



Job Satisfaction: An Exploratory Study of the Perceptions of University Teachers

Rizwan Ahmad *

Safia Naveed †

Shahid Anjum ‡

Abstract: *This research study was conducted to explore the job satisfaction of university teachers. The study might contribute from theoretical, management and academic perspectives. It was correlational research. The study was delimited to the University of Education Lahore. The population of the study was teachers working at the University of Education Lahore. The Census sampling technique was applied to select the desired sample. The job satisfaction survey developed by Spector was used with prior permission. The validity and reliability of the instrument were insured through pilot testing. The data were collected with prior permission from the concerned authority. Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to the data. Teachers reported themselves to be satisfied with their jobs. They were found satisfied on the subscales Supervision, coworkers, nature of work, promotion, communication, fringe benefits, pay, contingent rewards, operating procedure, respectively. No significant difference was observed in job satisfaction on the basis of designation, age, qualification, marital status and gender.*

Key Words: Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Operating Procedures Contingent Rewards Fringe Benefits, Coworkers, Nature of Work, Communication

Introduction

The behavioral research on organizational situations has revealed key characteristics that are either beneficial or detrimental to the performance (Pohlman & Gardiner, 2000). In this context, job satisfaction (JS) is a well-studied factor (Bodla & Danish, 2009). This factor is much more important to research in academic institutions, particularly universities, which educate the nation's brains. The teaching vocation requires satisfaction (Cunanan, 2006). JS is an attitude connected with how much people like or loathe their jobs. A low level of JS predicts harmful attitudes and conduct in the workplace (Spector, 1997).

JS is vital for maintaining suitable personnel inside an organization, ensuring that the right people are in the appropriate place, with the correct culture, and that they are happy. According to research, Employees who are satisfied in their professions perform better and attract more support from coworkers. JS is a factor

that is frequently researched in management (Bodla & Danish, 2009; Ross & Emily, 2001; Tsai et al., 2007).

Teachers who succeed in their occupations and have their basic needs satisfied at work will be happy people, as they will struggle to manage their vividness. University teachers, as organizational workers, are of monstrous importance because they provide advanced education to individuals and foster financial activities for the growth and prosperity of the organization. Teachers that are ecstatic about their job performance and organizational dedication are ecstatic. The present research explores JS in university teachers.

According to Robbins (2001), JS is defined as a person's overall attitude about their employment. The gap between the remuneration received and what they are genuinely entitled to get. It is a personalized articulation of one's wealth linked to one's job, according to Gibson and Donnelly (2000). Mullins (2002) describes it as a

* Lecturer, University of Education, Lower Mall Campus Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: rizwanahmad@ue.edu.pk

† School Education Department, Government of the Punjab, Punjab, Pakistan.

‡ PhD Scholar, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

multifaceted concept that may signify a variety of things.

According to [Baron and Greenberg \(2003\)](#), it is a state of mind toward one's job, as well as cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses to one's work. Some people may be completely satisfied with their jobs, while others may be completely disappointed. According to [Shane et al. \(2005\)](#), work satisfaction is a multifaceted concept that includes a variety of factors.

There are a number of factors that determine whether or not people are satisfied with their work. A few employees may be happy with certain elements of their profession but unsatisfied with others ([Mullins, 2002](#)). Some variables lead to good or bad evaluations of their occupations, according to [Baron and Greenberg \(2003\)](#), which are mentioned below.

Pay

Financial incentives, without a doubt, may have a considerable part in deciding JS. Pay can have a major influence on JS, as Arnold and Feldman (1996) revealed. Employees have a plethora of needs, and money offers the tools to fulfil them ([Arnold & Feldman, 1996](#)).

Promotion

Self-improvement and a stronger social position are both possible with promotion. Employees who find particular opportunities to be reasonable are more likely to be knowledgeable about JS ([Spector 1997](#)).

Supervision

According to [Baron and Greenberg \(2003\)](#), the level of JS will undoubtedly rise if employees see supervisors be reasonable, well-equipped, and sincere. Furthermore, employees who perceive their superiors to be unjust, incompetent, or prejudiced will have a lower degree of JS.

Fringe Benefits

Fringe advantages can be both monetary and non-monetary. Inadvertent sympathetic conditions that draw a worker's attention inside and outward may so improve their performance and elicit higher degrees of authoritative responsibility ([Suliman & Iles 2000](#)).

Contingent Rewards

Appreciation and recognition for outstanding

effort may be such remunerates. Such incentives support the theory of reinforcement in terms of motivation ([Spector 2008](#)).

