of teaching students with special needs.

The data collection technique in this research uses instruments. The instrument used in this research consists of research question indicators which contain items related to demographics, research samples, and the level of knowledge of education lecturers. A pilot study was conducted on 55 research respondents to obtain the validity and reliability of the items. The data collection process in this research involved collecting information from 127 university lecturers in the city of Malang, Indonesia. The data collection process was designed to capture a comprehensive understanding of the factors that influence job satisfaction, including remuneration, tasks, and work environment. To collect the necessary data, a series of research questions were developed, including demographics, details of the study sample, and the level of

knowledge and experience of special education faculty. Instrument validation was carried out with 55 research respondents to ensure the validity and reliability of the research questions and instruments.

Data analysis techniques use various statistical techniques to draw meaningful conclusions and insights. Descriptive statistics using SPSS Version 26.0 data analysis are used to summarize and present data clearly and concisely by looking at calculations of measures such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency to provide an overview of the level of job satisfaction of college lecturers based on various factors. Descriptive statistics help identify trends and patterns in data, highlighting areas of strength and areas that may require attention. T-test analysis was used to compare the average job satisfaction scores between various groups of research participants, such as men and women. This statistical test makes it possible to examine differences in job satisfaction based on gender, thereby providing insight into potential disparities or similarities in satisfaction levels between male and female special education lecturers. In addition, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to analyze variations in job satisfaction among special education lecturers based on factors such as length of teaching experience and highest qualification in special education. The data analysis process facilitated the identification of key drivers of job satisfaction and highlighted areas where improvement or intervention may be needed to enhance the well-being and effectiveness of higher education faculty, specifically in their important role in supporting students with special needs.

### 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### Result

The results of this research describe the findings in detail, starting from the level of knowledge of special education lecturers when managing student behavior with learning disabilities. Mean results, standard deviation, and test results for job satisfaction according to gender is show in [Table 1](#).

**Table 1.** Mean Results, Standard Deviation, and Test Results for Job Satisfaction According to Gender

	Gender	Minimal	Standard Deviation	N	T -Test	PValue
Remuneration	Man	49.17	18.55	67	0.492	0.631
	Woman	57.23	20.36	60		
Task	Man	72.83	23.35	67	0.365	0.716
	Woman	61.02	25.56	60		
Environment Work	Man	60.64	20.63	67	0.248	0.804
	Woman	49.49	22.07	60		

Note: Significant level at  $p < 0.05$

[Table 1](#) shows the results of the mean, standard deviation, and t-test of job satisfaction based on gender. For the remuneration factor, the mean for male lecturers is 49.17 with a standard deviation of 18.55 while the mean for female lecturers is 57.23. The t-test result was 0.482 and the p-value = 0.631. Because  $p > 0.05$ , hypothesis  $H_{01}$  (a) fails to be rejected. For the task factor, the mean for male lecturers is 72.83 with a standard deviation of 23.35, while the mean for female lecturers is 71.02 with a standard deviation of 25.56. Based on the results of the t-test, the calculated  $t_{value} = 0.365$  with  $p_{value} = 0.716$ . Because  $p > 0.05$ ,  $H_{01}$ (b) fails to be rejected. For work environment factors, the mean for male lecturers is 60.64 with a standard deviation of 20.63, while the mean for female lecturers is 49.49 with a standard deviation of 22.07. The t-test shown is 0.248 with  $p_{value} = 0.804$ . Because  $p > 0.05$ ,  $H_{01}$  (c) fails to be rejected.  $H_{02}$ : There is no significant difference in average job satisfaction based on factors (a) remuneration, (b) assignments, and (c) work environment for special higher education lecturers according to the lecturer's teaching experience. Mean results, standard deviation, and ANOVA test results for job satisfaction according to length of teaching experience is show in [Table 2](#).

