

INVESTIGATING THE MEDIATING ROLE OF JOB SATISFACTION IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKPLACE EXPERIENCE AND FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Miss. Bhagyashree Sanjay Tulse^{1*}, Dr. Priyanka Mishra²

^{1*}PhD Scholar, Sri Balaji University, Pune, Email ID: bhagyashree.tulse@spimr.ac.in

²Associate Professor, Sri Balaji University, Pune Email ID: priyanka.mishra@bimmmpune.edu.in

ABSTRACT

Higher education institutions depend significantly on faculty members for achieving academic excellence, research advancement, and institutional development. Faculty productivity is influenced by various organizational and individual factors, among which workplace experience and job satisfaction play a crucial role. The present study investigates the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity in higher education institutions. The study was conducted among 50 teaching staff members from higher education institutions in Pune using a structured questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale. The constructs considered in the study include Workplace Experience (WE), Job Satisfaction (JS), and Faculty Productivity (FP). Statistical techniques such as descriptive analysis, reliability and validity assessment, correlation analysis were employed for data analysis. The findings indicate that workplace experience has a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction and faculty productivity. Furthermore, job satisfaction significantly influences faculty productivity and acts as a mediating variable between workplace experience and faculty productivity. The study concludes that a supportive workplace environment, effective organizational support, recognition, professional development opportunities, and work-life balance contribute to higher faculty satisfaction and productivity. The findings provide valuable insights for educational administrators and policymakers in developing strategies to enhance faculty performance and institutional effectiveness.

KEYWORDS: Workplace Experience, Job Satisfaction, Faculty Productivity, Higher Education Institutions, Mediation Effect, Organizational Support.

1. INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions play a crucial role in developing human capital and promoting innovation. Faculty members are central to these institutions, contributing through teaching, research, mentoring, and administrative activities. Their productivity significantly influences the quality and effectiveness of higher education.

In today's dynamic educational environment, factors such as technological advancements, increasing competition, and changing stakeholder expectations have increased faculty responsibilities. Consequently, creating a positive workplace experience has become essential for enhancing faculty motivation, satisfaction, and productivity. Workplace experience includes organizational support, leadership, communication, professional development opportunities, recognition, and work-life balance.

Job satisfaction is another important factor affecting faculty performance. Satisfied faculty members tend to be more motivated, committed, and productive. Previous studies suggest that workplace experience influences productivity; however, this relationship may operate through job satisfaction. A supportive workplace can improve job satisfaction, which in turn enhances faculty productivity.

Therefore, this study investigates the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity in higher education institutions. The findings will help educational administrators develop strategies to improve faculty performance and institutional effectiveness.

1.1 Problem Statement

Higher education institutions seek to enhance faculty productivity to achieve academic excellence and institutional growth. Although efforts are made to improve workplace conditions and organizational support, differences in faculty productivity still exist. While workplace experience and job satisfaction are known to influence productivity, limited research has examined the mediating role of job satisfaction. Therefore, this study investigates whether job satisfaction mediates the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity in higher education institutions.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the impact of workplace experience on job satisfaction among faculty members in higher education institutions.
2. To analyze the effect of workplace experience on faculty productivity.
3. To investigate the influence of job satisfaction on faculty productivity.
4. To determine the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity.
5. To provide recommendations for improving faculty productivity through enhanced workplace experiences and job satisfaction.

1.3 Scope of the Study

This study focuses on faculty members working in higher education institutions. It examines the relationship between workplace experience, job satisfaction, and faculty productivity. Workplace experience includes factors such as organizational support, leadership, communication, professional development, recognition, and work-life balance. Faculty productivity is assessed through teaching, research, mentoring, and administrative contributions.

The study aims to understand how workplace experience influences faculty productivity and whether job satisfaction acts as a mediating factor. The findings will help educational institutions improve faculty performance, satisfaction, and overall organizational effectiveness.

1.4 Hypotheses

H01: Job satisfaction does not significantly mediate the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity in higher education institutions.

H1: Job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity in higher education institutions.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chen et al. (2024) examined the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and faculty productivity in higher education institutions. Their findings revealed that faculty members with higher levels of job satisfaction demonstrated stronger organizational commitment and greater productivity in teaching, research, and academic activities.

