

Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Higher Education Faculty: An Empirical Analysis

¹*Sabu George*, Assistant Professor, P M Government College Chalakudy
sabugeorge2205@gmail.com

²*Dr. Sajikumar K B*, Associate Professor, P M Government College Chalakudy
drsajikumarkb@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explores the key factors influencing job satisfaction among teachers in higher education, focusing on the roles of work environment, compensation, professional development opportunities, work-life balance, and recognition. Employing a quantitative research design, data was collected through a structured survey administered to a representative sample of higher education faculty. The analysis reveals a strong correlation between job satisfaction and the aforementioned predictors, with these factors explaining 53.1% of the variance in job satisfaction. The regression model is well-fitted, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.506, and no significant autocorrelation issues were detected. Notably, work-life balance emerged as the most significant predictor of job satisfaction, while recognition, though positive, was not statistically significant within this model. The findings underscore the critical importance of fostering a supportive work environment, providing equitable compensation, offering opportunities for professional growth, and maintaining a balance between work and personal life to enhance job satisfaction among higher education faculty. These insights can inform policy and organizational strategies aimed at improving faculty satisfaction and overall institutional effectiveness.

Key words – compensation, professional development opportunities, recognition, work-life balance and work environment.

I. Introduction

Education is universally acknowledged as a cornerstone for personal and societal development, shaping individuals' futures and driving collective progress. Teachers are at the heart of this transformative process and play a pivotal role in nurturing intellectual growth, ethical values, and civic responsibility. Nelson Mandela's assertion that "Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world" underscores the profound impact of education on societal advancement. By imparting knowledge and fostering critical thinking, teachers contribute significantly to creating a knowledgeable, ethical, and progressive society.

The influence of teachers extends well beyond the classroom, affecting students' intellectual and moral development. As Henry Adams famously stated, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." Teachers mould future leaders,

innovators, and responsible citizens, thereby shaping society's moral and ethical framework. John Dewey's perspective that "Education is not preparation for life; education is life itself" further highlights the integral role of education in everyday life and its continuous impact on personal growth. Furthermore, Mahatma Gandhi's exhortation to "Live as if you were to die tomorrow. Learn as if you were to live forever" reflects the enduring value of knowledge and ethical living promoted by educators.

The significance of education and teachers in nation-building cannot be overstated. According to UNESCO, "Education transforms lives and is at the heart of UNESCO's mission to build peace, eradicate poverty and drive sustainable development." By investing in education and supporting teachers, societies can foster economic development, social cohesion, and democratic values. This investment enhances individual capabilities and drives broader societal progress, contributing to a prosperous and equitable future.

Despite teachers' critical importance, various challenges affect their job satisfaction, which impacts educational quality and effectiveness. Increasing workloads, stagnant wages, and rising non-tenure-track positions are significant issues. A study by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reveals that teachers face intensified workloads due to larger class sizes and additional administrative duties, contributing to dissatisfaction. Compensation issues, particularly the prevalence of adjunct and part-time positions, further exacerbate financial stress and job dissatisfaction, as the National Education Association (NEA) highlighted.

Professional development and career advancement opportunities also significantly affect job satisfaction. Research published in the Journal of Higher Education emphasizes that access to continuous learning and clear career progression pathways are crucial for maintaining high levels of job satisfaction. Effective leadership and positive collegial relationships within institutions also play a critical role, as supportive administration and a collaborative work environment enhance job

satisfaction, according to a Harvard Graduate School of Education study.

Maintaining a healthy work-life balance is increasingly important. As reported by the Times Higher Education Supplement, the demands of academia often encroach on personal time, leading to burnout and decreased satisfaction. Strategies to address these challenges include reducing administrative burdens, increasing salaries, providing tenure-track positions, offering robust professional development, and promoting supportive leadership and work-life balance.

This study aims to comprehensively investigate the factors influencing job satisfaction among teachers in higher education, focusing on the work environment, compensation and benefits, professional development, work-life balance, and recognition and reward systems. By examining these factors, the research seeks to identify challenges and propose strategies to enhance teacher satisfaction, ultimately contributing to a more effective, ethically grounded, and prosperous educational system.

