

AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON FACTORS AFFECTING SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYEES AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE ORGANISATION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO EDUCATION SECTOR

Dr. Manish Madan
Associate Professor
Rukmini Devi Institute of Advanced Studies
Madhuban Chowk, Rohini, Delhi.

Dr. Nidhi Gupta
Professor & HOD – BBA
Rukmini Devi Institute of Advanced S.
Madhuban Chowk, Rohini, Delhi.

Abstract

Purpose: Everyone from managers, retention agents to HR need to get a handle on employee loyalty and satisfaction – how engaged is the workforce to the organization and are workers really contented with the way of things for gauging their choice to stay with the company. Human Resource Management's main aspects are measurement of employee satisfaction and employee commitment towards their organization. Companies must ensure that employee satisfaction is high among the workers, which is a must condition for increasing productivity, responsiveness, quality and overall customer service. The litmus test can be conducted to study absenteeism, turnover and average length of service. If turnover is increasing, surely the loyalty levels are low and vice versa.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Descriptive research has been applied, describes data and characteristics about the population or phenomenon being studied. The researchers have used primary data through self-constructed structured Questionnaire and as far as the secondary data is concerned that was obtained from web sites, journals etc. Structured questionnaire was constructed to interview the employees of various Educational Institutions on 23 different parameters on Likert's five point scale, which was later reduced to 5 factors by using the statistical technique of factor analysis.

Findings: It is found that the employees working in the Educational Institutions are satisfied in terms of Authority and work culture, Relationship with Peers, Salary and Career Advancement, Involvement and Training and Rotation of job.

Research Limitations/Implications: The study focuses on general problems faced by employees in the Educational institution. There might be certain more variables as one employee is satisfied on particular aspect but another may not on the same aspect.

Key Words: Employee Satisfaction, Satisfaction of Employees, Educational Institutions.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between how satisfied a person is with their job and their actual job performance is open to discussion and debate. It's hard to correlate those two aspects primarily because when people are asked if they get job satisfaction from working at ABC Company, a certain percentage will say yes just because they think if they say no, there could be a negative consequence. For instance, if you tell your boss you are not satisfied with your job, what if his reply is 'Then I guess you better leave'? Thus, while we understand there is a correlation between satisfaction and performance, it's hard to definitively nail it down without some sort of survey error being present. “Productive employees are always happy employees.” “productive employees are not productive employees.” We frequently here these obvious statements but these are conflicting statements too made by HR professionals and managers in organizations. Now a daysdebatable topic among practitioners are employee attitudes and job satisfaction even at a time when employees are increasingly important for organizational success and competitiveness. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to provide greater understanding of the research on this topic and give recommendations related to the major practitioner knowledge gaps. As indicated indirectly in a study of HR professionals (**Rynes, Colbert, & Brown, 2002**), as well as based on our experience, the major knowledge gaps in this area are: (1) the causes of employee attitudes, (2) the results of positive or negative job satisfaction, and (3) how to measure and influence employee attitudes. As per the outcome of a 2011 survey of U.S. households by the Conference Board, across all income brackets, job dissatisfaction is widespread among workers of all age groups. The study found that only 47% of those surveyed say they are satisfied with their jobs, down from 61.1 percent in 1987, the first year in which the survey was conducted. Organizations measures frequently job satisfaction which is a very important attribute. Rating scale is the most common way of measurementwhere employees report their reactions to their jobs. Questions relate to salary, work responsibilities, variety of tasks, promotional opportunities the work itself and co-workers. Some questioners ask yes or no questions while

others ask to rate satisfaction on 1 – 5 scale where 1 represents “not all satisfied” and 5 represents “extremely satisfied”.

