An Empirical Analysis of Job Satisfaction in Higher Education Institutes : A Study of Faculty at Ludhiana

Ruchika Jain*

* Department of commerce, Gobindgarh Public College, Alour, Khanna

Abstract

Teachers are the pillars of the society, who help students to grow to shoulder the responsibility of taking their nation ahead of others. Dissatisfaction among teachers is undesirable for their best performance in their profession. This paper aims at identifying the factors affecting the job satisfaction of teachers by conducting exploratory factor analysis. Quantitative research has been done by using the EFA statistical technique. Simple random sampling technique has been used to collect the response from 248 teachers. The study revealed behavior of colleagues, financial rewards, job resources and non-financial rewards as important variables affecting job satisfaction of faculty in higher education institutions in India. The results of this study are useful for administrators to take strategic actions for taking into consideration the provision of identified factors to increase the satisfaction level of faculty working in their educational institutions.

Key Words

Job Satisfaction, Teachers, Higher Educational Institutions, Exploratory Factor Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Education is the most essential organ of a country. The growth of a country is widely affected by the quality education (Shah and B. Jumani, 2015). Higher education institutes are regarded as the power-house of knowledge, training specialists in various aspects of life (Khalid *et al.*, 2012).

The central figure in the educational system is the teacher, who performs a variety of crucial duties. Higher education has become more competitive and professors now have to juggle a variety of tasks including teaching, research and publication, consulting and community involvement (Sinniah *et al.*, 2022). A good educational system is thus built on a strong teaching faculty. A major requirement for an educational institution is to attract and retain high-quality teachers. The total effectiveness of educational institutions is determined by its teachers, as well as their level of devotion and happiness and satisfaction at job (Malik *et al.*, 2010). Teachers are always a benefit to society and teaching is a really honorable career. One way to conceptualize the ultimate educational process would be as a meaningful exchange between the teacher and the student. Thus, a teacher has a direct and significant influence on how a student approaches learning. Teachers' professional dedication and job satisfaction are crucial in the sphere of education since they serve as role models for the students (Bashir, 2017). But Higher education institutions have always faced the issue of finding and keeping influential faculty members. (Liu *et al.*, 2023). Maintaining teacher stability and development is essential to raising teaching and learning standards and providing a strong foundation for both sustainable development and high-quality, well-rounded education (Zhang *et al.*, 2023). Teachers' psychological survival in their institutions is mostly determined by job satisfaction (Liu *et al.*, 2023).

A job is not just one's primary source of income but also an essential aspect of daily existence. Employees spend a significant portion of their days at work, which significantly affects their social status. Since employment occupies a major portion of the lives of many people, job happiness is a crucial aspect of general well-being. A skilled teaching staff is the foundation of an effective system. Therefore, attracting and keeping excellent teachers is a top priority for educational institutions (Sharma and Jyoti, 2006). The formation of excellent instructors requires an understanding of the contributing elements. One of those crucial elements is job satisfaction. Researchers, decision-makers and leaders in education all acknowledge that one of the key variables influencing student progress is teacher satisfaction. One of the most important aspects of institutional dynamics is teachers' work satisfaction, which is typically regarded as the main dependent variable used to assess the efficacy of an organization's human resources. Therefore, an effective educational system depends critically on an awareness of the factors influencing teachers' satisfaction with their jobs.

Job satisfaction of faculty is crucial because it influences teaching

quality, encourages high levels of dedication and points the way toward generating students of the highest caliber. Knowing how satisfied academics are with their jobs will assist academic institutions in developing strategies to keep bright students in the classroom, reduce absenteeism and turnover and draw in fresh talent (Mustapha and Zakaria, 2013). Teachers' professional dedication and job satisfaction are crucial in the sphere of education since they serve as role models for the students (Bashir, 2017).

