

Are Faculty Satisfied with their Job? – A Study Identifying the Influencing Factors

¹Dr.S. Priya Durga, ²Dr.D. David Winster Praveenraj

¹Assistant Professor, Kalasalingam Business School, Kalasalingam Academy of Research and Education, Tamil Nadu, India

²Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, Bannari Amman Institute of Technology, Sathyamangalam, Tamil Nadu, India.

E-mail: ¹E-mail: priyadurgasm@gmail.com, ²ddavidwins@gmail.com

Article Info

Volume 83

Page Number: 3807 - 3817

Publication Issue:

July - August 2020

Article History

Article Received: 06 June 2020

Revised: 29 June 2020

Accepted: 14 July 2020

Publication: 30 August 2020

Abstract:

To study the impact of intrinsic, extrinsic & general satisfaction factors in determining the faculty job satisfaction and to examine the extent to which these dimensions of job satisfaction influencing the level of faculty job satisfaction among the two categories of faculty, labelled as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers, a sample of six hundred and forty six full time faculty from thirty seven higher education institutions in India were surveyed. Result signifies that academics in India experience job satisfaction at the education institutions an important antecedent, which implies career growth opportunities, compensation and social status appear to be the significant determinants of Job satisfaction in which faculty were most satisfied, whereas dissatisfaction was exhibited for creativity/Independence, working environment and personal satisfaction. Furthermore, the study explores that presence of intrinsic factors will positively influence job satisfaction of satisfiers while absence of extrinsic factors cause strong dissatisfaction which explain dissatisfiers level of job satisfaction at the higher education institutions. Conversely, general satisfaction reveals significant relationship in explaining the level of job satisfaction of both satisfiers and dissatisfiers. The study also confirms that demographics were the predictors which explain variation in the degree of faculty job satisfaction

Keywords: Faculty Job Satisfaction, Higher Education Institutions, India.

I. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is a pleasurable positive state of mind, as a result of one's job experiences in an organisation. Since the model of job satisfaction emerging at the late 1950's, numerous studies contributed to the discussions in understanding of the factors/facets which determining job satisfaction. Among the earlier studies, Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy theory contribute to the basis of assessment of job satisfaction by identifying that a variety of factors (psychological, social, emotional, economic) collectively have correlation with employees satisfaction with work environment. March and Simon (1958) in their model of organizational equilibrium proposes that employees will be more likely to stay in the organization when they are satisfied with their job. Several years later Herzberg et al.,(1967) first coined and distinguished the factors relating to job satisfaction into two sets of work-related factors (i.e) Hygiene factors and Motivators. Motivators (intrinsic factors) refers to set of conditions/factors related to job performance which provide high job satisfaction such as achievement, advancement, possibility of growth, responsibility etc, whereas, hygiene factors (extrinsic factors) comprised of institution policies and practices, supervision, inter-personal relations with supervisors, subordinates and peers, job security, working conditions, personal life, status etc, all these factors act as strong dissatisfiers if these factors were absent in the working environment.

Locke (1969) proposed another perspective on job satisfaction and explaining that employees perceive and experience the fulfillment in what they are doing will result in increase in their productivity will constitute job satisfaction. Spector (1985) identified that complete picture of an individual's job satisfaction which can be determined by different facets includes fair pay and fringe benefits, promotion opportunities, supervision, contingent rewards (reward based on performance), operating rules and procedures, colleagues, nature of work, and communication. Dissatisfaction towards any of the facets may also have a negative impact on job satisfaction which leads to turnover. It does support the findings of Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) of Hackman & Oldham (1975) identified that task identity, skill variety, autonomy, task significance and feedback are the core job characteristics which

measure employee's satisfaction results in low absenteeism and turnover.

Research pertaining to faculty job satisfaction has received much attention as a result of lack of attention towards human capital in academia, the perception of faculty regarding their status in the academic profession and the issue of retention of faculty talent in academia (Gautam Biswas, 2010). Moreover, remarkable growth of higher educational institutions with sanctioned intake capacity of AICTE approved higher education institutions offering UG & PG programs is 25,68,501 in 2018-19, nearly threefold increase in annual intake of students compared to the past decade (AISHE, 2018-19), GATS agreement with Indian educational sector & India's permanent membership with Washington Accord has ultimately changed not only the scenario of higher education by demanding high quality standards in educational programmes including increasing cross border educational opportunities, multidisciplinary engineering education & demand for new learning standards but also changed the role of faculty/teacher in academic to meet the new challenges includes skillset to develop & use of new teaching methodology, enhanced planning and implementing curriculum, new perceptions towards students – teacher relationship (Kavita Bhatnagar et al., 2011).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Teachers' job satisfaction refers to the extent a teacher perceives and values various factors such as pay, evaluation, responsibility, collegiality and recognition (Lester, 1982). As it is relevant to physical and mental wellbeing of faculty, an understanding of factors related to job satisfaction of academics is important. Previous research work done in the Indian academic context is discussed below