**Table 2.** Mean Results, Standard Deviation, and ANOVA Test Results for Job Satisfaction According to Length of Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience	Minimal	Standard Deviation	N	ANOVA Test	PValue	
Remuneration	1-6 years	66.51	20.26	59	F = 1.361	0.252
	7-11 years	59.39	20.73	32		
	12-16 years	62.40	14.28	22		
	17-21 years	67.60	14.38	7		
	> 22 years old	74.00	0.00	7		
Task	1-6 years	67.90	25.55	52	F = 1.326	0.265

Teaching Experience		Minimal	Standard Deviation	N	ANOVA Test	P <sub>Value</sub>
Work environment	7-11 years	76.30	26.15	30	F = 1.298	0.275
	12-16 years	67.90	17.87	18		
	17-21 years	84.80	18.15	13		
	> 22 years old	93.00	0.00	14		
	1-6 years	69.40	21.91	62		
	7-11 years	63.98	23.06	32		
	12-16 years	60.56	15.55	22		
	17-21 years	73.40	15.57	6		
> 22 years old	78.90	0.00	3			

Note: Significant level at  $p < 0.05$

Table 2 shows the results of the respondents' assessments using the mean, standard deviation, and ANOVA test of job satisfaction according to length of teaching experience. For the remuneration factor, the mean for lecturers who have taught between 1 and 6 years. The ANOVA test results obtained for the assignment factor, the average for lecturers who have taught between 1 and 6 years is 67.90 with a standard deviation, the average for lecturers teaching with a standard deviation and the mean for lecturers who teach 21 years and over is 93.00 with a standard deviation of 0.00. The results of the ANOVA test showed that there were no significant differences in job satisfaction according to the length of teaching experience (remuneration, assignments, and work environment), the Tukey Post-Hoc Test was not carried out. Mean results, standard deviation, and ANOVA test results for job satisfaction according to higher education qualifications is show in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Mean Results, Standard Deviation, and ANOVA Test Results for Job Satisfaction According to Higher Education Qualifications

Highest pass in Special Education		Minimal	Standard deviation	N	Anova Test	P <sub>Value</sub>
Remuneration	Certificate	65.78	16.80	42	F = 2.569	0.098
	Diploma	54.79	17.90	37		
	Degrees	59.20	22.67	43		
	Lecturer	53.48	0.00	5		
Task	Certificate	60.55	21.60	42	F = 2.188	0,099
	Diploma	64.41	23.28	37		
	Degrees	73.50	28.90	43		
	Lecturer	62.00	0.00	5		
Work environment	Certificate	65.88	18.72	42	F = 2.345	0.094
	Diploma	53.46	20.23	37		
	Degrees	61.15	25.60	43		
	Lecturer	57.90	0.00	5		

Note: Significant level at  $p < 0.05$

Table 3 presented in this study shows the mean, standard deviation, and ANOVA test of job satisfaction according to the highest qualification in Special Education. In the remuneration factor, the mean of lecturers who have a short-term course. The ANOVA test results obtained  $F = 2.188$  with  $p_{value} = 0.099$ . Because  $p > 0.05$ ,  $H_{03}(b)$  fails to be rejected. The results of the ANOVA test show that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction according to the highest higher education qualification (remuneration, duties, and work environment), so the Tukey Post-Hoc Test was not carried out.

### Discussion

It was found that optimizing job satisfaction among higher education lecturers is an important aspect of ensuring the welfare of educators and the effectiveness of educational practices in supporting students with diverse student learning needs. Job satisfaction is a multifaceted concept that is influenced by various factors including remuneration, tasks, and work environment and this research is in line with research (Farmaki et al., 2022; Wyrwa & Kaźmierczyk, 2020). Discovering these factors on job satisfaction could provide valuable insight into how educational organizations can better support special education faculty in fulfilling their roles. When lecturers feel they are adequately compensated, this can have a positive impact on their motivation, morale, and overall job satisfaction. In the context of higher education, where



faculty often face unique challenges and responsibilities, ensuring that they receive fair remuneration is critical to retaining experienced and dedicated educators (Arian et al., 2018; Li et al., 2020). Professional development opportunities, mentoring programs, and access to teaching materials tailored to the needs of higher education students can empower faculty and contribute to their job satisfaction. This finding is in line with this opinion found that by recognizing the importance of clear job expectations and providing the necessary support, institutions can create a conducive environment for special education faculty to thrive (Shah et al., 2021).

The work environment, which includes factors such as college culture, administrative support, coworker relationships, and overall workplace atmosphere, has a significant impact on higher education faculty job satisfaction. A positive and supportive work environment encourages collaboration, communication, and professional growth among educators (Ismael & Yesiltas, 2020; Obaki, 2017). On the other hand, a toxic or unsupportive work environment can cause stress, burnout, and dissatisfaction among lecturers. Educational institutions must prioritize creating positive and inclusive work environments for special education faculty. This includes promoting a culture of mutual respect, providing opportunities for professional collaboration, and offering emotional and administrative support. By creating a supportive work environment, institutions can increase job satisfaction, retention rates, and the overall well-being of special education faculty (Karakus et al., 2024; Mgaiwa, 2021). Optimizing special education lecturers' job satisfaction requires a comprehensive approach that takes into account the relationship between remuneration, duties, and work environment.