JOB SATISFACTION

The important components to an employee's job satisfaction include pay, promotion, benefits, supervisor personality, co-workers and safety on the job. These job characteristics affect how an employee feels on the job. Besides these there are other, more subtle influences on employee job satisfaction like personality types and rudiments of workplace culture. According to **Arnold et al (1998)** the concept of job satisfaction has gained importance for two important reasons. Firstly, Someone's general mental well-being can be indicated by job satisfaction. If a person is unhappy at work, this person will be unhappy in general. Secondly, and more importantly for this project, the general assumption is that happiness at work improves work motivation and, in consequence, job performance. Job satisfaction has been an important focal point for organizational and industrial psychology. In defining job satisfaction the reference is often made to **Locke's (1976)** description of job satisfaction as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences” (**Jex, 2002**). Several elements related to the job such as salary, working conditions, colleagues and boss, career prospects and, of course, the intrinsic aspects of the job itself (**Arnold et al, 1998**) are directly involved in appraisal..

The study also found that those teachers who received parental support reported higher levels of job satisfaction than teachers who did not. The study also revealed that there was no correlation between teacher satisfaction and benefits such as salary, holidays and working hours. Research conducted by **Lumsden(1998)** showed that major percentage of teacher's time is spent in the classroom and therefore got few opportunities to share their successes with colleagues. Hence they preferred to rely more often on the students' level of response.

Education sector is seen as more to be a pure & divine service. Every company should consider their employees as valuable assets which needs to be developing starts from the recruitment process until their development. This whole process contains a considerable cost for any organization. Satisfaction is a relevant measure because many studies have demonstrated that other factors being equal, satisfied individuals are likely to be willing to exert more effort than unsatisfied individuals (**Bryant, 2006; Özgüngör, 2010**). The same holds true for satisfied faculty members and students as well in education institutes.

As employee turnover continues to be a serious business predicament, the concept of job satisfaction assumes significance for educational sectors also that are facing acute shortage of

qualified and competitive teaching work force. Faculty job satisfaction levels seem to have direct bearing on the institutional as well as the student development. The proper understanding of job satisfaction, retention and employee turnover aspects of the faculties would help the policy makers to understand a very important organ of the society, responsible for future of the nation and generation.

Some studies also threw the light on the fact that intellectual challenge of teaching and career growth also play a crucial role in teacher job satisfaction. On the other hand, it is perceived that work overload, poor pay and the depiction of faculties by the media have been linked with faculty's job dissatisfaction. On a similar line of thought, **Watt and Richardson (2007)** said that if the teaching environment does not facilitate the satisfaction needs of teachers, then teachers are unhappy and unproductive.

The other factors which are responsible for increment in teacher discontentment like problems arising from changes in organizational routines, overwork – especially paperwork, students' evaluations, schools' grading procedures, behavior problems, low pay, student indiscipline, few possibilities for career progression and the overall decline of society's esteem towards education and training **Singh and Rawat (2010)** and **Shann (2001)**. Furthermore, **Arnett and Polkinghorne (2010)** identified some other factors as contributing to teacher's satisfaction or dissatisfaction: nature of recent education reforms, inclusion of students with special needs, support and recognition from school or college administrator, faculty's pay, physical environment or the ambience of the school, daily workload of teaching itself, class size, student discipline and behavior, lack of resources for delivering the quality education and lack of opportunities for career progression.

MHRD has formulated an action plan to achieve an increase in the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in higher education to 21% by the end of the 12th five-year plan period from the current 13.5%. Raising the GER would create the requirement of an additional demand over 26 million in higher education and almost one million school teachers by 2020.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Keith Davis, "Job satisfaction is defined as "Favorableness or favorableness with which the employees view their work and results when there is a fit between job characteristic and wants of the employees".

Stephen P. Robbins: Job satisfaction as the “Difference between the amount of rewards the workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive”. Further he says, “Job satisfaction is an individual general attitude towards his or her job”.

C.B.Mamoria explains: “Job satisfaction is the collection of tasks and responsibilities regularly assigned to one person while a job is a group of positions, which involves essentially the same duties, responsibility, skill and knowledge”.

In Locke words, “Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience”.