Bowen & Radhakrishnan (1991) proposed a study to explain the effect of motivator and hygiene factors which influencing job satisfaction of faculty from agriculture education. Result signifies that regarding the motivators, faculty were most satisfied with the career itself and least satisfied with the career development opportunities, whereas with regard to hygiene factors, faculty were most satisfied with the collegial atmosphere, interpersonal relationships and least satisfied with the policies prevailing at the institution. Moreover, the study also found that

faculty's job satisfaction was an individual behaviour while considering faculty's age, tenure, designation and teaching experience. The study with female faculty in Indian colleges of Karnataka state conversely reveals that attitude towards teaching, teaching career and family responsibility was the predominant influential factors in determining job satisfaction (Mukthamath et al., 1991).

Significant indicators of job satisfaction which emerged from the study done by Rachna Agaral & Munish Nagar (2013) in Business schools in New Delhi includes autonomy, empowerment and recognition proves to be key motivators for job satisfaction in which faculty were most satisfied, whereas dissatisfaction was exhibited for compensation and employment conditions. Study results also explores that career advancement & promotion as the foremost important factor, followed by salary and leave benefits and co-operation & support from colleagues which influence faculty retention at business schools. This study therefore seems to highlight the importance of intrinsic factors in determining faculty job satisfaction but in explaining job satisfaction with retention both intrinsic and extrinsic factors have significant effect. Research conducted by Raja Nandan et al., (2013) on analyzing the job satisfaction of management faculty of higher education institutions in Andhra Pradesh indicated that motivation, work itself, working conditions, working relations, organizations policies & procedures, pay and benefits, teaching performance, research performance and strengths & opportunities appear to be the significant determinants of Job satisfaction, which exhibited variation by designation, qualification, age and experience.

In another research with faculty of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry in Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology in Jammu, Gautam et al., (2006) found that career growth opportunities, Motivation, working condition and support for research have positive and significant effect on job satisfaction and signifies that job satisfaction is a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing more than one factors operating simultaneously. Moreover, the younger faculties are more satisfied when compared to those with a longer service period. Research about factors influencing the job satisfaction of academics by Schulze (2006) revealed that academics were positively inclined towards general job satisfaction. Negative perception

towards teaching career, early exits from teaching profession, psychological withdrawal from the job and demographics were the predictors which explain the degree of faculty job satisfaction. Another study with academics of fifty one private universities in Bangladesh, Ali and Akhter (2009) reveals that salary, working conditions, training facilities, course allocation were the strong dissatisfied factors in explaining positive job satisfaction & retention of academia. Further it has been found that there is no significant difference between male and female faculty members regarding job satisfaction. The study of Sharma and Jyoti (2010) comprised one hundred and twenty academics from Jammu University in India that securities, recognition, new experience, independence, supportive relationship with co-faculty were the most influenced factors in defining academic job satisfaction. Further it has been found out that professor were more satisfied than lecturers and job satisfaction decline in the middle age. In addition to that, the study explains that intrinsic, extrinsic and demographic factors were effecting academic staff's job satisfaction.

Another research by Bhavna and Rajashree (2012) indicates that job satisfaction of the faculty members not only influence their retention at the institutions, but also have influence on academic support to the students. Faculty members feel contented in their job only highly when the management of the institution focuses on aspects like career and opportunities, pay & benefits, support from management and good working condition. Mittal and Raj Kumar Singh (2017), in their work on determinants of job satisfaction of faculty reveals that salary & economic incentives, working conditions and growth opportunities in teaching career were found to be contributing to the faculty job satisfaction, which will have more influence the faculty towards job shift intention. Evidence from the another study conducted among academic staff at higher learning institute in Lesotho by pii (2003) focus on determinants of job satisfaction appeared to be more extrinsic in nature, results found that factors such as compensation, institutional policies and practices, working conditions, supervision and human relations were significantly associated with job dissatisfaction.