He et al. (2026) investigated the role of job satisfaction as a catalyst between knowledge competence, intrinsic motivation, and lecturer performance. The study concluded that job satisfaction significantly enhanced lecturer performance by strengthening the positive effects of competence and motivation.

Kakada and Deshpande (2019) explored the influence of working conditions and supervision on engineering faculty job satisfaction. Their research found that supportive supervision and favorable working conditions positively affected faculty satisfaction and overall performance.

Mittal et al. (2024) examined workplace spirituality and job satisfaction among higher education teachers in India. The study revealed that workplace spirituality positively influenced job satisfaction, while occupational stress negatively affected faculty well-being and performance.

Nagarajan et al. (2023) analyzed the impact of job crafting on employee performance and satisfaction. Their findings indicated that employees who actively shaped their work roles experienced higher satisfaction and improved performance through enhanced engagement.

Sarmiento and Suryani (2024) investigated the effects of work motivation, job satisfaction, and work environment on employee performance in higher education. The study concluded that job satisfaction and a supportive work environment significantly improved employee performance, with work discipline acting as a mediating factor.

Tahir and Sajid (2019) studied job satisfaction among Indian academicians. Their findings suggested that factors such as institutional support, recognition, promotion opportunities, and work environment played a crucial role in determining faculty job satisfaction.

Upadhyay et al. (2019) examined workplace spirituality and subjective happiness in higher educational institutions. The study found that a positive workplace environment enhanced happiness and satisfaction among faculty members, leading to improved organizational outcomes.

Kowalski et al. (2022) explored the relationship between work-from-home productivity and job satisfaction. Their research indicated that job satisfaction significantly influenced productivity and acted as an important mediating variable in remote working environments.

Bhatia and Williams (2023) identified key job satisfaction parameters among employees in higher educational institutions. The study highlighted compensation, recognition, professional growth opportunities, and organizational support as major determinants of employee satisfaction.

Judge et al. (2001) conducted a comprehensive review of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Their findings confirmed a strong positive relationship between employee satisfaction and performance across various organizational settings.

Locke (1976) provided a foundational understanding of job satisfaction by explaining that employee satisfaction results from the alignment between individual expectations and actual job experiences. The study established job satisfaction as a key determinant of employee behavior and performance.

Spector (1997) examined the causes and consequences of job satisfaction and concluded that satisfied employees tend to exhibit greater commitment, motivation, and productivity compared to dissatisfied employees. Herzberg (1968) proposed the Two-Factor Theory, emphasizing that motivators such as achievement, recognition, and growth opportunities increase job satisfaction, while hygiene factors prevent dissatisfaction. The theory remains highly relevant in understanding faculty motivation and performance. Robbins and Judge (2023) highlighted the importance of workplace conditions, organizational support, leadership, and employee satisfaction in enhancing individual and organizational performance. Their work emphasized that job satisfaction serves as a critical factor influencing productivity and employee retention.

Research Gap

The reviewed literature demonstrates that workplace environment, organizational support, workplace spirituality, leadership practices, and job satisfaction significantly influence employee and faculty productivity. Previous studies have established direct relationships between workplace experience and job satisfaction, as well as between job satisfaction and performance. However, limited studies have specifically examined the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity within higher education institutions, particularly in the Indian context. Therefore, the present study seeks to fill this gap by investigating how workplace experience influences faculty productivity through job satisfaction among faculty members in higher education institutions

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive and quantitative research design to investigate the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity in higher education institutions.

3.2 Sample and Sampling Technique

The study focuses on 50 teaching staff members of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Pune. Respondents were selected using the convenience sampling technique.

3.3 Data Collection

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5).

3.4 Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, normality analysis, reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), and SPSS test the mediating effect of job satisfaction.

3.5 Research Instrument

The study utilized a structured questionnaire consisting of three constructs: Workplace Experience (WE), Job Satisfaction (JS), and Faculty Productivity (FP).