Operating Procedures

Specific workplace characteristics, such as experiencing the weightiness of labor, feelings of obligation, and information about work results, lead to favorable mental states, which lead to job satisfaction ([Judge et al., 2000](#)). Self-governance gives rise to feelings of responsibility. Through employment criticism, we can learn more about the aftereffects of work. When these characteristics are combined, the nature of labor expands and becomes more adaptable. High levels of JS are associated with the increased span, whereas low levels are associated with tiredness and dissatisfaction. Job dimensions and organizational environment are linked to JS, and As a consequence, a few numbers of factors contribute to good JS, whereas others lead to job dissatisfaction ([Spector 2008](#)).

Coworkers

People's judgments of rationality, according to [Spector \(2008\)](#), are key drivers of their behavior. Worker motivation and organizational social order are impacted by how coworkers' demands are reconciled with the organization's needs, work-life equality practices, and the physical working environment, according to [Martins and Coetzee \(2007\)](#). Work meets a person's social segment requirements. Extended JS is prompted by having good-natured and reliable colleagues. [Ghazzawi \(2008\)](#) claims that a specialist's relationships, the social activities they attend, and the lifestyle to which that individual is exposed all has an impact on JS.

Nature of Work

The manager's actions may have an impact on how the task is completed. Work satisfaction is defined as the contentment of human resources with the work they do. Workers like to do work that is reasonably challenging. This provides them with a wide range of tasks and possibilities ([Spector 1997](#)).

Communication

The setting of specific goals and the encouragement of desired behavior both renew inspiration and compelling communication. The

fewer twists, ambiguities, and inconsistencies that occur in internal communications inside firms, the more happy employees will be with their jobs ([Robbins 1993](#)).

JS in Teachers

In their research, [Salvendy et al. \(1982\)](#) discovered that workers are content with their occupations in organizations. [Susan \(2003\)](#) also stated that employees are often pleased with their occupations.

Demographic Variables Affecting JS

Gender

Despite the fact that various research on gender and job satisfaction have been undertaken, academics have yet to reach an agreement on the impact of gender on job satisfaction ([August & Waltman, 2004](#); [Callister, 2006](#); [Hagedorn, 2000](#); [Perna, 2001](#); [Rosser, 2004](#); [Rosser, 2005](#); [Seifert & Umbach, 2008](#); [Tack & Patitu, 1992](#)). Gender, on the other hand, only explains 1% of the variance in JS, according to [Bozeman and Gaughan \(2010\)](#). Many academicians, on the other hand, believe that there was no difference between males and girls on the JS ([Boran, 2011](#); [Lisa, 2012](#); [Sangay, 2010](#); [Titus, 2007](#)).

Marital Status

Many researchers have looked into the relationship between marital status and JS, but none have looked into the relationship between marital status and JS. In a shared family structure, family members may assist one another with domestic responsibilities. [Athanasios \(2001\)](#); [Bilgic \(1998\)](#); [Boran \(2011\)](#); [Sangay \(2010\)](#); [Sidani and Jamali \(2010\)](#); [Mark and Stephen \(2015\)](#) all agreed that JS had nothing to do with marital status.

Qualification

[Crossman and Abou-Zaki \(2003\)](#); [Hayfaa \(2012\)](#); [Sangay \(2010\)](#); [Sidani and Jamali \(2010\)](#); [Robert \(1991\)](#); [Wang \(2006\)](#) all concluded that university teachers' qualifications had little effect on their JS in their studies. As a result, JS variation cannot be attributed solely to qualification.

Age

Research backs up the fact that JS does not vary with age. There is no substantial variation in JS with age, according to [Lisa \(2012\)](#). Similar findings

were found by [Crossman and Abou-Zaki \(2003\)](#), [Hayfaa \(2012\)](#), [Sidani and Jamali \(2010\)](#), [Sarkar, Alf and Parkpoom \(2003\)](#). In their study, [Leafy et al. \(2015\)](#) also come to the conclusion that JS is not substantially associated with autism.

Designation

In many studies, senior faculty members were found to be happier with their work than younger faculty members. Teachers in higher-ranking positions are happier in their professions ([Adkins et al. 2001](#); [Oshagbemi, 2003](#); [Tack & Patitu, 1992](#)). Similar findings were obtained in other studies ([Eyupoglu & Saner, 2009](#); [Okpara et al., 2005](#)). Although it was not proved to be significant in [Lisa \(2012\)](#) and [Titus \(2015\)](#) researches, several studies have found a favourable relationship between designation and JS.

Objectives and Research Questions

This research study was conducted to explore the JS in university teachers. Two research questions were designed keeping in view the objectives of the research study, presented below

1. What is the perception regarding JS in university teachers?
2. Is there any difference in JS on the basis of demographic (gender, marital status, age, qualification and designation)?