Contribution of Researchers

YEAR	AUTHOR	FINDINGS
1992	Roznowski and Hulin	The most important information to have regarding an employee in an organization is a validated measure of his/her level of job satisfaction.
1997	Nancy C. Morse	“Satisfaction refers to the level of fulfillment of one’s needs, wants and desire. Satisfaction depends basically upon what an individual wants from the world, and what he gets.” Employee satisfaction is a measure of how happy workers are with their job and working environment.
1997	Hunter &Tietyen	Employees are more loyal and productive when they are satisfied.
1997	Spector	Job satisfaction as all the feelings that a given individual has about his/her job and its various aspects. Employee satisfaction is a comprehensive term that comprises job satisfaction of employees and their satisfaction overall with companies“ policies, company environment etc.
2002	Dinham and Scott	Has shown that teachers derive satisfaction by matters intrinsic to the role of teaching such as student successes, counseling students, positive relationships with parents and students, and personal growth. External factors such as salaries, holidays and working hours did not rank high in teacher satisfaction levels.
2006	Miller	There is no limit for the employees to reach the full satisfaction and it may vary from employee to employee. Sometimes they need to change their behaviors in order to execute their duties more effectively to gain greater job satisfaction.
2006	Zembylas&Papanastasiou	Job satisfaction as a social construct does not have a precise definition despite having drawn the attention of a number of researchers. Teacher job satisfaction may be defined as the teacher’s “affective relation to his or her teaching role and is

		a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from teaching and what one perceives it is offering to a teacher”.
2007	Bhatti&Qureshi	It is sure that there may be many factors affecting the organizational effectiveness and one of them is the employee satisfaction. Effective organizations should have a culture that encourages the employee satisfaction
2007	Kaliski	Job satisfaction is a worker’s sense of achievement and success on the job. It is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal well-being. Job satisfaction implies doing a job one enjoys, doing it well and being rewarded for one’s efforts. Job satisfaction further implies enthusiasm and happiness with one’s work. Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that lead to a feeling of fulfillment.
2008	Moyes, Shao & Newsome	Employee satisfaction may be described as how pleased an employee is with his or her position of employment.
2010	Singh and Rawat	Identified other factors that contribute to increased teacher discontentment: problems arising from changes in administrative routines, overwork – especially paperwork, students’ evaluations, schools’ grading procedures, behavior problems, low pay, student indiscipline, few possibilities for career progression and the overall decline of society’s esteem towards teaching.
2011	BrikendAziri	Studied Job Satisfaction and found that Job satisfaction is under the influence of a series of factors such as: The nature of work, Salary, Advancement opportunities, Management, Work groups and Work conditions. It is one of the major challenges for today’s organization. Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have towards their work. Meanwhile, when a worker employed in a business organization, brings with it the needs, desires and experiences which determinates expectations that he has dismissed.

Table 1: Contribution of Researchers

OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

1. To study the satisfaction level of employees of educational Institutions regarding salary with respect to experience.

2. To study the satisfaction level of employees of educational institutions between the gender groups regarding job rotation.
3. To study the satisfaction level regarding training opportunities with respect to different age groups.
4. To study the overall satisfaction of employees in the educational Institutions.

HYPOTHESIS OF STUDY

HN1: There is no difference in satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience.

HA1: There is difference in satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience.

HN2: There is no difference of satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation.

HA2: There is difference of satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation.

HN3: There is no difference in the satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group.

HA3: There is difference in the satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group.

HN4: Employees are satisfied in the educational Institutions.

HA4: Employees are not satisfied in the educational Institutions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A **research design** is a systematic plan to study a scientific problem. Descriptive research has been applied, which is also known as statistical research, describes data and characteristics about the population or phenomenon being studied.

Sources of Data

To cater the need of the research, the researchers have used primary data through self-constructed structured Questionnaire and as far as the secondary data is concerned that was obtained from web sites, journals etc.

Data Collection Tool

Structured questionnaire was constructed to interview the employees of various Educational Institutions on 23 different parameters like: Salary, Job rotation, Work environment, welfare measures in the educational institutions etc. measured on Likert's five point scale, which was later reduced to 5 factors by using the statistical technique of factor analysis.

Sampling Technique

Under the probabilistic sampling techniques, systematic sampling was done.

Sample Size

Sample sizes of 150 employees from various departments of educational Institutions were taken for the study.

