JOURNAL: PRIMAX INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH
ISSN: Print ISSN: 2321-3604 Online ISSN: 2321-3612 & Open Access
DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/X2EZC
Impact Factor: 7.184
PRIMAX IJCMR VOLUME NO.10, ISSUE NO-2, JULY -SEPTEMBER - 2022
Research Article

INFLUENCE OF DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES ON JOB SATISFACTION: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS IN LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGES

Dr. A. Ravichandran
Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Satyawati College Evening (University of Delhi), Delhi, India

*Corresponding author | Received: 05/07/2022 | Accepted: 20/08/2022 | Published: 10/09/2022

Abstract: *It is important to understand the Job Involvement of faculty employees as they play vital role to produce a greater number of employable graduates, develop innovative curriculum, carryout the valuable research and development activities and maintain higher level of academic standard of the institutes. It is also important to understand the influence of personal and professional attributes on the level of JS as it will enable to understand how demographic attributes variant the level of JS among academic workforce. The aim of this paper is to explore the influence of demographic attributes on the level of JS of academics. Based on the primary data collection among 656 faculty members, the findings of the study indicate that demographic attributes of faculty members have significant influence on the level of their Job Satisfaction. However, gender has no significant influence on their JS level and both male and female faculty members' JS level is above the moderate level. The results provide strong support to theoretical aspect particularly for Herzberg (1959) two factor theory i.e., hygiene factors such as Salary and Promotion, Interpersonal Relations and Physical Working Conditions and motivational factor of Job Content or work itself. This study also provides strong empirical support for the proposed hypotheses of influence of demographic attributes on the level of JS except gender (as stated above) and findings of this study confirm and negated with the propositions existed in the past research studies.*

Key words: Demographic attributes, Personal variables, Professional variables Job Satisfaction, Government College, Private and Self-Financed College.

Introduction

In the present context of fast changing global and competitive business world Indian organizations find difficult to attract and retain talent. This problem is more serious in service sector like banking, IT and IT enabled, health, hospitality, etc. and even if these industries attract the young talent they are not able to retain them due to better opportunities in other organizations or foreign assignments. Higher educational sector is not an exceptional one to attract and retain the qualified faculty members. The shortage of academic talent and inability to attract the right number of academic talents is critical phenomenon in the HEIs particularly in the Private and Self-Financed (PSF). It seems that young Indian talents do prefer to join either non-academic industries or accept assignment in foreign industries or foreign universities. One of the important reason behind this could be less satisfaction in their job due to lack of: research and consultant opportunities; freedom and autonomy in the profession, conducive work environment, uncompetitive pay structure particularly in the PSF institutions; industry-institute interaction; faculty empowerment, interpersonal relations; comfortable physical working conditions; etc. The present young

talents expect more job autonomy, job challenges, competitive pay structure, fast growth opportunities, training and development for updated technology, recognize for extraordinary performance and more empowerment. These factors will significantly play and determine more satisfaction in their job. Apart from these factors, personal and professional (demographic) attributes of employee such as age, gender, educational qualification, present job position, income, marital status, promotion, religion, race, length of service, nature of post, etc would also significantly determine job satisfaction of employee. The aim of the present study is to investigate the influence of select personal and professional attributes on the Job Satisfaction (JS) of academics in liberal arts and science colleges of Tamil Nadu Province (India). Satisfied academic staffs in any higher educational institution would contribute significantly for quality in teaching, research output, developing innovative curriculum, producing more employable graduates and ultimately to preserve for the high level of academic standard of the institute at international level.

Theoretical Background

Job Satisfaction, its determinants and its out comes

Several authors and management philosophers defined the term job satisfaction and various factors to determine the level of job satisfaction. Locke (1976) defined JS as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job experiences”. Dawis and lofquist (1984) defined that job satisfaction is “the result of the employee’s appraisal of the degree to what extent the components of fulfills the individual’s needs. Ejio (1980) and Hoy and Miskel (1987) described that job satisfaction is the totality and combination of psychological, physiological well being such as pay, fringe benefits, promotion, interpersonal relations, job content, physical working conditions, encouragement for employee empowerment, challenges in job, freedom and autonomy, which cause to say “I am satisfied with my job”. There are numerous factors determined the level of job involvement of workers. Herzberg (1959) coined the factors of job satisfaction and he categorized two factor theory of intrinsic (motivation) and extrinsic (hygiene) factors. He classified intrinsic factors are work itself, advancement, growth, recognition, achievement; and responsibility, working conditions, supervision, salary, company policies, job security, and status relationship with superiors, subordinates and peers, and factors in personal life are classified as extrinsic factors.

Several research studies in the past analyzed and found that organizational factors were determined the level of job satisfaction of academics. For example, Fessehatsion and Bahta (2016) investigated and found that research opportunities, interpersonal relations and training

and development have strong and positively influenced on the level of JS of the faculty in HEIs in Eritrea. Santhapparaj and Alam (2005) examined the relationship between monetary benefits, promotion, fringe benefit, working conditions, research support, training and development and overall JS and the result showed that salary, promotion, working conditions, research support have strong and positive correlation with JS. A study conducted by Bowen and Radhakrishna (1991) in the HEIs and their results showed that academics were more satisfied with their job content and interpersonal relations and least satisfied with career advancement. Pay, allowances and other monetary benefits, job content, physical working conditions, interpersonal relationship, job support and promotional opportunities are the significant organizational factors to have greater contribution for the level JS of academic workforce in the HEIs (Sonmezer & Eryaman, 2008). Academics working in PSF colleges were highly dissatisfied with salary offered their institution and intrinsic factors like growth opportunities, recognition, work load and extrinsic factors like low monetary benefits given by the Colleges played a very significant role of major dissatisfying factors of JS among these academic workforce. Bowen and Radhakrishna (1991) conducted a study among academics and their results revealed that job content was most determinant factor of JS and opportunity for advancement was least one. Similarly, a study of Muhammad Ehan et al. (2012) found that pay and promotion were the significant and positive influence of JS among academic workforce in Pakistan. Mulindwa (1998) revealed in his study that pay was greater contribution of JS among academics and administrative staff of Polytechnic Colleges. Thus, faculty members are more satisfied when they perceive that they are paid satisfactorily (Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) and they are also satisfied more when they are recognized for their effort in the work (Ali and Ahmed, 2009).

Clovin (2001) analyzed the organizational factors of interpersonal relations, work atmosphere, professional autonomy, administrative support and leadership style with JS and the findings shown that these factors have positively associated with the JS. In the research of Fajana (2002) found that leadership and job design were determined as important factor for the level of JS and these two components were positively affected the JS.Spector (1997) conducted and identified nine organizational dimensions which were strongly influenced the level of JS and these were: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures (required rules and procedures), coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Okpara (2004) examined and identified five dimensions of job satisfaction: pay, promotion, supervision, job content and co-workers and his study was based on dimensions of Spector's (1997) of job satisfaction because his study was broader and several

researchers were most and widely used.

