Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)
Vol. 41, No. 3 (2021), pp. 515-526

Exploration of Job Satisfaction Level of University Teachers: A Comparison between Public and Private Universities

Nazma Bibi
Assistant Professor,
Government Degree College(W), Kot Khawaja Saeed, Lahore
Email: nazma.bibi@ymail.com

Mahr Muhammad Saeed Akhtar
Ex-Chairman, Department of Islamic Education,
University of the Punjab, Lahore
Email: mahrsaeed1@yahoo.com

Muhammad Mohsan Ishaque
Ph.D. Scholar, University of Gujrat, Gujrat
Email: mmohsinishaq@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study discovers the job satisfactionlevel of the teaching staff of 22government and private sector universities. The sample was selected througha two-stagerandom sampling technique which consisted of 660 teachers.The job satisfactionof teachers was measured through the Job Satisfaction Survey(JSS) of Spector 1994. The JSS comprised nine subscales; pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work, and communication.The JSS was distributed to the selected teachers and the response rate was 93%.Gathered data were analyzedthrough descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (one-sample t-test, independent sample t-test, and two-way ANOVA). Theresults showeda significantdifference between the job satisfactionlevel of teachers working in government and privateuniversities.Moreover, a significant difference between the JS level of lecturers, associate professors, and professors was also found but an insignificant difference was observed between the JS level of lecturers vs assistant professors and associate professorsvs professors.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Education, Universities, Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

I. Introduction

Organizations are designed by a group of people to accomplish the goals that any individual cannot accomplish alone. An organization's significant resource is its workers and an organization must provide a satisfactory environment to the employees in which they can perform well (Bibi, 2020).Job satisfaction is one of the most debatable issues in Industrial Psychology and the management of organizational ethics. There are various perspectives about JS.It is the attitude of a person toward the job. Job satisfaction in the small sense means professional attitudes. Spector (1997) describedJS as "the feelings of an individual about his/her job, involving diverse aspects of the job"(p. 35).

Date of Publication and available Online: 05 August, 2021

Research on the area of JSis essentialas it might be a vital component in the achievementor failure of an institute.Earlier, JS was studied by certain expertsfrom the viewpoint of need fulfillment specifically, whether the job satisfies the worker'sphysical and emotional desires with the things offered to the employee. Yet this attitude has been criticizedbecause nowadays,most scholars are motivated to focuson cognitive needs rather than essential needs (Ibrahim, Ohtsuka,Dagang,&AbuBakar,2014).Moreover, Spector (1985) stated that factors affectingJS are "pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, and co-workers, nature of work, work content and communication"(p. 695). In the current study, these factors of JS were studied through the survey.

In universities, teachers serve thecountry by givingquality education as indicated by the rapidly changing world in this current period. Therefore, JS of university teachers is an important zone of research that needs to be discussed in the Pakistani context.In universities, quality teaching is a dream without highly motivated and satisfied teachers.Moreover, it is also observed that most of the teachers want to join the public sector as compared to private sector universities. So, to explore the JS level of both sector universities and their comparison was also the purpose of the study. Furthermore, a comparison between the JS level of teaching faculty employed in both sector universities was also measured through this study.

Employees are a great force in any organization and lead an organization towards success. In other words, the success of an organizationdepends upon its employees. So, this study was planned to explore the JS level of university teachers. Moreover, a comparison between the JS level ofteachers working in public and private sector universities was also the purpose of this study because the private sector has also a great contribution to the education system. Furthermore, a designation-wise comparison was also made in this study because the researcher was curious that whether the JS level fluctuates or remained the same among different designations of the teachers.This exploration of JS was made through the JSS scale of Spector (1994).

The focal point of theresearch was to measure the job satisfaction level ofgovernment and private university teachers in Punjab. Moreover, a comparison between the job satisfaction levels of both sector university teachers regarding their designations was also the objective of this study. This research was framed to respond to the subsequent research questions.

- Is there a significant difference between the subscales of JS level of public university teachers with scale mean *i.e.*, 3?
- Is there a significant difference between the subscales of JS level of private university teachers with a scale mean *i.e.*, 3?
- Is there a significant difference between the subscales of JS level of public and private university teachers?
- Is therea significant difference between the teachers' JS levelsby their designation?

