

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12426862

# DETERMINANTS OF FACULTY SATISFACTION IN A PHILIPPINE STATE UNIVERSITY: THE INTERPLAY OF COMPENSATION, RECOGNITION, AND WORKLOAD

Abigail Quimosing-Ocay<sup>1\*</sup>, Desiree S. Banggawan<sup>2</sup>, Rodolfo B. Tucay, Jr.<sup>3</sup>, Dennis P. Ocampo<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor III, Kalinga State University, Tabuk City, Kalinga, Philippines, [abquimosing@ksu.edu.ph](mailto:abquimosing@ksu.edu.ph), 0000-0001-6624-7928

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor III, Kalinga State University Tabuk City, Kalinga, Philippines, [dsbanggawan@gmail.com](mailto:dsbanggawan@gmail.com), 0000-0003-2198-7142

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor III Kalinga State University Tabuk City, Kalinga, Philippines, [rbtucay@ksu.edu.ph](mailto:rbtucay@ksu.edu.ph), 0000-0003-0010-9455

<sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor III, Kalinga State University Tabuk City, Kalinga, Philippines [dpocampo@ksu.edu.ph](mailto:dpocampo@ksu.edu.ph), 0000-0002-2225-4197

Received: 14/08/2025

Accepted: 24/04/2026

Corresponding Author: Abigail Quimosing-Ocay  
([abquimosing@ksu.edu.ph](mailto:abquimosing@ksu.edu.ph))

## ABSTRACT

*This paper has explored the variables that determined faculty satisfaction at Kalinga State University with special emphasis on the interaction of compensation, recognition, and workload. The data collection was conducted using a structured survey questionnaire in three campuses with a total of 115 faculty members using a quantitative research design. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression. Data indicated that faculty members expressed moderate satisfaction levels in general, with compensation receiving the highest rating, and recognition and workload ratings as neutral. The correlation analysis revealed that the relationship between compensation and faculty satisfaction is very strong, workload is strongly correlated, and recognition has a weak relationship. The regression analysis also revealed that compensation is the best predictor of faculty satisfaction, followed by workload and recognition, and the model accounts to 87.8% of the variations in faculty satisfaction. The results indicate that extrinsic factors, especially compensation and workload, are those that mainly cause faculty satisfaction with recognition as a secondary factor. In view of these findings, the research suggests a work-based faculty satisfaction improvement model, which focuses on fair remuneration, equal distribution of workloads, and reinforced reward mechanisms. The research also has some empirical knowledge which can be used in the policies of the institution, and make the work of faculty better and healthier in the state universities and colleges.*

## INTRODUCTION

The faculty members have a leading role in supporting the main mandate of higher education institutions, such as teaching, research, and social interaction. Their performance directly impacts institutional performance, the performance of students, and the output of research. Faculty satisfaction, therefore, has emerged as one of the crucial topics of study in Higher Education, as it has been linked to organizational commitment, productivity, and retention (Baig and Yadegaridehkordi, 2025; Alakoum *et al.*, 2024).

There is a large amount of literature that shows that faculty satisfaction is determined by extrinsic and intrinsic factors. Salary, benefits, and promotions are extrinsic as they are inherent in providing stability and decreasing discontent (Bakotić, 2016). Conversely, intrinsic motivation-related factors such as recognition, professional development, and a meaningful set of involvement in academic activity are vital in attention to motivation and long-term commitment (Zhang and Gandham, 2025). Research also illustrates that faculty members are more engaged, have a greater job satisfaction, and are more likely to remain loyal to their organizations when they believe that the institution supports and appreciates them (Li *et al.*, 2025; Olabode Gbobaniyi *et al.*, 2023).

Workload has become one of these determinants, which is becoming more and more complex. The nature of academic work in the world has been exacerbated by the increased academic workload through publishing burdens, extension, and administrative work. This has been associated with rising stress levels and diminished job satisfaction among the faculty members due to this growing workload (Kim & Pattarawadee Maijan, 2024). In a similar vein, unequal allocation of workloads and inadequate institutional support can contribute to further dissatisfaction, especially in the developing higher education systems.

Faculty members in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippine environment work in a highly-structured policy setting. The Republic Act No. 11466 regulates compensation and benefits, whereas national budget circular No. 461 and its amended version under the Joint Circular No. 3 s. govern the aspects of faculty ranking and promotion. 2022. These models are contingent to assure equity and standardization, but research indicates that differentiation in implementation, like benefits delay, inconsistency in incentives, and lack of transparency in promotion procedures, still influences faculty beliefs and attitudes of fairness.