Job satisfaction has been found to be led or influenced with several organizational outcomes. For example, employees who were more satisfied with pay, career advancement, physical working conditions, job content, interpersonal relations have greatly led to Company performance in the form of quality in output, financial performance and customer satisfaction. Research studies in the past have also been found that JS have led to several work-related outcomes and work behaviors of employees such as outperformed by individual employees (Ezeanyim, Ezinwa, Ufoaroh, Theresas & Ajakpo, 2019; Verma and Jain , 2014; Shah *et al,* 2012; Wolomasi*et al.,* 2019; Ravichandran and Bhardwaj, 2021; and Ravichandran and Venkat Raman, 2015), more retention or less intention to quit behavior.

Demographic attributes and its influence on JS

Demographic attributes are the individual characteristics and it is classifiable of a given population and it is most commonly used by both Government and business sector. For example, government often used the demographic characteristics for the purpose of obtaining data about public health, human development index, income distribution, etc. Similarly, business sector also uses the demographic characteristics of the population: to segment the market for their products; to decide advertisement campaign; appropriate composition of employees; etc. The various components of demographic attributes of the given population can be age, gender, race, religion, marital status, income, occupation, educational qualification, type of family and its size, language, work experience, designation, promotion etc. and based on these characters both government and business sector conducts survey and collect the data for their own purposes. Further the data analysis from these demographic characters of the population will significantly influence the government and business sector to take appropriate decision or to make appropriate policy framework.

Employee job satisfaction in any organization play a very significant role as it leads several outcomes as stated in the earlier paragraph. Existing research studies found that several demographic factors of employee have also affected the level of JS (Mehboob and Bhutto, 2012; Paul and Phua, 2011; Amarasena et al. 2015; Milledzi, Amponsah, and Asamani, 2018; and Shrestha, 2019). Mixed results were found from the existing research literature i.e. some studies shown demographic variables were significantly and positively influenced on the level of JS and some were either no influence or negatively influenced. For example, a study conducted by DeVaney and Chen (2003) and their results shown that age of the academic employees have strong influence on the level of their job satisfaction i.e., senior academic staffs were more satisfied than their counter part of juniors. A study of

Milledzi, Amponsah, and Asamani (2018) also found that age has strong influence on the level JS among academic staff of the university. Similarly, studies of Mello (2006); Paul and Phua (2011); and Amarasena, Ajward, and Haque (2015) examined and found that the level JS was increased in the same direction with increasing the age of employees. In a study of Saner and Eyupoglu (2012) among academic staffs in North Cyprus, the findings of the study indicated that age has significantly influenced overall JS and extrinsic factors and not with intrinsic factors of Herzberg theory. Contrast to the above research findings, research studies of (Sakiru, Ismail, Samah, and Busaya, 2017; Shrestha, 2019; Akpofure, Ikhifa, Imide, and Okokoyo, 2006) have shown that age has not significantly or negatively influenced the level of job satisfaction.

Similar to influence of age on the level of JS gender will also influence the level of JS. It is well aware that there is increasing trend of female workforce all over the world and they are employed in almost all field of economy including pilot, defense and educational sector. Male and female employee may expect differently from their job components and these may or may not fulfill their expectation which will lead to either higher or less JS level or even dissatisfaction. There were mixed findings from the existing research studies which related gender and the level of JS. The findings from the research studies of (Olorunsola, 2012; Clark, 1997; Booth, Burton and Mumford, 2000; Mehboob, Sarwar, and Bhutto, 2012; Castillo and Cano, 2004; Syed et al, 2012; and Spector, 2008) have shown that male employee were more satisfied than female employees and thus gender has significant influence on the level of JS. However, some research studies have found that there was no significant difference between male and female on the level of JS and thus gender has not significantly influenced on the level of JS (Mcneely, 1984; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 1999; Sakiru, Ismail, Samah, and Busaya, 2017; Oshagbemi and Gill, 2004; Paul and Phua, 2011; and Shrestha, 2019).

Apart from Age and Gender several other demographic variables such as monthly income, job position or designation, work experience, marital status, promotion, etc. have also affected the level of JS. A study conducted by Shrestha (2019) among university faculty to analyze the relationship between demographic variables and the level of JS. The findings of this study shown that monthly income, academic rank, work experience, nature of post, type of college and educational qualification were significantly related with the level of JS and age and gender were not significantly influenced. Monthly salary and promotion (Hagedorn, 1994; and Muhammad Ehsan et al., 2012), academic Rank (Paul and Phua, 2011; and Toker, 2011; and Ghafoor, 2014; Sabharwal and Corley,2009; and Malik, 2011), work

experience and publication (Zarafshani and Alibaygi, 2008), social recognition (Amarasena, Ajward and Haque, 2015), teaching experience, educational qualification, marital status and number of children (Amarasena et al., 2015; Malik, 2011); marital status (Milledzi, Amponsah and Asamani, 2018; and Hagedorn, 2000) have significantly and positively affected the JS level of academic employees. But work experience (Olorunsola, 2012; Paul and Phua, 2011; Long, 2007; Mohammed, et al., 2017; and Oshagbemi, 2003), job position and monthly salary (Amarasena, Ajward and Haque, 2015; and Mohammed, et al., 2017), educational qualification (Sakiru, Ismail, Samah and Busaya, 2017; Shafie abadi and Khalajasadi, 2010; Mohammed, et al., 2017), marital status (Shafie abadi and Khalajasadi, 2010; and Mohammed, et al., 2017) have not been significantly varied with the level of JS. There is strong research support that indicates the demographic variables significantly influenced the level of JS. In the Indian context, there are several research studies that related job satisfaction and its exposure of both at individual and Company level. However, it seems that there is inadequate of research work which relate demographic variables and job satisfaction in general and particularly in the Indian general HEIs. Thus, it is believed that there is paucity on research investigating the influence of demographic variables on the JS level among academic employees in the Indian HEIs. Based on this theoretical consideration and empirical research support in the existing studies, the present research study has undertaken to address this research gap.

Significance of the Study

It is important to understand the Job Involvement of faculty as they play vital role to produce more number of employable graduates, develop innovative curriculum, carryout the valuable research and development activities and maintain higher level of academic standard of the institute. It is also important to understand the influence of personal and professional attributes on the level of JS as it will enable to understand how demographic attributes variant the level of JS among academic workforce. Thus, the findings of the present study will provide a comprehensive understanding about the factors of JS which are required to strengthen to obtain more JS level for attracting and retaining more qualified faculty members which is the central issue in the Indian HEIs.