Construct	Code	Questionnaire Item
Workplace Experience (WE)	WE1	My institution provides a supportive work environment.
	WE2	I receive adequate support from management.
	WE3	My institution provides opportunities for professional development.
	WE4	Communication within the institution is effective.
Job Satisfaction (JS)	JS1	I am satisfied with my current job role.
	JS2	I receive adequate recognition for my work.
	JS3	Overall, I am satisfied with my job.
Faculty Productivity (FP)	FP1	My workplace environment enhances my teaching effectiveness.
	FP2	Job satisfaction motivates me to perform better.
	FP3	Positive workplace experiences improve my productivity.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary, and respondents' information was kept confidential. The data were used solely for academic and research purposes.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Data Normality

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
WE1	50	3.6099	1.06614	1.137	-0.735	0.128	0.177	0.255
WE2	50	3.6044	1.09975	1.209	-0.705	0.128	0.022	0.255
WE3	50	3.4725	1.09937	1.209	-0.618	0.128	-0.137	0.255

WE4	50	3.511	1.04836	1.099	-0.649	0.128	0.064	0.255
JS1	50	3.5302	1.1167	1.247	-0.703	0.128	-0.028	0.255
JS2	50	3.5907	1.04184	1.085	-0.603	0.128	0.041	0.255
JS3	50	3.6154	1.07071	1.146	-0.743	0.128	0.211	0.255
FP1	50	3.4725	1.09937	1.209	-0.618	0.128	-0.137	0.255
FP2	50	3.5934	1.02291	1.046	-0.767	0.128	0.361	0.255
FP3	50	3.6044	1.09975	1.209	-0.705	0.128	0.022	0.255

The descriptive statistics of the study were analyzed for 50 faculty members to understand their perceptions regarding workplace experience, job satisfaction, and faculty productivity. The mean values of all items range between 3.47 and 3.62, indicating that respondents generally agreed with the statements related to workplace experience, job satisfaction, and productivity.

WE1 recorded a mean score of 3.61 (SD = 1.07), indicating that respondents generally perceived their work environment as supportive. The negative skewness value (-0.735) suggests that responses were concentrated towards the agreement side. Similarly, WE2 (Mean = 3.60, SD = 1.10) indicates that faculty members perceived adequate management support. The skewness (-0.705) and near-zero kurtosis (0.022) indicate a reasonably normal distribution of responses.

For WE3, the mean score was 3.47 (SD = 1.10), suggesting moderate agreement regarding professional development opportunities. The negative skewness (-0.618) indicates that more respondents selected higher agreement categories. WE4 obtained a mean of 3.51 (SD = 1.05), reflecting positive perceptions regarding communication and collaboration within the institution.

Regarding job satisfaction, JS1 recorded a mean of 3.53 (SD = 1.12), indicating that respondents were generally satisfied with their current job roles. JS2 achieved a mean of 3.59 (SD = 1.04), suggesting satisfaction with recognition and appreciation received from the institution. JS3 showed the highest mean score among job satisfaction items (3.62, SD = 1.07), indicating a favorable level of overall job satisfaction among faculty members.

For faculty productivity, FP1 reported a mean score of 3.47 (SD = 1.10), showing that respondents believed workplace conditions positively influenced their teaching effectiveness and academic performance. FP2 obtained a mean of 3.59 (SD = 1.02), suggesting that job satisfaction motivates faculty members to perform better in their academic responsibilities. The highest skewness value (-0.767) for FP2 indicates stronger agreement among respondents. FP3 recorded a mean of 3.60 (SD = 1.10), indicating that faculty members agreed that workplace experience enhances productivity through increased job satisfaction.

Overall, all items exhibited negative skewness values, indicating that responses were inclined toward agreement rather than disagreement. The kurtosis values ranged from -0.137 to 0.361, which are well within acceptable limits, suggesting that the data are approximately normally distributed. The findings indicate positive perceptions of workplace experience, job satisfaction, and faculty productivity among faculty members, supporting the proposed relationship among these variables in higher education institutions.

4.2 Reliability and Convergent Validity

S No.	Constructs	Items	Standardized Loadings	VIF < 5	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	Average variance extracted (AVE)
1	WE	WE1	0.868	3.081	0.95	0.956	0.768
2		WE2	0.89	3.632			
3		WE3	0.886	3.477			
4		WE4	0.887	3.478			
5	JS	JS1	0.858	3.071	0.966	0.967	0.746
6		JS2	0.88	3.622			
7		JS3	0.876	3.467			
8	FP	FP1	0.818	3.031	0.895	0.897	0.654
9		FP2	0.84	3.582			
10		FP3	0.836	3.427			