Teachers who are happy in their jobs, are punctual and regular at work, their teaching is very effective and they want to stay in teaching only (Walker *et al.*, 2004). Three factors were shown to be drivers of teachers' job satisfaction by Iwu *et al.*, (2018). These include pay, potential for advancement and job-related duties. Professional development opportunities and collaborative leadership practices were shown to be the main factors influencing school teachers' work satisfaction in another Ethopian study (Abdulahi, 2020). One study conducted in South Africa found that the following factors are crucial in determining employee motivation: university policy and administration, supervisory and subordinate relationships, work environment, management, remuneration, peer relationships, personal affairs, reputation and job security etc. Leadership style, work environment and organizational culture were cited as determinants of job satisfaction for lecturers' performance by (Basak and Govender, 2015; Subarto *et al.*, 2021). Kumar, J. (2023) argued that teachers' job performance is substantially impacted by their motivation and the factors that influence them. The administration must create motivational policies and practices for teachers to suit their demands. To strengthen the education system administrations should give enough resources such as bonuses, rewards, communication, moral and emotional support and salary increases to assure quality learning and high performance from teachers. As a result, numerous studies have found various determinants of job satisfaction. In Punjab, India, Rana and Soodan (2019) performed a cross-sectional study. They discovered that the organizational environment had a considerable impact on college professors' stress levels. As a result, it is argued that a human higher education policy is urgently needed to safeguard the rights of educators who help shape the nation's future. According to a different study done in Punjab (Pakistan), teachers working in higher education institutions experience significant issues with job security and workload (Dhuryana & Hussain, 2018). In a government university in Punjab, Pakistan, (Amin *et al.*, 2013) investigated the impact of principals and administrators style of leadership on faculty members' level of job satisfaction. The study's Guoba, A. *et al.*, (2022) revealed that teachers' job

satisfaction is most significantly influenced by the nature of their work and workplace communication, while teachers are least satisfied with their compensation and prospects for advancement. Tria, J. Z. (2023) conducted a systematic study that adds to the corpus of evidence about educators' job happiness by finding relevant elements and supporting different theoretical theories of job satisfaction. The factors identified in this SLR are educators' self-efficacy, administrators' leadership and supervision, support and decision-making styles, job performance, job stress and burnout, organizational culture and school climate, motivation, commitment and engagement, salary and other remuneration/compensation.

RESEARCH GAP

The studied literature offered a fragmented picture of the different aspects of job satisfaction (JS). The topic of job satisfaction and the factors that affect it are not the exclusive focus of any particular study. As a result, every variable (factor) is included in this study in order to examine academics' job satisfaction in higher education. Additionally, an effort has been made to determine which of these variables accounts for the greatest variance in the job happiness of academicians in higher education as well as to determine the relationship between the factors and job satisfaction.

RATIONALE BEHIND THE STUDY

The job satisfaction of teaching faculty is most important factor for the success of any education institute. There aren't plenty of studies that deal with this topic, according to the literature but very few studies are conducted in this context in Punjab, India and no particular study is conducted covering all the major determinants of job satisfaction. Also, there is no study so far done in district Ludhiana. Thus present study is an attempt to cover all major factors affecting satisfaction level of faculty at higher education institutes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section deals with the research design and methodology for studying the aim and objectives of our study.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The specific objectives of this study were to :-

1.   Estimate the prevalence and understand the factors associated with level

of job satisfaction of regular faculty in Higher Education Institutes.

1a **:** Estimate the prevalence of financial rewards associated with job satisfaction.

1b **:** Estimate the prevalence of non- financial aspects associated with job satisfaction

1c **:** Estimate the prevalence of Job resources in terms of infrastructure, academic and research support.

1d **:** Estimate the behavior of colleagues associated with job satisfaction.

Study Design and Settings

The research design of the present study is descriptive in nature because the study includes the identification and analysis of measures influencing the level of job satisfaction developed by earlier scholars who have conducted studies in this area.

Study Participants

The study participants included regular faculty of degree and education colleges of Ludhiana district affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Sampling

The random sampling technique was used for the selection of colleges and participants.

Sample Size

Total PU affiliated degree and Education Colleges in study area are 57. (Source: http://dcdc.puchd.ac.in/affiliateColleges.aspx)

Out of 57, sample of 20 colleges (Annexure 1) was selected. Faculty members were also chosen randomly based upon availability and finally a sample of 248 faculty members was taken for this study.

DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected with the help of a structured questionnaire. Secondary data was also used from sources such as journals, books etc. After a duly thorough literature review and deep discussions with some regular faculty of Panjab University Colleges, a survey instrument was prepared covering the measures associated with level of job satisfaction of regular faculty in Higher Education Institutes. All the items of the constructs other than demographic were measured with 5 point likert scale where 1 as Strongly Disagree, 2 as Disagree, 3 as Neutral, 4 as Agree, 5 Strongly Agree.

Validity and Reliability of the Survey Tool

Before beginning the data collection, it is crucial to evaluate the study tool's validity and reliability. Therefore, the questionnaire underwent testing for reliability and validity.

Validity

The degree to which a measure's scores accurately reflect the variable is called validity (Price *et al.*, 2015). Among the various types of validations, content validity was found to be most appropriate for the current study.

Content validity is how well it "covers" the relevant construct (Price *et al.*, 2015). The questionnaire with the design objectives was distributed to some academicians to check content validity (n = 04, Annexure 2). The proposed modifications were made.

Reliability of the Survey

The survey was pilot-tested in October 2023 with 20 regular faculty members of nearby colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh. The internal consistency was found to be high with a value of 0.82. This value denotes the high reliability of the questionnaire. The participants stated that the questionnaire's items were straightforward to understand and they were able to complete the questionnaire in approximately 5-10 minutes. In addition to expert feedback, inputs were also sought from these participants, to make any necessary last-minute changes.

DATA ANALYSIS

In order to find underlying factors that explain the pattern of correlation within a set of observed variables and to streamline and condense the data into a small number of factors that accounted for the majority of the variance observed into much larger manifest variables, factor analysis was performed using SPSS. Principal component analysis and the varimax orthogonal rotation approach were used to summarise the original data with the fewest factors and best coverage.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The study used Principal Component Analysis (PCA) in combination with varimax rotation to meet its goal. The appropriateness of the data is evaluated prior to EFA using the correlation matrix, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity.

Scale Reliability

In order to decide which scale items to keep and which to remove for the development of a reliable scale, item-wise reliability analysis was done on chosen variables. While doing a reliability study, inter-item correlations and Cronbach's alpha statistics were used to determine the extent to which items were connected with the collection of items being studied.

Table 1
Scale Reliability

Variables	Communalities		Correc-ted Item Total Cor-relation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Mean	Std. Dev.
	Initial	Extra-ction				
My salary is fair as per the work load and designation.	1.000	.591	.552	.928	3.58	1.106
Salary is paid in time.	1.000	.626	.521	.928	3.45	1.162
My college sets clear criteria for the overall reward system.	1.000	.590	.509	.927	3.48	1.068
The salary received is considered to be best compared with other colleges.	1.000	.743	.536	.927	3.14	1.231
The increment system is very much appreciated and satisfied.	1.000	.738	.519	.928	3.17	1.250
The authorities encourage faculty to pursue further studies and research work.	1.000	.734	.632	.925	3.02	1.149
Academic and Research achieveme-nts of faculty are shared at social media platforms of college.	1.000	.687	.609	.926	3.02	1.207
Faculty is allowed duty leave to attend Seminars and Workshops.	1.000	.686	.503	.927	3.41	1.160
Working hours are suitable to fulfill family responsibilities.	1.000	.835	.715	.924	3.09	1.122
Job security is ensured.	1.000	.816	.572	.926	3.36	1.119
Number of teachers is sufficient to manage workload.	1.000	.845	.662	.925	3.39	1.115
Classrooms are equipped with all necessities to favour teaching activities.	1.000	.802	.595	.926	3.15	1.167