Statistical Tools Used

IBM SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), for data analysis and as far as for hypothesis testing the statistical tools used are Chi square test for factor, Kruskal Wallis test, Mann-Whitney U test etc and for the reduction of factors the factor analysis is done using Rotated component matrix and for the reliability the cronbach's alpha was calculated and sample adequacy was tested on KMO and Bartlett's Test.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Factor Analysis

Data reduction technique was used to find out the major factors that contribute towards the employee satisfaction.

KMO and Barlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.902
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1624.885
	Df	253
	Sig.	0.000

Table 2: KMO and Barlett's test of Sphericity

From table 2, it is found that the value for Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was more than 0.6, and it is 0.902 also Bartlett's Test of Sphericity has sig value less than 0.05 at 5 % level of significance. So factor analysis was conducted successfully for data reduction.

Rotated Component Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5
Duties with authority	0.745				
Respect given by superiors	0.648				
Number of working hours in Educational Institution.	0.632				
Fair Treatment by the superiors and management of Institution.	0.541				
Support from superiors and management of Institution.	0.528				
Freedom to take Decisions.					
Work Recognition					
Environment of working in Team		0.761			
Treatment of Mistakes		0.682			
Freedom of suggestions		0.657			
Comfortable discussion on personal issues.		0.631			
Proper guidance from superiors and management of Institution.		0.612			
Clarity of Role					
Satisfied with salary and rewards.			0.862		
Opportunities for career development			0.731		
Opportunities for further study			0.629		
Appreciation of Creativity and Innovations.					
Satisfied with Welfare Facilities.					
Involvement in Decision Making				0.638	
Training and Development activities.				0.549	
Full Utilization of Potential				0.521	
Proper Division of Work					
Rotation of Job					0.831

Table 3: Rotated Component Matrix

From the table 3, the 23 variables are condensed to five factors viz.

Factor 1: This factor explains the first component and is designated as “*Organizational Culture*”.

Factor 2: This factor explains the second component and is designated as “*Interpersonal Behavior*”.

Factor 3: This factor explains the third component and is designated as “*Employee Compensation, Benefits & Welfare Schemes*”.

Factor 4: This factor explains the fourth component and is designated as “*Employee Empowerment, Training, & Development*”.

Factor 5: This factor explains the Fifth component and is designated as “*Rotation of Job*”.

From the above table 3, it is found that there are certain variables which are of some importance in the employee satisfaction but does not contribute in the satisfaction of employees in the education sector. These variables are Freedom to take Decisions, Work recognition, clarity of role, Appreciation of Creativity and Innovations, satisfied with welfare facilities and proper division of work.

Total Variance Explained

Components	Rotation sums of squared Loadings		
	Total	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	3.562	15.741	15.741
2	3.401	15.103	30.844
3	2.841	12.459	43.303
4	2.457	10.671	53.974
5	1.430	6.932	60.906

Table 4: Total Variance Explained

Thus all the factors i.e. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are capable of explaining 60.906 of the total variance.

TEST OF NORMALITY

In order to check the normality of variables, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied and it was observed that significant value of all the variables is less than 0.05 i.e. at 5% level of significance. So the data is found to be normal. As the data is normal so for hypothesis testing non- parametric tests were applied.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Measurement of satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience.

HN1: There is no difference in satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience.

HA1: There is difference in satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience.

Test Statistics

Test Statistics	Salary and Career Advancement
Chi – Square	18.42
Df	3
Asymp. Sig.	0.000
a. Kruskal-Wallis Test	
b. Grouping Variable: Experience	

Table 5: Test Statistics of satisfaction of employees regarding salary with respect to experience

Kruskal – Wallis test is applied to measure the satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience. From the table 5, it is found that the Asymp. Sig. value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 i.e. 5% level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted that is there is difference in satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience.

Measurement of satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation.

HN2: There is no difference of satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation.

HA2: There is difference of satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation.