Aim Of The Study

Despite reasonable amount of research on job satisfaction was carried out in the past, various dimensions (intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction factors) in determining the job satisfaction and the extent to which these dimensions of job satisfaction influencing the level of faculty job satisfaction among the two categories of faculty, labelled as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers have not yet been explored. Hence the present study is the effort to fill the research gap in this context.

III. Methodology

Six hundred and forty six full time faculties, selected randomly from thirty seven higher education institutions, having accredited engineering programs by AICTE, India were surveyed. Faculty having at least one year of teaching experience was included in this study, since the present research talks about job satisfaction, one year could be the minimum considerable time for the faculty members to understand and experience the practices prevailing at the institution and to get benefited and satisfied. The surveyed data includes demographic information

includes gender, age, marital status, Experience in teaching, academic credentials and designation, views on Job Satisfaction (JS). The 12 –items scale Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss et al (1967) under three dimensions was used to measure faculty's job satisfaction at the higher education institutions. The reliability results (Table 2) shows that the items of all the facets of job satisfaction are highly reliable.

IV. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Table 1 explains the information on the distribution of six hundred and forty six faculty concerning various categories of five demographic variables. Of which, 60% of respondents were male & nearly 51% of respondents belong to the age group of 31-40 years. 40% of the respondents were holding post graduate qualification; only 25% of the respondents holding doctoral degree. Most of the respondents were in the cadre of "Assistant Professor" (61%) and 43% having teaching experience of 5 years and below. All these sample composition shows that the ratio of young faculty was high.

Table 1: Sample Composition

Demographic Variables	Categories	Frequency (N=646)	%
Gender	Male	385	60
	Female	261	40
Age	30 years & younger	215	33
	31 – 40 years	327	51
	Older than 40 years	104	16
Academic Credentials	Doctorate	163	25
	Master’s degree & higher	227	35
	Post Graduate	256	40
Designation	Professor or higher	129	20
	Associate professor	122	19
	Assistant professor	395	61
Teaching Experience	5 years & less	278	43
	6 -10 years	148	23
	11-15 years	106	16
	More than 15 years	114	18

In this study, a SEM (Structural Equation Modelling) using AMOS was carried out to examine the role of various dimensions of job satisfaction (Intrinsic, Extrinsic & General satisfaction factors) in determining faculty’s job satisfaction and also to explore the extent, these dimensions of job satisfaction influencing the level of faculty job satisfaction among the two categories of faculty, labeled as Satisfiers.

H1 (a) intrinsic factors (b) extrinsic factors (c) general satisfaction factors have significant effect in determining the faculty’s job satisfaction at Higher Education Institutions in India

The result of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Table 2) shows that the standardized factor loadings/estimate is greater than 0.50 for all the three dimensions of Job Satisfaction: Intrinsic, Extrinsic & General satisfaction factors, which shows the content validity of the constructs (Hair et al., 2010). It does

match with the content model of Herzberg et al., 1967; Locke, 1969; Hackman & Oldham, 1975 that job satisfaction is multidimensional which can be determined by more than one dimension.

The co-efficient (standardized) of various dimensions of job satisfaction (Table 2) explains that all the three dimensions: Intrinsic, Extrinsic & General satisfaction factors have significant effect in measuring the job satisfaction of faculty in Indian Higher Education Institutions. It does support the earlier research findings in the Indian academic context (Bowen & Radhakrishnan 1991; Sharma & Jyoti, 2010; Agarwal & Munish Nagar, 2013; Raja Nandan et al., 2013) which explains that to determine faculties job satisfaction, in the academic context of India, multi-dimensional approach can provide a more complete picture in measuring individual’s job satisfaction because dissatisfaction towards any of the facets may also have a negative impact on job satisfaction.

Table 2: Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of Dimensions of Job satisfaction & Overall Job Satisfaction along with Reliability

Hypothesis	Items	Dimensions of Job satisfaction		Overall Job Satisfaction (JS)		
		Standardized Factor loadings	Cronbach Alpha	Standardized co-efficient	t-value	
H1	Intrinsic Factors (IF)	Career Advancement Opportunities	0.882	0.905	0.979	11.865
		Recognition	0.845			
		Independence/Creativity	0.777			
		Job Security	0.842			

	Achievement	0.797			
Extrinsic Factors (EF)	Compensation	0.962	0.852	0.729	13.661
	Interpersonal Relationship (with HOD/Management)	0.637			
	Social Climate	0.957			
	Working Environment	0.501			
General Satisfaction (GS)	Societal contribution	0.872	0.913	0.860	18.615
	Social Status	0.924			
	Career satisfaction	0.861			