II. Literature Review

Job satisfaction (JS)is a zone of interest for scholarsfor many years. Job satisfaction is asignificant factor in administrative success. The success of an institute depends on hard-working, honest, motivated, and satisfied employees. They are among the main goals of organizational success (Bushra, Usman, & Naveed, 2011).

Different people defined job satisfaction differently.Locke (1976) described JS as, “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one job or job experience”.In another way, “an employee's general attitude towards his or her job” is job satisfaction (Robbins, Coutler,& Vohra, 2009, p. 312).According to Armstrong (2006), JS is an attitude and emotional state individuals have about their task. Positive and perfect mindsets towards the job exhibit job satisfaction. Negative and annoying viewpoints concerning the job show job dissatisfaction.Job satisfaction is a condition that reflects a person's positive and negative feelings about work, co-workers, and the workplace (Darman & Hamzah, 2017). In addition, it is defined as satisfaction in the workplace as a reflection of one's judgment of one's job or experience at work over some time. JS retains workers in any organization and also contributes to the welfare of employees (Toropova, Myrberg, & Johansson, 2020). According to Luthan (2011), JS is the outcome of worker insights of how well his job offers things that are considered significant.Bhamani (2012) specified that job satisfaction is a predicting element to keep excellent staff in educational institutions.

Different elements determine JS*e.g.*, pay, promotion, work’s nature, work itself, supervision, operating procedures, communication, and fringe benefits, etc (Spector, 1997).The present research had taken into consideration the above-mentioned factors that affect JS. According to Khalid, Irshad, and Mahmood, (2011) pay is a vital factor that affects the JS of employees. Kondalkar (2007) stated that the pay and promotion policy of the organization must be in line with the organization’s standards and employees’ outlooks.Moreover, promotion and JS are strongly linked with each other (Peterson, Puia & Suess, 2003). Moreover, Gok, Karatuna, and Karaca (2015) revealed that supervisors play a key role in influencing the work environment and boosting JS amongstsubordinates.Job satisfaction can be affected by the benefits provided by the organization and promotion (Srivastava, 2002).

Extrinsic rewards (handsome salary, promotion, incentives) and intrinsic rewards(recognition, participation, and appreciation) upsurge the employees’ JS (Andrew & Kent, 2007). In 2019, Abuhashesh, Rand Al-Dmour, and Ra’ed Masa’deh led a study concerning determinants of JS and showed that salary is the major determinant of JS.According to Spector (1997), operating procedures also influence the JS of employees. Research investigations showed that if the situation between colleagues and co-workers is pleasant, then employees’ JS might be enhanced (Kreitner&Kinicki, 2001). Spector (1997) revealed that operating procedures also affect JS.Warr (2007)found that the support of colleagues is also significant for JS. Another important determinant of JS is the nature of work. Robbins and Judge (2013) posited thatJS can be boosted by making the work challenging.One more factor which determines JS is communication.Jorfi, Yaccob, and Shah (2011)described that communication has a main role in job satisfaction.

Ghafoor (2012) revealed that university teachers with the lower designation are less satisfied than teachers with the high designation. Moreover, Latif, Shahid, Sohail,

and Shahbaz (2011) revealed that private sector college teachers are less satisfied than public college teachers.In Turkey, another research showed that job satisfaction is largely due to factors such as opportunities for new skills, promotions, participation in decision-making, and independence, recognition (Nadim, Chaudhry, Kalyar, and Riaz, 2012).In Bangladesh, a study concerning JS of female government sector university teachers revealed that they are more satisfied with promotion, fringe benefits, and colleagues(Alam, Talha, Sivanand, & Ahsan, 2005).

By keeping in vision the above debate, it is obvious that JS is not a single construct. Many factorsgovernthe job satisfaction of workers.The importance of JS can be imagined in such a way that job dissatisfaction causes fatigue and decreases employees' commitment to work. Employees left the job due to this job dissatisfaction and sometimes workforces may move from private to the government sector and vice versa (Hashemi &Sadeqi, 2016).Some of the highlights of the doctrinal review are included in the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) Scale by Spector (1994) which is investigated in current research.