These are especially the issues at Kalinga State University (KSU). With the university being a developing regional SUC in the Cordillera Administrative Region, it is endowed with the dual mandate of providing quality higher education and also doing its part in the preservation of culture and development of the region. The teachers are supposed to work in a resource-constrained environment, balancing between teaching, research, and extension, as well as administrative tasks. Although the institutional policies are correlated with the national standards, the differences between the perceived sufficiency of their pay, the recognition procedures, and the workload can contribute to faculty motivation and work satisfaction.

Faculty satisfaction is not just relevant to personal well-being. Supported by the Self-Determination Theory (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Hagger and Star, 2026), when faculty are satisfied, they will exhibit higher intrinsic motivation, and this will improve the teaching performance, research outcomes, and student involvement. In a more competitive and quality-oriented higher education environment, it is the role of institutions to make sure that members of the faculty are well supported, appreciated, and rewarded.

Regardless of the increasing literature available on the topic of international literature, there is a gap contextually and empirically in recognizing how compensation, recognition, and workload relate to the levels of satisfaction among the faculty in Philippine SUCs. The current research tends to focus on these on a case-by-case manner, without focusing on their interactive or interacting influences, especially on regional university. To fill this gap, the current work explores the effects of these determinants on KSU, with the intention of producing evidence-based findings that could be used to shape institutional policies and increase the satisfaction of faculty.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

### *International Perspectives on Faculty Satisfaction*

International research confirmed that faculty remuneration greatly defines morale and performance. Zhang and Gandham (2025) highlight that promotional structures and salary policies, to some extent, are determinants of dissatisfaction with the faculty staff, and lagging behind these hygienic factors causes discontent. Equally, according to Karorsa and Allen (2024), institutional climate, workload, and work systems greatly affect faculty satisfaction, and environmental factors are

important. Samuel Opolot et al. (2026) additionally added that the commitment of faculty is enhanced and turnover intentions are reduced in institutions where the organizational culture is positive, particularly where the leadership offers valuable support and where the organization cares about its employees, which is aligned with the organizational support theory.

Difficulties are more acute in the developing countries. To promote TVET lecturers in Nigerian universities, Izuakor et al. argue that promotion requirements, especially those associated with the output of research, are the dominant motivators (2026). Simultaneously, the authors mention that institutional restraints, such as the lack of funding and the excessive workload, can suppress motivation in case promotion systems are not supported by the substantive incentives, whereas Nakirya et al., (2025) emphasized that when the faculty feels that they are fairly treated, through transparent promotion procedures, the manageable workloads, and meaningful participation in decision-making, their morale and performance rise, so the importance. Recent studies indicate that imbalanced teaching and research roles persist as a major obstacle in higher education with unjust workload policies influencing the faculty satisfaction level and morale. It has been emphasized that to effectively assist faculty participation requires instant strategies (especially, institutional) among which are safeguarded research time, professional acceptance, and equal workload distributions (Malcom et al., 2024). Taken together, these studies point to a key idea that four aspects are the most important aspects of compensation, but with the understanding that faculty satisfaction is a complex concept, there are four dimensions that would be multidimensional, i.e., fairness, recognition, and growth opportunities.

### ***Faculty Satisfaction in the Philippine Context***

The framework used to control the pay of faculty in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the Philippines includes the Salary Standardization Law and the JC3, s. To be promoted and rated in 2022. Nevertheless, the processes of these structures demonstrate the presence of gaps. Pius (2025) observed that pay, promotion, and institutional support items such as recognition are all linked to the level of faculty satisfaction and faculty morale, whereas Cruz (2010) recorded the low morale among the SUC faculty in Luzon due to delayed allowance release and lack of recognition opportunities. Furthermore, Cadimas and Canape (2025)

discovered that programs like the provision of research incentives, lower class sizes, as well as rewarding research and extension activities in promotion processes could be effective in supporting faculty roles and their overall satisfaction.

Research carried out in higher education within the Philippines indicates that faculty satisfaction and morale is significantly influenced by the institutional policies and structure. Indicatively, the same study by a state university has identified a lack of clarity in research-related policies, insufficient staff support, and the absence of appreciation as factors that can potentially decrease faculty engagement and motivation (Launio et al., 2024). According to other studies, leadership practices and resource constraints are factors in the level of satisfaction and productivity of faculty in their job (Pius, 2025). Empirical research and commentaries on the well-being of faculty attribute the workload pressures. As an example, a study of the workload of faculty in a national university in the Philippines reported that faculty spend numerous hours engaged in teaching and non-teaching (allied) activities, and that the number of hours spent on these activities is directly linked to higher levels of stress, highlighting the relevance of workload pressure to well-being (Vizcarra et al., 2024). The above results propose the assumption that faculty welfare is largely influenced by the manner in which individual institutions apply national policies despite standardization of the national policies.