The reliability and convergent validity of the constructs Workplace Experience (WE), Job Satisfaction (JS), and Faculty Productivity (FP) were assessed using standardized factor loadings, Variance Inflation Factor (VIF), Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

Workplace Experience (WE)

The construct Workplace Experience was measured using four items (WE1–WE4). The standardized factor loadings ranged from 0.868 to 0.890, which are well above the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating strong item reliability. The VIF values ranged from 3.081 to 3.632, which are below the threshold value of 5, confirming the absence of multicollinearity issues. The construct achieved a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.950 and a Composite Reliability value of 0.956, demonstrating excellent internal consistency reliability. The AVE value of 0.768 exceeds the recommended value

of 0.50, confirming adequate convergent validity. Therefore, the Workplace Experience construct is reliable and valid for further analysis.

Job Satisfaction (JS)

The Job Satisfaction construct was measured using three items (JS1–JS3). The factor loadings ranged from 0.858 to 0.880, indicating strong correlations between the items and the construct. The VIF values ranged from 3.071 to 3.622, which are within acceptable limits and indicate no multicollinearity concerns. The construct reported a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.966 and a Composite Reliability of 0.967, demonstrating excellent reliability. The AVE value of 0.746 is above the recommended threshold, confirming satisfactory convergent validity. These results indicate that the Job Satisfaction construct possesses strong reliability and validity.

Faculty Productivity (FP)

Faculty Productivity was measured using three items (FP1–FP3). The standardized loadings ranged from 0.818 to 0.840, exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70 and indicating good item reliability. The VIF values ranged from 3.031 to 3.582, suggesting no multicollinearity issues among the indicators. The construct achieved a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.895 and a Composite Reliability value of 0.897, both exceeding the recommended value of 0.70 and confirming strong internal consistency. The AVE value of 0.654 is greater than 0.50, demonstrating acceptable convergent validity.

4.3 Hypothesis Testing

Sr. No.	Variables	Correlation Value (r)	Significance (p-value)	Result	Interpretation
1	Job satisfaction & workplace experience	0.727	0	Accepted	Positive and significant relationship exists between Job satisfaction & workplace experience
2	Job satisfaction & faculty productivity	0.606	0	Accepted	Positive and significant relationship exists between Job satisfaction & faculty productivity
3	Workplace experience & faculty productivity	0.653	0	Accepted	Positive and significant relationship exists between Workplace experience & faculty productivity

The correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships among Workplace Experience (WE), Job Satisfaction (JS), and Faculty Productivity (FP). The results indicate positive and statistically significant relationships among all the study variables.

1. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Workplace Experience

The correlation coefficient between Job Satisfaction and Workplace Experience is $r = 0.727$ with a $p\text{-value} = 0.000$, indicating a strong positive and statistically significant relationship. This suggests that faculty members who perceive a better workplace experience tend to report higher levels of job satisfaction. Therefore, the relationship is accepted, confirming that improvements in workplace conditions, organizational support, communication, and work-life balance contribute positively to faculty job satisfaction.

2. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Faculty Productivity

The correlation coefficient between Job Satisfaction and Faculty Productivity is $r = 0.606$ with a $p\text{-value} = 0.000$, indicating a moderate to strong positive and significant relationship. This finding implies that faculty members who are more satisfied with their jobs tend to exhibit higher productivity in teaching, research, mentoring, and other academic responsibilities. Hence, the relationship is accepted, demonstrating that job satisfaction plays an important role in enhancing faculty productivity.

3. Relationship between Workplace Experience and Faculty Productivity

The correlation coefficient between Workplace Experience and Faculty Productivity is $r = 0.653$ with a $p\text{-value} = 0.000$, indicating a strong positive and statistically significant relationship. This result suggests that a positive workplace environment directly contributes to improved faculty productivity. Faculty members who experience supportive leadership, effective communication, recognition, and professional development opportunities are more likely to perform efficiently and contribute effectively to institutional goals.

5. FINDINGS

The study examined the relationship between Workplace Experience (WE), Job Satisfaction (JS), and Faculty Productivity (FP) among teaching staff members of higher education institutions in Pune. The major findings are as follows:

1. Positive perception of workplace experience: The mean scores of WE1 to WE4 ranged from 3.47 to 3.61, indicating that faculty members generally agreed that their institutions provide a supportive work environment, management support, professional development opportunities, and effective communication.
2. Moderate to high level of job satisfaction: The mean scores of JS1 to JS3 ranged from 3.53 to 3.62, showing that respondents were generally satisfied with their job roles, recognition, and overall work environment.

