

***Building Academic Staff Portfolio to Increase Employee Retention:
A Case Study of a Thai University***

Pannarat Kadish, Rangsit University, Thailand
Maureen Ricafort, Webster University, Thailand

The IAFOR International Conference on Education - Dubai 2015
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

The competition to retain the best employees, specifically learned and research-active faculty members, is now a challenge for universities in Thailand. Retaining these kind of employees is crucial in the growth of universities and in maintaining its QA rating. The Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) requires all universities, both public and private, to comply with the standards of Quality Assurance for continuous quality improvement. Key areas of QA requirements as mentioned by Thaima (2012) which is directed at building academic staff portfolio includes: Teaching & Learning, Research and Provision of Academic Services to the Community. This research paper aims to examine employee retention through employee job satisfaction and its relationship with university support in building academic staff portfolio. Moreover, this study aims to present a clear understanding of the key areas in academic staff portfolio which complies with the requirements of OHEC and how it is perceived by employees as contributing factors to employee job satisfaction thus employee retention. The results of this study will aid the university in identifying key areas in building academic staff portfolio that they should focus on or build upon to retain outstanding employees. It will also assist the university in recognizing the importance of building academic staff portfolio in understanding the needs and expectations of their faculty members.

Keywords: Employee Job Satisfaction, Employee Retention, Academic Staff Portfolio, Reward and Recognition, Training and Development

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

The competition to retain the best employees, specifically learned and research-active faculty members, is now a challenge for universities in Thailand. Retaining these kind of employees is critical in the growth of universities and in maintaining its QA rating. The Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC), Ministry of Education requires all universities, both public and private, to comply with the standards of Quality Assurance for continuous quality improvement. Key areas of QA requirements focus on Teaching & Learning, Research, Provision of Academic Services to the Community and Preservation of Art & Culture. Among these four key areas, the first three key areas overlap with building academic staff portfolio.

Employee job satisfaction measures how happy employees are with their jobs and their working environment so much so they would stay with the organization for a longer period of time, thus employee retention. Losing critical employees according to Ramlall (2004) incurs significant economic disadvantage of a minimum of one year's pay and benefits to a maximum of two for the company.

While different variables contribute to the satisfaction of employees, rewards and recognition as well as training and career development are at the forefront. Hence, this study aims to examine employee retention through employee satisfaction in relation to the support given by the current university to the academic staff.

Literature Review

While satisfaction refers to the level of fulfilment of one's needs, wants and desires (Morse, 1997), employee satisfaction refers to the fulfilment of one's needs, wants and desires at work (Sageer, Rafat, and Agarwal, 2012). Employee satisfaction describes how happy employees are of his or her position of employment (Moyes, Shao & Newsome, 2008) that is resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Islam & Siengthai, 2009).

Satisfied employees tend to be more productive and responsive (Heskett et al, 1994), increases customer satisfaction (Carpitella, 2003) and decreases employee turnover (Maloney & McFillen, 1986). A competitive salary scheme, a functional working environment, career developments, training and education opportunities and a good relationship with colleagues contribute to employee satisfaction (Aydin & Ceylan, 2009). Employees are more productive and loyal when they are satisfied (Hunter & Tietjen, 1997), thereby they stay longer with an organization.

The necessity to retain qualified employees in the higher education sector stems from the need to provide quality education, develop institutional effectiveness and attain accreditation, consequently a higher QA rating from the OHEC in Thailand. Employee retention is now an emerging issue in the workforce management of the near future.

Retention is the process where employees are encouraged to remain with the organization for the maximum period of time (James & Mathew, 2012; Ratna & Chawla, 2012; Balakrishnan & Vijayalakshmi, 2014). It involves strategies and measures taken by employers to create and foster a work environment where

motivating factors are presented to encourage employees to stay with the organization. Thus, this article is focused on key areas of QA requirements in relation to building academic portfolio.