II. Review of Literature

Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction

Research on job satisfaction among faculty members in higher education shows a complex web of factors contributing to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Studies by Mehboob et al. (2012) highlight the importance of creating a positive work environment, offering competitive compensation, providing professional development opportunities, and maintaining a good work-life balance. Additionally, recognition and administrative support are crucial in enhancing job satisfaction. Sahito and Vaisanen (2015) found that factors such as autocratic management, poor administrative systems, mistrust, job insecurity, weak social interactions, and lack of appreciation can lead to significant dissatisfaction among teacher educators in Sindh universities. Naz (2017) emphasizes the importance of self-efficacy, positive affect, and favourable working conditions in Karachi, where self-efficacy was found to have the strongest impact on job satisfaction. Wong and Heng (2009) applied Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, revealing that policies, administration, and salary increase satisfaction. However, personal achievement, growth, and interpersonal relations are critical to addressing dissatisfaction among Malaysian university faculty. Similarly, Anastasiou and Papakonstantinou (2014) found that secondary education teachers in NW Greece were satisfied with the nature of their work but not with their working conditions, especially younger teachers and women, who experienced higher stress levels.

The Role of Leadership, Organizational Culture, and Job Environment

Leadership practices and organizational culture also significantly impact job satisfaction among higher education faculty. Studies by Kinman and Jones (2008) identify that effort-reward imbalances contribute to work-life conflict and lower job satisfaction, suggesting the need for fair reward systems. Kooij et al. (2013) found that tailored HR practices can enhance job satisfaction for ageing employees, highlighting the importance of supporting diverse workforce needs. Kouzes and Posner (2002) emphasized leadership behaviours that inspire and motivate teams, while Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) underscored the importance of fit between employees and their jobs, organizations, groups, and supervisors, noting that better fit leads to higher job satisfaction and performance. Lund (2003) and Schneider et al. (2009) highlight how positive organizational culture and climate enhance employee attitudes and performance. Research by Smart (1990) and Volkwein and Zhou (2003) suggests that improving the work environment and organizational climate can significantly enhance job satisfaction and reduce faculty turnover intentions. This aligns with Oshagbemi's (1997) study, which identified work environment and recognition as key factors influencing job satisfaction among higher education faculty.

Psychological, Social, and Administrative Factors

Psychological factors, social dynamics, and administrative support play essential roles in shaping job satisfaction among educators in higher education. Research by Locke (1976) and Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) explores the complexity of job satisfaction, considering factors such as job crafting and psychological needs. Deci and Ryan (2012) emphasize the role of intrinsic motivation and social development in enhancing job satisfaction, providing a theoretical foundation for understanding motivation and satisfaction. Studies by Sabharwal and Corley (2009) and Maher and Gibbons (2019) examine gender and collegial relationships, highlighting the importance of supportive networks and fair treatment in faculty satisfaction. Compensation is also a critical determinant of job satisfaction, as noted by Gomera and Anwar (2019) and Zhao and Sapp (2021), who emphasize the need for competitive remuneration practices. Tools for assessing engagement, burnout, and job stress, such as those developed by Schaufeli et al. (2006) and Spector and Jex (1998), underscore the impact of these factors on job satisfaction and performance. Finally, studies by Barkhuizen and Rothmann (2013), Murphy and Thompson (2017), and Ng and Burke (2014) focus on the influence of

administrative support, reward systems, and career development opportunities, all contributing to enhanced job satisfaction in academic settings. Through these various studies, it becomes clear that a multifaceted approach is necessary to understand and improve job satisfaction among higher education faculty, considering personal, organizational, and environmental factors that shape educators' experiences and attitudes.

Objectives of the study

1. To assess the work environment's impact on teachers' job satisfaction in higher education.
2. To evaluate the role of compensation and benefits in influencing job satisfaction among higher education faculty.
3. To determine the significance of professional development opportunities in enhancing job satisfaction of higher education teachers.
4. To examine the importance of work-life balance in the overall job satisfaction of higher education faculty.
5. To investigate the effects of recognition and reward systems on teachers' job satisfaction in higher education.
6. To assess the impact of work environment, compensation and benefits, professional development opportunities, work-life balance and recognition and reward on teachers' overall job satisfaction in higher education.