The findings of this research provide several important factors for the management of educational organizations to increase and maintain the level of job satisfaction of university lecturers. Even though research findings show that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female lecturers, the aspect of job satisfaction remains an important element in determining employee contributions to the organization. This finding is in line with previous research that the performance of men is not significantly different from the performance of women in higher education (Kwiek, 2018; Galvão et al., 2019; Anwar et al., 2020). The research results also show that the length of teaching experience does not have a significant mean difference in job satisfaction. The results of the research show that the average lecturer's teaching experience on job satisfaction through remuneration, assignment, and work environment factors is higher at the level of teaching experience of 16 years and above compared to others (Buerkle et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2022). The findings show that student graduation rates do not have a significant difference with job satisfaction. The research results show that the highest average level of agreement on job satisfaction through remuneration, tasks, and work environment factors is higher. This illustrates that special education lecturers, regardless of their academic qualification level, are committed to carrying out their duties. This is different from research which found that most lecturers were dissatisfied with the salary offered because it was not in line with other positions that had the same qualifications and approval (Bilal et al., 2019; Mgaiwa, 2021).

The implications regarding the factors that influence lecturer job satisfaction in higher education are very significant, both for the development of educational policy and for managerial practice in educational institutions. The research results show that there is a difference between lecturers' expectations and the reality they face in the work environment (Prasetya, 2021; Sihombing, 2020). This indicates the need for more attention from institutional management to create a more supportive work environment. Although the research results show that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction based on remuneration factors, this does not mean that this aspect can be ignored. Competitive remuneration remains a key factor in attracting and retaining quality lecturers. Therefore, institutions need to carry out regular evaluations of the salary structure and allowances given to lecturers and ensure that they receive proper recognition for their contributions (Brinia et al., 2023; Calveti et al., 2020). Furthermore, this research also underlines the importance of clear communication between management and lecturers. Open and transparent communication regarding expectations, responsibilities, and performance evaluation can help lecturers feel more valued and involved in the decision-making process.

Limitations and challenges need to be considered when addressing the issues in this research. One of the main limitations in addressing job satisfaction among higher education lecturers is the complexity and diversity of the students they serve. Higher education faculty work with students who have a wide range of disabilities, learning needs, and behavioral challenges. This diversity can make it difficult to implement a universal approach to job satisfaction, as faculty may need support and resources tailored to the specific needs of their students. Another limitation is the lack of standard measures to assess job satisfaction among higher education lecturers. Although tools such as the Faculty Job Satisfaction Questionnaire can provide valuable insight, there may be limitations in capturing all factors that influence job satisfaction in this unique context. In conclusion, although optimizing job satisfaction among special education faculty is critical to increasing student success and faculty retention, it is important to acknowledge and address

limitations and challenges that may impact these goals. By recognizing and addressing these limitations through targeted interventions, support, and advocacy, educational organizations can create a more supportive and fulfilling environment for special education faculty, ultimately benefiting educators and students in the special education sector.

Recommendations can be implemented to address the unique challenges and needs of educators in this sector. Professional Development Opportunities: Educational institutions must prioritize providing ongoing professional development opportunities tailored to the specific needs of higher education lecturers. Training programs, workshops, and seminars that focus on inclusive teaching practices, behavior management strategies, and assistive technology can increase educators' skills and confidence in supporting students with diverse learning needs. Transparent communication channels and regular feedback sessions can help educators understand their role, set goals for professional growth, and address any concerns or challenges they may face in their work. Recognizing and appreciating the hard work and dedication of college lecturers is very important for increasing morale and job satisfaction. College administrators can implement recognition programs, awards, and appreciation events to recognize the contributions of higher education educators and demonstrate the value placed on their efforts in supporting students with disabilities.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This research concludes that optimizing job satisfaction among higher education faculty is critical to ensuring the success of students with diverse learning needs and the overall effectiveness of higher education programs. Job satisfaction is closely related to factors such as salary, assignments, and work environment, all of which play an important role in shaping the experience and well-being of lecturers in the field. Higher education faculty face unique challenges in their roles, including educating students with a wide range of disabilities, developing individualized education plans, and creating inclusive learning environments. The demanding nature of their responsibilities underscores the importance of recognizing and addressing the factors that contribute to job satisfaction in this profession. Remuneration is a key factor that influences job satisfaction among university lecturers. Fair and competitive compensation not only recognizes the dedication and expertise required for this role but also demonstrates the value of higher education educators' contributions.