### ***Recognition, Workload, and Promotion as Determinants of Satisfaction***

Recognition remains as one of the most effective faculty motivators. Literature shows that recognition of teaching and extension work positively impacts faculty morale and commitment to their institutions (Röbken et al., 2025). Likewise, financial and non-financial rewards that rely on research productivity have proven to encourage participation in scientific endeavors, such as publication and sharing (Lv, 2024; Ramada et al., 2025). The findings lend credence to the views of Herzberg, who thought that recognition, other than remuneration, is an important motivational tool and a long-term source of productivity among the academic faculty.

Promotion and workload are critical in determining the welfare and job satisfaction of faculty. A transparent and equitable distribution of workloads will give more chances to faculty members to be satisfied and feel treated fairly, although unequal distribution of advising and

committee roles can make them feel frustrated and experience a feeling of inequity (O'Meara *et al.*, 2019). According to recent research, the workloads may also have a toll on the faculty's well-being, lessening the job satisfaction and making the faculty vulnerable to burnout, in particular, when the institutional policies are not clear or are not enforced consistently (Sabagh *et al.*, 2018). These discoveries underscore the importance of having clear, equitable, and politically delivered policies to encourage a better, more sustainable academic working environment. These results highlight the significance of clear institutional-level policies and equity in workload and promotion in creating a supportive academic environment.

Notably, they stated that professional development opportunities like training grants and supporting conferences should be included in the promotion policies. In the absence of these supports, promotion criteria can be seen to be punitive and not developmental.

### ***Emerging Trends and Post-Pandemic Considerations***

The COVID-19 pandemic brought a lot of issues that concerned the welfare of the faculty, especially the workload and recognition. When the institutions quickly changed the format of learning to online, the faculty members were forced to redesign the courses, use new technologies, and offer more academic and emotional support to the students. Research indicated that these growing digital teaching roles must be acknowledged in faculty morale and engagement (Johnson *et al.*, 2020; UNESCO, 2020). In addition, institutional workload policies that specifically consider online instruction, online advising, and other distance academic activities are more likely to result in increased faculty satisfaction (Cutri *et al.*, 2020; Watermeyer *et al.*, 2021). These lessons underscore the need to acknowledge and adequately appreciate faculty work in online settings to affirm their health in these times of educational upheaval.

In recent research, it is assumed that non-monetary compensation (flexible work hours, professional development opportunities, meaningful recognition) is more appreciated in the post-pandemic period because it is also significant to stimulate employee motivation and lead to their overall job satisfaction (Gigauri, 2020). Therefore, these studies imply that compensation and recognition systems should adapt to the dynamic education environment, incorporating new aspects of academic practice in current assessment models.

### ***Synthesis of the Reviewed Literature***

The sources of collected literature bring the discussion toward four determinants of faculty contentment that are considered critically important: sufficient and prompt compensation; significant benefits and rewards, the use of regular acknowledgment, as well as sensible workload, and promotion practices. International researches focus on the multidimensional aspect of faculty satisfaction, whereas Philippine researches focus on the discrepancies between national frameworks and institutional execution.

This research fills this gap by critically evaluating faculty satisfaction at Kalinga State University in all faculties, with appropriate recommendations that are localized and evidence-based to enhance welfare policies, institutional performance, and adherence to CHED and AACUP accreditation standards.

### ***Objectives of the Study***

In this study, the authors explored the factors that determined the faculty satisfaction at the Kalinga State University, which addressed the relationship between the aspects of compensation, recognition, and workload. In particular, it was aimed to find answers to the following:

1. To establish the contentment of the faculties concerning payment, appreciation, and workload;
2. to determine the correlation between compensation, recognition, workload, and overall faculty satisfaction;
3. to establish which of compensation, recognition, and workload contributes significantly to predicting faculty satisfaction; and
4. to create an evidence-based faculty satisfaction improvement model to guide institutional practices and policies.

### **METHODOLOGY**

This part provides the research design, locale, and population of the study, instrumentation, data gathering procedure, and the data analysis tools used in the study.

#### ***Locale of the study***

This study was carried out in Kalinga State University (KSU), in particular, 3 campuses, namely, Bulanao, Rizal, and Dagupan. The choice of these campuses was based on the diversity of academic programs, faculty ranks, and employment statuses within the university. This context facilitated context-unique conclusions of faculty contentment on compensation, recognition, and workload.