Continued

Continued Table 1

Enough technological support is available for teaching and research.	1.000	.827	.600	.926	3.25	1.157
Staff room is fully furnished.	1.000	.856	.670	.925	3.13	1.167
Library is equipped with recent editions of books and journals.	1.000	.826	.931	.925	3.40	1.071
My colleagues treat me with dignity and respect.	1.000	.734	.524	.927	3.69	1.011
I can seek help from my colleagues when facing difficulty at work.	1.000	.745	.581	.926	3.76	1.016
My colleagues do not indulge in internal politics.	1.000	.728	.503	.927	3.66	1.071
My colleagues are always ready to work as a team.	1.000	.597	.506	.927	3.55	1.033
I can rely on my colleagues.	1.000	.731	.558	.926	3.54	1.144
In most ways, being a teacher is close to my ideal.	1.000	.659	.528	.927	3.29	1.192
My conditions of being a college teacher are excellent.	1.000	.766	.589	.926	3.19	1.207
I am fully satisfied with my job.	1.000	.822	.592	.926	3.21	1.160
My job provides me a respectful status in society.	1.000	.809	.571	.926	3.27	1.203
If I could choose my career over, I would change almost nothing.	1.000	.771	.525	.927	3.38	1.134

The value of cronbach's alpha of the scale is 0.948 which is good indicator. All independent and dependent variables had Cronbach's alpha's value higher than 0.70 (Hair *et al.*, 2012). The value of the constructs' communality is >0.5, with a range of 0.590 to 0.856, which is sufficient for the justification of the constructs. It is important to mention here corrected-item-total correlation is also >0.5 ranging between 0.503 and 0.670 which is acceptable (Hair *et al.*, 2009).

KMO and Bartlett's Test

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value is used to assess the data's suitability for sampling. The KMO measured value is 0.867, which is higher than the 0.50 threshold limit (Hair Jr. *et al.*, 2012). To rule out the likeli-hood that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix, the Bartlett's test of sphericity is applied. The Bartlett's test results of this objective are significant with chi-square of

4963.803 (p-value < 0.01). So, both the results confirm that factor analysis is appropriate for the data set (Table1).

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation coefficients were used to investigate the relationships between all the variables. The correlations between the various items in the current study were rather good and substantial to go ahead with factor analysis as shown in the following Correlation Matrix. Factor analysis is performed with varimax rotated, Principal Component Analysis.

Table 2
Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
FR 1	1																								
FR 2	.567	1																							
FR 3	.435	.529	1																						
FR 4	.442	.548	.543	1																					
FR 5	.389	.470	.532	.740	1																				
NR 1	.212	.271	.360	.410	.454	1																			
NR 2	.307	.321	.364	.427	.433	.704	1																		
NR 3	.314	.275	.296	.223	.173	.552	.517	1																	
NR 4	.318	.397	.372	.419	.402	.743	.713	.663	1																
NR 5	.247	.283	.363	.295	.319	.661	.631	.698	.789	1															
JR 1	.269	.203	.209	.226	.221	.420	.317	.341	.457	.387	1														
JR 2	.225	.242	.182	.225	.243	.345	.250	.262	.397	.301	.773	1													
JR 3	.224	.179	.175	.220	.274	.413	.337	.246	.406	.327	.769	.752	1												
JR 4	.193	.243	.235	.311	.287	.399	.300	.247	.473	.369	.785	.797	.839	1											
JR 5	.242	.225	.185	.209	.193	.407	.307	.342	.468	.424	.858	.739	.757	.771	1										

Continued

Continued Table 5

BC1	.240	.345	.267	.214	.120	.205	.269	.273	.346	.270	.271	.345	.225	.360	.310	1									
BC2	.312	.259	.276	.273	.139	.255	.260	.272	.307	.297	.396	.304	.302	.395	.370	.709	1								
BC3	.281	.317	.191	.199	.096	.201	.258	.305	.326	.248	.297	.278	.222	.324	.258	.673	.684	1							
BC4	.282	.223	.324	.194	.209	.238	.319	.171	.323	.167	.311	.283	.322	.299	.305	.607	.552	.511	1						
BC5	.285	.334	.264	.287	.163	.264	.279	.168	.370	.228	.396	.377	.285	.418	.369	.592	.683	.659	.675	1					
JS1	.131	.211	.297	.353	.392	.368	.335	.260	.347	.301	.309	.201	.230	.255	.231	.164	.284	.181	.171	.182	1				
JS2	.196	.216	.250	.254	.207	.286	.321	.186	.358	.243	.394	.339	.288	.424	.346	.310	.370	.269	.196	.324	.598	1			
JS3	.177	.226	.300	.323	.286	.391	.316	.180	.306	.170	.355	.306	.368	.365	.326	.222	.296	.197	.260	.293	.661	.741	1		
JS4	.220	.202	.226	.253	.153	.288	.338	.194	.347	.193	.352	.250	.329	.366	.290	.269	.329	.302	.276	.262	.586	.767	.769	1	
JS5	.163	.123	.258	.204	.216	.309	.231	.257	.298	.147	.331	.310	.277	.302	.276	.216	.279	.241	.225	.173	.612	.686	.732	.757	1

