



# Job satisfaction of youth administrators in Guangxi public vocational undergraduate colleges

Hongmei Chen<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Sirikorn Tosati<sup>1</sup>, Tanaput Chancharoen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bansomdejchaopraya Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>2</sup> Guangxi Vocational University of Agriculture, Nanning, Guangxi, China

\*Corresponding Author Email: [chenhongmei008@foxmail.com](mailto:chenhongmei008@foxmail.com)

**Abstract.** The study aimed 1) to study job satisfaction of young administrators in Guangxi Public Vocational Undergraduate Colleges; 2) to compare job satisfaction of young administrators in Guangxi Public Vocational Undergraduate Colleges with difference basic information. The participants was 185 young administrators under 40 years of age at Guangxi Vocational University of Agriculture, and the instruments used was the job satisfaction questionnaire, and the analysis statistics included mean score, standard deviation and t test or ANOVA test. The findings revealed that 1) The overall job satisfaction is general satisfied, among which the satisfaction of work allowances was not satisfied. The satisfaction scores of the six dimensions are from high to low: assessment and evaluation, management policies, teacher training, working environment, job promotion and work allowances. 2) There was no significant difference between gender and marital status, and statistically significant differences in job satisfaction among different ages, education, working time and administrative level.

**Keywords:** job satisfaction, young administrators

## 1 Introduction

In 2019, the Ministry of Education of China officially proposed the pilot program for undergraduate level vocational education. <sup>1</sup> Vocational undergraduate education, as a new phenomenon in China's higher education reform, has been receiving continuous attention in recent years. As of June 2023, there are a total of 32 undergraduate level vocational colleges in China. <sup>2</sup> With the increasing scale of vocational undergraduate education and the continuous expansion of the development scale of vocational undergraduate education, the number of students on campus continues to increase, and the administrative management work in universities is becoming increasingly heavy. The work pressure of administrative management personnel in universities is increasing. <sup>3</sup> Nowadays, the administrative management team in universities is becoming increasingly younger, and the continuous development of vocational undergraduate education has higher requirements for this group. Young administrators under the age of 40 are facing increasing pressure in areas such as job promotion, educational advancement,

and improved living conditions, which has a significant impact on the normal administrative management of schools.<sup>4</sup>

This article subdivides the administrative management personnel under the age of 40 from the administrative management personnel group of public vocational colleges in Guangxi into a special group as the research object. The aim is to stimulate their work enthusiasm, mobilize their work enthusiasm and initiative, and enhance their personal comprehensive ability by studying the most suitable incentive mechanism for this group of people.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, it will provide important support for the strengthening of the construction of young administrative staff in Guangxi public vocational undergraduate colleges, the improvement of Management science level of administration, and the promotion of rapid and sustainable development of colleges and universities.

## 2 The job satisfaction of young administrators in Guangxi public vocational undergraduate colleges

Up to now, there is only one public vocational undergraduate college in Guangxi, namely Guangxi Vocational University of Agriculture. In this study, with 200 school administrators under 40 years old as a sample, 200 questionnaires were distributed online and 200 were collected, of which 178 were valid. The job satisfaction involved in the questionnaire includes six dimensions, including work allowances, management policies, working environment, job promotion, assessment and evaluation, and teacher training. A total of 18 questions are set, which are scored in the form of five points. 5 points represents "very satisfied" and 1 point means "Very dissatisfied". Using mean and standard deviation to interpretation. The mean values are defined as follows:1) Average of 4.50-5.00 means very satisfied; 2) An average of 3.50-4.49 means quite satisfied.3)Average 2.50-3.49 means general satisfied.4)An average of 1.50- 2.49 means not satisfied.5)Average 1.00-1.49 means Very dissatisfied.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.1 Statistical analysis of the job satisfaction survey sample

#### 2.1.1 Statistical analysis of the basic personal information description

Using computer data processing software, the basic information of the 178 administrative personnel involved in the survey from gender, marital status, age, education, working time, administrative level, and frequency distribution and percentage analysis data, as shown in below.

**Table 1.** Basic Personal Information of the Respondent (N=178)

Project	classify	Frequency	percentage(%)
Gender	Male	74	41.6
	female	104	58.4
Marital status	Unmarried	118	66.3

	Married	60	33.7
Age	Under30 years old	88	49.4
	30-40years	90	50.6
Education	Junior college or below	8	4.5
	Bachelor degree	70	39.3
	Master degree	89	50.0
	PhD degree	11	6.2
Working time	Under 3 years	36	20.3
	3-5 years	83	46.6
	5-10 years	53	29.8
	Over 10 years	6	3.3
Administrative level	cadre of section rank	6	3.3
	cadre at the rank of section chief	35	19.7
	general staff	137	77.0

According to the table 1, we found that:

1) Gender. According to the statistical results, 74 male administrators were surveyed, accounting for 41.6% of the total survey, and 104 female administrators, accounting for 58.4% of the total survey.