### **Research design**

The survey method comprised a quantitative research design. This method was suitable because it could easily measure and statistically analyze the satisfaction of the faculty without controlling for any variable. The design allowed determining the level of satisfaction and analyzing the correlation between compensation, recognition, workload, and the overall satisfaction with faculties. In order to balance out the quantitative data, the qualitative inputs on the well-constrained responses were limited and analyzed in order to support the context and give further in-depth insights into the results.

### **Respondents of the study**

The participants of the research were 115 faculty members of the Kalinga State University (KSU), which is permanent teaching staff of the three campuses of the university: Bulanao, Rizal, and Dagupan. The sample consisted of different representations of the participants, those belonging to different colleges and academic fields. The respondents in terms of campus distribution were 77 Bulanao Campus, 33 Dagupan Campus, and 5 Rizal Campus. Such a distribution shows the ratio of the faculty members at the three campuses and guarantees that the data are representative of different institutional conditions at KSU.

A stratified random sampling method was employed with respondents classified by academic rank, length of service, and status of employment. Faculty members with one (1) year of experience in teaching at KSU were only considered so that those who participated have been exposed to KSU policies and practices adequately. A sample size was calculated by the 5 percentage margin of error and the Slovin's formula using official faculty population data retrieved from the Human Resource Management Office (HRMO). This sampling process increased representativeness and the validity of the findings of the study.

### **Instrumentation**

To answer the research questions, the most important data collection tool was a structured survey questionnaire that was formulated to evaluate faculty satisfaction in terms of compensation, recognition, and workload. The instrument was divided into three sections (a demographic profile section, a faculty satisfaction scale that measured the degree of suspicion on three elements (compensation, recognition, and workload), and the overall faculty satisfaction,

and open-ended questions aimed to provide extra insights and recommendations). Experts in human resource management and higher education were involved to ensure the content validity of the questionnaire. Besides, a pilot test was performed on the faculty members who were not part of the final sample, in order to verify the clarity of the instrument, its reliability, and internal consistency.

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

The collection of data was initiated after gaining formal permission from the University President and Human Resource Management Office (HRMO) of Kalinga State University. It was then coordinated with the deans and program chairs of the various colleges to help in the distribution and retrieval of the survey instruments. The questionnaire was used in both hard copies and through the use of online platforms (e.g., Google Forms) to ensure the highest level of participation and ensure the availability of respondents.

### **Data analysis**

The information derived from the survey was tabulated, coded, and analyzed with the aid of suitable statistical methods to answer the research objectives. Faculty satisfaction was measured using a 5-point Likert scale, which had relative descriptive interpretations that varied from strongly disagree (or very low satisfaction) to strongly agree (or very high satisfaction). To identify the satisfaction level of the faculty with the compensation, recognition, and volume of work, descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and standard deviation were used. Inferential statistics were used to compare the relationship between the variables of compensation, recognition, workload, and overall faculty satisfaction using Pearson product-moment correlation. In addition, the multiple regression analysis was performed in order to determine which of compensation, recognition, and workload is the most significant predictor of faculty satisfaction. The themes and insights of the qualitative responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed with thematic analysis to determine the recurring themes and insights, which served to corroborate the quantitative results and to develop an evidence-based framework on faculty satisfaction improvement.

## **RESULTS**

This section shows the results of the study concerning the degree of satisfaction of faculty, the

correlation between compensation, recognition, workload, and overall faculty satisfaction, the influential predictors of faculty satisfaction, and the summary of the significant findings obtained to develop a framework.

### Level of Faculty Satisfaction

This section, it provides the percentage of faculty satisfaction in Kalinga State University in three areas: compensation, recognition, and workload.

**Table 1. Level of Faculty Satisfaction in Terms of Compensation, Recognition, and Workload**

Variable	Mean	Descriptive Rating	Interpretation
Compensation	3.41	Agree	Moderately Satisfied
Recognition	2.96	Neutral	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
Workload	2.88	Neutral	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfied</b>

Faculty satisfaction at the level was measured on the compensation level, recognition, and workload. Findings indicated that faculty members are fairly satisfied, on the whole ( $M = 3.32$ ). In the three domains, compensation ( $M = 3.41$ ) was rated highest, which means that the faculty tends to find their salary and benefits to be satisfactory. Nonetheless, it rated recognition ( $M = 2.96$ ) and workload ( $M = 2.88$ ) as neutral, which implied that faculty members are more uncertain about the sufficiency of recognition systems and the equitability of workload distribution. These results suggest that although compensation is quite good, non-monetary aspects of faculty experience can be improved.

### Relationship Between Variables and Faculty Satisfaction

This section examines the relationships between compensation, recognition, workload, and overall faculty satisfaction.