Thaima (2012) described the primary objectives of each key area of QA requirements as described by the National Education Act. According to Thaima, the first key area or folio 1, Teaching & Learning, is directed at the primary objective of universities, colleges and institutions in providing knowledge and skills that would assist their students to be successful in their lives.

The second key area or folio 2, Research, is aimed at encouraging faculty members to conduct research studies supporting the country's goal of self-reliance for continued social and economic development. The third key area or folio 3, Provision of Academic Services to the Community, strives for community development through the provision of different kinds of academic services.

Research Methodology

The study aims to conduct a primary research on the rate of satisfaction of employees when it comes to university support in building academic staff portfolio. The primary objective of the study is to establish a correlation between employee satisfaction and employee retention. The study was carried out using a survey questionnaire in collecting primary data from respondents of a Thai university.

A total of 332 completed questionnaires (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970) were gathered out of the 1,000 disseminated questionnaires. Respondents of the study are limited to faculty members and employee satisfaction is in terms of rewards, recognition, training and career development which is relevant to building academic staff portfolio linked to Thai QA requirements.

A structured and standardized questionnaire scale was developed by the researcher to collect quantitative information. The questionnaire is composed of a demographic section, statements regarding employee satisfaction on university support and determinants of employee retention. The questionnaire was also translated into Thai language for the purpose of ease of data collection.

Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means and standard deviations were generated and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) and correlation were applied in the analysis of data to identify the relationship between employee satisfaction on university support in building academic staff portfolio and employee retention. Any information gathered in the survey will only be used for academic writing purposes.

Research Design: Descriptive Research
Sampling Unit: Faculty Members
Sampling Method: Convenience Sampling
Sampling Size: 332 Respondents
Data Collection Method: Primary Data
Research Instrument: Questionnaire

The Objectives of the Study

The study aimed to address the following objectives:

- To identify a correlation between employees satisfaction with regards to university support in building academic staff portfolio and employee retention.
- To identify significant relationship between demographic factors of respondents and employee satisfaction as with regards to university support in building academic staff portfolio.
- To aid the university by identifying areas in building academic staff portfolio compliant with Thailand's Quality Assurance requirements that would engage and retain employees.

Hypotheses

Researchers found that demographic factors such as gender, age, educational attainment, length of service and income have a significant and positive relationship with employee satisfaction. For instance, Sageer, Rafat & Agarwal (2012) identified age, gender, and educational attainment as significant determinants of employee satisfaction. It was stated in their study that the younger the employees are, the higher the energy level and the more satisfied they are with their jobs.

The same can be said with educational attainment of employees, the higher the education level, the more opportunities to develop personality traits that could lead to better evaluation process and satisfaction in the workplace. Additionally, the study indicated that women tends to be more satisfied than men when it comes to employee satisfaction. A similar research by Ghafoor (2012) affirmed that demographic factors such as gender, qualification, experience, rank/designation, job status and salary of academic staff positively influences job satisfaction while age has no significant impact.

Moreover, several research studies conducted is directed at identifying employee retention and organizational commitment. A study by Balakrishnan & Vijayalakshmi (2014) focused on job satisfaction leading to retention of qualified faculty members. It was stated in this study that better compensation package, scope of advancement and improvements, better training or working experience, better access to institution sponsored training, workshops and seminars, among others significantly affects the performance and retention in an organization. Another research study conducted by Iqbal (2010), confirmed that organizational tenure or length of service is significantly and positively associated with organizational commitment and thus retention.