Objectives of the Study

Based on the conceptual consideration, the following important objectives are framed:

1. To examine and understand the level Job Satisfaction of academic employees;
2. To study and understand the demographic composition of academic employees in the study institutes;
3. To investigate and report the influence of demographic attributes on the level of job satisfaction; and
4. To identify and report both theoretical and practical implication of the study.

Methodology

Hypotheses

H_1: There will be significant differences between Age and the level of Job Satisfaction.

H_2: Gender is likely to be significantly influenced on the level of Job Satisfaction.

H_3: There is likely to be significant variation between Educational Qualification and the level of Job Satisfaction

H_4: Monthly Salary will likely to significant influence on the level of Job Satisfaction.

H_5: Academic Rank will likely to be significantly influenced on the level of Job Satisfaction.

H_6: There is significant variation between nature of post and the level of Job Satisfaction.

H_7: There is likely to be significant variation between number of promotions obtained and the level of Job Satisfaction.

H_8: There will be significant difference between Teaching Experience and the level of Job Satisfaction.

Variables and Its measurement

The study is focused on two sets of facets i.e. personal and professional (Demographic) variables and job satisfaction. The following demographic variables have been considered to be more appropriate for the present study and they are: Age, Gender, Educational Qualification, Academic Rank, MGS, Teaching Experience & Number of Promotion obtained in the present institute. The other important aspect is Job Satisfaction and it is the "feel of academic employees about the satisfied/dissatisfied level in their job related factors. These job-related factors have been measured by four dimensions such as Promotion & Salary (P&S) Job Specification (JS) Interpersonal Relationship (IPR), and Physical Work Environment (PWE). "Salary and Promotion" means satisfaction level of academic employees about their basic pay, allowances and promotional opportunities in the current institute and it is noted in 3 statements in the questionnaire. "Job Content" is academic employees' satisfaction level with regards to teaching workload, sense of accomplishment in

the job, professional guidance from senior faculty members, research and consulting opportunities and opportunity for guiding research scholars and it is measured 5 statements in the questionnaire. "Interpersonal Relationship" is a feeling of academic employees towards maintaining relationship with colleagues, non-teaching staffs and head of department/institute and 3 statements were included in the questionnaire. "Physical Work Environment" is defined as the satisfaction of academic employees towards physical infrastructure and service facilities such as (LCD projector, laptop, whiteboard, supportive staff in the lab/workshop, telephonic facilities, canteen and catering services, e-journals, etc.) provided in the workplace and this has been measured by 7 statements in the questionnaire.While the demographic factors were measured by categorical/nominal data, the JS factors were measured by five point Likert-scale ranging from 5=highly satisfied to 1= highly dissatisfied. A pilot study was conducted with 40 academic employees to obtain internal consistency for the level of JS by using Cronbach Alpha test and it was obtained as .652, .685, .690 and .725 respectively for S & P, JC, IPR and PWE. Coefficient Alpha of value .70 to be considered as good and a value exceeding .60 to be acceptable level of internal consistency of the factors (Nunally and Bernstein, 1994).

Sampling and Data Collection

The present study is based on quantitative research technique using a structured questionnaire to quantify the demographic and JS factors. The survey was conducted among academic employees in Liberal Arts and Science Colleges from the Tamil Nadu Province (India) comprising Government owned, Government Aided and Private and Self-financed institutes. This Province has geographically divided into four regions i.e. East, West, North and South and these four regions have adequate number of colleges. The researcher applied two important criteria to select the sample institute to ensure adequate representation from all the regions and maintain uniformity. They are: The institutes which are complied "mandatory disclosure" in its website address with full details of faculty members including their contact details; and those institutes which have completed 20 years and above from the date of its establishment assuming that these institutes follow a well established HR practices. Based on the above stratified sampling technique, the researcher has selected randomly 9 institutes from each region (3 each from Government, Government Aided, and PSF) comprising total of 36 institutes. The questionnaire was prepared both in print and online mode (Google form) for the convenient of the respondent academic employees. The researcher mailed 25 questionnaires to each select sample institute and total of 900 (9X4X25=900) with prior consent of the respondent academic employees. The

researcher has taken care to obtain a fair representation among all the demographic factors. A total of 702 respondent academic employees were filled and returned and the response rate was 78%. Out of these 702 responses, 46 were found incomplete and remaining 656 responses were considered and taken for data analysis purpose.

Organization of Data Analysis and Statistical Tools

The information collected related to demographic and JS variables were first coded in a master table using IBM SPSS software 20 version. Descriptive statistics of cross tabulation with percentage analysis was applied to obtain number of observation and percentage among each demographic factor from each type of institute. Further independent 't" test was applied to find out the differences, if any, between gender and Nature of Post and the level of JS. One way ANOVA test was applied to analyze the significant differences, if any, between remaining demographic factors and the level of JS. The mean score of five point Likert-Scales for JS level was slightly modified into three stages to have more meaningful interpretation and thus it is modified as: 1-2.49 to be interpreted as "less satisfied", 2.5 to 3.49 to be "moderate level" and 3.5-5 to be as highly satisfied (Kassaw & Golga, 2019).

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Frequency Distribution

Frequency distribution analysis (table 1) reports that only very meager representation (8.2%) of young academic employees (less than 30 years of age) from all the three types of the institute. There is fair representation of middle aged (more than 50% from GA and PSF and around 50% from GOVT institute) academic employees from all the institute and only moderate representation of older age group from GOVT and GA institute. There is only minimum representation (13.5%) of older age academic employees from the PSF institute. It is possible to understand that either all the categories of the institute are not able to attract the young talent or young talent could join the teaching profession after 30 years of age due to completing research degree qualification such as M.Phil and or PhD. It is also possible to understand that PSF colleges are not able retain the old age academic employees and this could be due to lack of providing better promotional opportunities. Concerning to gender it is clearly reports that there is well representation of male (59.8%) and fair representation of female (40.2%) academic employees from all the categories of the institute and it could say that female is equally employing with male in the teaching profession. It seems that highly qualified (PhD, 72.1%) academic employees are well represented in all the three categories of the institute. In regards to monthly gross salary there is minimum representation of respondents whose monthly gross salary of both less than Rs. 30,000 and Rs. 30,000 to

60,000 from GOVT (6.5% & 2.5%) and GA (5.5% & 5.5%) institute and well representation of 60,000 to 1,50,000 and moderate representation from above Rs. 1,50,000. Contrast to this there is higher representation (80%) of respondents whose monthly gross salary Rs. Less than 30,000 and only very minimum people were responded from remaining categories of gross salary income in PSF institutions. It could say that both GOVT and GA institutes are offering attractive compensation but academic employees in PSF institutes are poorly paid.