According to Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001), there is a positive association between JS and employees' in-role performance. In the management set, JS was studied in the banking sector in Pakistan by (Arif&Chohan, 2012; Shaikh, Bhutto,&Maitlo, 2012). Moreover, Lwu et al (2018) led a study and found that "teachers' pay or salary, growth opportunities and responsibilities attached to work are the top three job characteristics variables that contribute to teacher job satisfaction" (p. 1). Ali and Anwar (2021) led research in the banking sector and used four factors e.g. "(reward, compensation, incentive and customer" (p. 26), and found that all these four factors have a significant influence on JS.Still, there was a need to find job satisfaction more to assist understanding in different settings.

III. Methodology

The nature of the study was descriptive as the existing phenomenon was explored without manipulating or controlling the situation. Quantitative data was collected through the JSS of Spector (1994). There are 22 total general universities in Punjabof which13 universities are governed by the government and 9 universities belong to the private sector.

A. Sampling

This research used a two-stage random sampling technique. In the first stage, seven public and five private universities were randomly selected. The strength of teachers working in selected public universities was4109 and no. of private university teachers was2507. In the subsequent stage, 10% of teachers of these universities were chosen randomly; public, 410 and private,250 and the total sample was 660 teachers. According to Gay, Mills, & Airasian (2011), if the population is more than 5,000 subjects then a sample size of a minimum of 400 or more individuals may be adequate consideringthe restricted time and money.

B. Instrumentation

JS level of university teachers was assessed through the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) of Spector (1994) which is most frequently used in research studies. This scale consisted of 36 itemson five points Likert scale.Subscales of the JSS were; "pay,

promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures co-workers, nature of work and communication" (Spector, 1985; p.695).\

Table 1: Position of Subfactors in JSS

Major Variable	Sub factors	No. of Items	Item's position in JSS
Job Satisfaction	Pay	4	1-4
	Promotion	4	5-8
	Supervision	4	9-12
	Fringe Benefits	4	13-16
	Contingent Rewards	4	17-20
	Operating Procedures	4	21-24
	Co-workers	4	25-28
	Nature of Work	4	29-32
	Communication	4	33-36
Total no. of Items in JSS Scale		36	1-36

The Cronbach alpha of JSS in the local context was 0.83.Data was collected through different means; personal visits, email, and courier service.The response rate was 93%, as the responsive sample was 614.

IV. Data Analysis

Collected data wereanalyzed by using descriptive statistics like mean andstandard deviation and inferential statistics, one-sample, independent-sample *t*-test, and two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used. The following analysis addressed the first research question of the study.

Table 2: Comparison between Scale Mean Score and JS level of Public Teachers' Mean Score

Subscale	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-value	*df*	Sig. 2-tailed
Pay	381	3.27	.61	.27	8.75	380	.01
Promotion	381	3.20	.73	.20	5.40	380	.01
Supervision	381	3.21	.75	.21	5.64	380	.01
Fringe Benefits	381	3.19	.63	.19	5.992	380	.01
Contingent Rewards	381	3.27	.69	.27	7.80	380	.01
Operating Procedures	381	3.46	.69	.46	12.88	380	.01
Co-workers	381	3.37	.60	.37	11.89	380	.01
Nature of Work	381	3.39	.63	.39	12.21	380	.01
Communication	381	3.22	.65	.22	6.60	380	.01
Total scale	381	3.29	.43	.27	8.75	380	.01