**Table 2. Correlation Between Compensation, Recognition, Workload, and Overall Faculty Satisfaction**

Variables	r-value	Interpretation
Compensation	0.98	Very Strong Positive
Recognition	0.24	Weak Positive
Workload	0.71	Strong Positive

**Table 3. Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Faculty Satisfaction**

Predictor	Beta Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Compensation	0.450	<0.001	Significant Predictor
Workload	0.219	<0.001	Significant Predictor
Recognition	0.102	0.001	Weak but Significant

**Table 4. Model Summary**

R	R <sup>2</sup>	Interpretation
0.937	0.878	87.8% of variance explained by the predictors

The results of a multiple regression analysis indicated that the synergistic interactions of compensation, recognition, workload have a significant predictive value on faculty satisfaction, with the model explaining 87.8% of this variance ( $R^2 = 0.878$ ). Compensation appeared to be the best predictor ( $\beta = 0.450$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), which suggests it had a dominant effect on satisfaction. Workload ( $\beta =$

The correlation analysis revealed that there is a very strong positive relationship between compensation and overall faculty satisfaction ( $r = 0.98$ ), which means that compensation increase is strongly correlated with the increase in the level of satisfaction. Another factor which showed strong positive correlation ( $r = 0.71$ ) between workload and well-being of the faculty members is that manageable and reasonable workloads were very important to the faculty welfare. Contrastingly, recognition had poor positive relationship ( $r = 0.24$ ) meaning that current recognition practices might not play a significant role in determination of satisfaction. On the whole, the findings indicate that compensation and workload are more important issues that can determine faculty satisfaction.

### Predictors of Faculty Satisfaction

The important predictors of faculty satisfaction are determined in this section through a multiple regression analysis. Although correlation analysis shows associations, regression analysis shows the degree to which each factor affects faculty satisfaction when all the factors are taken into account.

0.219,  $p = 0.001$ ) is also an important factor, and thus the balanced distribution of work force is important. In the meantime, recognition (is statistically significant  $\beta = 0.102$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), but its impact is somewhat smaller. These results indicate that all three factors are crucial, but institutional initiatives must emphasize on compensations and workload management.

### Basis for Framework Development

The section will provide a summary of the

important results of the research and will form the foundation on which I will base my evidence-

based faculty satisfaction improvement framework.

**Table 5. Summary of Key Findings for Framework Development**

Factor	Level of Satisfaction	Relationship Strength	Predictive Power	Priority Level
Compensation	Moderate	Very Strong	High	High
Recognition	Neutral	Weak	Low	Moderate
Workload	Neutral	Strong	Moderate	High

The summary of findings provides a reasonable foundation towards the creating a framework of faculty satisfaction improvement. Compensation had always been at the top in the level of satisfaction, strength of correlation and predictive power hence an institutional intervention recommendation is of the first priority. Although rated neutral in terms of satisfaction, workload indicated positive correlations and high predictive power, which means that workload policies should be better. The recognition, although statistically significant, had lesser impact meaning that existing recognition systems need to be redesigned and made stronger. Taken as a whole, these results underline that economical and structural aspects are the primary factors in motivating faculty satisfaction with recognition playing a supportive role.

## DISCUSSION

This research investigated the factors that affect the faculty satisfaction in Kalinga State University in the context of compensation, recognition and workload. The results support the conclusion that the satisfaction of the faculties is a multidimensional concept that is influenced by extrinsic and intrinsic variables, which in turn are supported by the existing research about the higher education activities and standard motivational concepts.

### *Level of Faculty Satisfaction*

The research results reveal that the overall satisfaction of the faculty members at Kalinga State University is moderate, and compensation scored quite higher than recognition and workload, which were rated as moderate- to neutral. This trend indicates the root of multidimensionality of faculty satisfaction highlighting in literature. In line with Zhang and Gandham (2025), hygienic (e.g., salary and working conditions) and motivational (e.g., recognition and professional fulfillment) factors influence higher education satisfaction. The current results indicate that hygiene factors like compensation are well taken care of to avoid dissatisfaction, the motivational factors are not well developed.

The comparatively positive attitude towards compensation is similar to the Philippine-based research which suggests that standardized pay systems within national policies generates a minimal level of security to the faculty members (Pius, 2025). Nevertheless, the neutral establishments of recognition and workload indicate the systemic internal lapses. According to Launio et al. (2024), poor policies, institutional support, and recognition mechanisms can be seen as reducing the level of faculty engagement. Analogously, Vizcarra et al. (2024) also highlighted that the high demands of workloads especially in teaching and other related activities can also lead to stress and lack of satisfaction.