III. Methodology

Research Design

This study utilizes a quantitative research design to explore the factors affecting job satisfaction among higher education faculty. Data will be gathered through a survey method, employing a structured questionnaire to obtain responses from participants.

Population and Sample

The population for this study consists of teachers working in higher education institutions. A stratified random sampling technique will be used to ensure representation from various types of institutions (Government, aided, and self-financed colleges). The sample size will be determined based on the total number of faculty members, with the aim of at least 100 respondents to ensure statistical significance.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

Data will be collected using a structured questionnaire based on job satisfaction factors. The questionnaire comprises 25 items, each measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The items are categorized into five sections: Work Environment, Compensation and Benefits, Professional Development Opportunities, Work-Life Balance, and Recognition and Reward Systems.

Data Analysis

Data collected from the questionnaires will be analyzed using statistical methods. Descriptive statistics will be used to summarize the responses. Inferential statistics, such as multiple regression analysis, will be employed to determine the strength and nature of the relationship between the identified factors and job satisfaction.

IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1 Demography

Demography	Category	Count	Percentage
Gender	Male	24	24
	Female	76	76
Institution	Government College	19	19
	Aided College	24	24
	Unaided College	57	57
Age	21-30	13	13
	31-40	52	52
	41-50	22	22
	51-60	13	12
Experience	0-5	23	23
	6-10	29	29
	11-15	37	37
	16-20	6	6

	Above 20	5	5
Position	Assistant Professor	90	90
	Associate Professor	5	5
	Professor	3	3
	Principal	2	2

Table 1 provides a demographic overview of the study participants, highlighting key characteristics such as gender, institutional affiliation, age, and teaching experience. The majority of participants are female (76%), with males comprising 24%. Regarding institutional affiliation, most teachers work at unaided colleges (57%), while fewer are employed at aided (24%) and government colleges (19%). The largest age group among participants is 31-40 years (52%), followed by those aged 41-50

(22%) and 21-30 (13%), with the smallest group being 51-60 years (12%). In terms of teaching experience, the majority of participants have 11-15 years of experience (37%), followed by 6-10 years (29%) and 0-5 years (23%). A smaller percentage of participants have 16-20 years (6%) or more than 20 years of experience (5%). This demographic distribution provides a diverse sample for analysing factors influencing job satisfaction among higher education teachers.

Table 2 Work Environment

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
I have a supportive relationship with my colleagues.(WE1)	1	3	10	18	67	4.37
The administration provides adequate support for my work.(WE2)	3	11	21	38	28	3.55
I have access to the resources I need to perform my job effectively.(WE3)	3	9	24	36	28	3.56
The work environment at my institution is positive and conducive to productivity.(WE4)	2	10	24	31	33	3.61
I feel respected and valued by my colleagues.(WE5)	1	2	11	39	47	4.24

The table 2 assesses job satisfaction among teachers in higher education based on their work environment, using a 5-point Likert scale. The statement "I have a supportive relationship with my colleagues" received the highest satisfaction with a mean score of 4.37, indicating strong positive

relationships. Teachers also felt respected and valued by their colleagues, reflected in a mean score of 4.24. However, satisfaction with administrative support and access to resources was lower, with mean scores of 3.55 and 3.56, respectively, suggesting room for improvement in these areas.

Table 3 Compensation and Benefits

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
I am satisfied with my salary.(C1)	21	19	19	19	22	3.02
The benefits provided by my institution meet my needs.(C2)	17	19	22	21	21	3.1
My compensation is competitive compared to other institutions.(C3)	9	15	23	36	17	3.37
I feel that my financial compensation reflects the effort I put into my work.(C4)	19	16	22	25	18	3.07

The institution provides good health and retirement benefits.(C5)	32	12	18	21	17	2.79
---	----	----	----	----	----	------

The table 3 evaluates job satisfaction related to compensation and benefits among teachers in higher education, using a 5-point Likert scale. Satisfaction with salary (mean score of 3.02) and financial compensation relative to effort (mean score of 3.07) suggests moderate levels of contentment, with a balanced distribution of responses across the scale.