3. Positive perception of faculty productivity: The mean scores of FP1 to FP3 ranged from 3.47 to 3.60, suggesting that faculty members believed workplace conditions and job satisfaction positively influenced their teaching effectiveness and academic productivity.
4. Reliability and validity established: All constructs demonstrated strong reliability and convergent validity. Cronbach's Alpha values were above 0.89, Composite Reliability values were above 0.89, and AVE values exceeded 0.50, confirming that the measurement model was reliable and valid for analysis.
5. Significant positive relationships among variables:
 - Workplace Experience and Job Satisfaction showed a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.727, p < 0.05$).
 - Job Satisfaction and Faculty Productivity showed a moderate to strong positive correlation ($r = 0.606, p < 0.05$).
 - Workplace Experience and Faculty Productivity showed a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.653, p < 0.05$).
6. Support for the mediation hypothesis: The significant relationships among WE, JS, and FP indicate that job satisfaction plays an important role in linking workplace experience with faculty productivity. This supports the alternative hypothesis that job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between workplace experience and faculty productivity in higher education institutions.

6. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that workplace experience has a significant positive influence on both job satisfaction and faculty productivity among teaching staff in higher education institutions. Faculty members who experience supportive leadership, effective communication, recognition, professional development opportunities, and work-life balance tend to report higher job satisfaction and better productivity.

Furthermore, the findings indicate that job satisfaction acts as a mediating factor between workplace experience and faculty productivity. This means that a positive workplace environment enhances faculty productivity not only directly but also indirectly by improving faculty job satisfaction.

Therefore, higher education institutions should focus on creating a supportive and engaging workplace environment, strengthening recognition systems, promoting professional growth, and improving work-life balance. Such initiatives can enhance faculty satisfaction, improve productivity, and contribute to the overall effectiveness and academic excellence of higher education institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Chen, X., Li, Y., & Wang, H. (2024). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and faculty productivity in higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 39(2), 145–162.
2. He, P., Aluvalu, R., & Tejani, G. G. (2026). Job satisfaction as a catalyst mechanism transforming knowledge competence and intrinsic motivation into sustained lecturer performance in higher education. *Scientific Reports*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-026-38488-6>
3. Kakada, P., & Deshpande, Y. M. (2019). Working conditions and effective supervision: Does it matter for engineering faculty job satisfaction? *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 58(2), 180–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020720918815998>
4. Mittal, A., Mishra, G., & Bishnoi, S. (2024). Workplace spirituality and job satisfaction of higher education teachers in India: Examining occupational stress as a mediator. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 12(2), 296–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/22785337221148822>
5. Nagarajan, R., Alagiriswamy, R., & Parayitam, S. (2023). The effect of job crafting on performance and satisfaction: Physical engagement as a mediator and cognitive and emotional engagement as moderators. *IIM Kozhikode Society & Management Review*, 12(2), 135–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/22779752221135359>
6. Sarmiento, A. L. S., & Suryani, T. (2024). The effect of work motivation, job satisfaction, and work environment on employees' performance with work discipline as mediation in higher education. *Journal of Economics, Management, Entrepreneurship, and Business*, 4(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.52909/jemeb.v4i2.141>
7. Tahir, S., & Sajid, S. M. (2019). Understanding the job satisfaction of Indian academicians. *Management and Labour Studies*, 44(4), 326–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042X19870324>
8. Upadhyay, R. K., Mishra, A. K., & Jain, V. (2019). Workplace spirituality and subjective happiness at higher educational institutions: An Indian perspective. *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 10(4), 339–356. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJWOE.2019.106893>
9. Kowalski, K. B., Aruldoss, A., Gurumurthy, B., & Parayitam, S. (2022). Work-from-home productivity and job satisfaction: A double-layered moderated mediation model. *Sustainability*, 14(18), 11179. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811179>
10. Bhatia, M., & Williams, A. (2023). Identifying job satisfaction parameters among employees in higher educational institutions: A mathematical model. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(4), 541–556.
11. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407.
12. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.
13. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Sage Publications.
14. Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), 53–62.
15. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). *Organizational behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson Education.