#### 5. REFERENCES

- Alrawahi, S., Sellgren, S. F., Altouby, S., Alwahaibi, N., & Brommels, M. (2020). The application of Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation to job satisfaction in clinical laboratories in Omani hospitals. *Heliyon*, 6(9), e04829.1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04829>.
- Anwar, N., Nik Mahmood, N. H., Yusliza, M. Y., Ramayah, T., Noor Faezah, J., & Khalid, W. (2020). Green Human Resource Management for organisational citizenship behaviour towards the environment and environmental performance on a university campus. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 256(2), 120401.1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120401>.
- Arian, M., Soleimani, M., & Oghazian, M. B. (2018). Job satisfaction and the factors affecting satisfaction in nurse educators: A systematic review. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 34(5), 389-399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2018.07.004>.
- Arueyingho, O., Chitchyan, R., & Bird, C. (2023). Career progression and skills in Smart Local Energy Systems. *Applied Energy*, 349(July), 121596.1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121596>.
- Atmaca, Ç., Rızaoğlu, F., Türkdöğän, T., & Yaylı, D. (2020). An emotion focused approach in predicting teacher burnout and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 90(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103025>.
- Bauer, G. R., Churchill, S. M., Mahendran, M., Walwyn, C., Lizotte, D., & Villa-Rueda, A. A. (2021). Intersectionality in quantitative research: A systematic review of its emergence and applications of theory and methods. *SSM - Population Health*, 14(April), 100798.1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100798>.
- Bilal, Guraya, S. Y., & Chen, S. (2019). The impact and effectiveness of faculty development program in fostering the faculty's knowledge, skills, and professional competence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences*, 26(4), 688-697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjbs.2017.10.024>.
- Bousinakis, D., & Halkos, G. (2021). Creativity as the hidden development factor for organizations and employees. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 71(July 2021), 645-659. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2021.07.003>.

