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Abstract
Job satisfaction is referred to as an attitude of an individual towards his job; it is a state or behavior resulting due to various intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The job satisfaction concept was first defined by (Hoppock in 1935), for him job satisfaction is a result of emotional, physical, and environmental factors to which an individual is exposed. Teachers need to be satisfied with their job; however, the real earning of a teacher is the recognition that an academician gets for his contribution in upliftment of the education system, a teacher desires for acknowledgment for his work, a gesture as small as an appreciation mail can do wonders in boosting the confidence and motivating a teacher. But the irony is, this remains an unmet need of the teacher resulting in dissatisfaction, absenteeism, demotivation and eventually reflecting in poor quality of education. The present study is to examine those factors that can add to satisfaction of an academician from management department in a higher education setup. A total data of 300 teachers from different public and private Universities situated in Lucknow city of Uttar Pradesh India was taken. SPSS software version 22 was used for data analysis. Factor analysis was done at the first stage. The Kaiser’s criterion technique was also applied to determine the factors (components) to be retained for the factor analysis. Only factors with an Eigen value of 1.0 or more were retained for analysis. Kolmogorov-Smirnov’s and Shapiro-Wilk’s tests of normality were also used to test if the generated components (factors) are normally distributed, and the p-values of less than 0.001 for all the components indicated a normal distribution. Overall, the results suggest that teachers’ payor salary, growth opportunities and job enrichment at work are the top three job characteristics variables that contribute to teacher job satisfaction. The result shows that salary and job enrichment add to job satisfaction of teachers. The outcome of the study was further substantiated by various previous research work.

As future scope of study the researcher wants to extend similar research in various other geographical location of India and further the questionnaire will be modified, as students will be the new respondents.
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INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is generally viewed as a positive feeling or emotion that a person might have with regard to their job, person, situation etc. Dissatisfaction is a feeling of anger, discontentment, and disappointment, frustration, towards job, work environment, culture, person or situation. The importance of job satisfaction has been a concern since eternity, prior researches have proven that satisfied employee is many folds important than a highly automated machinery, or business strategy. Job satisfaction is an emotional pleasant and positive status which is resulting from the job assessment or job experience of an individual (Saatchi, 2008). Job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances, which cause a person to truthfully say "I am satisfied with my job" this statement given by Hoppock (1935) marked the origination of a new concept of job satisfaction. Motivation is a feeling that is present or absent under the presence or absence of satisfaction, which is caused by certain factors Nelson and Quick(2003). Job satisfaction is a measurable behavior and there are various variables that lead to satisfaction of an employee towards job hence measuring job satisfaction has often been the focus of researchers and organizational management interested in identifying the determinants of job satisfaction (Ellicks;& Loganson, 2001; Jamieson & Richards, 1996).

However, several globally acclaimed tools or scales are available to assess the job satisfaction level of employees in different context. Few tools measure job satisfaction in general and few measures are facet specific these facets make up the job, the presence or absence of these facet, are quiet influential in determining the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of an employee. In this paper, an attempt is made to critically review the globally accepted facet specific job satisfaction measuring instruments and identify few facets after a series of steps (factor extraction,
using PCA). Further the researcher attempts to establish an equation among job satisfaction and the various factors leading to satisfaction of a teachers towards its job.

The number of scales developed by analysts to measure job satisfaction has increased lately. Still the interest and need for advancement of new and normalized tools is expanding generally, the reason can be, either deficiency of formal tools or the lack of reliability and validity of existing tools in some specific context. However, the present study is an attempt to identify the steps that lead to development of a reliable and valid tool for measuring job satisfaction of faculty members in Indian context. The researcher has identified 5 standardized tools for measuring job satisfaction.

Further review of previous studies has established that these tools were used for measuring job satisfaction in different context. The researcher has picked up the common items from the standardized tools and attempted to identify the reliability and validity of the items selected. The researcher performed Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to identify various components. Further factor scores were calculated. The components were named on the basis of the facets of previous tools identified in the literature review for measuring job satisfaction. A cross validation of facets identified by EFA will be finally done through CFA and a tool for measuring the job satisfaction of academicians ‘in Indian context after cross validation can be the future scope of study.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**


Interestingly Adeyemo.S.K; et.al (2015) tried to give a new dimension to job enrichment by emphasizing on its use in decision making. It was suggested that job enrichment predicts success of administrators; hence focus should be given on enhancing experience and education of employees. A relationship was also drawn by Hackman, J. R., et.al (1971) job re designing job satisfaction and decision making. This was also proved by Nzewi.N.H, et.al (2017), according to them job autonomy and commitment influences the productivity level of the organization.