Intrinsic factors have high influence in determining the faculty's job satisfaction with the co-efficients of 0.979 (Table 2). The standardized factor estimates of the CFA results (Table 2) signifies that regarding Intrinsic Factors (IF) faculty were most satisfied with the career development opportunities (0.882) followed by Recognition(0.845), job security (0.842), Achievement (0.797) and least satisfied with Independence/creativity in doing their job. Findings concerning higher education institutions faculty job satisfaction with intrinsic factors are supported by studies Bowen & Radhakrishnan (1991); Rachna Agarwal & Munish Nagar, (2013); Mittal and Raj Kumar Singh (2017)

General Satisfaction factors (GSF) was the facet next to Intrinsic factors with the co-efficient of 0.860 has the relative power to influence faculty's job satisfaction at higher education institutions in India. Findings with regard to general satisfaction does support the earlier studies of Gautam et al., (2006); Sharma & Jyoti, (2010) which reveals that academics were positively inclined towards general job satisfaction other than job related factors. The standardized factor estimates of the CFA results (Table 2) signifies that with regard to General Satisfaction factors (GSF) faculty were most satisfied with the "social status (0.924)" which makes them feel that the teaching career deserves a place in the economy/society followed by societal contribution (0.872) and least satisfied with the personal satisfaction in their teaching career (0.861). While understanding the perception of faculty in higher education career choice, status in the society and a sense of personal satisfaction also have influence in measuring teachers job satisfaction.

As revealed by the co-efficient (Table 2) extrinsic factors appear to be the least facet among the three determinants but it also a significant one (standardized co-efficient of 0.729) in determining the faculty job satisfaction. Considering the Extrinsic factors, faculty were most satisfied with the factor

"Compensation (0.962)"(i.e) the amount of pay & benefits they receive followed by Social climate (0.957), Interpersonal Relationship with HOD/Management (0.637) and least satisfied with the working environment (0.501). Satisfaction of academics could be determined positive only when prominence should be given to these extrinsic factors. It does support the studies of Bowen & Radhakrishnan, (1991); Ali & Akhter, (2009); Rachna Agaral & Munish Nagar, (2013); pii,(2003).

H2: Dimensions of job satisfaction (Intrinsic, extrinsic, general satisfaction factors) will significantly influence the faculty job satisfaction among the two categories of faculty (a) satisfiers (b) dissatisfiers

To determine the level of job satisfaction of faculty of Higher Education Institutions, India, their sum of scores on the three dimensions of job satisfaction were divided and grouped into two categories of faculty, labelled as "Satisfiers" (faculty having high job satisfaction score) and "Dissatisfiers" (faculty having least job satisfaction score). Table 3 shows the comparative structural model of both satisfiers and dissatisfiers with standardized co-efficients exposes that all the three dimensions of job satisfaction were highly correlated with job satisfaction of both categories of faculty i.e. satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

An interesting finding from the results of comparative model (Table 3) shows that the effect of Intrinsic factors (IF) on faculty's job satisfaction were highly significant for satisfiers. It signifies that satisfying the faculty in their job at the Higher Education Institutions is no longer by means of extrinsic factors, it's quite different and some significant intrinsic factors related to job performance have been emerged as strong motivators which explains the job satisfaction of satisfiers. Whereas, regarding dissatisfiers group of faculty, the role of extrinsic factors reveals a significant correlation exist between extrinsic factors and dissatisfaction towards

faculty job at the Higher Education Institutions. This may due to the fact that factors regarding with context of job including inter-personal communication with supervisors, subordinates and peers, job security,

working conditions etc., all these act as strong dissatisfiers if these factors were absent in the institution.

Table 3: Results of Comparative Structural Model - among Satisfiers & Dissatisfiers

Hypothesis No & Path	Groups of Faculty				Hypothesis (Results)	
	Satisfiers (having high satisfaction score)		Dissatisfiers (having least satisfaction score)			
	Standardized co-efficient	P value	Standardized co-efficient	P value		
H2	Intrinsic factors	0.397	<0.001**	0.187	<0.002*	Supported (Satisfiers > Dissatisfiers)
	Extrinsic Factors	0.143	<0.002*	0.380	<0.001**	Supported (Dissatisfiers > Satisfiers)
	General Satisfaction Factors	0.357	<0.001**	0.195	<0.001**	Supported (Dissatisfiers > Satisfiers)