- Brinia, V., Katsionis, C., Gkouma, A., & Vrekousis, I. (2023). Attitudes and Perceptions of School Principals about the Contribution of Evaluation to the Efficient Operation of Schools Both at the Administrative and Educational Levels. *Education Sciences*, 13(4), 366. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040366>.
- Briones, E., Gallego, T., & Palomera, R. (2022). Creative Drama and Forum Theatre in initial teacher education: Fostering students' empathy and awareness of professional conflicts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 117(2), 103809.1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103809>.
- Buerkle, A., O'Dell, A., Matharu, H., Buerkle, L., & Ferreira, P. (2023). Recommendations to align higher education teaching with the UN sustainability goals – A scoping survey. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 5(August), 100280.1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100280>.
- Burić, I., & Moè, A. (2020). What makes teachers enthusiastic: The interplay of positive affect, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 89, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103008>.
- Calvetti, D., Mêda, P., Gonçalves, M. C., & Sousa, H. (2020). Worker 4.0: The future of sensorized construction sites. *Buildings*, 10(10), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/BUILDINGS10100169>.
- Carpenter, R., DiChiacchio, T., & Barker, K. (2019). Interventions for self-management of type 2 diabetes: An integrative review. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 6(1), 70–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2018.12.002>.
- Emanuel, F., Ricchiardi, P., Sanseverino, D., & Ghislieri, C. (2021). Make soft skills stronger? An online enhancement platform for higher education. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2(December), 100096.1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100096>.
- Farmaki, A., Pappas, N., Kvasova, O., & Stergiou, D. P. (2022). Hotel CSR and job satisfaction: A chaordic perspective. *Tourism Management*, 91(June 2021), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104526>.
- Fatimah, F., Sarbaini, S., & Arisanty, D. (2022). Leading in Entrepreneurial Universities: Do Demographics Display Different Commitments? *Frontiers in Education*, 7(July), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.882735>.
- Fazal, S., Masood, S., Nazir, F., & Majoka, M. I. (2022). Individual and Organizational Strategies for Promoting Work–Life Balance for Sustainable Workforce: A Systematic Literature Review from Pakistan. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(18), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811552>.
- Fernández-Gavira, J., Castro-Donado, S., Medina-Rebollo, D., & Bohórquez, M. R. (2022). Development of emotional competencies as a teaching innovation for higher education students of physical education. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010300>.
- Fütterer, T., van Waveren, L., Hübner, N., Fischer, C., & Sälzer, C. (2023). I can't get no (job) satisfaction? Differences in teachers' job satisfaction from a career pathways perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 121(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103942>.
- Galvão, A., Mendes, L., Marques, C., & Mascarenhas, C. (2019). Factors influencing students' corporate social responsibility orientation in higher education. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 215(2), 290–304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.059>.
- García-álvarez, J., Vázquez-Rodríguez, A., Quiroga-Carrillo, A., & Caamaño, D. P. (2022). Transversal Competencies for Employability in University Graduates: A Systematic Review from the Employers' Perspective. *Education Sciences*, 12(3), 1-37. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12030204>.
- Hadi Mogavi, R., Deng, C., Juho Kim, J., Zhou, P., D. Kwon, Y., Hosny Saleh Metwally, A., Tlili, A., Bassanelli, S., Bucchiarone, A., Gujar, S., Nacke, L. E., & Hui, P. (2024). ChatGPT in education: A blessing or a curse? A qualitative study exploring early adopters' utilization and perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 2(1), 100027.1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100027>.
- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, 3(February), 275–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004>.
- Ismael, F., & Yesiltas, M. (2020). Sustainability of CSR on organizational citizenship behavior, work engagement and job satisfaction: Evidence from Iraq. *Revista de Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala*, 71(1), 212–249. <https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.71.15>.
- Jarva, E., Mikkonen, K., Tuomikoski, A. M., Kääriäinen, M., Meriläinen, M., Karsikas, E., Koivunen, K., Jounila-llola, P., & Oikarinen, A. (2021). Healthcare professionals' competence in stroke care pathways: A mixed-methods systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 30(9–10), 1206–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15612>.
- Karakus, M., Toprak, M., & Chen, J. (2024). Demystifying the impact of educational leadership on teachers' subjective well-being: A bibliometric analysis and literature review. *Educational Management*