Significance of the Study

From a theoretical, managerial, and academic viewpoint, the researcher believed that this study would be beneficial. This exploratory study is important from a theoretical viewpoint since it will encourage other social scientists to examine their hypotheses and promote future research. This exploratory study would be useful to university administration in improving the organizational climate and increasing the effectiveness of the organization in the future. This research project will serve as a model for other researchers who want to investigate this variable.

Limitations

Because the data supplied by university lecturers was self-reported, it might base upon their subjective discernment. The respondents were guaranteed anonymity, yet it might be possible that they over or under-reported their perceptions

of the JS. Furthermore, despite the high level of engagement in this research study, it is possible that their reactions will differ from those who did not express an interest or participate.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This descriptive research study was designed to investigate job satisfaction in university teachers. A cross-sectional survey method was employed to collect the data required to analyze the problems discussed in this research study.

Population and Sampling

The population of this research study was composed of the teachers working at the

University of Education Lahore. Information regarding the number of teachers was collected from the official website of the University of Education Lahore, owing to its contradiction might be in the actual number of teachers working. In this research study, census sampling was applied. All teaching staff of the University of Education Lahore was the sample of the study. The participants in this research study were teachers from the University of Education Lahore. The number of teachers was gathered from the University of Education Lahore's official website, and there may be a discrepancy in the real number of teachers working. The census sampling method was used in this investigation. All faculty members of the university were a sample of the study.

Table 1. Distribution of Sample on the basis of Demographic Characteristics

Background variables		N = 245	%
Gender	Male	127	51.8
	Female	118	48.2
	Total	245	100
Marital status	Married	168	68.6
	Single	77	31.4
	Total	245	100
Qualification	Masters	106	43.3
	MPhil	95	38.8
	PhD	44	18
	Total	245	100
Age	29 & below	73	29.8
	30-39	114	46.5
	40-49	45	18.4
	50 & above	13	5.3
	Total	245	100
Designation	Lecturer	176	70.6
	Assistant Professor	57	20.4
	Associate Professor	10	4.1
	Professor	2	0.8
	Total	245	100
Workload	6 & below	48	19.6
	9-12	103	42
	15 & above	94	38.4
	Total	245	100

Instrumentation

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

Spector developed JSS, a standardized tool (1994). With the author's permission, the scale was used for this research investigation. There are 36 items on the scale. Employees' attitudes regarding their jobs and the several characteristics of JS are assessed using a 9-facet scale. Thirty-six items are

used to examine nine aspects of JS. For all of the items, a total score is computed. Nine composite scales and thirty-six subscales each have their own score, which adds up to the overall JSS score. A five-point Likert type rating scale with five choices per item was employed. It went from strongly disagreeing (coded as 1) to strongly agreeing (coded as 5).

Table 2. Description of JSS Sub Scale and Number of Items on Each Sub Scale

S. No	Subscale	α	Item numbers
1	Pay	0.8	9, 18, 27, 36.
2	Promotion	0.8	8, 17, 26, 35.
3	Supervision	0.7	7, 16, 25, 34.
4	Fringe Benefits	0.7	6, 15, 24, 33.
5	Contingent rewards	0.8	5, 14, 23, 32.
6	Operating conditions	0.7	4, 13, 22, 31.
7	Coworkers	0.8	3, 12, 21, 30.
8	Nature of work	0.8	2, 11, 20, 29.
9	Communication	0.9	1, 10, 19, 28.

The survey contained negatively phrased items (3, 5, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23 and 36). Negatively phrased items were reverse scored. The reversals for the items in the left column were switched to the item in the right column.

Pilot Testing

The instrument utilized in the research study was pilot tested. To ensure content validity, the draft was shared with experts for review to ensure that each item was relevant. The instrument was pilot tested at Government College University Faisalabad, where fifty self-administered questionnaires were distributed to subjects who were not part of the study. Reliability analysis was performed, yielding a Cronbach alpha value of .8.

Data Collection

The researcher personally visited all the ten campuses of the University of Education for the collection of data. The data were collected with the prior permission of concerned Directors/ Principals of the campuses/ divisions as well as the concerned teachers. Standardized research instruments were administered among all the teachers working at the University of Education. Teachers were debriefed about the instruments and about rating the statements. The researcher made assure that the respondents have clearly provided all the relevant information to minimize the missing data. Research instruments consisted of 87 items in total and took 30-45 minutes to complete.

Table 3. Rate of Return of Research Instrument

Questionnaires	Number	Percentage
Distributed	336	100%
Returned	245	73%

Data Analysis

Obtained data were analyzed with the help of SPSS. Different statistical measures were applied to the data. According to the research questions,

collected data were analyzed through independent samples t-test and ANOVA. ANOVA and t-test were performed to explore the differences in JS scores of the subgroups such as gender, marital status, qualification, designation.