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant difference between Gender and Employee Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference between Age and Employee Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference between Educational Attainment and Employee Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant difference between Length of Service in Current University and Employee Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant difference between Length of Service as an Academician and Employee Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6: There is a significant difference between Academic Title and Employee Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 7: There is a significant difference between Monthly Income and Employee Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 8: Employee satisfaction on university support in building academic portfolio is significantly and positively associated with Employee Retention.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Factors

The first section of the survey yielded demographic information on the sample being studied. Demographic data is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Academic Staff

Characteristics (N=332)	N	%
Gender:		
Male	115	34.6
Female	217	65.4
Age:		
<20 years	0	0.0
20-29 years	88	26.5
30-39 years	104	31.3
40-49 years	105	31.6
50-59 years	29	8.7
>60 years	6	1.8
Educational Attainment:		
Bachelor	107	32.2
Master	205	61.7
Doctorate/PhD	18	5.4
Others	2	0.6
Length of Service in Current University		
<1 year	46	13.9
1-5 years	193	58.1
6-10 years	55	16.6
>10 years	38	11.4
Length of Service as Academician		
<1 year	14	4.2
1-5 years	114	34.3
6-10 years	101	30.4
>10 years	103	31.0
Academic Title/Rank		
Instructor/Lecturer	210	63.3
Assistant Professor	9	2.7
Associate Professor	1	0.3
Professor	0	0.0
Professor Emeritus	0	0.0
Others	112	33.7
Monthly Income (in THB)		
<20,000 Baht	68	20.5
20,000-50,000 Baht	220	66.3
50,001-100,000 Baht	44	13.3
>100,000 Baht	0	0.0

Descriptive Analysis of Employee Satisfaction

The second section of the survey described in Table 2 determines the level of satisfaction of employees as with regards to the support they are receiving from the university in line with building their academic portfolio. 9 factors were divided into 3 Folios, Folio 1 described university support with regards to teaching and learning factors, Folio 2 described university support with regards to research factors, and Folio 3 described university support with regards to provision of services to the community. The overall average showed that 89.5% of the academic staff were

satisfied with what they are receiving as university support in the 3 folios, while only 10.1% are neutral and 0.4% was dissatisfied. Out of the 3 folios, the third folio received the highest satisfied average rating with a 90.7% followed by the second folio with a 90.3% and the first folio with an 87.6%.

Table 2: Level of Employee Satisfaction

		Level of Satisfaction					
		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied	
		R.	%	R.	%	R.	%
Folio 1							
1	Student feedback on faculty evaluation communicated to the faculty.	2	0.6	53	16.0	277	83.5
2	Nomination for teaching rewards and recognition.	1	0.3	36	10.8	295	88.9
3	Participation and contribution to the delivery of continuing professional development programs.	2	0.6	30	9.0	300	90.4
Average		2	0.5	40	11.9	291	87.6
Folio 2							
1	Competitive funding relating to publication of scholarly works and conference participation.	1	0.3	40	12.0	291	87.7
2	Publication of scholarly journals, book chapters and textbooks.	0	0.0	29	8.7	303	91.3
3	Participating in collaborative research with other universities, industry, community groups or public agencies.	1	0.3	26	7.8	305	91.9
Average		1	0.2	32	9.5	300	90.3
Folio 3							
1	Dissemination of knowledge through projects, seminars and workshops that impacts community members.	2	0.6	40	12.0	290	87.4
2	Provision of professional expertise to community members and local practitioners.	2	0.6	29	8.7	301	90.7
3	Participation in public affairs and contribution to the development of public policy at a regional, national or international level.	1	0.3	19	5.7	312	94.0
Average		2	0.5	29	8.8	301	90.7
Overall Average		1	0.4	34	10.1	297	89.5

R. = Repetition

Descriptive Analysis of Employee Retention

The third section of the survey determines the level of satisfaction of employees as with regards to retention factors. Only 2 factors were described in this section and 88.3% of respondents indicated a satisfied rating while only 11.4% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 0.3% was dissatisfied.

Table 3: Level of Employee Satisfaction on Retention Factors

		Level of Satisfaction					
		Dissatisfied		Neither		Satisfied	
		R.	%	R.	%	R.	%
1	The university provides continuous effort in supporting the development of academic portfolio.	2	0.6	41	12.3	289	87.1
2	The university uses academic portfolio in determining promotions.	0	0.0	35	10.5	297	89.4
Average		1	0.3	38	11.4	293	88.3

R. = Repetition □

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

One way ANOVA was conducted to determine any significant difference among the demographic factors and employee satisfaction with university support on building academic staff portfolio.