Table 1: Frequency Distribution

Personal and Professional Variables		Ownership of the Institute						Total N = 656	
		GOVT N = 201		GA N = 200		PSF N = 255		N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age	Less than 30	2	1%	4	2%	48	18.8%	54	8.2%
	31-45	100	49.8%	109	54.5%	173	67.8%	382	58.2%
	Above 45	99	49.2%	87	43.5%	34	13.5%	220	33.5%
Gender	Male	141	70.1%	118	59%	133	52.2%	392	59.8%
	Female	60	29.9%	82	41%	122	47.8%	264	40.2%
Education	PG	1	.5%	3	1.5%	19	7.5%	23	3.5%
	M.Phil.,	27	13.4%	30	15%	103	40.4%	160	24.4%
	Ph.D	173	86.1%	167	83.5%	133	52.2%	473	72.1%
Gross Salary (P.M)	Less than 30,000	13	6.5%	11	5.5%	204	80%	228	34.8%
	30,000-60,000	5	2.5%	11	5.5%	47	18.4%	63	9.6%
	60,001-1,50,000	146	72.6%	129	64.5%	4	1.6%	279	42.5%
	Above !, 50,000	37	18.4%	49	24.5%	0	0%	86	13.1%
Academic Rank	Lecturer	9	4.5%	3	1.5%	21	8.2%	33	5%
	Assistant Professor	152	75.6%	140	70%	188	73.7%	480	73.2%
	Associate Professor	40	19.9%	57	28.5%	46	18%	143	21.8%
Present Teaching Exp.	Less than 10 years	85	42.3%	46	23%	158	62%	289	44.1%
	10-20 years	74	36.8%	88	44%	85	33.3%	247	37.7%
	Above 20 years	42	20.9%	66	33%	12	4.7%	120	18.3%
No. of Promotion	Nil	111	55.2%	81	40.5%	184	72.2%	376	57.3%
	One	42	20.9%	53	26.5%	51	20%	146	22.3%
	Two	34	16.9%	36	18%	17	6.7%	87	13.3%
	More than two	14	7%	30	15%	3	1.2%	47	7.2%
Nature of Post	Permanent/regular	185	92%	188	94%	109	42.7%	482	73.5%
	Temporary/Contract	16	8%	12	6%	146	57.3%	174	26.5%

GOVT=Government Institute; GA=Government Aided Institute; PSF=Private and Self-Financed Institute; N= Number of observation

In the professional variables academic rank representation from the Lecturer (5%) is very meager and moderate level of response from Associate Professors (21.8%) and there is well representation from the Assistant Professors in all the three categories of the institute (73.2%). It could say that only few institutes are still practicing the entry level job position of Lecturer and majority of the institutes have replaced it by Assistant Professor and more over promoting from

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is not taking in timely manner. Concerning to Teaching Experience there is fair and moderate response of less than 10 years and 10-20 years and only minimum level of representation from above 20 years of teaching experience in both GOVT and GA institutions. However, it seems that there is higher representation (62%) of less than 10 years and very meager representation of above 20 years of experience in PSF institutions. It could argue that PSF institutes are not able to attract and retain the well experienced academic employees and this could be due to unattractive compensation and other benefits. In all the three categories of the institute, invariably there is fair representation from those academic employees who have not been obtained even a single promotion, moderate representation of obtaining one promotion, minimum level in two promotions and only a very meager level in more than two promotions obtained. It is possible to say that HEIs in this Province are not showing much interest to promote the academic employees to various higher levels and the reasons behind this may be beauacratic delay, financial implications, etc. With regards to Nature of Post, there is excellent representation of permanent/regular post academic employees from both GOVT (92%) and GA (94%) and only meager responses from temporary/contract respondent. Contrast to this, there is more or less equal responses of both permanent/regular (42.7%) and temporary/contract (57.3%) from PSF institutes and it could say that these institutes are employing more temporary academic workforce than regular/permanent employees.

Influence of Personal Variables on Job Satisfaction

The analysis of one-way ANOVA (table 2) clearly indicates that there is significant variation between Age group and all the JS attributes except IPR where there is no significant difference. Further there is no significant difference between young (Less than 30 years) and middle aged (30 to 45 years) with overall JS as $p>.05$. Further Older (above 45 years) academic employees have greater JS level in all attributes followed by middle aged and young except PWE where young aged have higher JS level followed by middle aged and older. From the data analysis it could say that while age increased JS level also increased i.e., both age and JS level moves on the same direction and thus $\mathbf{H_1}$ is accepted as age has significant influence on the level of JS. This result is inconsonance with that of (DeVaney and Chen, 2003; Milledzi, Amponsah, and Asamani, 2018; of Mello, 2006; Paul and Phua, 2011; Amarasena, Ajward, and Haque, 2015) and contradiction with (Sakiru, Ismail, Samah, and Busaya, 2017; Shrestha, 2019; Akpofure, Ikhifa, Imide, and Okokoyo, 2006). The level of JS of both male and female are above the moderate level in all the attributes of JS. However, there is no significant difference between gender and all the JS attributes including overall JS at 5% level ($p>.05$) and therefore $\mathbf{H_2}$ is rejected. It could say that both male and female faculties are expected and fulfilled their needs at the same level from their jobs.

Table 2: One Way ANOVA/'t' Test: Personal Variables with Job Satisfaction

Personal Variables	Category of variables	Job Satisfaction Variables														
		Salary & Promotion			Job Content			Interpersonal Relations			Physical Work Environment			Overall Job Satisfaction		
		Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.
Age	Young	3.07	62.48	.000	3.60	20.71	.000	4.06	1.15	.316	4.13	19.00	.000	3.71	18.26	.000
	Middle aged	3.54			3.85			4.11			3.87			3.84		
	Older	4.20			4.08			4.17			3.61			4.01		
	Total	3.72			3.90			4.13			3.80			3.89		
Gender	Male	3.77	1.95	.051	3.92	1.01	.312	4.14	.765	.445	3.74	-2.68	.008	3.89	.613	.540
	Female	3.63			3.88			4.17			3.88			3.87		
	Total	3.70			3.90			4.16			3.81			3.88		
Educational Qualification	PG	3.19	36.50	.000	3.64	14.02	.000	4.00	1.45	.236	4.08	13.81	.000	3.73	11.54	.000
	M.Phil.,	3.27			3.73			4.08			3.99			3.77		
	PhD	3.89			3.98			4.15			3.72			3.93		
	Total	3.72			3.90			4.13			3.80			3.89		
Monthly Gross Salary	<30,000	2.87	299.08	.000	3.52	94.64	.003	4.09	.56	.639	4.12	45.65	.000	3.65	59.68	.000
	30000-60,000	3.39			3.73			4.17			4.02			3.83		
	60000-150000	4.22			4.15			4.14			3.53			4.01		
	>1,50,000	4.57			4.26			4.16			3.65			4.16		
	Total	3.72			3.90			4.13			3.80			3.89		

This result is inconsonance with that of (Mcneely, 1984; Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo & Cano, 1999; Sakiru, Ismail, Samah, and Busaya, 2017; Oshagbemi and Gill, 2004; Paul and Phua, 2011; and Shrestha, 2019) and contradiction with that of (Olorunsola, 2012; Clark, 1997; Booth, Burton and Mumford, 2000; Mehboob, Sarwar, and Bhutto, 2012; Castillo and Cano, 2004; Syed et al, 2012; and Spector, 2008).