Table 4. Placement of Data Analysis with Regard to Objectives as well as Research Questions

Objectives	Research Questions	Instrument	Analysis
3. To investigate the existing level of JS in university teachers.	What is the existing level of JS among university teachers?	JSS	Mean scores calculated
4. To explore the differences in their JS scores with regard to some demographic variables	Do the demographic variables exert an effect on their JS?	JSS	Independent sample t-test and ANOVA

Descriptive Statistics of JSS

At first, a brief, however, complete and clear description of the major variables of the study are exhibited for a better comprehension of the data. Frequency distribution, range (both potential and actual), skewness and kurtosis for every factor of the variables are given in Table 4.10. Skewness and kurtosis were investigated to see the normality in the data. All the skewed values fell inside the array

of -1 to +1, which indicates the normality of the data. Cut score for JSS is 2.5. Table 4.10 indicates teachers of UE Lahore found to be satisfied with their jobs ($M = 3.09$). They experienced greater satisfaction on subscales of Supervision ($M = 3.43$), Co-Workers ($M = 3.32$), Nature of Work ($M = 3.26$), Promotion ($M = 3.19$), Communication ($M = 3.04$) and lesser on Fringe Benefits ($M = 2.97$), Pay ($M = 2.92$), Contingent Rewards ($M = 2.88$) and the least on Operating Procedures ($M = 2.77$).

Table 5. Psychometric Properties of the JSS Sub Factors

Variable	n	M	SD	MPI	Range		Skew	Kurtosis
					Potential	Actual		
Pay	245	11.66	2.31	2.92	4-20	7-17	.211	-.437
Promotion	245	12.75	2.47	3.19	4-20	7-20	.384	.336
Supervision	245	13.71	2.57	3.43	4-20	6-20	-.326	.127
Fringe benefits	245	11.87	2.46	2.97	4-20	4-20	-.097	.191
Contingent rewards	245	11.51	2.64	2.88	4-20	4-19	-.239	.116
Operating procedures	245	11.09	2.35	2.77	4-20	6-20	.284	.339
Co-workers	245	13.27	2.20	3.32	4-20	8-20	.046	-.119
Nature of work	245	13.02	2.09	3.26	4-20	6-19	-.700	.619
Communication	245	12.17	2.05	3.04	4-20	4-17	-.971	2.43
Job Satisfaction	245	111.0	9.65	3.09	36-18	85-16	.603	1.92

Gender Wise Comparison of University Teachers' JSS Score

Table 6. Gender Wise Comparison of JSS Score

WFC Sub Scale	Gender	M	SD	df	t value	P-value	Effect size r/ Cohn's d
Pay	Male	2.89	.56	243	.439	.44	-.086/-0.043
	Female	2.94	.60				
Promotion	Male	3.17	.64	243	.557	.56	-.064/-0.032
	Female	3.21	.60				
Supervision	Male	3.37	.66	243	.126	.13	-.194/-0.096
	Female	3.49	.62				
Fringe benefits	Male	2.98	.65	243	.733	.73	.049/0.024
	Female	2.95	.58				
Contingent rewards	Male	2.84	.75	243	.321	.32	-.122/-0.061
	Female	2.92	.55				
Operating procedures	Male	2.76	.65	243	.748	.75	-.034/-0.017

Co-workers	Female	2.78	.51	243	.442	.44	.091/0.045
	Male	3.34	.58				
Nature of work	Female	3.29	.52	243	.547	.55	.076/0.038
	Male	3.28	.53				
Communication	Female	3.24	.52	243	.297	.30	-.135/-0.067
	Male	3.00	.58				
JSS total	Female	3.07	.42	243	.353	.35	-.118/-0.059
	Male	3.07	.31				
	Female	3.10	.20				

Independent samples t-test was applied to compare the male and female university teacher's JSS mean scores. Table 4.11 demonstrates that male teachers' mean score (M = 3.07, SD = 0.31) was not

considerably significant than that of females teachers (M = 3.10, SD = 0.20). Both groups did not be different considerably neither on all of the facets nor on overall job satisfaction scores.

Marital Status Wise Comparison of University Teachers' JSS Score

Table 7. Marital status wise Comparison of JSS Score

WFC Sub Scale	Marital Status	M	SD	df	t value	P-value	Effect size r/ Cohn's d
Pay	Married	2.90	.53	243	.697	.70	-.067/-0.033
	Single	2.94	.66				
Promotion	Married	3.20	.58	243	.763	.76	.047/0.023
	Single	3.17	.70				
Supervision	Married	3.47	.65	243	.133	.13	.203/0.101
	Single	3.34	.63				
Fringe benefits	Married	2.95	.62	243	.537	.54	-.082/-0.041
	Single	3.00	.60				
Contingent rewards	Married	2.84	.67	243	.170	.17	-.183/-0.091
	Single	2.96	.64				
Operating procedures	Married	2.76	.59	243	.709	.71	-.051/-0.026
	Single	2.79	.58				
Co-workers	Married	3.33	.57	243	.706	.71	.018/0.009
	Single	3.30	.52				
Nature of work	Married	3.29	.54	243	.117	.12	.213/0.106
	Single	3.18	.49				
Communication	Married	3.01	.51	243	.185	.19	-.196/-0.098
	Single	3.11	.51				
JSS total	Married	3.08	.27	243	.921	.92	-.038/-0.019
	Single	3.09	.25				