These results indicate that although financial provisions might be able to sustain minimum satisfaction, it is ineffective in meeting the deeper organizational and professional needs. Faculty satisfaction, hence, cannot be entirely portrayed in terms of compensation only but also takes into consideration how institutions reward contributions and in how academic tasks are handled.

### *Compensation, Recognition, Workload as a relationship and Faculty Satisfaction*

The findings showed that the relationship between compensation and faculty satisfaction is very high with workload having a strong relationship with compensation with a weak relationship of recognition. This chain of influence justifies international and local literatures that focus on the group dominance of economic and structural influences on the job satisfaction.

The great correlation between compensation and satisfaction follows similar outcomes proposed by Bakotić (2016) and more recent works that state that the aspects of financial security and fair compensation systems are crucial in facilitating organizational commitment and limiting turnover intention. In less developed settings, like Philippine SUCs, which tend to be resource-starved, it is plausible that compensation, which directly responds to the economic needs of faculty members, is even more salient.

Another factor that appeared to be critical was workload as has been concluded by Malcom et al. (2024) and Sabagh et al. (2018) who discovered that inequitable or excessive workloads have a detrimental effect on faculty morale and well-being. The close bond within this study implies that the faculty members are very sensitive to the assignment of responsibilities specially to teaching, research and administrative work that shares the limited time and resources. This favors the statement that workload is not only a quantitative problem but forms a question of equity and transparency as highlighted by Nakiryia et al. (2025).

Contrarily, the weak correlation between recognition and satisfaction indicates that the current recognition systems are not consistently visible and perceived to have little or no value. Although recognition is always named in literature as one of the main motivational qualities that individuals are intrinsically driven by (Röbken et al., 2025; Lv, 2024), the ability to succeed depends on the actions of the institution. The results suggest that recognition practices in the university might not be institutionalized and in line with faculty expectations yet, thus restricting their effects on the general satisfaction.

Generally, the findings suggest tangible and structural (compensation and workload) causes have greater impact than symbolic rewards especially in a situation where the foundation needs are being satisfied.

### ***Predictors of Faculty Satisfaction***

The regression analysis further supported the hypothesis that compensation is the most influential predictor of faculty joy and the next factor is the workload and recognition. The great ability to explain ( $R^2 = 0.878$ ) indicates the joint significance of the variables in forming the faculty experiences.

The predominance of the compensation as a predictor reaffirms the conclusions of the international and Philippine studies which reiterate that perceived fairness and sufficiency of pay is core to job satisfaction (Zhang and Gandham, 2025; Pius, 2025). Fair pay in accordance with the organizational support theory (Olabode Gbobaniyi et al., 2023) addresses institutional value and support, thus increasing faculty commitment and motivation.

The strong predictive influence of workload indicates the dual nature of workload as a motivating and stressing factor. Manageable workloads can positively impact productivity and engagement, whereas the overwhelming number of demands may result in burnout and discontent as noted by

Alakoum et al. (2024). This study implies that the issue of workload management is still a vocal field where the institution needs to intervene, especially to promote an equitable allocation and coordination with the faculty roles.

Though recognition had a lesser predictive effect, its statistical significance shows that it has a significant effect on satisfaction. This is in line with the theory of Herzberg and associated researches which place recognition as a supplementary motivator that complements satisfaction in the case of achieving the basic conditions. Recognition should therefore not be ignored but should be reinforced to have the maximum effect.

### ***Application to Framework Development.***

The results offer great practical evidence of designing a unified faculty satisfaction model reflecting a combination of compensation, workload and recognition. In line with the examined literature, both extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of faculty work have to be covered by effective institutional strategies.

The emphasis on compensation and workload is indicative of larger trends in higher education, wherein institutions are moving toward fairer policies, transparency in workloads, and financial sustainability (Malcom et al., 2024; Cadimas and Canape, 2025). Simultaneously, the comparatively lower strength of recognition helps to demonstrate the necessity to reformulate recognition systems to make them transparent, consistent, and meaningful.

Moreover, the results are consistent with the post-pandemic insights that state the significance of non-financial incentives, professional growth prospects, and flexibility in work (Gigauri, 2020). The institutions need to thus update their policies in accordance with the changing nature of academic work, especially in balancing the traditional work and the new demands.

Altogether, the research finds a systemic and combined understanding of faculty satisfaction, in which the payment should provide job security, job descriptions should uphold fairness and well-being, and rewards should create motivation and professionalism. The institutions that do not balance these aspects are likely to lose faculty commitment, lower productivity, and turnover.

### ***Synthesis***

In conclusion, these discussions confirm that extrinsic factors, especially compensation and workload, is a significant contributor to faculty satisfaction in Kalinga State University, whereas

intrinsic factors, especially recognition, contribute to the same in a supportive but not a dominant way. These results align with the international and Philippine literature that points out the necessity of data-focused, contextual institutional policies responding to the complex and changing nature of faculty work.