Table 2 displayed detailed analysis of job satisfaction level of teachers working in public sector universities. One sample *t*-test was applied to find out the difference between job satisfaction level and scale mean i.e., 3. There were 9 subscales of job satisfaction in this study. Analysis of data against faculty of publicuniversities showed that t-value of the JS level 13.17 with *df*380 is significant as *p*-value = .01<0.05. Moreover, all subscales of job satisfaction are significant;pay (*M*= 3.27, *SD*= .61; *t* (380) = 8.75, *p*= .01< .05), promotion (*M*= 3.20, *SD* = .73; *t* (380) = 5.40, *p*= .01< .05), supervision (*M*= 3.21, *SD* = .75; *t* (380) = 5.64, *p*= .01< .05), fringe benefits (*M*= 3.19, *SD* = .63; *t* (380) = 5.99, *p*= .01< .05),contingent Rewards(*M*= 3.27, *SD* = .69; *t* (380) = 7.80, *p*= .01< .05),operating procedure (*M*= 3.46, *SD* = .69; *t* (380) = 12.88, *p*= .01< .05),

co workers (*M*= 3.37, *SD* = .60; *t* (380) = 11.89, *p*= .01< .05), nature of work (*M*= 3.39, *SD* = .63; *t* (380) = 12.21, *p*= .01< .05), communication (*M*= 3.22, *SD* = .65; *t* (380) = 6.60, *p*= .01< .05).

Table 3: Comparison between Scale Mean Score and JS level of Private Teachers' Mean Score

Subscale	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-value	*df*	Sig. 2-tailed
Pay	233	3.16	.71	.16	3.51	232	.01
Promotion	233	3.04	.70	.04	1.00	232	.31
Supervision	233	3.00	.57	.01	.17	232	.86
Fringe Benefits	233	3.11	.51	.11	3.45	232	.01
Contingent Rewards	233	3.11	.63	.11	2.82	232	.01
Operating Procedures	233	3.26	.68	.26	5.84	232	.01
Co-workers	233	3.12	.70	.12	2.74	232	.01
Nature of Work	233	3.21	.60	.21	5.44	232	.01
Communication	233	3.11	.64	.11	2.67	232	.01
Total scale	233	3.13	.38	.13	5.09	232	.01

One sample t-test was implied to compare the JS level of faculty members of private universities with the scale mean score *i.e.,* 3. Analysis of data revealed that t-value of the JS level 5.09 with *df*232 is significant as *p*-value = .01<.05. Moreover, seven subscales of job satisfaction were also found significant; pay (*M*= 3.16, *SD* = .71; *t* (232) = 3.51,*p*= .01< .05), fringe benefits (*M*= 3.11, *SD* = .51; *t* (232) = 3.45, *p*= .01< .05),contingent Rewards(*M*= 3.11, *SD* = .63; *t* (232) = 2.82, *p*= .01< .05), operating procedure (*M*= 3.26, *SD* = .68; *t* (232) = 5.84,*p*= .01< .05), co workers (*M*= 3.12, *SD* = .70; *t* (232) = 2.74, *p*= .00 < .05), nature of work (*M*= 3.21, *SD* = .60; *t* (232) = 5.44, *p*= .01< .05), communication(*M*= 3.11, *SD* = .64; *t* (232) = 5.09, *p*= .01< .05). On the other hand, two subscales of job satisfaction found insignificant difference between scale mean; promotion (*M*= 3. 40, *SD* = .70; *t* (380) = 1.00, *p*= .31> .05), supervision (*M*= 3.00, *SD* = .57; *t* (380) = .17, *p*= .86> .05).

To answer the third research question independent sample t-test was implied to find out the difference between teachers' mean JS level working in public and private universities. Analysis of data presented in table 4.

Table 4 revealed the outcomes of an independent sample t-test aboutthe comparison between the JS level of teaching faculty working in government and private universities. Analysis of data showed significant difference between the JS level of teachers working in public universities (*M*= 3.29, *SD* =.43) and private universities (*M*= 3.12, *SD* = .38; *t* (612) = 4.66, *p*= .01 < α= .05). Teachers of both sector universities have different job satisfaction levels. Moreover, public and private university teachers have significant difference in subscales of job satisfaction except fringe benifts on which teachers of both sector universities have insignificant difference (Public:*M* =3.19, *SD* = .63; private:*M* = 3.11, *SD*= .51; t (612) = 1.61 , *p*= .10> α= .05).