Independent samples t-test was applied to compare the married and single university teacher's JSS mean scores. Table 4.12 demonstrates that male teachers' mean score (M = 3.08, SD =

0.27) was not considerably significant than that of females teachers (M = 3.09, SD = 0.25). The groups varied considerably, neither on the rest of the facets nor on overall JS scores.

Qualification Wise Comparison of University Teachers' JSS Score

Table 8. Qualification wise Comparison of JSS Score

Variable	Source	Df	SS	MS	F	p	η ²
Pay	Between groups	2	1.033	.516	1.562	.21	.013
	Within groups	242	80.022	.331			
Promotion	Between groups	2	1.275	.637	1.677	.19	.014

Supervision	Within groups	242	91.963	.380			
	Between groups	2	.796	.398	.968	.38	.008
Fringe benefits	Within groups	242	99.579	.411			
	Between groups	2	2.909	1.455	3.946*	.02	.032
Contingent rewards	Within groups	242	89.205	.369			
	Between groups	2	.314	.157	.358	.70	.003
Operating procedures	Within groups	242	106.136	.439			
	Between groups	2	.439	.219	.631	.53	.005
Co-workers	Within groups	242	84.136	.348			
	Between groups	2	0.683	.342	1.129	.33	.009
Nature of work	Within groups	242	73.234	.303			
	Between groups	2	0.238	.119	.432	.65	.004
Communication	Within groups	242	66.628	.275			
	Between groups	2	0.305	.153	.579	.56	.005
JSS total	Within groups	242	63.870	.264			
	Between groups	2	0.075	.038	.522	.60	.004
	Within groups	242	17.441	.072			

* $p < .05$

Mean JSS scores of university teachers in various qualification levels are presented in table 4.13. ANOVA was applied to discover the differences in JSS score of various qualification level groups. Table 4.14 indicates that qualification level groups were neither considerably diverse from neither on

any of the subscales nor on overall JSS scores except on fringe benefits; this difference is significant among mean scores on fringe benefits $F(2,43) = 3.946$, $p = 0.02$, with an effect size of 0.032 . Taken together, these results advocate that JS is not significantly related to qualification.

AgeWise Comparison of University Teachers' JSS Score

Table 9. Age-wise Comparison of JSS Score

Variable	Source	df	SS	MS	F	p-value	η^2
Pay	Between groups	3	.215	.072	.213	.89	.003
	Within groups	241	80.841	.335			
Promotion	Between groups	3	1.527	.509	1.338	.26	.016
	Within groups	241	91.711	.381			
Supervision	Between groups	3	1.232	.411	.998	.39	.012
	Within groups	241	99.143	.411			
Fringe benefits	Between groups	3	.570	.190	.500	.68	.006
	Within groups	241	91.544	.380			
Contingent rewards	Between groups	3	1.474	.491	1.128	.34	.014
	Within groups	241	104.976	.436			
Operating procedures	Between groups	3	.347	.116	.331	.80	.004
	Within groups	241	84.228	.349			
Co-workers	Between groups	3	2.728	.909	3.078*	.03	.037
	Within groups	241	71.190	.295			
Nature of work	Between groups	3	1.696	.565	2.091	.10	.025
	Within groups	241	65.169	.270			
Communication	Between groups	3	1.157	.386	1.475	.22	.018
	Within groups	241	63.018	.261			
JSS total	Between groups	3	.267	.089	1.242	.30	.015
	Within groups	241	17.250	.072			

* $p < .05$

The mean JSS score of university teachers with various age groups is presented in table 4.15. ANOVA was applied to discover the differences between the mean JSS score of various age groups. Table 4.16 indicates that age is not the main source of variability in university teacher's JSS. It is

investigated that this difference is significant among mean scores on coworkers $F = (243) = 3.078, p = 0.03$, with effect size of 0.037. Taken together, these results advocate that JS is not significantly related to age.