Table 3: Post Hoc Test: - Comparison between Personal and Job Satisfaction Variables

Personal variables			**Job Satisfaction variables**									
Variables	**(I) Category**	**(J) Group Comp.**	**S & P**		**JC**		**IPR**		**PWE**		**Overall JS**	
			M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.
Age	Young	Middle	-.468*	.000	-.245*	.006	-.06	.765	.27*	.011	-.12	.077
		Older	-1.12*	.000	-.48*	.000	-.11	.385	.52*	.000	-.29*	.000
	Middle Aged	Young	.47*	.000	.25*	.006	.06	.765	-.27*	.011	.13	.077
		Older	-.65*	.000	-.23*	.000	-.06	.472	.25*	.000	-.17*	.000
	Older	Young	1.12*	.000	.48*	.000	.11	.385	-.52*	.000	.29*	.000
		Middle	.65*	.000	.29*	.000	.06	.472	-.25*	.000	.17*	.000
E.QLN.	**P.G**	M.Phil	-.082	.902	-.092	.739	-.081	.793	.082	.837	-.044	.879
		PhD	-.705*	.000	-.336*	.014	-.148	.434	.364*	.022	-.206*	.045
	M.Phil	P.G.	.082	.902	.092	.739	.081	.793	-.081	.837	.044	.879
		PhD	-.622*	.000	-.243*	.000	-.067	.396	.282*	.000	-.163*	.000
	PhD	P.G.	.705*	.000	.336*	.014	.148	.434	-.364*	.022	.206*	.045
		M.Phil	.622*	.000	.244*	.000	.067	.396	-.282*	.000	.163*	.000
M.G.S.	Less than 30,000	30,000-60,000	-.525*	.000	-.213*	.010	-.083	.721	.106	.595	-.179*	.003
		60,000-1,50,000	-1.35*	.000	-.640*	.000	-.046	.801	.593*	.000	-.361*	.000
		Above 1,50,000	-1.707*	.000	-.741*	.000	-.064	.802	.468*	.000	-.511*	.000
	30,000-60,000	Less than 30,000	.525*	.000	.213*	.010	.084	.721	-.106	.595	.179*	.003
		60,000-1,50,000	-.830*	.000	-.427*	.000	.038	.961	.487*	.000	-.183*	.002
		Above 1,50,000	-1.182*	.000	-.528*	.000	.0196	.997	.361*	.002	-.332*	.000
	60,0000-1,50,000	Less than 30,000	1.354*	.000	.640*	.000	.046	.801	-.593*	.000	.361*	.000
		30,000-60,000	.830*	.000	.427*	.000	-.038	.961	-.487*	.000	.183*	.002
		Above 1,50,000	-.353*	.000	-.101	.314	-.019	.993	-.126	.323	-.150*	.005
	Above 1,50,000	Less than 30,000	1.707*	.000	.741*	.000	.064	.802	-.468*	.000	.511*	.000
		30,000-60,000	1.182*	.000	.528*	.000	-.020	.997	-.361*	.002	.332*	.000
		60,000-1,50,000	.353*	.000	.101	.314	.019	.993	.126	.323	.150*	.005

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Influence of Professional Variables on Job Satisfaction

The One Way ANOVA/'t' and Post Hoc test (Table 4&5) reports that there is significant variation between the academic rank categories of the faculty members and the level of JS attributes in S&P, JC and overall JS but no significant variation in IPR and PWE. Both Assistant and Associate Professors have higher level of JS than the Lecturer level except in PWE where Lecturers have more JS level than the other two categories. It is to be understood that higher the level of academic rank will be the higher the JS and vice-versa and this data analysis is in consonance with the findings of Shrestha (2019; Paul and Phua, 2011; and Toker, 2011; and Ghafoor, 2014; Sabharwal and Corley,2009; and Malik, 2011) and contradiction with the findings of (Amarasena, Ajward and Haque, 2015; and Mohammed, et al., 2017). The data analysis partially supports the **H_5** and therefore this hypothesis could be partially accepted. Concerning to nature of post there is significant variation between permanent/regular and contractual/temporary employees in all the JS attributes ($p<.05$) except IPR where there is no significant variation as $p>.05$). Moreover, permanent faculty members have greater JS level in all the aspects than the temporary/contractual faculty members. This may be the reason due to higher salaries and benefits, privileges, recognition, comfortable working conditions to the permanent teachers which may not be provided to the temporary/contractual staff. The **H_6** is accepted as nature of post has significantly influenced on the level of JS and this finding is confirmed with that of Shrestha (2019). Regards to Promotion, it depicts that there is significant variation between the group and within the group in S&P, JC and overall JS aspects and no significant variation in IPR and PWE. The findings from this analysis confirms with that of (Hagedorn, 1994; and Muhammad Ehsan et al., 2012). Further the Post Hoc analysis indicates that there is no relationship difference in overall JS between faculty members who obtained promotion NIL and obtained ONE as $p>05$. The data analysis partially supports **H_7** as there is no significant difference in IPR and PWE and therefore this hypothesis is partially accepted. Length of teaching experience and the level of JS attributes also similar to Age and Promotion i.e., there are significant differences between length of teaching experience (both between the group and within the group) and JS level in S&P, JC and overall JS ($p<.05$) and no statistical differences in IPR and PWE ($p>.05$). Moreover, higher the length of experience is higher the level of JS and vice-versa. It is to be understood that both age and length of teaching experience could move on the same direction i.e., when age of the faculty members increases the length of teaching experience will also increase and because of this the JS level in both age and length of teaching experience have similar results.