Table 4: Comparison between JS of Public and Private University Teachers

Variables	Sector	M	SD	Mean Difference	t- value	*df*	Sig.
Pay	Public	3.27	.61	.11	2.04	612	.04
	Private	3.16	.71				
Promotion	Public	3.20	.73	.15	2.61	612	.01
	Private	3.04	.70				
Supervision	Public	3.21	.75	.21	3.68	612	.01
	Private	3.00	.57				
Fringe benefits	Public	3.19	.63	.07	1.61	612	.10
	Private	3.11	.51				
Contingent rewards	Public	3.27	.69	.15	2.87	612	.01
	Private	3.11	.63				
Operating procedures	Public	3.46	.69	.19	3.41	612	.01
	Private	3.26	.68				
co-workers	Public	3.37	.60	.24	4.53	612	.01
	Private	3.12	.70				
Nature of work	Public	3.39	.63	.18	3.48	612	.01
	Private	3.21	.60				
Communication	Public	3.22	.65	.10	2.00	612	.04
	Private	3.11	.64				
Total scale	Public	3.29	.43	.16	4.66	612	.01
	Private	3.12	.38				

The fourth research question was related to the comparison between the JS levels of public and private university teachers by their designation. To answer the question, two-way ANOVA was used.The following tables demonstrated the analysis of data.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Public and Private University Teachers' JS levels by their Designation

Designation	N		Mean		S.D.	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Lecturer	207	115	3.31	3.20	0.42	0.35
Assistant Professor	110	68	3.34	3.14	0.41	0.33
Associate Professors	34	28	3.15	3.00	0.53	0.61
Professors	30	22	3.00	2.87	0.36	0.18
Total	381	233	3.29	3.12	0.43	0.38

Table 6: Two-way Analysis of Variance about JS level of Public and Private University Teachers by their Designation

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
University	2.60	1	2.60	15.63	.01	.025
Designation	4.41	3	1.47	8.81	.01	.042
University Designation	0.27	3	.09	0.55	.64	.003
Total	6514.37	614				

This study was intended to compare the job satisfaction level of teachers working in public and private sector universities. Teachers of different designations are working in universities like a lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Analysis of data revealed statistically significant difference $F(1, 614) = 15.63$; $p=.01<\alpha=0.05$between the JS level of teachers working in public and private university

but this difference has small magnitude (partial eta squared = 0.025). Moreover, designation wise significant difference F (3, 614) = 8.81; p=.01<α=0.05 was also found among the teachers about their JS level but the magnitude of this difference was small (partial eta squared = 0.042).Furthermore, insignificant interaction difference F (3, 614) = 0.55 ; p=.64>α=0.05 was found among the teachers about their JS level and the magnitude of this difference was also very small (partial eta squared = 0.003).Additionally, Post hoc comparisons were made through the Tukey HSD test to find out the difference of job satisfaction level among the teachers of one designation to another. The findings of the data analysis are presented in the following table.

Table 7: Comparison of Mean Differences in JS level of Public and Private University Teachers by their Designation

Comparison	Estimated Mean Difference	Standard Error of Difference	Sig.	95% C.I	
				Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Lecturer vs Assistant Professor	0.009	0.038	.99	-0.08	0.10
Lecturer vs Associate Professor	0.188	0.056	.01	0.04	0.33
Lecturer vs Professor	0.269	0.061	.01	0.11	0.42
Assistant Professor vs Associate Professor	0.178	0.060	.01	0.02	0.33
Assistant Professor vs Professor	0.25	0.064	.01	0.09	0.42
Associate Professor vs Professor	0.08	0.07	.72	-0.11	0.27

Findings of analysis revealed that mean score of JS forlecturer (M = 3.27, SD = 0.40) and assistant professors (M = 3.26, SD = 0.39; p = .99 >α=.05) did not differ significantly. While,mean score of JS for lecturer (M = 3.27, SD = 0.40) significantly differed from the mean score for associate professors (M = 3.08, SD = 0.57; p=.01<α=.05). Moreover, mean score of JS for lecturer and professors also differed significantly (M = 3.00, SD = 0.31; p =.01<α=.05). Analysis of data for assistant professors and associate professors showed significant difference (p =.01 <α=.05) between their JS levels. Similarly, mean score of JS for assistant professors and professors have also significant difference (p =.01<α=.05) but mean score of JSfor associate professors and professors did not reach to the significant level (p = .72 >α=.05).