Designation Wise Comparison of University Teachers' JSS Score

Table 10. Designation wise Comparison of JSS Score

Variable	Source	df	SS	MS	F	p-value	η^2																																																																																																								
Pay	Between groups	5	2.593	.519	1.580	.17	.032																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	78.462	.328				Promotion	Between groups	5	2.139	.428	1.122	.35	.023	Within groups	239	91.099	.381	Supervision	Between groups	5	2.214	.443	1.078	.37	.022	Within groups	239	98.161	.411	Fringe benefits	Between groups	5	2.360	.472	1.257	.28	.026	Within groups	239	89.753	.376	Contingent rewards	Between groups	5	1.869	.374	.854	.51	.018	Within groups	239	104.581	.438	Operating procedures	Between groups	5	1.018	.204	.583	.71	.013	Within groups	239	83.557	.350	Co-workers	Between groups	5	.660	.132	.431	.83	.009	Within groups	239	73.257	.307	Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020	Within groups	239	65.526	.274	Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010
Promotion	Between groups	5	2.139	.428	1.122	.35	.023																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	91.099	.381				Supervision	Between groups	5	2.214	.443	1.078	.37	.022	Within groups	239	98.161	.411	Fringe benefits	Between groups	5	2.360	.472	1.257	.28	.026	Within groups	239	89.753	.376	Contingent rewards	Between groups	5	1.869	.374	.854	.51	.018	Within groups	239	104.581	.438	Operating procedures	Between groups	5	1.018	.204	.583	.71	.013	Within groups	239	83.557	.350	Co-workers	Between groups	5	.660	.132	.431	.83	.009	Within groups	239	73.257	.307	Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020	Within groups	239	65.526	.274	Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073								
Supervision	Between groups	5	2.214	.443	1.078	.37	.022																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	98.161	.411				Fringe benefits	Between groups	5	2.360	.472	1.257	.28	.026	Within groups	239	89.753	.376	Contingent rewards	Between groups	5	1.869	.374	.854	.51	.018	Within groups	239	104.581	.438	Operating procedures	Between groups	5	1.018	.204	.583	.71	.013	Within groups	239	83.557	.350	Co-workers	Between groups	5	.660	.132	.431	.83	.009	Within groups	239	73.257	.307	Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020	Within groups	239	65.526	.274	Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																				
Fringe benefits	Between groups	5	2.360	.472	1.257	.28	.026																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	89.753	.376				Contingent rewards	Between groups	5	1.869	.374	.854	.51	.018	Within groups	239	104.581	.438	Operating procedures	Between groups	5	1.018	.204	.583	.71	.013	Within groups	239	83.557	.350	Co-workers	Between groups	5	.660	.132	.431	.83	.009	Within groups	239	73.257	.307	Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020	Within groups	239	65.526	.274	Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																																
Contingent rewards	Between groups	5	1.869	.374	.854	.51	.018																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	104.581	.438				Operating procedures	Between groups	5	1.018	.204	.583	.71	.013	Within groups	239	83.557	.350	Co-workers	Between groups	5	.660	.132	.431	.83	.009	Within groups	239	73.257	.307	Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020	Within groups	239	65.526	.274	Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																																												
Operating procedures	Between groups	5	1.018	.204	.583	.71	.013																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	83.557	.350				Co-workers	Between groups	5	.660	.132	.431	.83	.009	Within groups	239	73.257	.307	Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020	Within groups	239	65.526	.274	Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																																																								
Co-workers	Between groups	5	.660	.132	.431	.83	.009																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	73.257	.307				Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020	Within groups	239	65.526	.274	Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																																																																				
Nature of work	Between groups	5	1.340	.268	.978	.43	.020																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	65.526	.274				Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018	Within groups	239	62.987	.264	JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																																																																																
Communication	Between groups	5	1.188	.238	.901	.48	.018																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	62.987	.264				JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																																																																																												
JSS total	Between groups	5	.180	.036	.497	.78	.010																																																																																																								
	Within groups	239	17.336	.073																																																																																																											

The mean JSS score of university teachers with various designation groups is presented in table 4.17. ANOVA was applied to discover the differences between the mean JSS score of various designation groups. Table 4.18 indicates that designation groups are not considerably different neither on any of the subscales nor on overall JS score. Taken together, these results advocate that JSS is not significantly related to designation.

Conclusions

Data analysis shows that university teachers feel satisfied with their jobs and different aspects of JS. Data analysis revealed gender-wise, no difference exists in the JS of university teachers. Both male and female university teachers perceived JS as not significantly different from one another, overall as well as sub-scale-wise. Hence, it is safe to say that JS has nothing to do with gender. The comparison

of university teachers on the basis of marital status concludes that both the groups of married and single university teachers did not differ significantly either on the overall level or on the rest of the facets of JS. So, it can be said that married and single university teachers possess the same level of JS. It can be concluded that university teachers at various qualification levels groups are not significantly different neither on any of the subscales nor on the overall JS level except on fringe benefits. It can be concluded from the data analysis that age is not the main source of variability in university teacher's JS. It is investigated that this difference lies only on coworkers. On the whole, the results suggest that JS is not significantly associated with age. The comparison on the basis of designation reveals that various designation groups of university teachers do not either on any of the subscales or

on overall JS level. These results advocate that JS is not significantly related to the designation.