## CONCLUSIONS

This paper analyzed the factors contributing to faculty satisfaction in Kalinga State University, in terms of compensation, recognition, and workload. On the findings, a number of conclusions are drawn.

To begin with, the satisfaction among the members of the faculty is moderate overall, as the domain of compensation was the most satisfactory, whereas the neutral level was found in the domains of recognition and workload. This shows that even though the financial terms of the employment are more or less tolerable, there are specific issues related to the recognition of faculty work and the distribution of tasks.

Second, it confirmed that faculty satisfaction is strongly linked with compensation, recognition, and workload although with varying degrees of strength. The study showed very strong relationships between compensation and workload, as well as recognition and general satisfaction, and only weak relationships between recognition and workload. What it means is that tangible and structural factors are more immediate in terms of their impact on the faculty perceptions, in contrast to the symbolic or intrinsic rewards.

Third, the regression analysis reiterated the fact that compensation is the best predictor of faculty satisfaction, followed by workload and recognition. The explanatory power of the model is high, which shows that these three variables have a strong explanatory power of faculty satisfaction in the institution. This highlights the importance of equitable compensation policies and equal distribution of workloads in influencing faculty experiences.

Lastly, the results offered a strong empirical foundation of evidence-based faculty satisfaction improvement model. The findings point to the fact that the issue of faculty satisfaction improvement should be handled in a well-rounded manner, considering not just financial, but also structural and motivational aspects. Priority areas such as compensation and workload come into view, and recognition can be seen as a complementary factor that boosts satisfaction when basic needs are fulfilled.

All in all, there are two main conclusions of the study: extrinsic factors (especially pay and workload) primarily motivate the faculty to be satisfied at Kalinga State University, and intrinsic factors (such as recognition) are supportive but not decisive.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Compensation Enhancement.* The university can also audit and redefine its remuneration mechanism in order to make sure that the salaries, benefits, and motivational structures are acceptable, competitive, and complementary to the faculty qualifications and tasks. These involve making payments on time, giving extra credits for research and extension work, and regularly comparing remuneration packages to other institutions of comparable size in order to ensure equity and motivation of the faculty.
2. *Policy Reform and Workload Management.* The institution can develop visibility and equal workload policies whereby teaching, research, and administrative positions are fairly assigned to the members of the faculty. The assignment of workload has to be matched with payment, and a proper support system can be established to avoid overweight and encourage work-life balance.
3. *Strengthening Recognition Systems.* To improve its recognition programs, the university can identify clear and consistent standards through which it recognizes the efforts of the faculty. Rewards can be both monetary and non-monetary, including awards, promotions, and recognition by the community, to make faculty feel that they are appreciated and encouraged.
4. *Adoption of a Satisfaction Framework of Faculty.* The institution can employ and execute an extensive faculty contentment model that incorporates approaches regarding compensation, work, and recognition. Constant checking in the form of surveys and feedback systems could be implemented to help make continuous improvement and make sure that all faculty requirements are properly met.
5. *Policy and Administrative Support.* University administration can reinforce transparency and fairness in addition to faculty welfare by enhancing communication, motivating faculty to intervene in decision-making, and integrating the enforcement of institutional policies in all units.
6. *Future Research Directions.* Future research can address more variables that influence faculty satisfaction, including leadership, organizational culture, and professional development, and can also adopt comparative or longitudinal research that can bring a more in-depth insight into faculty experience over time.