Job performance and job enrichment to have been found to be related Ira Feder (1999). Further to this Parker.KS (1998) in his longitudinal analysis showed that increased job enrichment and increased quality of communication predicted the development of greater self-efficacy.

The results provided by Palomo.R.D, et.al (2020), shows evidence about the positive relation between employees job enrichment, job satisfaction and commitment, and the intermediary role of satisfaction between enrichment and commitment. Females were seen more committed than male with enriched job. Although it’s is deemed that job enrichment enhances job satisfaction which has been researched by various researchers as mentioned above but it is also found that on special cases it becomes a deterrent for job satisfaction, Asl,M.I, et.al (2015), Orpen,C. (1979).
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REVIEW OF TOOLS USED FOR MEASURING JOB SATISFACTION


Table No1.1. Various Job Satisfaction Indexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Indexes</th>
<th>Developed By</th>
<th>Total Items and Facets</th>
<th>Facets In Each Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>JDI (Job Diagnostic Index)</td>
<td>Smith et al. 1969</td>
<td>Items-72 Facets-5</td>
<td>Work, pay, promotions, supervision and co-workers. Fields, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>JSS (Job Satisfaction Survey)</td>
<td>Spector 1997</td>
<td>Items-36 Facets-9</td>
<td>Pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work and communication. Fields, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>MSQ (The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire)</td>
<td>Weiss et al. 1967</td>
<td>Items-120 Facets-20</td>
<td>ability, utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical variety, and working conditions. Fields, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Job Diagnostic Survey</td>
<td>Hackman and Oldham 1980 (used for job enrichment)</td>
<td>Facets-5</td>
<td>Skill variety, task identity, significance, Autonomy, Feedback from the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction Index</td>
<td>Schriesheim and Tsue, 1980</td>
<td>Facets-6</td>
<td>Work, supervision, co-workers, pay, promotion opportunities and the job in general. Fields, 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common Facets Used in all Tools

Work, pay, Promotions, Rewards, Advancement, Recognition, Working conditions, Feedback from the job, Skill variety, Task identity

Source: Author’s own analysis

Facet approach for measuring job satisfaction is all about establishing a positive relation between job components (like pay, promotion, work, opportunities, rewards, advancements, working condition or environment) and satisfaction among employees. Facets have the power to lead to satisfaction and dissatisfaction, Locke’s (1976). The above models were studied in different context like school teachers (Pepea, A., et al. 2017), nursing staff (Kumar A 2015), dairy workers (Kulik, C.T., Oldham, G. R., & Langner, P. H. 1988), restaurant employees (Hancer, M., & George, R. T. 2003), health employees (Batura, N., Skordis-Worrall, J., Thapa, R., Basnyat, R., & Morrison, J. 2016), university workers (Stanton, J. M., Sinar, E. F., Balzer, W. K., Julian, A. L., Thoresen, P., Aziz, S., Fisher, G. G., & Smith, P. C. 2002). No such work was seen on faculty members form higher education sector irrespective of specialization.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objectives
Hypothesis

H01: Demographics do not have a significant impact on job satisfaction of faculty members. H02: Job satisfaction does not predict quality education.

As a first step, researcher carefully examined the pre validated tools related to the construct of job satisfaction. Examining the tools helped the researcher to establish items and facets of the desired construct to ensure that the content of the scale is focused on the actual domain of interest, rather than unrelated areas. In the present research, the researcher identified 35 items; a questionnaire was framed by rephrasing the items in the tools that were reviewed as per the Indian context.

Population: The survey was conducted among 300 management faculties of selected public and private universities of Lucknow region. The faculties were identified on the basis of demographics: (Gender, marital status, highest qualification, public or private nature of university.)

Sampling Technique: Simple Random Sampling

Sampling Location: Lucknow, capital city of Uttar Pradesh: India

Reliability: Determining reliability statistics is an important issue in scale advancement. Reliability relates to the repeatability, steadiness or consistency of a device. Cronbach's alpha statistic is one of the methods for measuring internal consistency of the questionnaire.