Table 4: One Way ANOVA/'t' Test: Professional Variables with Job Satisfaction

Professional Variables	Category of variables	Job Satisfaction Variables														
		Salary & Promotion			Job Content			Interpersonal Relations			Physical Work Environment			Overall Job Satisfaction		
		Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.	Mean	F/t*	Sig.
Academic Rank	Lecturer	2.64	43.69	.000	3.62	9.20	.000	4.02	1.99	.136	3.94	1.36	.258	3.55	25.45	.000
	Asst. Prof.	3.67			3.88			4.11			3.78			3.86		
	Associate Prof.	4.12			4.05			4.20			3.85			4.06		
	Total	3.72			3.90			4.13			3.80			3.89		
Nature of Post	Permanent/regular	4.03	17.935	.000	4.03	10.502	.000	4.14	1.314	.189	3.69	-7.14	.000	3.97	9.729	.000
	Temporary/Contract	2.86			3.54			4.08			4.09			3.64		
	Total	3.45			3.79			8.22			3.89			3,81		
Promotion	Nil	3.51	29.03	.000	3.81	13.97	.000	4.12	.667	.573	3.80	.916	.433	3.81	18.21	.000
	One	3.73			3.92			4.09			3.85			3.90		
	Two	4.11			4.09			4.20			3.70			4.03		
	More than two	4.55			4.26			4.14			3.84			4.20		
	Total	3.72			3.90			4.13			3.80			3.87		
Teaching Experience	Less than 10 years	3.44	44.76	.000	3.75	26.83	.000	4.11	.380	.684	3.83	2.07	.128	3.78	24.36	.000
	10-20 years	3.75			3.96			4.14			3.81			3.92		
	More than 20 years	4.31			4.17			4.14			3.69			4.08		
	Total	3.72			3.90			4.13			3.80			3.87		

Table 5: Comparison between Professional and Job Satisfaction Variables

Professional variables			Job Satisfaction variables									
Variables	**(I) Category**	**(J) Group Comp.**	**S & P**		**JC**		**IPR**		**PWE**		**Overall JS**	
			M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.	M.D (I-J)	Sig.
Academic Rank	Lecturer	Asst. Prof.	-1.0236*	.000	-.2628*	.026	-.0916	.636	.15574	.384	-.3055*	.000
		Associate Prof.	-1.4747*	.000	-.4279*	.000	-.1802	.220	.08458	.782	-.4995*	.000
	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	1.0236*	.000	.26280*	.026	.09160	.636	-.1557	.384	.30558*	.000
		Associate Prof.	-.4510*	.000	-.1651*	.006	-.0886	.222	-.0711	.490	-.1940*	.000
	Associate Professor	Lecturer	1.4747*	.000	.42791*	.000	.18026	.220	-.0845	.782	.49958*	.000
		Asst. Prof.	.4510*	.000	.16511*	.006	.08866	.222	.07115	.490	.19400*	.000
Promotion	**NIL**	One	-.2186*	.040	-.1122	.162	.03419	.925	-.0500	.863	-.0866	.112
		Two	-.6007*	.000	-.2900*	.000	-.0721	.703	.09192	.641	-.2177*	.000
		More than two	-1.0390*	.000	-.4559*	.000	-.0186	.997	-.0425	.975	-.3890*	.000
	One	Nil	.2186*	.040	.11223	.162	-.0341	.925	.05003	.863	.08669	.112
		Two	-.3820*	.005	-.1777	.084	-.1063	.502	.14195	.381	-.1310	.069
		More than two	-.8203*	.000	-.3436*	.001	-.0528	.944	.00747	1.000	-.3023*	.000
	Two	Nil	.6007*	.000	.29001*	.000	.07218	.703	-.0919	.641	.21776*	.000
		One	.3820*	.005	.17778	.084	.10636	.502	-.1419	.381	.13106	.069
		More than two	-.4382*	.022	-.1659	.349	.05356	.953	-.1344	.670	-.1712	.079
	More than two	Nil	1.0390*	.000	.45593*	.000	.01862	.997	.04255	.975	.38903*	.000
		One	.8203*	.000	.34369*	.001	.05280	.944	-.0074	1.000	.30233*	.000
		Two	.4382*	.022	.16592	.349	-.0535	.953	.13447	.670	.17127	.079
Teaching Experience	Less than 10 years	10-20 years	-.3087*	.000	-.2105*	.000	-.0394	.698	.02750	.879	-.1328*	.000
		Above 20 years	-.8626*	.000	-.4206*	.000	-.0367	.820	.14323	.110	-.2941*	.000
	10-20 years	>10 years	.3087*	.000	.21054*	.000	.03944	.698	-.0275	.879	.13282*	.000
		<20 years	-.5538*	.000	-.2101*	.002	.00273	.999	.11574	.251	-.1613*	.001
	Above 20 years	Less than 10 years	.8626*	.000	.42065*	.000	.03671	.820	-.1432	.110	.29419*	.000
		10-20 years	.5538*	.000	.21011*	.002	-.0027	.999	-.1157	.251	.16138*	.001

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

This data analysis confirms with that of (Zarafshani and Alibaygi, 2008; Amarasena et al., 2015; Malik, 2011) and contradiction with that of findings (Olorunsola, 2012; Paul and Phua, 2011; Long, 2007; Mohammed, et al., 2017; and Oshagbemi, 2003). The $\mathbf{H_8}$ is also partially accepted because there is no statistical difference in JS level in IPR & PWE. Overall, the data analysis confirms with existing research studies for some aspects in JS level and negated with other aspects therefore mixed findings have resulted in this study.

Implications of the Study

The findings of this study provide strong support to theoretical aspect particularly for Herzberg two factor theory i.e., hygiene factors such as Salary and Promotion, Interpersonal Relations and Physical working conditions from this study. There is higher JS level (total mean score is more than 3.5) of faculty members in all the above three factors. Similarly, the "Job Content" or "Work itself" of motivational factor from this study have also strongly and positively affected (total mean score is more than 3.5) the JS level. Thus, this study is contributing to strengthen for well establishment of Herzberg two factor theory. This study also provides strong empirical support for the proposed hypotheses of influence of demographic attributes on the level of JS except gender and where there is no significant influence. Also, the findings of the study confirm or negated with the propositions existed in the past research studies. Understanding the influence of demographic attributes of academic staff on the level of JS would enable the regulatory bodies for HEIs, policy makers and educational institutions to formulate the right composition of academic staff and imply in the HR planning strategy and also in other HR policies to attract and retain the highly competent, qualified and experienced faculty members. This is because the results of this study indicate that the highly qualified, seniors (older), professionally well experienced and higher number of promotions obtained academic staff have higher JS level than the younger, less qualified, less experienced and lower job positioned which would directly impact to be more committed academic staff towards their teaching and research activities, positive organizational citizenship behavior, higher performance in their teaching and less tendency to leave from the institution. Overall, this study supports both theoretically and also empirically for the proposed hypotheses to the influence of personal (except gender) and professional attributes to the level of job satisfaction.