Inter–item Correlation : Mean = .320, Minimum = .258, Maximum = .858, Range = .762, Max/Min = 1.125, Variance = .046, N = 25

Total Variance Explained and Naming of Factors

. The results of rotated sums of squared loadings show that the total variance explained by the five factors was 75.94% which is considered good for the successful implementation of factor analysis and its results. According to Malhotra and Dash (2013), at least 50% of the total variation should be explained by the components that were retrieved. The Table 3 shows the eigen values which ranges from 1.312 to 4.305 and the individual % of variance and cumulative variance of explained by each factor is given.

Factor Loadings and Cronbach's Alpha Results

Exploratory Factor analysis is done to analyze the data and to determine whether the data set is relevant for further analysis or not. For this factor loadings are checked and the factor reliability is checked with the help of Cronbach's alpha value of each variable. The cronbach's alpha value of the five factors was found above the threshold limit of 0.70. As per Hair *et al.* (2009), the average factor loadings of all the items should be above 0.5. In the given Table factor loadings of all the items are above the threshold limit of 0.5.

Table 3
Total Variance Explained

Comp-onent	Initial Eigen Values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumu-lative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumu-lative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumu-lative %
1	9.381	37.522	37.522	9.381	37.522	37.522	4.148	16.591	16.591
2	2.591	10.365	47.887	2.591	10.365	47.887	3.844	15.377	31.968
3	2.505	10.018	57.905	2.505	10.018	57.905	3.672	14.688	46.656
4	2.349	9.397	67.302	2.349	9.397	67.302	3.578	14.313	60.968
5	1.638	6.553	73.856	1.638	6.553	73.856	3.222	12.887	73.856
6	.891	3.563	77.419						
7	.651	2.604	80.023						
8	.582	2.329	82.351						
9	.520	2.081	84.432						
10	.455	1.820	86.252						
11	.417	1.669	87.921						
12	.380	1.519	89.441						
13	.341	1.365	90.805						
14	.326	1.303	92.108						
15	.299	1.195	93.303						
16	.270	1.081	94.384						
17	.253	1.013	95.396						
18	.212	.850	96.246						
19	.194	.778	97.024						
20	.173	.693	97.717						
21	.146	.586	98.303						
22	.123	.492	98.795						
23	.116	.463	99.258						
24	.098	.391	99.649						
25	.088	.351	100.000						

Extraction Method : Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4

Rotated Component

	Component				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
JR3	.869				
JR4	.856				
JR2	.853				
JR1	.849				
JR5	.846				
JS3		.860			
JS4		.857			
JS2		.852			
JS1		.818			
JS5		.748			
BC3			.824		
BC4			.822		
BC2			.805		
BC1			.794		
BC5			.723		
NR3				.860	
NR4				.800	
NR2				.797	
NR1				.751	
NR5				.729	
FR3					.817
FR4					.806
FR2					.732
FR1					.699
FR5					.631
Eigen Value	9.381	2.591	2.505	2.349	1.638
% Variance	16.591	15.377	14.688	14.313	12.887
Cumulative % Variance	16.591	31.968	46.656	60.968	73.856
Scale Reliability Alpha (Cronbach's Alpha)	.845	.909	.947	.896	.918

Cronbach's Alpha = .929, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = .867, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Approx. Chi-Square = 4963.803, Df = 300, Sig = 0.00, Mean = 83.49

Factor One (Financial Rewards)

The first factor explains the highest of the three factors i.e. 16.591 % of the total variance explained and is named as financial rewards. It includes the statements which explain the financial factors affecting job satisfaction of faculty. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.845 and factor loadings range from 0.846 to 0.869. It covers 4.148 of the eigen value. The inter item correlation ranges from .389 to .750 and item to total correlation ranges from .557 to 0.735.