Test Statistics

	Rotation of Job
Mann-Whitney U	347.9

Wilcoxon W	384.7
Z – value	-1.832
Asymp. Sig. (two tailed)	0.173
Grouping Variable: Gender	

Table 6: Test Statistics of satisfaction of employees between the gender regarding job rotation

Mann-Whitney U and Wilcoxon W tests are applied to measure the satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation. From the table 6, it is found that the Asymp. Sig. value is 0.173 which is more than 0.05 i.e. 5% level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected that is there is no difference of satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation.

Measurement of satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group.

HN3: There is no difference in the satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group.

HA3: There is difference in the satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group.

Test Statistics

	Involvement and Training
Chi-Square	7.931
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	0.074
a. Kruskal-Wallis Test	
b. Grouping Variable: Age	

Table 7: Test Statistics of satisfaction of employees in training opportunities

Kruskal – Wallis test is applied to measure the satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group. From the table 7, it is found that the Asymp. Sig. value is 0.074 which is more than 0.05 i.e. 5% level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected that is there is no difference in the satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group.

Measurement of Satisfaction level of employees in the Educational Institutions.

HN4: Employees are satisfied in the educational Institutions.

HA4: Employees are not satisfied in the educational Institutions.

Organizational Culture

Test Statistics for Factor 1: Organizational Culture

Test Statistics	Duties with authority	Respect given by superiors	Number of working hours in Educational Institution.	Fair Treatment by the superiors and management of Institution.	Support from superiors and management of Institution.
Chi-Square	112.842	186.229	122.820	139.294	152.072
Df	4	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 8: Test Statistics for Organizational Culture

It is found that for all the variables under factor 1 had a significance value less than 0.05 at 5% level of significance, thus we fail to accept the null hypothesis. Thus we could say that employees are satisfied within the organization.

Interpersonal Behavior

Test Statistics for Factor 2: Interpersonal Behavior

Test Statistics	Environment of working in Team	Treatment of Mistakes	Freedom of suggestions	Comfortable discussion on personal issues.	Proper guidance from superiors and management of Institution.
Chi-Square	139.652	158.401	191.842	120.762	171.832
Df	4	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 9: Test Statistics for Interpersonal Behavior

It is found that for all the variables under factor 2 had a significance value less than 0.05 at 5% level of significance, thus we fail to accept the null hypothesis. Thus we could say that employees are satisfied within the organization.

Employee Compensation, Benefits & Welfare Schemes

Test Statistics for Factor 3: Employee Compensation, Benefits & Welfare Schemes

Test Statistics	Satisfied with salary and rewards.	Opportunities for career development	Opportunities for further study
Chi-Square	119.742	109.621	78.023
Df	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 10: Test Statistics for Employee Compensation, Benefits & Welfare Schemes

It is found that for all the variables under factor 3 had a significance value less than 0.05 at 5% level of significance, thus we fail to accept the null hypothesis. Thus we could say that employees are satisfied within the organization.

Employee Empowerment, Training, & Development

Test Statistics for Factor 4: Employee Empowerment, Training, & Development

Test Statistics	Involvement in Decision Making	Training and Development activities.	Full Utilization of Potential
Chi-Square	56.921	68.928	119.632
Df	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 11: Test Statistics for Employee Empowerment, Training, & Development

It is found that for all the variables under factor 4 had a significance value less than 0.05 at 5% level of significance, thus we fail to accept the null hypothesis. Thus we could say that employees are satisfied within the organization.

Rotation of Job

Test Statistics for Factor 5: Rotation of Job

Test Statistics	Rotation of Job

Chi-Square	98.037
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	0.000

Table 12: Test Statistics for Rotation of Job

It is found that for all the variables under factor 5 had a significance value less than 0.05 at 5% level of significance, thus we fail to accept the null hypothesis. Thus we could say that employees are satisfied within the organization.

Conclusion

The outcome of this research is that the employees working in the Educational Institutions are satisfied in terms of Authority and work culture, Relationship with Peers, Salary and Career Advancement, Involvement and Training and Rotation of job. There is difference in satisfaction of employees of educational institutions regarding salary with respect to experience. There is no difference of satisfaction between the gender groups regarding job rotation. There is no difference in the satisfaction level of employees in training opportunities with respect to age group.