Findings from the ANOVA test between gender and employee satisfaction revealed that there are no significant differences for all the nine factors in three folios, between respondent's gender and their satisfaction with university support on building academic portfolio. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is rejected.

Results of the ANOVA test on significant differences between age and employee satisfaction is shown on Table 4. 8 out of 9 factors proved to have significant differences thus hypothesis 2 is accepted for these 8 factors. Results also show that the younger age group (20-29 years and 30-39 years) has the highest means of employee satisfaction on university support in developing academic portfolio.

Table 4: Analysis of Variance of Age and Employee Satisfaction

	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Student feedback	20-29 yrs	4.06	.488	5.668	.000
	30-39 yrs	4.13	.592		
	40-49 yrs	3.90	.603		
	50-59 yrs	3.66	.614		
	>60 yrs	3.67	.516		
Teaching rewards & recognition	20-29 yrs	4.20	.550	8.223	.000
	30-39 yrs	4.25	.535		
	40-49 yrs	4.02	.537		
	50-59 yrs	3.69	.660		
	>60 yrs	3.67	.516		
Professional development programs	20-29 yrs	4.25	.552	5.025	.001
	30-39 yrs	4.27	.578		
	40-49 yrs	4.11	.593		
	50-59 yrs	3.83	.658		
	>60 yrs	3.67	.516		
Research funding	20-29 yrs	4.16	.523	2.395	.050
	30-39 yrs	4.16	.576		
	40-49 yrs	4.01	.628		
	50-59 yrs	3.86	.581		
	>60 yrs	4.17	.408		
Publication of research works	20-29 yrs	4.22	.535	3.087	.016
	30-39 yrs	4.25	.498		
	40-49 yrs	4.09	.574		
	50-59 yrs	3.90	.673		
	>60 yrs	4.17	.408		
Collaborative research	20-29 yrs	4.30	.438	4.317	.002
	30-39 yrs	4.26	.540		
	40-49 yrs	4.11	.625		
	50-59 yrs	3.86	.639		
	>60 yrs	4.00	.000		
Provision of professional expertise	20-29 yrs	4.25	.509	5.990	.000
	30-39 yrs	4.17	.565		
	40-49 yrs	3.94	.456		
	50-59 yrs	3.93	.753		
	>60 yrs	3.67	.816		
Contribution to development of public policy	20-29 yrs	4.31	.488	5.482	.000
	30-39 yrs	4.25	.517		
	40-49 yrs	4.04	.437		
	50-59 yrs	3.97	.823		
	>60 yrs	3.83	.753		

Table 5 illustrates the findings from the ANOVA test between educational attainment of respondents and their satisfaction. 5 out of 9 factors from the three folios given supported the acceptance of hypothesis 3, stating that there are significant differences between educational attainment and employee satisfaction. The test also proved that the highest satisfaction rating from respondents came from the lowest educational attainment (Bachelor degree). Only one factor, collaborative research, gained the highest employee satisfaction rate than the others from respondents with a Doctorate/PhD degree.

Table 5: Analysis of Variance of Educational Attainment and Employee Satisfaction

	Educational Attainment	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Teaching rewards & recognition	Bachelor	4.19	.631	4.694	.003
	Master	4.10	.515		
	Doctorate	3.83	.618		
	Others	3.00	1.414		
Professional development programs	Bachelor	4.20	.606	2.729	.044
	Master	4.17	.570		
	Doctorate	4.11	.676		
	Others	3.00	1.414		
Collaborative research	Bachelor	4.24	.580	3.465	.017
	Master	4.16	.550		
	Doctorate	4.22	.647		
	Others	3.00	.000		
Provision of professional expertise	Bachelor	4.14	.606	6.396	.000
	Master	4.09	.501		
	Doctorate	3.94	.416		
	Others	2.50	2.121		
Contribution to development of public policy	Bachelor	4.30	.518	10.731	.000
	Master	4.13	.502		
	Doctorate	3.94	.416		
	Others	2.50	2.121		

□

The outcome from the ANOVA test on length of service in current university and employee satisfaction is supported by Table 6. Hypothesis four, accepted by 6 out of 9 factors of the study, stated a significant difference between length of service and employee satisfaction. Respondents with less than five years but more than one year tenure in the current university gained the highest means of employee satisfaction for all 6 factors.