Factor Two (Non Financial Rewards)

The second factor explains 15.377 % of the total variance explained and is named as non-financial rewards. It includes the statements which explain the importance of non financial rewards like job security and working hours etc in job satisfaction level of faculty in higher education institutions. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.909 and factor loadings range from 0.748 to 0.860. It covers 3.844 of the eigen value. The inter item correlation ranges from .517 to .789 and item to total correlation ranges from .687 to .856.

Factor Three (Job Resources)

The third factor 14.688 % of the total variance explained and is named as job resources. It includes the statements which explain the importance of job resources to impact the job satisfaction. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.947 and factor loadings range from 0.723 to 0.824. It covers 3.672 of the eigen value. The inter item correlation ranges from .739 to .858 and item to total correlation ranges from .832 to .876.

Factor Four (Behaviour of Colleagues)

The fourth factor explains 14.313 % of the total variance explained and is named as behavior of colleagues. It includes the statements which explain the role played by behavior of colleagues to influence the job satisfaction level of faculty. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.896 and factor loadings range from 0.729 to 0.860. It covers 3.578 of the eigen value. The inter item correlation ranges from .512 to .709 and item to total correlation ranges from .679 to .779.

Factor Five (Job Satisfaction)

The fifth factor explains 12.887 % of the total variance explained and is named as job satisfaction. It includes the statements which explain the job satisfaction level of faculty. The cronbach alpha of this factor is 0.918 and factor loadings range from 0.631 to 0.817. It covers 3.222 of the eigen value. The inter item correlation ranges from .586 to .769 and item to total correlation ranges from .684 to .838.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Satisfaction of a teacher is a major aspect in institutional dynamics and is widely regarded as the primary dependent variable used to assess the performance of an organization's human resources. Thus, understanding the elements influencing teachers' job satisfaction is critical for a successful educational system. (Sharma & Jyoti, 2009;Khalid *et al.*, 2012). Unless teachers are satisfied they cannot perform adequately (Kumar J, 2023). It is crucial to comprehend the elements that lead to teachers' job satisfaction in order to guarantee that they are. This study has attempted to determine what factors influence teachers' job satisfaction and what level of job satisfaction they have. A sample of 248 college instructors from twenty higher education institutions in the Ludhiana district that are affiliated with Panjab University Chandigarh were chosen at random for this study. An organized survey was created to examine the degree of contentment among the educators included in this investigation. The four factors considered in this study that influence job satisfaction are financial rewards, non-financial rewards, job resources and behavior of colleagues. Out of these factors, positive behaviour of colleagues is the most important factor to influence the job satisfaction level of faculty in higher education institutes with highest mean score of 18.21. 'Financial rewards' is the second important factor with mean score of 16.81, the results are supported by the Basak & Govender, 2015; Subarto *et al.*, 2021, studies. Job resources are at third place with mean score of 16.32 while non-financial rewards are least important with mean score of 15.91, similar finding has been found in the research conducted by Guoba, A*et al.*, (2022). The faculty members were categorized into 3 different categories, depending on the total scores achieved by them. The faculty members were classified as highly satisfied when their score was above 94 (above 75%), as satisfied when their score was between 62 and 93 (between 50 and 75%) and as dissatisfied when their score was below 62 (less than 50%). Data from the study revealed that 50 (20%) faculty members out of total sample of 248 were found to be highly satisfied, while 180 (73%) faculty members were satisfied. Only 18 faculty members, that formed around 7% of the sample, were dissatisfied with their jobs. The overall Mean score was 83.49, with a standard deviation of 17.295. The job satisfaction level of faculty was hence, quite good. The results of this study are useful for administrators to take strategic actions for taking into consideration the provision of identified factors to increase the satisfaction level of faculty working in their educational institutions.