2) Marital status. According to the statistical results, among the respondents, 118 were unmarried administrators, accounting for 66.3% of the total survey; 60 were married administrators, accounting for 33.7% of the total survey.

3) Age. According to the statistical results, all the respondents are young administrators, among which 88 are under30 years old, accounting for 49.4%, and 90 are aged 31-40years, accounting for 50.6%.

4) Education. According to the statistical results, among the respondents, 89 have the most master degree, accounting for 50.0%; followed by 70 bachelor degree, accounting for 39.3%; 11 PhD degree, accounting for 6.2%; 8 Junior college or below, accounting for 4.5%.

5) Working time. According to the statistical results, the working time of the respondents are 3-5 years, accounting for 46.6% of the total survey, followed by the working time of 5-10 years, accounting for 29.8%, the working time of under 3 years, accounting for 20.3%, and the working time of Over 10 years are the least, accounting for only 3.3%.

6) Administrative level. According to the statistical results, the administrative level of the respondents is mainly general staff, accounting for 77.0%; the cadre at the rank of section chief is 19.7%, and cadre of section rank, only 3.3%.

### 2.1.2 Descriptive analysis of each dimension of job satisfaction

Using computer data processing software, the average and standard deviation of the 178 administrative personnel participating in this survey on the six dimensions of salary allowance, management policy, working environment, job promotion, assessment and evaluation, and teacher training, and the overall job satisfaction is show in the table below.

**Table 2.** Descriptive analysis of the satisfaction of each dimension

Job satisfaction	M	SD	Level
Work allowances	2.20	0.64	not satisfied
management policies	2.89	0.71	General satisfied
work environment	2.79	0.87	General satisfied
Job promotion	2.71	0.77	General satisfied
Assessment and evaluation	2.95	0.76	General satisfied
Teacher training	2.85	0.75	General satisfied
Grand mean score	2.73	0.076	General satisfied

According to the table 2, we found the respondents' overall job satisfaction was general satisfied, with the smallest standard deviation and the lowest mean value, indicating that the respondents have relatively consistent views on the work allowances was not satisfied. The satisfaction scores of the six dimensions were ranked from high to low, as follows: assessment and evaluation, management policies, teacher training, working environment, job promotion, and work allowances.

**2.2 Differential analysis of job satisfaction based on different basic information**

Using computer data processing software, will participate in the survey of youth management personnel personal basic information (gender, marital status, age, education, working time, administrative level) of job satisfaction (work allowances, management policies, work environment, promotion, evaluation, teacher training) six dimensions, using the calculated average, standard deviation, minimum and maximum, t test or ANOVA test, analysis is as follows:

**2.2.1 Gender**

**Table 3.** Difference analysis of gender dimensions of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction	Gender	N	M	SD	T	Sig
-Work allowances	male	74	2.7387	.44924	1.447	.231
-management policies						
-work environment						
-Job promotion	female	104	2.7308	.55866		
-Assessment and evaluation						
-Teacher training						

According to the table 3, we found that:

A two sample t-test was performed to compare job satisfaction between male and female.

There was not a significant difference in job satisfaction between male (M=2.7387, SD=.44924) and female (M=2.7308, SD=.55866); t=1.447, Sig=.231.

**2.2.2 Marital status**

**Table 4.** Difference analysis of marital status dimensions of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction	Marital status	N	M	SD	T	Sig
-Work allowances -management policies -work environment	Unmarried	118	2.6365	.48124	2.876	.092
-Job promotion -Assessment and evaluation -Teacher training	Married	60	2.9259	.52810		

According to the table 4, we found that:

A two sample t-test was performed to compare job satisfaction between unmarried and married.

There was not a significant difference in job satisfaction between unmarried (M=2.6365, SD=.48124) and married (M=2.9259, SD=.52810); t=2.876, Sig=.092.

**2.2.3 Age**

**Table 5.** Difference analysis of age dimensions of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction	Age	N	M	SD	T	Sig
-Work allowances -management policies -work environment	Under30 years old	88	2.5398	.42091	6.144	.014
-Job promotion -Assessment and evaluation -Teacher training	31-40years	90	2.9241	.52891		

According to the table 5, we found that:

A two sample t-test was performed to compare job satisfaction between Under30 years old and 31-40years.

There was a significant difference in job satisfaction between Under30 years old (M=2.5398, SD=.42091) and 31-40years (M=2.9241, SD=.52891); t=6.144, Sig=.014.