Table 6: Analysis of Variance of Length of Service in Current University and Employee Satisfaction

	Length of Service in Current University	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Student feedback	<1 yr.	3.93	.490	2.703	.046
	1-5 yrs.	4.06	.588		
	6-10 yrs.	3.93	.634		
	>10 yrs.	3.79	.577		
Teaching rewards & recognition	<1 yr.	4.07	.533	5.988	.001
	1-5 yrs.	4.20	.545		
	6-10 yrs.	4.00	.544		
	>10 yrs.	3.82	.692		
Professional development programs	<1 yr.	4.09	.590	4.598	.004
	1-5 yrs.	4.26	.538		
	6-10 yrs.	4.02	.623		
	>10 yrs.	3.97	.753		
Collaborative research	<1 yr.	4.11	.482	4.024	.008
	1-5 yrs.	4.27	.530		
	6-10 yrs.	4.09	.586		
	>10 yrs.	3.97	.753		
Provision of professional expertise	<1 yr.	4.13	.453	5.783	.001
	1-5 yrs.	4.18	.530		
	6-10 yrs.	3.87	.511		
	>10 yrs.	3.92	.749		
Contribution to development of public policy	<1 yr.	4.13	.499	4.308	.005
	1-5 yrs.	4.25	.511		
	6-10 yrs.	4.00	.430		
	>10 yrs.	4.03	.753		

The ANOVA test on length of service as academician and employee satisfaction proved that hypothesis five should be accepted for only 5 out of the 9 factors stated in the questionnaire.

Table 7 indicates that the three factors of folio 1 gained the highest means of employee satisfaction from respondents who has served to be academicians for less than 10 years but more than five years. While the factor “provision of professional expertise” gained the highest satisfaction rating from respondents with less than a year of serving as academicians, the factor “contribution to development of public policy” gained the highest satisfaction rate from respondents of more than one year to less than five years of academic experience.

Table 7: Analysis of Variance of Length of Service as Academician and Employee Satisfaction

	Length of Service as Academician	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Student feedback	<1 yr	3.93	.616	4.087	.007
	1-5 yrs	4.03	.540		
	6-10 yrs	4.11	.581		
	>10 yrs	3.83	.612		
Teaching rewards & recognition	<1 yr	4.14	.663	7.460	.000
	1-5 yrs	4.18	.536		
	6-10 yrs	4.24	.532		
	>10 yrs	3.89	.593		
Professional development programs	<1 yr	4.14	.663	3.990	.008
	1-5 yrs	4.20	.567		
	6-10 yrs	4.29	.589		
	>10 yrs	4.01	.602		
Provision of professional expertise	<1 yr	4.21	.579	4.091	.007
	1-5 yrs	4.19	.530		
	6-10 yrs	4.11	.564		
	>10 yrs	3.94	.557		
Contribution to development of public policy	<1 yr	4.21	.579	4.743	.003
	1-5 yrs	4.30	.497		
	6-10 yrs	4.15	.498		
	>10 yrs	4.03	.585		

The ANOVA findings on significant differences between the academic title and employee satisfaction lead to the acceptance of hypothesis 6 by 5 out of 9 factors. Table 8 which illustrates the mean values, shows that the highest number of respondents (63.3% are instructors and lecturers) gained nearly as high as the employee satisfaction means of respondents under the “Others” category.