IMPLICATIONS

In the context of human resource management, the empirical findings are significant because academicians tend to place a higher emphasis on fundamental factors. A detailed examination of the numerous factors of job satisfaction highlights the significance of the job's attributes and suitability for improving academics' job satisfaction. It should be emphasised before employing someone that their expectations and values align with the position. The degree of job satisfaction would be higher the less the difference. The causes of the drop in job satisfaction could be investigated further.

SOURCE OF FUNDING

The present study is funded from Research Promotion Fund of Panjab University Alumni Association.

References

Abdulahi, B. A. (2020), Determinants of Teachers' Job Satisfaction : School Culture Perspective, *Humaniora*, 32(2), 151.

Amin, M.; Shah, S.; and Tatlah, I. A. (2013), Impact of Principals / Directors' Leadership Styles on Job Satisfaction of the Faculty Members : Perceptions of the Faculty Members in a Public University of Punjab, Pakistan, *Journal of Research & Reflections in Education (JRRE)*, 7(2).

Basak, S. K.; and Govender, D. W. (2015), Theoretical Framework of the Factors Affecting University Academics Job Satisfaction, *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 14(2), 317–326.

Bashir, L. (2017), Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Relation to Professional Commitment, *The International Journal of Indian Psychology,* 4(4), 52–59

Byrne, B. M. (2010), Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS : Basic Concepts, Applications and Programming (Multivariate Applications Series), Taylor & Francis Group.

Dhuryana, A. S.; and Hussain, F. (2018), The Effecting Job Security and Work Load on Job Satisfaction of Teachers Among Higher Education Institution in Southern Punjab, *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Emerging Trends in Engineering, Management and Sciences*, 18–20.

Guoba, A.; •ygaitiene, B.; and Kepaliene, I. (2022), Factors Influencing Teachers' Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 4(4), 234-241.

Hair Jr., J. F.; Matthews, L. M.; Matthews, R. L.; and Sarstedt, M. (2009), PLS-SEM or CB-SEM : Updated Guidelines on which Method to Use, *International*

Journal of Multivariate Data Analysis, 1(2), 107–123. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMDA.2017.087624

Hair, J. F.; Sarstedt, M.; Ringle, C. M.; and Mena, J. A. (2012), An Assessment of the Use of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling in Marketing Research, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40*(3), 414–433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0261-6

Iwu, C. G.; Ezeuduji, I. O.; Iwu, I. C.; Ikebuaku, K.; and Tengeh, R. K. (2018), Achieving Quality Education by Understanding Teacher Job Satisfaction Determinants, *Social Sciences*, 7(2), 25.

Khalid, S.; Irshad, M. Z.; and Mahmood, B. (2012), 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.

Kumar, J. (2023), Influence of Motivation on Teachers' Job Performance, *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications,* 10(1), 1-11.

Liu, Y.; Yi, S.; and Siwatu, K. O. (2023, January), Mediating Roles of College Teaching Self-efficacy in Job Stress and Job Satisfaction Among Chinese University Teachers, *In Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 7, p. 1073454), Frontiers.

Malhotra, N.; and Dash, S. (2013), Future of Research in Marketing in Emerging Economies, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning,* 31(2).

Malik, M.; Samina, N.; Naeem, B.; and Danish, R. (2010), Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of University Teachers in Public Sector of Pakistan, *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n6p17

Mustapha, N.; and Zakaria, Z. C. (2013), Measuring Job Satisfaction from the Perspective of Interpersonal Relationship and Faculty Workload Among Academic Staff at Public Universities in Kelantan, Malaysia.

Rana, A.; and Soodan, V. (2019), Effect of Occupational and Personal Stress on Job Satisfaction, Burnout and Health : A Cross-Sectional Analysis of College Teachers in Punjab, India, *Indian Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 23(3), 133.

Price, P. C.; Jhangiani, R. S.; and Chiang, I.-C. A. (2015), *Research Methods in Psychology*.

Shah, N. H.; and Jumani, N. B. (2015), Relationship of Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention of Private Secondary School Teachers, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4s2p313

Sharma, R. D.; and Jyoti, J. (2009), Job Satisfaction of University Teachers : An Empirical Study, *Journal of Services Research,* 9(2).

Sharma, R. D.; and Jyoti, J. (2006), 'Job Satisfaction Among School Teachers', *IIMB Management Review,* 18(4), 349-363.