Discussion

It is evident from the data analysis that university teachers feel satisfied with their jobs and the different facets of JS. Certain researches were conducted by [Michalinos and Elena \(2003\)](#), which support the results of the present research study. [Salvendy et al. \(1982\)](#) and [Susan \(2003\)](#) also agree with these results. Both male and female university teachers experience the same level of JS. So, it can be said that JS is not related to gender. Numerous research studies have been conducted on gender and JS where they reach no agreement that gender does not affect JS ([August & Waltman, 2004](#); [Bozeman & Gaughan, 2010](#); [Callister, 2006](#); [Hagedorn, 2000](#); [Perna, 200](#); [Rosser, 2005](#); [Rosser, 2004](#); [Seifert & Umbach, 2008](#); [Tack & Patitu, 1992](#); [Titus, 2007](#)).

The comparison of university teachers on the basis of marital status finds that both the groups of married and single university teachers do not differ significantly on JS. So, we can say that married and single university teachers possess the same level of JS. These results are affirmed by [Athanasios \(2001\)](#), [Boran \(2011\)](#), [Hayfaa \(2012\)](#), [Mark & Stephen \(2015\)](#), [Salameh & Hamdan \(2007\)](#), [Sangay \(2010\)](#), Saiyadian (1985), [Sidani & Jamali \(2010\)](#). The possible reason behind that may be the joint family system and the family support. This research study suggests that that qualification does not influence JS significantly. Pertaining to the influence of qualification on JS ([Crossman & Abou-Zaki, 2003](#); [Hayfaa, 2012](#); [Robert & Sommeria, 1991](#); [Sangay, 2010](#); [Sidani & Jamali, 2010](#); [Wang, 2006](#)), are also of the view that qualification is not significantly related to JS.

No significant difference is observed among all the four age groups with respect to JS. A big pile of research studies exist in favour of the findings

of the present research study, which claims that JS is not associated with age ([Crossman & Abou-Zaki, 2003](#); [Hayfaa, 2012](#); [Leafy et al., 2015](#); [Sidani & Jamali, 2010](#)). The findings of the present research study suggest that JS is not related to designation. [Adkins at al. \(2001\)](#), [Okpara at al. 2005](#); Titus (2015;) affirm it.

Recommendations

The administration team ought to plan a year arrangement in regard to professional improvement, and all university teachers are given a reasonable chance to build up their capacities. The administration should play their neutral role in this regard. Along these lines, strategy creators and academic administrators ought to take fundamental measures for the ideal procurement of natural and outward occupation prizes for making central personnel exceptionally fulfilled and fully devoted to procuring the advantages of enhanced inspiration and execution.

Implications

A nation is constructed by its residents; natives are formed by educators, and educators are made by educator teachers. So for the advancement of any nation, it is crucial to have great educators, and great instructors who can be delivered just on the off chance that we have excellent arrangement of teacher training and committed proficient and fulfilled educator teachers. Overwhelmingly satisfied teachers with fewer amounts of conflicts may effectively execute their academic and professional obligations at job put so forward at home. Such educators turn out to be an increasingly crucial consideration toward the educational organizations which require deeming a new skeleton in their professional progression models, which account for entirely satisfied personnel.