Limitations of the Study

This study is restricted to only four Herzberg two factor theory of JS i.e., Salary and Promotion, Inter Personal Relationship and Physical Work Environment in hygiene factors and "Job Content or Work itself" in motivational factor and not covered all the factors. The present research study is also restricted to only one Province in India i.e., Tamil Nadu and also to liberal arts and science institutions and other HEIs such as engineering, medicine, law, etc. have not been included. It is, therefore, generalization from these findings to the overall influence of demographic attributes to JS of the academic staff and also overall higher education sector at the level needs to be kept in perspective (Ravichandran and Dua, 2022)

References

- Agyapong, D., Asiamah, M., and Cudjoe, E.A. (2019), "Effect of Compensation Package on Staff Intention to Quit in Technical University: A Structural Equation Approach". Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting, 11(2):1-13.
- Akpofure, R.R, Ikhifa, O.G., Imide, O.I., and Okokoyo, I. E. (2006), "Job Satisfaction Among Educators in Colleges of Education in Southern Nigeria". Journal of Applied Sciences, 6(5): 1094-1098.
- Ali, R., and Ahmed, M.S. (2009), "The Impact of reward and recognition programs on employee's motivation and satisfaction: An empirical study". International Reviw of Business Research Papers, 5(4): 270-279.
- Alpander, G.G. (1985), "Factors Influencing Hospital Employee Motivation: A Diagnostic Instrument: *Hospital & Health Service Administration*, 30: 67-83.
- Amarasena et al. (2015), "The effect of demographic factors on job satisfaction of university faculty members in Shri Lanka". International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection, 3(4): 89-106.
- Ayele, D. (2014). Teachers' job satisfaction and commitment in general secondary schools of Hadiya zone, in southern nation nationality and people of regional state. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/29136342.pdf.
- Baluchistan. *International Journal of Academic Research, 3*(1), 267-272.
- Bayfield, A.H. & Crockett, W.H. (1955). Employee attitude and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin vol. 5, (396-424).
- Booth, A., Bujrton, J. and Mumford, K. (2000), "The position of women in UK". Academic Economics Journal, 3: 12-33.
- Boran, T. (2011), "Job Satisfaction of academic staff: An empirical study on Turkey". Quality Assurance in Education, 19(2): 156-169.
- Bowen, B.E., & Radhakrishna, R.B. (1991).Job satisfaction of agriculture education faculty: A constant phenomenon. *Journal of Agricultural Education 32*(2). 16-22.

- Bozeman, B. and Gaughan, M. (2011), "Job Satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. Journal of Higher Education, 82 (2):154-186.
- Brooks, R. (2000). Why loyal employees and customers improve the bottom line. The Journal for Quality and Participation, 23(2), 40-44.
- Cano, J. & Miller, G. (1992), "A Gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors, and job dissatisfier factor of agricultural education teachers". Journal of Agricultural Education, 33(3): 40-46.
- Castillo, J. X., and Cano, J. (2004), "Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction among faculty members". Journal of Agricultural Education, 45(3): 72.
- Castillo, JX, & Cano, J. (1999), "A Comparative analysis of Ohio agriculture teachers' level of job satisfaction". Journal of Agricultural Education, 40(4): 67-76.
- Chiu, Y. T. (2000). A study on the relationship among organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior of nursing personnel. Master's Thesis, Department of Human Resource Management,http://etd. lib.nsusu.
- Clark, A.E. (1997), "Job Satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? Labor Economics, 4: 341-372.
- Clovin, L.A. (2001), "Analysis of factors influencing teachers' morale questionnaire". Journal of Educational Management, 12(11): 122-131.
- Curry, J., Wakefield, D., Price, J., & Mueller, C. (1986). "On the Causal Ordering of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment". Academy of Management Journal, 29 (4), 847-858.
- Dawis, R, and Lofquist, L. (1984), A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment, University of Minnesota Press, MI.
- DeVaney, S. A., and Chen, Z.S. (2003), "Job Satisfaction of recent graduates in Financial Services, US Department of Labor". Bureau of Labor Statistics Compensation and Working Conditions Online.
- Dhawan, SK and Roy, S (1993), "Scientists and their job: A case study from India", *Productivity*, 33(4): 650-655.Discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46, 539-556.
- Ejiogu, A. (1980). Theories of job satisfaction and job performance. An over and critiques, focus on the teachers' profession. Lagos: Joja Press Ltd.
- Ezeanyim, Ezinwa, E. Ufoaroh, Theresas, E., and Ajakpo (2019), "The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance in Selected Public Enterprise in Awka, Anambra State". *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: An Administration and Management, 19(7):41-50.*
- Fajana, S. (2002), "Human Resource Management: An Introduction". Lagos: Labofin and Company.
- Fessehatsion, P.W. and Bahta, D.T. (2016), "Factors Affecting Academic Job Satisfaction in the Public Institutions of Higher Education, Eritrea". Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 6(11): www.iiste.org.
- Fletcher, C & Williams, R. (2006). Performance management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. British Journal of Management, 7(2), 169-179.

- Fournet, G.P. (1966) "Job Satisfaction: Issue and Problems. Personnel Psychology, 6 (summer) (165- 183).
- Freund, A. (2005). Commitment and job satisfaction as predictor's turnover intentions among welfare workers. Administration in Social Work, 29 (2), 5-21.
- Ghafoor, M. (2014), "Antecedents and consequences of Job Satisfaction". Evidence from Pakistanis Universities. PhD Thesis, University of Dundee, Dundee.
- Ghani, Z. (2014), "A study on the relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave among managers: A case study of shipping firms, Dubai". Unpublished Dissertation. Anglia Ruskin University-UK.
- Gursoy, D., Swanger, N. (2007)., "Performance-enhancing internal strategic factors: impacts on financial success," International Journal of Hospitality Management, 26 (1): 213–227.
- Hagedorn, L. (2000). What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff.
- Hagedorn, L.S. (1994), "Retirement proximity's role in the prediction of satisfaction in academia". Research in Higher Education, 35(6): 711-728.
- Herzberg, H. (1959). The motivation to work (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Hoy, K.W. and Miskel, C.G. (1987), Educational Administration: Theory, research and practice, New York: Random.
- Kayalvizhi, S. & Chokkanathan, K. (2011). A study on factors influencing the job satisfaction of Lecturers employed in Self-Financing arts Colleges, South India. *International Journal of research in commerce and management, 2*(5), ISSN: 0976-2183.
- Kassaw, E.S. and Golga, D.N., "Employees‟ Organizational Commitment in Higher Educational Setting". *Preprints* 2019, 2019040029 (doi: 10.209 44/ preprints201904.0029.v2).
- Khandelwal, P. (1986), "Perceived need satisfaction and importance among supervisory and managerial personnel", *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology,* 23(1): 25-29.
- Khandwalla, P. (1988), "Organizational effectiveness. In J Pandey (Ed.)", Psychology in India: A Trend Report, New Delhi: Sage.
- Locke E.A. (1976), "The nature and causes of job satisfaction". In M.D. Dunnette (ED). Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976): 1297-1343.
- Long, L.John & Others (2007), "Factors influencing job satisfaction of extension agents in the Mississippi state University extension Service". Proceedings of the 2007 AAAE Research Conference, Vol. 34.
- Malik, N. (2011). Study of job satisfaction factors of faculty members at university of Baluchistan. *International Journal of Academic Research, 3*(1), 267-272.
- Mcneely, R.L. (1984), "Occupation, gender and work satisfaction in a comprehensive human service department". Administration in Social Work, 8(2): 35-47.
- Mehboob, F., Sarwar, M.A., and Bhutto, N.A. (2012), "Factors affecting job satisfaction among faculty members". Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences, 1(12):1-9.
- Mello, J. (2006), "Strategic Human Resources Management". Ohio: Thompson South Western.
- Milledzi, E., Y., Amponsah, M.D., and Asamani (2018), "Impact of socio-demographic

factors on job satisfaction among academic staff of universities in Ghana". International Journal of Research studies in Education, 7(2): 67-88.