- Administration and Leadership*, 22(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432241242629>.
- Karami, A., White, C. N., Ford, K., Swan, S., & Yildiz Spinel, M. (2020). Unwanted advances in higher education: Uncovering sexual harassment experiences in academia with text mining. *Information Processing and Management*, 57(2), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2019.102167>.
- Kwiek, M. (2018). High research productivity in vertically undifferentiated higher education systems: Who are the top performers? *Scientometrics*, 115(1), 415–462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2644-7>.
- Lawn, S., Zhi, X., & Morello, A. (2017). An integrative review of e-learning in the delivery of self-management support training for health professionals. *BMC Medical Education*, 17(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-017-1022-0>.
- Leenknecht, M. J. M., & Carless, D. (2023). Students' feedback seeking behaviour in undergraduate education: A scoping review. *Educational Research Review*, 40(July), 100549.1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100549>.
- Li, Y., Huang, H., & Chen, Y. Y. (2020). Organizational climate, job satisfaction, and turnover in voluntary child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105640.1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105640>.
- Luque-Reca, O., García-Martínez, I., Pulido-Martos, M., Lorenzo Burguera, J., & Augusto-Landa, J. M. (2022). Teachers' life satisfaction: A structural equation model analyzing the role of trait emotion regulation, intrinsic job satisfaction and affect. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 113(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103668>.
- Matahela, V. E., & van Rensburg, G. H. (2022). Motivation as a facilitator of self-leadership in nurse academics. *Heliyon*, 8(6), e09580.1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09580>.
- Mgaiwa, S. J. (2021). Academics' job satisfaction in Tanzania's higher education: The role of perceived work environment. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 4(1), 100143.1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2021.100143>.
- Moxley, E., Maturin, L. J., & Habtezege, D. (2021). A lesson involving nursing management of diabetes care: Incorporating simulation in didactic instruction to prepare students for entry-level practice. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 16(1), 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2020.09.007>.
- Mulneh, M. D., Moges, G., Abebe, S., Hailu, Y., Makonnen, M., & Stulz, V. (2022). Midwives' job satisfaction and intention to leave their current position in developing regions of Ethiopia. *Women and Birth*, 35(1), 38–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2021.02.002>.
- Naparin, H., & Binti Saad, A. (2017). Infographics in Education : Review on Infographics Design. *The International Journal of Multimedia & Its Applications*, 9(4/5/6), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.5121/ijma.2017.9602>.
- Nik Othman, N. N. J., Mohd Kamaruzaman, F., & Rasul, M. S. (2024). Challenges in engaging students with learning disabilities in food industry. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 13(4), 2357. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i4.28124>.
- Nordgren, K., Kristiansson, M., Liljekvist, Y., & Bergh, D. (2021). Collegial collaboration when planning and preparing lessons: A large-scale study exploring the conditions and infrastructure for teachers' professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 108(1), 103513.1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103513>.
- Nwoko, J. C., Emeto, T. I., Malau-Aduli, A. E. O., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2023). A Systematic Review of the Factors That Influence Teachers' Occupational Wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(12), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20126070>.
- Obaki, S. O. (2017). Impact of Classroom Environment on Childrens Social Behavior. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61/2017.5.1/61.1.1.7>.
- Papakostas, G. A., Sidiropoulos, G. K., Papadopoulou, C. I., Vrochidou, E., Kaburlasos, V. G., Papadopoulou, M. T., Holeva, V., Nikopoulou, V. A., & Dalivigkas, N. (2021). Social robots in special education: A systematic review. *Electronics (Switzerland)*, 10(12), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics10121398>.
- Parcerisa, L., Verger, A., Pagès, M., & Browes, N. (2022). Teacher Autonomy in the Age of Performance-based Accountability: A Review based on Teaching Profession Regulatory Models (2017-2020). *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 30(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.14507/EPAA.30.6204>.
- Prasetya, R. E. (2021). Effectiveness of Teaching English for Specific Purposes in LMS Moodle: Lecturers' Perspective. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 6(1), 93. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v6i1.498>.
- Salminen, L., Tuukkanen, M., Clever, K., Fuster, P., Kelly, M., Kielé, V., Koskinen, S., Sveinsdóttir, H., Löytyniemi, E., & Leino-Kilpi, H. (2021). The competence of nurse educators and graduating nurse students. *Nurse Education Today*, 98(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2021.104769>.

- Selvaraj, A., Radhin, V., KA, N., Benson, N., & Mathew, A. J. (2021). Effect of pandemic based online education on teaching and learning system. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 85(May), 102444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2021.102444>.
- Shah, S. S., Shah, A. A., Memon, F., Kemal, A. A., & Soomro, A. (2021). Online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: Applying the self-determination theory in the 'new normal.' *Revista de Psicodidactica*, 26(2), 169–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psicod.2020.12.004>.
- Sihombing, M. (2020). The Effect of Transformational Leadership, Work Discipline, and Satisfaction on Lecturers' Performance at the Tarbiyah and Teaching Faculty of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. *Journal of K6 Education and Management*, 3(2), 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.11594/jk6em.03.02.01>.
- Sulistiari, E. (2021). Merdeka dalam Pengembangan Berkelanjutan. In *Merdeka dalam Pengembangan Berkelanjutan* (pp. 371–375).
- Tao, H., Ellenbecker, C. H., Wang, Y., & Li, Y. (2015). Examining perception of job satisfaction and intention to leave among ICU nurses in China. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences*, 2(2), 140–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2015.04.007>.
- Tonguç, G., & Ozaydin Ozkara, B. (2020). Automatic recognition of student emotions from facial expressions during a lecture. *Computers and Education*, 148(August 2019), 103797.1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103797>.
- Wyrwa, J., & Kaźmierczyk, J. (2020). Conceptualizing job satisfaction and its determinants: A systematic literature review. *Ekonomicheskaya Sotsiologiya*, 21(5), 138–168. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1726-3247-2020-5-138-168>.
- Yuhertiana, I., Izaak, W. C., Rahmawati, A., & Sucahyati, D. (2024). Creative performance of lecturers in post-pandemic COVID 19: evidence from Indonesia. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2369974>.
- Zhao, W., Zhang, J., Liu, X., & Jiang, Z. (2022). Application of ISO 26000 in digital education during COVID-19. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, 13(3), 101630.1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2021.10.025>.