References

- Adkins, C. L., Werbel, J. D. & Fahr, J.-L. (2001). A field study of job insecurity during a financial crisis. *Group & Organization Management*, 26(4), 463-83.
- Arnold, H. J. & Feldman, D. C. (1996). *Organizational Behaviour*. McGraw Hill.
- Athanasios, D. Koustelios, (2001). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction of Greek teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(3), 354-358.
- August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(2), 177-192.
- Baron, A. R., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational Behaviour in organization. *Understanding and managing the human side of work*. Prentice Hall, 12-17.
- Bilgic, R. (1998). The relationship between job satisfaction and personal characteristics of Turkish workers. *Journal of Psychology*, 132(5), 549-557. doi: 10.1080/00223989809599287.
- Bodla, M. A., & Danish, R. Q. (2009). Politics and workplace: an empirical examination of the relationship between perceived organizational politics and work performance. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 16(1), 44-62.
- Boran, T. (2011). Job satisfaction of academic staff: an empirical study on Turkey. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(2), 34-67.
- Bozeman, B., & Monica G. (2010). Job Satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-186.
- Callister, R. R. (2006). The impact of gender and department climate on job satisfaction and intentions to quit for faculty in sciences and engineering fields. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(3), 367-375.
- Crossman, A., & Abou-Zaki, B. (2003). Job satisfaction and employee performance of Lebanese banking staff. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(4), 368-376. doi: 10.1108/026839403104731.
- Elisa, J. Grant-Vallone, S. I. & Donaldson, (2012). Consequences of work-family conflict on employee well-being over time. *Work & Stress*, 15(3), 214-226.
- Eyupoglu, S. Z., & Saner, T. (2009). Job satisfaction: Does rank make a difference? *African Journal of Business Management*, 3(10), 609-615.
- Ghazzawi, I. (2008). Job satisfaction antecedents and consequences: A new conceptual framework and research agenda. *The Business Review*, 11(2), 1-10.
- Gibson, L. J., Donnelly, J. H & Ivancevich, J. M. (2000). *Fundamentals of Management*. Irwin.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 5-20.
- Hayfaa, A. Tlaiss, (2012). Determinants of job satisfaction in the banking sector: the case of Lebanese managers, *Employee Relations*, 35(4), 377-395.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 237-249.
- Leafy, T., Michel P., & Prosper B. L. M., (2015), *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(3), 34-56.
- Mark, R. T., Stephen, L. & Mueller. (2015). Demographic and cultural predictors of international service worker job satisfaction. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 19(2), 45-61.
- Martins, N. & Coetzee, M. (2007). Organizational culture, employee satisfaction, perceived leader emotional competency and personality type: An exploratory study in a South African engineering company. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(2), 20-32.
- Michalinos, Z. & Elena, P. (2003). Principals and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(5), 19-98.
- Mullins, L.J. (2002). *Management and Organizational Behaviour*. Pitman Publishing.
- Okpara, J. O., Squillace, M., & Erundu, E., A (2005). Gender differences and job satisfaction: a study of university teachers in the United States. *Women Manage. Review*, 20(3), 177-190.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal Correlates of Job Satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK

- universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(12), 1210-1232.
- Perna, L.W. (2001). The contribution of historically Black colleges and universities to the preparation of African Americans for faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(3), 567-294.
- Pohlman, R., & Gardiner, G. (2000). *Value driven management: How to create and maximize value over time for organizational success*. Amacom Div Organizational Mgmt Assn.
- Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour*. Prentice Hall.
- Robert, R. (1991). The effects of educational level on correctional officer job satisfaction, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19(2), 123-137.
- Robert, R., & Sommeria, J. (1991). Statistical equilibrium states for two-dimensional flows. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 229, 291-310.
- Ross, E. (2001). Love the Job. *Business Review Weekly*, 23(4), 56-59.
- Rosser, V. J. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285-309.
- Rosser, V.J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285-309.
- Saiyadain, M. S. (1985). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction: India-Nigeria comparison. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 143-153.
- Salameh, P., Hamdan, I. (2007). Pharmacy manpower in Lebanon: an exploratory look at work-related satisfaction. *Res. Social. Adm. Pharm*, 3, 336-350.
- Salvendy, G. P. Mc.Cabe, S. G. Sanders, J. L. Knight, & E. J. McCormicks. (1982). Impact of personality and intelligence on job satisfaction of assembly line and bench work: An industrial study. *Journal of Applied Ergonomics*, 13(4), 34-68.
- Sangay Drukpa Locke, E. A., (2010). *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction, Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Rand Mc Nally.
- Sangay, D. (2010). Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in Thimphu district of Bhutan. *Unpublished master's thesis: Mahidol University*.
- Sarkar, S. J., Alf Crossman, & Parkpoom C. (2003). The relationships of age and length of service with job satisfaction: an examination of hotel employees in Thailand. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(7), 745-758.
- Seifert, T. A., & Umbach, P. D. (2008). The effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 357-381.
- Shane, M., Stephen, L., & Van Glinow, M. A. (2005). *Perilaku Organisasi. Mc. Bukit Graw. Boston*.
- Sidani, Y., & Jamali, D. (2010). The Egyptian Worker: Work Beliefs and Attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92(3), 433-450.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*. Sage.
- Spector, P. (2008). *Industrial and Organizational Behaviour* (5th edition). John Wiley & Sons.
- Suliman, A. & Iles, P. (2000). Is continuance commitment beneficial to organizations? Commitment-performance relationship: a new look. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(5), 407-426.
- Susan, J. Linz, (2003). Job satisfaction among Russian workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(6), 626 - 652.
- Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril*. Washington, DC: George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.
- Titus, M .A. (2007) 'Detecting selection bias, using propensity score matching, and estimating treatment effects: An application to the private returns to a master's degree. *Research in Higher Education* 48(4), 487-521.
- Tsai, W. C., Chen, C. C., & Liu, H. L. (2007). Test of a model linking employee positive moods and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 23-67.
- Wang, H. (2006). *Unpublished Masters Thesis of Department of Business Administration & Economics, KRISTIANSTAD University College, Auckland New Zealand*