Sinniah, S.; Al Mamun, A.; MdSalleh, M. F.; Makhbul, Z. K. M.; and Hayat, N.

(2022), Modeling the Significance of Motivation on Job Satisfaction and Performance Among the Academicians : The Use of Hybrid Structural Equation Modeling-Artificial Neural Network Analysis, *Frontiers in Psychology,* 13, 935822

Subarto, S.; Solihin, D.; and Qurbani, D. (2021), Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Its Implications for the Lecturers Performance, *Journal Pendidikan Ekonomi Dan Bisnis (JPEB),* 9(2), 163–178.

Tria, J. Z. (2023), Job Satisfaction Among Educators : A Systematic Review, *International Journal of Professional Development, Learners and Learning,* 5(2), ep2310.

Walker, W.; Garton, B.; and Kitchel, T. (2004), Job Satisfaction and Retention of Secondary Agriculture Teachers, *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(2), 28–38. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2004.02028

Zhang, X.; Cheng, X.; and Wang, Y. (2023), How is Science Teacher Job Satisfaction Influenced by Their Professional Collaboration? Evidence from Pisa 2015 Data, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health,* 20(2), 1137

Annexure 1

List of Colleges Selected for Study

S.No.	Name of the College
1.	Gobindgarh Public College, Alour, Khanna
2.	Govind National College, Narangwal, Ludhiana
3.	SDP College for Women, Ludhiana
4.	KamlaLohtia SD College, Ludhiana
5.	Master Tara Singh Memorial College, Ludhiana
6.	AS College for Women, Khanna
7.	AS College, Khanna
8.	AS College Education, Khanna
9.	DD Jain Memorial College for Women, Ludhiana
10.	Khalsa College for Women, Civil Lines, Ludhiana
11.	Guru Nanak National College Doraha
12.	GHG Khalsa College, GurusarSudhar
13.	Malwa college Bondli, Samrala
14.	Guru Nanak College of Education, Gopalpur
15.	GHG Khalsa College of Education, GurusarSadhar
16.	Shree AtamVallabh Jain College Hussainpura , Ludhiana
17.	Guru Nanak khalsa college for Women, Model Town, Ludhiana
18.	DD Jain College of Education, Ludhiana
19.	Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce amd Management, Ludhiana
20.	Malwa Central College of Education for Women, Civil Lines, Ludhiana

Annexure 2

Composition of Expert Group for the Content Validity

S. No.	Name of the Expert	Institution	Email Id
1.	Dr. Satinder Kumar	Punjabi University, Patiala	kumarsatinder1981@gmail.com
2	Dr. Rajni Bansal	Chitkara University	rajni.bansal@chitkara.edu.in
3.	Dr. Kiran Mehta	Chitkara University	ujjawala.kiran@chitkara.edu.in
3.	Dr. YashminSofat	A S College, Khanna	yashminsofat@gmail.com

Annexure 3

Questionnaire / Scale

Financial Rewards	My salary is fair as per the work load and designation. Salary is paid in time. My college sets clear criteria for the overall reward system. The salary received is considered to be best compared with other colleges. The increment system is very much appreciated and satisfied.
Non-Financial Rewards	The authorities encourage faculty to pursue further studies and research work. Academic and Research achievements of faculty are shared at social media platforms of college. Faculty is allowed duty leave to attend Seminars and Workshops. Working hours are suitable to fulfill family responsibilities. Job security is ensured.
Job Resources	Number of teachers is sufficient to manage workload. Classrooms are equipped with all necessities to favour teaching activities. Enough technological support is available for teaching and research. Staff room is fully furnished. Library is equipped with recent editions of books and journals.
Behavior of Colleagues	My colleagues treat me with dignity and respect. I can seek help from my colleagues when facing difficulty at work. My colleagues do not indulge in internal politics. My colleagues are always ready to work as a team. I can rely on my colleagues.
Job Satisfaction	In most ways, being a teacher is close to my ideal. My conditions of being a college teacher are excellent. I am fully satisfied with my job. My job provides me a respectful status in society. If I could choose my career over, I would change almost nothing.