V. Discussion

This study was intended to explore the JS level of university teachers. Moreover, a comparison between the JS level of public and private university teachers and by designation was also the purpose of this study. The first research question was about the JS level ofteachers employed in government universities.One sample t-test was applied to answer this question. The results showed that there is a significant difference between the mean score and overall JS level of teachers and the subscales of JS as well. The outcomes are in line with the study of Alam et al.(2005) and Latif et al. (2011).They concluded that government sector teachers are more satisfied with promotion, fringe benefits, and staff. The second research question was related to the JS level of private sector university teachers. The results have shown that the mean score of teachers' JS level on seven subscales differed significantly from the scale mean except promotion and supervision. This difference in promotion and supervision might be due to a less defined service structure and promotion rules in private sector universities. Moreover, the mechanistic structure of institutions may also be responsible for this significant difference (Bibi, 2020).

The findings of the next research question indicated that the teaching faculty of both sector universities differed significantly (both subscale-wise and also overall JS).Moreover, findings showed that the teaching faculty of government sector universities(M=3.29, SD=.43)is more satisfied than the teaching faculty of private sector universities (M=3.12, SD=.38). Pay, job security, and permanent job status might be the reasonsfora better level of JSingovernment sector universities. These results are aligned with the studies conducted by (Khalid et al., 2011).Khalid et al. (2011) concluded that government-sector teachers are more satisfied with their colleague's relations.Results of a comparative study done by Latif et al. (2011) also supported the outcomes of this researchthat private-sector college teachers are less satisfied than teachersofpublic colleges.

Designation-wise comparison showedsignificant differences existed between the JS level of public and private university teachers and also by their designation. Moreover, post hoc comparisons revealed that lecturers and assistant professors have an insignificant difference in their level of JS. Similarly, associate professors and professors have also the same results. Contrarily to these findings, a significant difference between the JS level of lecturers vsassociate professors and professors was observed. Similarly, it was also found a significant difference in JS level of assistant professors vs associate professors and professors. These significant differences might be due to teachers' stability in the job and also the job security and promotion in the job. (Ghafoor,2012).

VI. Conclusions

Job satisfaction plays a crucialrole in the success of any organization. A high level of JS inspires the staff to get maximum results.The study concludes that public university teachers are more satisfied than the teachers working in private sector universities. Besides, there was a significant difference between fringe benefitsoffered to the teachers of both sector universities. Therefore, private sector universities should focus on factors to enhancethe JS level of the teachers.Furthermore, service structure and promotion rules for private university teachers should be regulated. Employees mustbe paid according to their qualifications and experience.

This research was restricted to the region of Punjab and in future investigations, the samplemay be taken from different areas of Pakistan. This study does not examine the relationship between job satisfaction and other important outcomes affecting the success of the organization. However,understanding the levels and strengths of job satisfaction at the top education is an important first step in continuing to explore. The results are helpful for the university administration to enhance employees' job satisfaction, as it also enlightens the elements which help to increaseJS. Moreover, job security is a keyelement of JS that was not considered while measuring job satisfaction, so future research on this point needs to include job security

References

Abuhashesh, Rand Al-Dmour, & Ra'ed Masa'deh (2019). Factors that affect Employees' Job Satisfaction and Performance to Increase Customers' Satisfactions. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research, 2019*(1), 1-23.

Alam, S. S., Talha, M., Sivanand, C. N., & Ahsan, M. N. (2005).Job satisfaction of university women teachers in Bangladesh. *Journal of Social Sciences, 1*(2), 88-91.

Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). An Empirical Study of Employees' Motivation and its Influence Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Engineering, Business, and Management, 5*(2), 21-30.

Andrew, D. P. S., & Kent, A. (2007). The impact of perceived leadership behaviors on satisfaction, commitment, and motivation: An expansion of the multidimensional model of leadership. *International Journal of Coaching Science, 1*(1), 35-56.

Arif, A., & Chohan, A. (2012). How job satisfaction is influencing organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): A study on employees working in the banking sector of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 4*(8), 74-88.

Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice.* (10th ed.). London: Kogan Page Publishing.

Bibi, N. (2020). *Relationship of organic and mechanistic organizational structure with job satisfaction and job performance of teaching faculty at higher education institutions.* (Unpublished Ph. D Thesis), Institute of Education & Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Bhamani, S. (2012). Factors Determining Job Satisfaction of Early Childhood Teachers. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science (JHSS), 3*(1), 43-48.

Bushra, F., Usman, A., & Naveed, A. (2011). Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employees' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Banking Sector of Lahore (Pakistan). *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(18), 261-267.

Darman & Hamzah, D. (2017). The Effect of Personality, Ability, Organizational Support, job satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment towards Lecturer Performance of Private University in Gorontalo. *Scientific Research Journal (SCIRJ), 5*(6), 61-70.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E. & Airasian, P. W. (2011). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications.* New York, NY: Pearson.

Ghafoor, M. M. (2012). Role of demographic characteristics on job satisfaction. *Far East Research Centre, 6*(1), 30-45.

Gok, S., Karatuna, I., &Karaca, P. O. (2015). The role of perceived supervisor support and organizational identification in job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 17*(1), 38-42.

Hashemi, J., Sadeqi, D. (2016).The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate: a case study of government departments in Divandarreh. *World Scientific News, 45*(2), 373-383.

Ibrahim, R. A., Ohtsuka, K., Dagang, M. M., & Abu Bakar, A. (2014). Job satisfaction among Malaysian employees: An application of Spector's job satisfaction survey in the South East Asian context. *JurnalPengurusan, 41*(1), 69-79.

Iwu, C. G., Ezeuduji, I. O., Iwu, I. C., Ikebuaku, K., &Tengeh, R. K. (2018). Achieving Quality Education by Understanding Teacher Job Satisfaction Determinants. *Social Sciences, 25*(7), 1-13.

Jorfi, H., Yaccob, H. F. B., & Shah, I. M. (2011). Human resource management-emotional intelligence: Communication effectiveness mediates the relationship between stress management and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Managing Information Technology, 3*(4), 1-7.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376-407.

Khalid, S., Irshad, Z. M., &Mahmood, B. (2011). Job Satisfaction among academic staff: A Comparative analysis between public and private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management, 7*(1), 126-136. doi:doi:10.5539/ijbm.v7n1p126

Kondalkar, V. J. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour.* New Delhi: New Age International, Limited Publishers.

Kreitner, R., &Kinicki, A. (2001). *Organizational Behavior.* (5th ed.). Maiden head: McGraw-Hill.

Latif, K., Shahid, M.N., Sohail, N. & Shahbaz, M. (2011). Job Satisfaction among Public and Private College Teachers of District Faisalabad, Pakistan: A Comparative Analysis. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 3*(8), 235-240.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette, *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1343). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Luthan, F. (2011).*Organizational Behavior.* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Nadim, M., Chaudhry, M. S., Kalyar, M. N., & Riaz, T. (2012). Effects of motivational factors on teachers' job satisfaction: A study on public sector degree colleges of Punjab, Pakistan. *The Journal of Commerce, 4*(4), 25-32.

Peterson, D. K., Puia, G. M., &Suess, F. R. (2003). An exploration of job satisfaction and commitment among workers in Mexico. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(2), 73-88.

Robbin, S. P., Coutler, M., & Vohra, N. (2009).*Management.* (10th ed.). New Delhi: Pearson Education, Inc.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior.* (15th ed.).New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Shaikh, M. A., Bhutto, N. A., & Maitlo, Q. (2012). Facets of job satisfaction and its association with performance. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(7), 322-326.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*(6), 693-713.

Spector, P. E. (1994). *Job satisfaction survey.* Tampa, Florida: Department of Psychology, University of South Florida.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Srivastava, S. (2002). An empirical study of job satisfaction and work adjustment in public sector personnel. *Delhi Business Review, 3*(2), 1-4.

Statt, D. (2004). *The Routledge Dictionary of Business Management.* (3rd ed.). Detroit: Routledge Publishing.

Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction: the importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review,73*(8),1–27.