Reliability Statistics

Table No: 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor analysis

The reason for an exploratory factor analysis is to dissect scores on a few items to check whether they can be decreased to basic dimensions. Those items that are exceptionally related with one another will load on one factor. The items that are estimating one construct should load on one factor and those estimating another develop should load on an alternate factor. To proceed, the researcher conducted the KMO Barletts’ test for data adequacy; the result showed that for EFA the adequacy is sufficient and significant.

KMO, Barletts’ Test

Table No: 1.3

| Kaiser –Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | 704 |
| Barletts’ Test of Sphericity | 000 |

Factor Extraction: For factor extraction all those items which had extraction value of communalities of less than 0.4, indicating that they did not fit well with the factor solution and thus these items were not required and hence they were dropped. In the present study 74.348% variance for five components were reported and all the items having Eigen value >1 was considered. The scree plot clearly indicated five factor solution and number of iterations were 25. According to studies by Tanimura et al. 2011; Sewitch et al. 2003; Clark and Watson (1995), it was found that almost 95.3% studies were reported using at least one type of factor analysis—EFA or CFA. Further according to Bastos et al. (2010) and Ladhari (2010) found EFA to be the more commonly utilized construct validity method when compared to CFA.

3.7 Factor Score: Further the researcher calculated the factor scores for the identified 5 factors.

Component 1 (Opportunity for Promotion):
0.946* item1 + 0.616* item2 + 0.946* item3 + 0.946* item4

Component 2 (Pay):
0.637*item1 + 0.753*item2 + 0.956*item3 + + 0.956*item4
Hence the first object was established and 5 parameters leading to job satisfaction of faculty members in higher education sector were identified.

**Analysis for establishment of Objective 2:**

**Tools used for establishing objective 2:** Non parametric tests were used to find if demographics show significant difference on various factors that lead to job satisfaction of faculty members. Further Simple Linear Regression was conducted to explore the impact of the identified factors on improvement of education quality and hence to establish the second objective.

**Data Collection**

I- Simple random sampling was used to collect data from 300 management faculties of selected public and private universities of Lucknow region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>PhD Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>PhD Pursuing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.4: Demographics of sample**

II- The normality of data was checked by using K-S test (Table 1.5). It was found that the data is non-normal, so Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal-Wallis were used to find difference created by the demographics on the dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunity for Promotion</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Enrichment of Job</th>
<th>Opportunities for Research &amp; Development</th>
<th>Environment at Workplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-S Statistics</td>
<td>5.245</td>
<td>4.477</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>1.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.5: Table for normality of data- K S Test Statistics**

Further to test Hypotheses01 and to establish objective number 2, the researcher conducted the data analysis utilizing nonparametric test statistics equivalent to T-test, which are Wilcoxon rank-sum test or normally called Mann Whitney U test to assess differences in job satisfaction across married and unmarried, male and female faculties, having a difference in designation from different public and private universities, with or without a Ph.D. degree. Studies by various authors like Singh.V. Mohan. D.N. (2020); Hanif. Q. et al (2017), Madan.M. et al (2019), Hanaysha. J. (2016), Nayak .P. & Barua.M. (2020); Szromek. R.A. and Radoslaw Wolniak.R. (2020.) are provided as evidence to authenticate the usage of the above-stated tools. (2016) provided good evidence for use of the Kruskal Wallis H test. The results indicated that demographics had a significant impact on enrichment of job, pay and opportunities for promotion only, the demographics showed no significant difference on the other parameters. Hence the researcher has provided the required tables only, in order to avoid abundance of data analysis.

**Job enrichment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Z statistics (Mann-Whitney U test)</th>
<th>P statistics</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.901</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private University</td>
<td>-2.089</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Qualification</td>
<td>-1.495</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>P&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Z statistics (Mann-Whitney U test)</th>
<th>P statistics</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Coefficient

The job equation for the current model will be: 

$$Job\ satisfaction = \beta_0 + \beta_{promotion\ opportunities} + \beta_{fair\ salary} + \beta_{job\ enrichment} + \beta_{opportunity}$$

for research+ work environment

Since in the Coefficients table only promotion (p=.000) and job enrichment (.050) are significant, the regression equation for the current model will be:

$$Job\ satisfaction = (-3.737 + .506*promotion + .011*job\ enrichment)$$

The negative value of beta in job enrichment states that each unit of increment in job enrichment will reduce one unit job satisfaction and as result the performance quality will decline.