## LITERATURES CITED

- Alakoum, A., Nica, E., & Abiad, M. (2024). Enhancing faculty satisfaction and performance in higher education: The transformative role of hr and technology integration. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence*, 18(1), 2951–2967. <https://doi.org/10.2478/picbe-2024-0244>
- Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2025). Factors influencing academic staff satisfaction and continuous usage of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00506-4>
- Bakotić, D. (2016). Relationship between job satisfaction and organisational performance. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 29(1), 118–130. Tandfonline. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677x.2016.1163946>
- Cadimas, M. M., & Canape, B. B. (2025). Faculty workloads in relation to stress management and job satisfaction in the criminology programs. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(V), 4247–4256. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.905000323>
- Cutri, R. M., Mena, J., & Whiting, E. F. (2020). Faculty readiness for online crisis teaching: transitioning to online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1815702>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- Gigauri, I. (2020). Implications of COVID-19 for Human Resource Management. *International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 7(11), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.14445/23939125/ijems-v7i11p104>
- Izuakor, C. F., Emeghebo, U. M., Nwakile, T. C., Omega, G. N., Odewale, O. T., Attah, B. I., Ezeaku, M. N., & Ogbonna, I. J. (2026). Promotion incentives and the dynamics of research motivation among Technical and Vocational Education and Training lecturers in Nigerian universities. *Discover Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-026-01201-w>
- Johnson, N., Veletsianos, G., & Seaman, J. (2020). U.S. faculty and administrators’ experiences and approaches in the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Online Learning*, 24(2). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i2.2285>
- Kim, L., & Pattarawadee Maijan. (2024). An exploration process on job satisfaction in higher education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, 101097–101097. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101097>
- Launio, C. C., Kate, F., Banez, A., Matyline Camfili Talastas, Sito, L., & Baniqued, K. (2024). Motivating factors and challenges of faculty members in a state university in the Philippines in publishing journal articles. *Journal of Scientometric Research*, 13(3), 866–876. <https://doi.org/10.5530/jscires.20041215>
- Li, L., Kanchanapoom, K., Deeprasert, J., Duan, N., & Qi, Z. (2025). Unveiling the factors shaping teacher job performance: exploring the interplay of personality traits, perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02324-1>
- Lv, A. (2024). Incentive mechanisms, work engagement, and productivity of higher education teachers in China: Basis for faculty development plan. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2024.1044>
- Malcom, D. R., Park, S. K., Lebovitz, L., Attarabeen, O. F., Castleberry, A., Dey, S., DiVall, M. V., Kirkwood, C., Lee, K. C., Medina, M., Sheaffer, E. A., & Weldon, D. (2024). A national survey of perceptions around conditions associated with pharmacy faculty workload equity. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 88(3), 100664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajpe.2024.100664>
- Nakiryia, S., Mugizi, W., & Kiryowa, M. (2025). Supportive leadership and teachers’ team cohesion in government-aided secondary schools in Kayunga District, Uganda. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 8(2), 142–157. <https://doi.org/10.53449/x8h2fz62>
- Olabode Gbobaniyi, Srivastava, S., Abiodun Kolawole Oyetunji, Chiemela Victor Amaechi, Salmia Beddu, & Bajpai Ankita. (2023). The mediating effect of perceived institutional support on inclusive leadership and academic loyalty in higher education. *Sustainability*, 15(17), 13195–13195. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151713195>
- O’Meara, K., Jaeger, A., Misra, J., Lennartz, C., & Kuvaeva, A. (2018). Undoing disparities in faculty workloads: A randomized trial experiment. *PLOS ONE*, 13(12), e0207316. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207316>
- Pius, N. J. (2025). Higher education and faculty job satisfaction: Examining the link between attitude, productivity, and professional growth- a qualitative study. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering &*

- Management*, 10(50s), 01-12. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i50s.10094>
- Ramada, M. G. C., Lorejo, R. M., & Bojos, S. M. N. (2025). Attitude towards research, competence and productivity among faculty members at a state university. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2(5). <https://acr-journal.com/article/attitude-towards-research-competence-and-productivity-among-faculty-members-at-a-state-university-1666/>
- Röbken, H., Geier, N., Behrens, D., & Mertens, A. (2025). Gendered challenges in academia: Exploring the impact of working hours, stress, and job satisfaction among mid-level university staff in Germany. *Education Sciences*, 15(8), 990. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15080990>
- Sabagh, Z., Hall, N. C., & Saroyan, A. (2018). Antecedents, correlates and consequences of faculty burnout. *Educational Research*, 60(2), 131–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2018.1461573>
- Samuel Opolot, J., Simiyu, G., Tumwine, S., Mwesigwa, R., & Nasiima, S. (2026). Organizational culture and turnover intention in higher education: a moderated mediation model of commitment and self-efficacy. *Cogent Psychology*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2026.2632390>
- UNESCO (2020). *COVID-19 and higher education: Today and tomorrow; Impact analysis, policy responses and recommendations*. UNESDOC Digital Library. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375693>
- Vizcarra, M. L. O., Aragon, A. E. A., Tiangco, P.-V. V., & Basarte, C. A. (2024). Faculty workload and well-being at President Ramon Magsaysay state university: Impacts of Allied Tasks on Stress and Health. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(12). <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.12.24>
- Watermeyer, R., Crick, T., Knight, C., & Goodall, J. (2020). COVID-19 and digital disruption in UK universities: afflictions and affordances of emergency online migration. *Higher Education*, 81(3). <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-020-00561-y>
- Zhang, M., & Gandham, G. (2025). Faculty job satisfaction in higher education: A systematic review of empirical studies through Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. *Journal of Management World*, 2025(6), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.53935/jomw.v2024i4.1222>