Table 8: Analysis of Variance of Academic Title and Employee Satisfaction

	Academic Title	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Teaching rewards & recognition	Lecturer	4.10	.552	4.461	.004
	Asst Prof	3.56	.527		
	Assoc Prof	3.00	.		
	Others	4.16	.594		
Professional development programs	Lecturer	4.17	.592	3.706	.012
	Asst Prof	3.67	.500		
	Assoc Prof	3.00	.		
	Others	4.21	.592		
Publication of research works	Lecturer	4.13	.546	3.939	.009
	Asst Prof	3.78	.667		
	Assoc Prof	3.00	.		
	Others	4.24	.541		
Collaborative research	Lecturer	4.16	.572	3.041	.029
	Asst Prof	3.89	.601		
	Assoc Prof	3.00	.		
	Others	4.26	.549		
Contribution to development of public policy	Lecturer	4.13	.487	5.239	.002
	Asst Prof	3.78	.667		
	Assoc Prof	3.00	.		
	Others	4.28	.588		

Findings from the ANOVA test between monthly income and employee satisfaction appears on Table 9. Hypothesis 7 is accepted for almost all nine factors except the first factor of folio 3, “dissemination of knowledge through projects, seminars and workshops that impacts community members”. Table 9 shows that the higher the salary bracket of the respondent, the lesser they are satisfied with the university support in building academic portfolio.

Table 9: Analysis of Variance of Monthly Income and Employee Satisfaction

	Monthly Income	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Student feedback	<20,000 Tsh	4.16	.507	6.848	.001
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	3.98	.604		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	3.75	.534		
Teaching rewards & recognition	<20,000 Tsh	4.35	.512	13.764	.000
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	4.09	.582		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	3.80	.462		
Professional development programs	<20,000 Tsh	4.31	.580	4.820	.009
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	4.16	.605		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	3.95	.526		
Research funding	<20,000 Tsh	4.24	.461	4.930	.008
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	4.08	.599		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	3.89	.618		
Publication of research works	<20,000 Tsh	4.32	.502	4.682	.010
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	4.13	.537		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	4.02	.664		
Collaborative research	<20,000 Tsh	4.35	.512	4.995	.007
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	4.16	.566		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	4.02	.628		
Provision of professional expertise	<20,000 Tsh	4.25	.529	3.607	.028
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	4.05	.579		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	4.02	.457		
Contribution to development of public policy	<20,000 Tsh	4.34	.507	5.039	.007
	20,000-50,000 Tsh	4.14	.532		
	50,001-100,000 Tsh	4.05	.569		

□

Correlations

A correlation analysis, at a significant level of 0.01 (2-tailed) was also used to test hypothesis 8 of the study, focusing on a significant and positive association of employee retention and employee satisfaction on university support in building academic portfolio. Table 10 shows a positive correlation on all nine factors of employee satisfaction and employee retention.

Two factors, “participating in collaborative research with other universities, industry, community groups or public agencies” and “dissemination of knowledge through projects, seminars and workshops that impacts community members” gained the strongest positive correlation with employee retention factor “the university provides continuous effort in supporting the development of academic portfolio.” While “participating in collaborative research with other universities, industry, community groups or public agencies” gained the strongest positive correlation with retention factor “the university uses academic portfolio in determining promotions”, the second strongest correlation was from the factor “publication of scholarly journals, book chapters and textbooks”.

Table 10 : Correlation among Employee Satisfaction and Employee Retention

	Monthly Income	Continuous effort provided by the university in support of developing academic portfolio	University use academic portfolio in determining promotions
Student feedback	Pearson Correlation	.412**	.373**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Teaching rewards & recognition	Pearson Correlation	.370**	.422**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Professional development programs	Pearson Correlation	.405**	.384**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Research funding	Pearson Correlation	.448**	.443*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Publication of research works	Pearson Correlation	.483**	.472**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Collaborative research	Pearson Correlation	.518**	.497**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Dissemination through projects, seminars and workshops	Pearson Correlation	.528**	.460**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Provision of professional expertise	Pearson Correlation	.494**	.434**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332
Contribution to development of public policy	Pearson Correlation	.439**	.416**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000
	N	332	332

Conclusion

The results of the study indicated that six out of seven demographic factors, age, educational attainment, length of service in the current university, length of service as academician, academic title and monthly income, revealed a significant difference as with regards to employee satisfaction on university support in building academic portfolio.