REFERENCES

Arnett, S.E. and Polkinghorne, F.W. (2010). Job dissatisfaction: a factor in maintaining a highly qualified family and consumers sciences teacher workforce. *Online Journal of Workforce Education and Development* Volume IV, Issue 4 – Fall 2010

Arnold, J., Cooper, C.L., Robertson, I.T. (1998). *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behaviour in the Workplace*. 3rd ed. Pearson Education: Prentice Hall.

Bhatti, K., and Qureshi, T. (2007). Impact of Employee Participation on Job Satisfaction, Employee Commitment, and Employee Productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(2), 54 – 68.

Brikend, A. (2011). Job Satisfaction. *Management Research and Practice*, 3(4), 77-86.

Bryant, J. L. (2006). Assessing expectations and perceptions of the campus experience: The Noel

Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 134. San Francisco: JosseyBass.

Carpitella, B. (2003). Make residential construction the industry of choice [Electronic version]. *Professional Builder*, Oct 2003.

Derek R. Allen, Merris Wilburn, (2002). Linking customer and employee satisfaction to the bottom line, ASQ quality press publications cat log, Milwaukee, WI.

Dinham, S., and Scott, C. (2002). A Three Domain Model of Teacher and School Executive Satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36, 362-378.

Freeman, S. (2005). Employee satisfaction: The key to a Successful Company. Retrieved on March 15, 2011 <http://library.lp.findlaw.com/articles/file/00301/008927/title/Subject/topic/Employment>.

Heskett, J. L., Jones, T. O., Loveman, G. W., Sasser, W. E., and Schlesinger, L. A. (1994). Putting the Service-Profit Chain to Work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72 (2).

Hunter, W., and Tietyen, D. (1997). Business to Business Marketing: Creating a Community of Customers. *Lincolnwood-Illinois*, McGraw-Hill Professional.

Jex, Steve, M., (2002). Organizational psychology: A scientist Practitioner Approach.

Judge, T.A., Hulin, C.L. (1993), Job Satisfaction as a Reflection of a Disposition: a Multiple Source Causal Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decisions Processes*, 56, 388-421.

Kaliski, B.S. (2007). Encyclopedia of Business and Finance, Second edition, Thompson Gale, Detroit, p. 446.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp.1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Lumsden, L. (1998). Teacher Morale. ERIC Digest, Number 120. Eugene, OR: ERIC
- Maloney, W.F., and McFillen, J.M. (1986). Motivational Implications of Construction Work. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, March 1986, 137-151.
- Miller, J. L. (2006). Coach Yourself to Succeed @ Work: How to Achieve Optimal Performance and Job Satisfaction. CA, Dorrance Publishing Co.
- Moyes, G. D., Shao, L. P., and Newsome, M. (2008). Comparative Analysis of Employee Job Satisfaction in the Accounting Profession. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 6(2), 65-81.
- Nancy C. M. (1977). *Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job*, Ayer publishing.
- Özgüngör, S. (2010). Identifying Dimensions of students' ratings that best predict students' self efficacy, course value and satisfaction. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 38, 146-163.
- Rousseau, D. (1978). Characteristics of Departments, Positions, and Individuals: Contexts for Attitudes and Behaviors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 521-540.
- Rynes, S. L., Colbert, A. E., and Brown, K. G. (2002). HR professionals' beliefs about effective Human resource practices: Correspondence between research and practice. *Human Resource Management*, 41, 149-174.
- Shann, M. H. (2001). Professional Commitment and Satisfaction among Teachers in Urban Middle schools. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92 No. 2, 67-73.
- Singh, H.R., and Rawat, H.S. (2010). The Study of Factors Affecting the Satisfaction Level of Private School Teachers' in Haryana. *VSRD-TNTJ*, 1(4), 2010, 188-197.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Watt, H.M.G., & Richardson, P.W. (2007). Motivational factors influencing teaching as a career choice: Development and validation of the FIT-Choice Scale. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 75(3), 167-202.

Zembylas, M. and Papanastasiou, E. (2004). Job Satisfaction Among School Teachers in Cyprus. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42, 357-374.