**2.2.4 Education**

**Table 6.** Difference analysis of education dimensions of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction	Education	N	M	SD	F	Sig
-Work allowances -management policies -work environment	Junior college or below	8	2.1875	.65998	5.593	.001
-Job promotion	Bachelor degree	70	2.6452	.39321		
	Master degree	89	2.8315	.51332		

-Assessment and evaluation				
-Teacher training	PhD degree	11	2.9091	.76508

**Table 7.** Post hoc test of education

total	Junior college or below	Bachelor degree	Master degree	PhD degree
Junior college or below		*	*	*
Bachelor degree			*	
Master degree				
PhD degree				

According to the table 6 and table 7, we found that:

A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of four different education on job satisfaction.

A one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between at least four groups ( $F = [5.593]$ ,  $Sig = 0.001$ ).

LSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of job satisfaction was significantly different between Junior college or below and Bachelor degree, Junior college or below and Master degree, Junior college or below and PhD degree, Bachelor degree and Master degree.

There was no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between Bachelor degree and PhD degree or between Master degree and PhD degree.

### 2.2.5 Working time

**Table 8.** Difference analysis of working time dimensions of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction	working time	N	M	SD	F	Sig
-Work allowances	Under 3 years	36	2.5741	.41105		
-management policies	3-5 years	83	2.5562	.34830		
-work environment	5-10 years	53	3.0797	.60844	17.128	.000
-Job promotion						
-Assessment and evaluation	Over 10 years	6	3.1019	.46536		
-Teacher training						

**Table 9.** Post hoc test of working time

total	Under 3 years	3-5 years	5-10 years	Over 10 years
Under 3 years			*	*
3-5 years			*	*
5-10 years				
Over 10 years				

According to the table 8 and table 9, we found that:

A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of four different working time on job satisfaction.

A one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between at least four groups ( $F = [17.128]$ ,  $Sig= 0.000$ ).

LSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of job satisfaction was significantly different between Under 3 years and 5-10 years, Under 3 years and Over 10 years, 3-5 years and 5-10 years, 3-5 years and Over 10 years.

There was no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between Under 3 years and 3-5 years or between 5-10 years and Over 10 years.

**2.2.6 Administrative level**

**Table 10.** Difference analysis of administrative level dimensions of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction	administrative level	N	M	SD	F	Sig
-Work allowances -management policies -work environment	cadre of section rank	6	4.1019	.14664		
-Job promotion -Assessment and evaluation	cadre at the rank of section chief	35	3.2127	.32853	90.137	.000
-Teacher training	general staff	137	2.5519	.37687		

**Table 11.** Post hoc test of Administrative level

total	cadre of section rank	cadre at the rank of section chief	general staff
cadre of section rank		*	*
cadre at the rank of section chief			*
general staff			

According to the table 10 and table 11, we found that:

A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effect of three different administrative level on job satisfaction.

A one-way ANOVA revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between at least three groups ( $F = [90.137]$ ,  $Sig= 0.000$ ).

LSD Test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of job satisfaction was significantly different between cadre of section rank and cadre at the rank of section chief, cadre of section rank and general staff, cadre at the rank of section chief and general staff.

### 3 Conclusions

Compare the current situation of job satisfaction with different basic information, including work allowances, management policies, working environment, job promotion, assessment and evaluation, and teacher training. The results showed that the respondents' satisfaction with the overall job was general, among which the satisfaction with work allowances was not satisfied. The satisfaction scores of the six dimensions were ranked from high to low: assessment and evaluation, management policies, teacher training, working environment, job promotion and work allowances. Through the analysis, there was no significant difference between gender and marital status on job satisfaction, and statistical differences in job satisfaction by age, education, working time and administrative level.

### References

1. Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2019). *The National Implementation Plan for National Vocational Education*, Retrieved from <https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/>
2. Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2023). *List of national institutions of higher learning*, Retrieved from <http://www.moe.gov.cn/zhengce/content/>
3. Anna,T., Eva,M. & Stefan,J. (2022) .*Teacher job satisfaction: the importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics*. Educational Review Volume 73, Issue 1,71-77.
4. Belinda,G., Ryan,K. (2021) .*Job satisfaction, school rule enforcement, and teacher victimization*. School Effectiveness and School Improvement Volume 29, Issue 1,87-91.
5. Xuehai Zhang. (2023). Impact factors and path selection of college PE teachers' job satisfaction —— qualitative analysis based on root theory. *Zhejiang Sports Science*, 45 (04), 85-92.
6. Hareb,L., Anne,M. (2015) .*Prioritisation of factors influencing teachers' job satisfaction in the UAE*. International Journal of Management in Education Volume 12, Issue 1, 2015, 1-24.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