This finding is consistent with other research studies wherein demographic factors affects employee satisfaction (Acuna et al, 2009; Malik, 2011; Urosevic & Milijic, 2012; Ghafoor, 2012). But unlike Ghafoor (2012), this study revealed that there is no significant difference among gender and employee satisfaction on university support in building academic portfolio.

Furthermore, this study indicated that younger academicians at the age bracket of 20-39 years, with a bachelor's degree and instructor or lecturer academic title, whose employment at the current university is less than five years but more than 1 year, has been an academician for less than 10 but more than 5 years, and has an income of less than 20,000 THB, affirmed that they are more satisfied than others, revealed through high ratings/high mean score in employee satisfaction scale, with the university

support in building academic portfolio. An indication of the finding regarding educational attainment as stated by Mowday et al (1982) reveals that the higher the educational attainment, the less satisfied you are, as expectations rise as well. Iqbal (2010) on the other hand confirmed that organizational tenure leads to organizational commitment and retention. The second objective is addressed by these results.

A positive relationship between employee satisfaction and employee retention was also revealed in the study but three factors gained the strongest correlation with employee retention factors. Respondents who gave high ratings on publication of scholarly works, participation in collaborative research and dissemination of knowledge through projects, seminars and workshops, have a high satisfaction rate on retention factors of continuous support in the development of academic portfolio and academic portfolio as one of the basis for determining promotions. The first objective is addressed by these results.

Employees who are satisfied with their jobs are likely to stay with the organization longer. Retention strategies as Lockwood (2006) defined, are integrated strategies aiming to increase workplace productivity through improved processes focused on attracting, developing, retaining and utilizing people with required skills and aptitude. On the basis of the results of this study, universities in Thailand should focus more on the provision of university support in the publication and dissemination of scholarly works. This in turn would attend to the requirements of the Office of Higher Education Commission's quality assurance requirements of universities.

References

- Acuna, S.T., Gomez, M., & Juristo, N. (2009). How do personality, team processes and task characteristics relate to job satisfaction and software quality? *Information and Software Technology*, 51 (3), 627-639, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/J.infsof.2008.08.006>
- Aydin, B and Ceylan, A (2009). *Does organizational learning capacity (OLC) have impact on organizational effectiveness? Research analysis of the metal industry*. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 23 (3) 21 – 23.
- Balakrishnan, L., & Vijayalakshmi, M. (2014). *A Study on Retention Strategy's followed by Education Institutions in Retaining Qualified Employees*. *SIES Journal of Management*, 10(1), 69-80.
- Carpitella, B. (2003). *Make residential construction the industry of choice* (Electronic Version). Professional Builder.
- Cranny, C.J., Smith, P.C., & Stone, E.F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington.
- Danish, R. Q., & Usman, A. (2010). *Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: An empirical study from Pakistan*. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(2), P159.
- Ghafoor, M.M. (2012). *Role of demographic characteristics on job satisfaction*. *Far East Research Centre*, 6 (1), 30-45
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R., & Balkin, D.B. (1992). Determinants of Faculty Pay: An Agency Theory Perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal*. 35(5), 921-955.
- Guidelines for Developing an Academic Portfolio. *UTS.EDU.AU*. Retrieved December 30, 2014, from <http://www.iml.uts.edu.au/scholarship-research/acporfolio.html#what>
- Heskett, J.L., Jones, T.O., Loveman, G.W., Sasser Jr., W.E., & Schlesinger. (1994). *Putting the service-profit chain to work*. *Harvard Business Review* 72(2).
- Hunter, W., & Tietyen, D. (1997). *Business to business marketing: Creating a community of customers*. Lincolnwood-Illinois, McGraw-Hill Professional.
- Islam, M.Z., & Siengthai, S. (2009). *Quality of work life and organisational performance: empirical evidence from Dhaka Export Processing Zone*. Paper presented at the ILO Conference on 'Regulating for Decent Work', held at the International Labour Office, Geneva, July 8–10.
- Iqbal, A. (2010). *An Empirical Assessment of Demographic Factors, Organizational Ranks and Organizational Commitment*. *International Journal of Business and Mnaagement*, 5(3), 17-27.