Teachers expressed slightly higher satisfaction regarding the competitiveness of their compensation compared to other institutions, reflected in a mean score of 3.37. However, there is notable dissatisfaction with health and retirement benefits, which received the lowest mean score of 2.79, indicating a significant area of concern.

Table 4 Professional Development Opportunities

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
There are ample opportunities for professional growth at my institution.(PD1)	7	22	21	30	20	3.34
My institution supports my attendance at professional conferences and workshops.(PD2)	6	13	21	31	29	3.64
I am satisfied with the opportunities for career advancement available to me.(PD3)	6	18	21	27	28	3.53
The institution encourages continuous professional development.(PD4)	7	13	21	33	26	3.58
I have access to mentoring and coaching opportunities. (PD5)	11	12	24	28	25	3.44

The table 4 assesses job satisfaction regarding professional development opportunities among teachers in higher education, using a 5-point Likert scale. Teachers generally feel positive about institutional support for attending conferences and workshops (mean score of 3.64) and the encouragement of continuous professional

development (mean score of 3.58). Satisfaction with career advancement opportunities is also relatively high, with a mean score of 3.53. However, there is more mixed feedback about the availability of mentoring and coaching opportunities, as indicated by a mean score of 3.44, suggesting room for improvement in this area.

Table 5 Work-Life Balance

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
I am able to balance my work and personal life effectively.(WL1)	6	14	23	30	27	3.58
The institution provides sufficient leave and vacation time.(WL2)	5	12	17	35	31	3.75
My workload allows me to spend adequate time with my family and friends.(WL3)	13	16	16	36	19	3.32
The institution supports flexible work arrangements. (WL4)	13	16	28	24	19	3.2
I do not feel overwhelmed by my job responsibilities. (WL5)	5	12	36	32	15	3.4

The table 5 evaluates job satisfaction related to work-life balance among teachers in higher education, using a 5-point Likert scale. Teachers generally feel positive about the sufficiency of leave and vacation time provided by the institution, with a mean score of 3.75, and moderately satisfied with their ability to balance work and personal life, as

reflected in a mean score of 3.58. Satisfaction with workload and its impact on personal time is more mixed, with a mean score of 3.32. Additionally, support for flexible work arrangements is less favourable, indicated by the lowest mean score of 3.20, suggesting this is an area needing improvement.

Table 6 Recognition and Reward Systems

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
My contributions are recognized by the institution.(C1)	7	10	30	27	26	3.55
There are formal systems in place to acknowledge faculty achievements.(C2)	6	18	28	33	15	3.33
I receive constructive feedback on my performance.(C3)	4	16	35	30	15	3.36
I feel appreciated for the work I do.(C4)	2	11	26	40	21	3.67
The reward system at my institution motivates me to perform better.(C5)	14	15	33	24	14	3.09

The table 6 assesses job satisfaction regarding recognition and reward systems among teachers in higher education, using a 5-point Likert scale. Teachers generally feel appreciated for their work, with a mean score of 3.67 for feeling valued. However, satisfaction with formal recognition

systems and feedback is more mixed, with mean scores of 3.33 and 3.36, respectively. The reward system's effectiveness in motivating performance is also the lowest, with a mean score of 3.09, indicating a need for improvement in this area.

Table 7 Work environment Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.861	.742	.728	.42169	1.882

a. Predictors: (Constant), WE1, WE2, WE3, WE4, WE5

b. Dependent Variable: Work environment related job satisfaction

The model summary indicates that the work environment predictors (WE1, WE2, WE3, WE4, WE5) explain approximately 74.2% of the variance in the overall work environment satisfaction, as

reflected by the R Square value of 0.742. The Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.882 suggests that there is minimal autocorrelation in the residuals, indicating a well-fitted model.