*Standardized co-efficient is significant at 5%, where $p < .05$

**Standardized co-efficient is significant at 1%, where $p < .01$

It does synchronize with the content model of Herzberg et al.,(1967); Locke (1969) implies that presence of intrinsic factors will positively influence job satisfaction while absence of extrinsic factors cause strong dissatisfaction towards their job. It does also validate the earlier research findings from academic context (Bowen & Radhakrishnan, 1991; Ali and Akhter, 2009; Rachna Agaral & Munish Nagar, 2013; Raja Nandan et al., 2013; Mittal and Raj Kumar Singh,2017)

Moreover the effect of general satisfaction factors on faculty's job satisfaction was highly significant for both satisfiers and dissatisfiers. More often the factors regarding the psychological state of faculty towards their career signifies the job satisfaction of satisfiers, also it does influence the job satisfaction of dissatisfiers when there is absence of such psychological state among themselves. Findings with regard to general satisfaction do support the earlier studies of India (Schulze, 2006; Gautam et al., 2006; Sharma & Jyoti, 2010).

H3: Effect of dimensions (Intrinsic, Extrinsic & General satisfaction factors) of job satisfaction with regard to various categories

of demographic variables are significantly different or not

The results of Independent Sample t test (significant values of the t statistics) (Table 4) for the demographic variables gender & one way Independent ANOVA test (significant values of the F statistics)(Table 4) for the demographic factors age, academic credentials, designation and teaching experience were found to be less when compared to 0.05, which indicates that the effect of various dimensions (Intrinsic, Extrinsic & General satisfaction factors) in determining the faculty's job satisfaction at the higher educational institutions in India across various categories of five demographic variables (gender, age, academic credentials, designation, teaching experience) was significantly different. Result (Table 4) explores that the categories of Demographic variables; female, doctorates, above 40 years of age, cadre of professor or higher, faculty having above 15 years of teaching experience are different in their perception towards the dimensions of job satisfaction. Besides it implies that all these categories have high mean score for intrinsic factors, followed by general satisfaction factors and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.

Table 4: Effects of Dimensions of Job Satisfaction among Various Groups of Demographic Variables

Demographic variable	Test results	Intrinsic Factors	Extrinsic Factors	General Satisfaction Factors
Gender	T statistics*	-2.601	-3.049	-2.887
	T test (sig.value)	0.010	0.002	0.004
	Null Hypothesis	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Category (having higher mean value)	Female (3.73)	Female (3.34)	Female (3.50)

Age	F statistics**	25.394	32.224	29.094
	F test (sig.value)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Null Hypothesis	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Category (having higher mean value)	Above 40 Years (4.01)	Above 40 Years (3.60)	Above 40 Years (3.84)
Academic credentials	F statistics**	43.976	46.764	41.246
	F test (sig.value)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Null Hypothesis	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Category (having higher mean value)	Doctorate (4.07)	Doctorate (3.66)	Doctorate (3.80)
Designation	F statistics**	64.022	67.842	50.519
	F test (sig.value)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Null Hypothesis	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Category (having higher mean value)	Professor or Higher (4.21)	Professor or Higher (3.80)	Professor or Higher (3.96)
Teaching Experience	F statistics**	40.219	61.311	46.384
	F test (sig.value)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Null Hypothesis	Rejected	Rejected	Rejected
	Category (having higher mean value)	More than 15 Years (4.11)	More than 15 Years (3.77)	More than 15 Years (3.98)

*T Statistics of Independent Sample t Test (for variables having two categories)

** F Statistics of One way Independent Measure ANOVA (for variables having more than two categories)

Moreover the T test & F test statistics (Table 4) reveals that dimensions of job satisfaction exhibited variation, it does match with the earlier studies of Bowen & Radhakrishnan (1991); Gautam et al., (2006); Raja Nandan et al., (2013) Schulze (2006), which confirms that faculty's job satisfaction was an individual behaviour while considering faculty's gender, age, academic credentials, designation, teaching experience.

V. CONCLUSION

Intrinsic, extrinsic & general satisfaction factors have significantly influencing faculty job satisfaction at Higher Education Institutions which confirms that job satisfaction is multidimensional which can be determined by more than one dimension.

With regard to intrinsic factors faculty were most satisfied with the career development opportunities and least satisfied with Independence/creativity in doing their job, whereas with regard to extrinsic factors faculty were most satisfied with compensation and least satisfied in institution working environment. Moreover, regarding general satisfaction factors, faculty was most satisfied with social status and least satisfied while considering the personal satisfaction towards the teaching career. Management of higher education institutions can place emphasis on the determinants including career development opportunities supportive collegial atmosphere, interpersonal relationships, societal status and career satisfaction, to make the faculties' feel satisfied with their job at the institutions. Furthermore, the study also found that faculty's job satisfaction was an individual behaviour while considering faculty's gender, age, academic credentials, designation, teaching experience.