Coefficient table and model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>212.522</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.504</td>
<td>157.892</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>79.144</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291.667</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression equation can be given as:

$$Job\ satisfaction = \beta_0 + \beta_{promotion\ opportunities} + \beta_{fair\ salary} + \beta_{job\ enrichment} + \beta_{opportunity}$$

for research+ work environment

Since in the Coefficients table only promotion (p=.000) and job enrichment (.050) are significant, the regression equation for the current model will be:

$$Job\ satisfaction = (-3.737 + .506*promotion + .011*job\ enrichment)$$

The negative value of beta in job enrichment states that each unit of increment in job enrichment will reduce one unit job satisfaction and as result the performance quality will decline.

Coefficient table and model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>List of Predictors</th>
<th>Un standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Research objective 2 was fulfilled and null hypothesis was partially accepted and partially rejected, as it was found after analysis that demographic of public and private nature of university does have a significant difference on enrichment of job, pay and opportunities for promotion, however the other factors do not show any significant impact of demographics. Similar results were seen in many previous types of research, the work done by Salman Khalid, Muhammad Zohaib Irsad, Babak Mahmood, 2012, Saif-ud-Din, Khair-uz-Zaman, & Allah Nawaz 2010, substantiates the results of the present research. Both the researches propagate that the public or private nature of universities does have a significant difference in factors leading to job satisfaction.

Under the objective three the researcher desires to identify if job satisfaction leads to enhancement of quality education imparted at higher education sector. Considering the result of above test, it is reported that opportunities for promotion, pay and enrichment of job leads to satisfaction. Hence the researcher assumes that with every increase in pay, promotion opportunity and enrichment of job the quality of work is deemed to enhance. So, to test hypotheses 02 and 03 the researcher conducted linear regression. Work done by Naseer Khan, Set.al, (2020) , Donald W. Albright and (1972) support the statement that, job satisfaction strongly predicts improved quality of performance, retention, loyalty and commitment towards the organization.

Here quality of education is the criterion variable while Opportunities for Promotion, Enrichment of Job, and Pay are predictor variables. To analyze the hypotheses, simple linear regression was conducted, preliminary tests were conducted in all three regression models to satisfy the prerequisites. Further regressing overall quality of education with all 3 factors the reports show that the data fits the regression equation quiet well and Opportunities for Promotion, Enrichment of Job predict Job satisfaction.

### Annova

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>212.522</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.504</td>
<td>157.892</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>79.144</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291.667</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The adjusted R² adjusts for the number of terms in the model. Importantly, its value increases only when the new term improves the model fit more than expected by chance alone. Here adjusted R² is .724. Which shows a higher prediction (72.4%)

CONCLUSION

35 items were identified after a through literature review, however after conducting EFA total 5 parameters for job satisfaction were reported, the items that had desired eigen value were considered and rest items were discarded, the researcher had used previously established tools used to measure job satisfaction to collect the facets, however they were reframed as per requirement of the present study. The researcher ha further established that the public and privatenature of University have a significant impact on pay, promotion, job enrichment, the work reported by Singh V. Mohan. D.N. (2020); Hanif. Q. et al (2017); Madan. M. et al (2019), Hanaysha. J. (2016), Nayak. P. & Barua. M. (2020); Szromek. R.A. and Radosław Wolniak.R. (2020.) can be used as evidence to substantiate the authenticity of the present work. The main aim of this research work was to determine the relation between satisfaction of employees towards their job and its impact on quality of performance, the researcher achieved the third objective and has provides qualitative evidence that job satisfaction factors like pay and job enrichment do predict job satisfaction. However few previous researches have already established that improved quality of performance is predicted by job satisfaction, Mohd Nasurdin, A., etal (2020), Mathis and Jackson (2000), report of Vermeeren et al. (2014), Hameed et al. (2014), (Armanu, 2017; Qureshi & Sajjad, 2015), supported the statement that there is a significant positive relationship between employees' job satisfaction and their job performance. Moreover factors like compensation and job enrichment have a mediating influence on job satisfaction, and hence indirectly they are positively associated with increased job performance, satisfaction and productivity. Since the sample comprised of faculty members from higher education sector, and their performance at work determines the future of the nation, hence the administration should pay required concern regarding the reassessment of their salary on timely basis.

SCOPE FOR FURTHER STUDY

The present study also intends to further conduct cross validation using CFA. This study was confined to the geographical location of Lucknow, the researcher suggests that after the validation of the scale using CFA, further the standardized tool can be used PAN INDIA.
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