- James, L., & Mathew, L. (2012). *Employee Retention Strategies: IT Industry*. SCMS Journal of Indian Management, 9(3), 79-87.
- Jun, M., Cai, S., and Shin, H. (2006). *TQM practice in maquiladora: antecedents of employee satisfaction and loyalty*. Journal of Operations Management, 24, 791-812.
- Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Determining Sample Size for Research Activities*. Educational and Psychological Measurement.
- Larkin, R., & Burgess, J. (2013). *The Paradox of Employee Retention for Knowledge Transfer*. Employment Relations Record, 13(2), 32-43.
- Lockwood, N.R. (2006). *Talent management: driver for organizational success*. SHRM Research Quarterly, 51(6), 1-11.
- Malik, N. (2011). *Study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at university of Balochistan*. International Journal of Academic Research, 3 (1), 267-272
- Maloney, W.F. & McFillen, J.M. (1986). *Motivational implications of construction work*. Journal of Construction Engineering and management, 137-151.
- Martensen, A., & Grønholdt, L. (2006). *Internal Marketing: A study of employee loyalty, its determinants and consequences*. Innovative Marketing, 2(4), 92-116.
- Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D. (1990). *A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment*. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 171-194.
- Morse, N.C. (1977). *Satisfaction in the white-collar job*. Ayer publishing.
- Mowday R., Porter L. and Steers R. 1982. *Employee Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Moyes, G. D., & Shao, L. P., Newsome, M. (2008). *Comparative analysis of employee job satisfaction in the accounting profession*. Journal of Business & Economics Research, 6(2), 65-81
- Ramlall, S. (2004). *A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations*. Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge 5(1/2), 52-63.
- Ratna, R., & Chawla, S. (2012). *Key factors of Retention and Retention Strategies in Telecom Sector*. Global Management Review, 6(3), 35-46.
- Rizwan, M., Khan, W. M., Tariq, H. M. A., Ghaffar, A., Anjum, M. Z., & Bajwa, E. U. (n.d.) *Empirical Study of Employee Job Satisfaction*.

Sageer, A., Rafat, S. and Agawal, P. (2012). *Identification of variables affecting employee satisfaction and their impact on the organization*. Journal of Business and Management, 5 (1), pp. 32-39.

Singh, G., & Prakash, A. (2013). *A Study on Analysis of factors Related to Employee's Retention among Organized Retail Sector in Two Tier City*. Amity Global Business Review, 8131-140.

Sloan Work and Family Research Network, Boston College: Workforce Planning for Wisconsin State Government. (2005). *Employee Retention*. Retrieved December 30, 2014, from <https://workfamily.sas.upenn.edu/glossary/r/retention-definitions>

Thaima, W. (2012). *Internal Quality Assessment in Thai Higher Education*. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Thought, 2(2), 389-396.

Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). *Scholarship of teaching: a model*. Higher Education Research & Development, 19, 155-168.

Turkyilmaz, A., Akman, G., Ozkan, C., & Pastuszak, Z. (2011). *Empirical study of public sector employee loyalty and satisfaction*. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 111(5), 675-696.

Urošević, S., Milijić, N. (2012). *Influence of Demographic Factors on Employee Satisfaction and Motivation*. Organizacija, 45(4), 174-182.

Welcome to ISC, RSU. *CIELRSU.com*. Retrieved December 29, 2014, from <http://www.cielrsu.com/>