The effect of dimensions (intrinsic, extrinsic & general satisfaction factors) of job satisfaction on both categories of faculty i.e. satisfiers and dissatisfiers signifies that the role of intrinsic factors (i.e) the factors related to inner motives of job performance will

Xpredominantly derive the job satisfaction of satisfiers. Stakeholders of the higher education institutions have taken into account the changing scenario of higher education and demand for new learning standards which changed the role of faculty/teacher in academic, hence satisfying such faculty in their job is no longer extrinsic. Whereas, absence of extrinsic factors at the institutions have emerged as the significant relation, in explaining job dissatisfaction. In addition to that more recently, general satisfaction factors also act as the significant factors in measuring higher job satisfaction. Management of the education institutions focus on higher studies place emphasis on all the dimensions: intrinsic factors (career development opportunities, recognition, job security, achievement & Independence/creativity), extrinsic factors (compensation, Social climate, Interpersonal Relationship with HOD/Management & working environment) & general satisfaction factors (psychological state of faculty; societal contribution, social status & career satisfaction) as it signifies the effect on determining the faculty job satisfaction at the institutions, but once established strategies to satisfy the faculty it serves as a key for managing talent in higher education institutions.

VI. REFERENCES

1. All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2018-19, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, 2020
2. Ali T & Akhter I 2009. Job satisfaction of faculty members in private universities in the context of Bangladesh. *International Business Research*, 2(4): 167-175.
3. Bhavna R Shetty & Rajashree Gujarathi. (2012). "A Study of Faculty Job Satisfaction and its Impact on Student Satisfaction In Management

- Institutes of Nashik District Affiliated to University of Pune”, IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 3(4): 01-08.
4. Bowen BE & Radhakrishna RB 1991. Job satisfaction of Agricultural Education Faculty: a constant phenomenon. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 32 (2): 16 - 22.
 5. Gautam Biswas, Chopra KL, Jha CS & Singh DV 2010. *Profile of Engineering Education in India*, Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi.
 6. Gautam M, Mandal K & Dalal RS 2006. Job satisfaction of faculty members of veterinary sciences: an analysis, *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 18(7): 29-40.
 7. Hackman JR & Oldham GR 1975. Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 159-170.
 8. Herzberg F, Mausner B, Snyderman E & Barbara B (2nd ed) 1967. *The motivation to work*, New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
 9. Joseph F Hair, William C, Black Barry J, Babin Rolph E, Anderson (7th ed.) 2010. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
 10. Kavita Bhatnagar, Srivastava Kalpana & Amarjit Singh 2010. Is Faculty Development Critical to Enhance Teaching Effectiveness, *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 19(2): 138-141.
 11. Locke EA 1969. What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4:309-336.
 12. March JG & Simon HE. 1958. *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
 13. Maslow AH 1954. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
 14. Mittal, R.K & Raj Kumar Singh. (2017). “Determinants of Faculty Retention: A Study of Engineering and Management Institutes in the State of Uttar Pradesh and NCR Delhi”, *International Journal of Management Excellence*, 8(2):916-923.
 15. Mukthamath GC, Gaonkar V & Khadi PB 1991. Factors influencing job involvement and job satisfaction among women teachers. *Indian Journal of Behaviour*, 15 (3): 40 - 48.
 16. Pii JS 2003. Job satisfaction among academic staff at institutions of higher learning in Lesotho. Unpublished PhD thesis. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
 17. Schulze 2006. Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Academics in Higher Education, *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 20 (2): 318-335
 18. Spector PE 1985. Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13:693-713.
 19. Sharma & Jyoti 2010. Job Satisfaction of University Teachers: An Empirical Study, *Journal of Services Research*, 9(2): 51-80
 20. Rachna Agrawal & Munish Nagar 2013. A study on impact of job satisfaction of faculty members on student satisfaction in business schools in Delhi & NCR region, *International journal of Organizational behaviour and Management Perspectives*, 2(2): 322-330.
 21. Raja Nandan D & Siva Rama Krishnan K 2013. Determinants of Job

- Satisfaction of Faculty in Higher Education, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 49 (1): 132-147
22. Weiss DJ, Dawis RV, England GW & Lofquist LH 1967. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis, MN: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minneapolis.