- Milledzi, E., Y., Amponsah, M.D., and Asamani (2018), "Impact of social-demographic factors on job satisfaction among academic staff of universities Ghana". International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 7(2): 67-88.
- Mohammed,S., Azumah, A.A., and Tetteh, R. (2017), "An Empirical study of the Role of Demographics in Job Satisfaction of Sunyani Technical University staff ". Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/81471/ MPRA Paper No. 81471, posted 28 Sep 2017 14:23 UTC.
- Muhammad Ehsan M. Rizwan Q.D. and Yasin M. (2012), "The Impact of Pay and Promotion on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Higher Education Institutes of Pakistan". American Journal of Economics e-ISSN: 2166-496X.
- Mulindwa, S.K. (1998), "Job Satisfaction among Academic and Administrative Staff in Technical Education Institutions in Uganda: A Case Study of Uganda Polytechnic Kyambogo". Master's dissertation, Makerere University.
- Nazir, A.N. (1998), "Perceived importance of job factors and overall job satisfaction of bank employees", *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 33(4): 477-496.
- Nunally, J.C. and Bernstein, I.H. (1994), "Psychometric theory", New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Olorunsola, E.O, (2012), "Job Satisfaction and Personal Chracteristics of Administrative Staff in South West Nigeria Universities". Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 3(1): 46-50.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK Universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(12), 1210-1232.
- Oshagbemi, T., & Gill, R. (2004), "Differences in leadership styles and behavior across hierarchical levels in UK organizations". Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 25(1): 93-106.
- Panda, TK (2001), "Job satisfaction of dot com employees: an Indian experiment, *Management and Labor*, 26(2): 120-128.
- Paul, E.P., and Phua, S.K. (2011), "Lecturers' job satisfaction in a public tertiary institution in Singapore: ambivalent and non-ambivalent relationships between job satisfaction and demographic variables". Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 33(2): 141-151.
- Ravichandran, A. and Dua, S.A. (2021), "Job Satisfaction and Intention to Quit Behavior of Academics: A Comparative Analysis in General Higher Education". International Journal of all Research Education and Scientific Methods, 9(6):2753-2764.
- Ravichandran, A. and Dua, S.A. (2022), "Influence of Demographic Attributes on the Performance of Academic Staff: A Study of Higher Educational Institutions in a Province of India". International Journal of Advanced Research, 10(07): 592-605
- Ravichandran, A. and Venkat Raman, A. (2015), "Human Resource Management: Issues Confronting Indian Higher Education" ISBN: 978-3-639-66651-9 Scholars' Press, Saarbrucken, Germany.
- Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and

- Discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46, 539-556.
- Sakiru, O.K., Ismail, I.A.B., Samah, B.A. and Busaya, A.T. (2017), "Influence of Demographic Variables on Job Satisfaction Among Academicians in Public Universities". International Journal of Innovative Business Strategies, 3(1):127-135.
- Santhapparaj, A.S., and Alam, S.S. (2005), "Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in Private Universities in Malaysia". Journal of Social Science, 1(2):72-76.
- Shafie abadi, A., and Khalajasadi, Sh. (2010), "The survey of relationship between job satisfaction and mental health in university employees". Journal of Industrial Organizational Pschology News, 1(2): Tehran, Iran.
- Shah M. J., Rehman M., Akhtar G., Zafar H. and Riaz A. (2012), "Job Satisfaction and Motivation of Teachers of Public Educational Institutions", **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**
- Shrestha, I. (2019), "Influence of Demographic Factors on Job Satisfaction of University Faculties in Nepal". NCC-Journal, 4(1): 59-67.
- Singh, K. (2015), "Impact of Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intentions-A Comparative study of College Teachers of Professional and Non-Professional Institutions in Punjab". International Journal of Technical Research and Applications, 3(3): 6-10.
- Sinha, D. (1972), "Industrial Psychology: A trend report. In S. Mitra (Ed.) A survey of Research in Psychology. New Delhi: (ICSSR, 175-237).
- Sonmezer, M.G., &Eryaman, M.Y. (2008). A comparative analysis of job satisfaction level of public and private school. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, *4*(2), 189-212.
- Spector, P. (2008), "Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Syed, A.A.S.G., N adeem, B., Sabir, M., Faiz, M., Shikh, and Hina, S. (2012), "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members of Universities in Pakistan: A Case Study of University of Sindh-Jamshoro". Modern Applied Science 6(7).
- Tornow, W. W., Wiley, J. W. (1991), "Service quality and management practices: a look at employee attitudes, customer satisfaction, and bottom-line consequences," Human Resource Planning, 14(2):105-115.
- Venkat Raman, A. (1998), "A Structural and Behavioral Analysis for Human Resource Planning in Health Care Organization," Ph.D Thesis, Faculty of Management Studies, University of Delhi, Delhi p. (384).
- Venkat Raman, A. (1998), "A Structural and Behavioral Analysis for Human Resource Planning in Health Care Organization," Ph.D Thesis, Faculty of Management Studies, University of Delhi, Delhi p. (384).
- Verma, S. and Jain, S. (2014), "Teacher's Job Satisfaction & Job Performance", https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313644291_Teacher's_Job_Satisfaction_Job_Performance
- Vermeeren, B., Kuipers, B., &Steijn, B. (2014), "Does leadership style make a difference? Linking HRM, job satisfaction, and organizational performance".*Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 34(2), 174-195.

- Wolomasi A., Asaloei S., Werang, B. (2019), " Job Satisfaction and performance of elementary school teachers",https://www.researchgate.net/publication/ 338019377_Job_Satisfaction_and_performance_of_elementary_school_teachers.
- Zarafshani, K. and Alibaygi, A. (2008), "Predictors of job satisfaction among academic in Iranian University", NACTA Journal, 104 (2): 633-644.