Table 8 Work environment ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	48.108	5	9.622	54.107	.000 ^b
	Residual	16.716	94	.178		
	Total	64.824	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Work environment related job satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), WE1, WE2, WE3, WE4, WE5

The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model is statistically significant, as evidenced by the F-value of 54.107 and a p-value (Sig.) of 0.000, which is below the typical threshold of 0.05. This suggests that the work environment factors (WE1,

WE2, WE3, WE4, WE5) collectively have a significant impact on job satisfaction among teachers in higher education. The large F-value further supports that the variation explained by the model is substantial compared to the unexplained

variation, highlighting the importance of the work environment in influencing job satisfaction.

Table 9 Work environment Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.374	.233		1.605	.112		
	WE1	.116	.073	.134	1.591	.115	.388	2.576
	WE2	.202	.067	.264	3.012	.003	.356	2.805
	WE3	.144	.061	.188	2.370	.020	.438	2.284
	WE4	.135	.083	.177	1.612	.110	.228	4.392
	WE5	.245	.093	.258	2.622	.010	.283	3.538

a. Dependent Variable: Work environment related job satisfaction.

The coefficient table provides insight into the impact of specific work environment factors on the overall job satisfaction of teachers in higher education. The unstandardized coefficients indicate the change in overall job satisfaction for each unit change in a work environment factor, holding all else constant. Among the predictors, WE5 shows the most significant impact with a coefficient of 0.245 and a p-value of 0.010, suggesting a statistically significant positive effect on job satisfaction. Similarly, WE2 (B = 0.202, p = 0.003) and WE3 (B = 0.144, p = 0.020) also have significant positive

influences, indicating that these aspects of the work environment are crucial contributors to job satisfaction. However, WE1 (p = 0.115) and WE4 (p = 0.110) do not show significant effects individually. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all predictors are below 5, indicating that multicollinearity is not a major concern. Overall, the results highlight that certain aspects of the work environment significantly enhance job satisfaction among higher education teachers, particularly those represented by WE2, WE3, and WE5.

Table 10 Compensation -Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.972 ^a	.945	.942	.26449	1.857

a. Predictors: (Constant), C1, C2, C3, C4, C5

b. Dependent Variable: Compensation related job satisfaction.

The model summary indicates that the compensation and benefits predictors (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5) explain approximately 94.5% of the variance in the overall compensation satisfaction, as shown by the R Square value of 0.945. The Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.857 suggests minimal autocorrelation in the residuals, indicating that the model is well-fitted and reliable.

Table 11 Compensation -ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	112.040	5	22.408	320.307	.000 ^b
	Residual	6.576	94	.070		
	Total	118.616	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Compensation related job satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), C5, C4, C2, C3, C1

The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model is highly statistically significant, with a p-value (Sig.) of 0.000 and a large F-value of 320.307. This suggests that the compensation and benefits predictors (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5) collectively have a substantial and significant impact on job satisfaction

among teachers in higher education. The model explains a significant portion of the variation in overall compensation satisfaction, as shown by the relatively small residual sum of squares (6.576) compared to the regression sum of squares (112.040). The high F-value indicates that the

variance explained by the model is much greater than the variance unexplained, confirming the strong influence of compensation and benefits on job

satisfaction. Therefore, improving these factors can lead to significant improvements in job satisfaction among higher education teachers.

Table 12 Compensation -Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.242	.081		3.008	.003		
	C1	.190	.039	.253	4.864	.000	.218	4.578
	C2	.143	.036	.182	3.985	.000	.283	3.534
	C3	.214	.039	.235	5.452	.000	.316	3.161
	C4	.179	.029	.226	6.071	.000	.427	2.343
	C5	.154	.028	.213	5.614	.000	.412	2.430

a. Dependent Variable: Compensation related job satisfaction

The coefficients table highlights the significant impact of specific compensation and benefits factors on the overall job satisfaction of teachers in higher education. All five predictors (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5) are statistically significant, as evidenced by their p-values being less than 0.05. C3 has the highest unstandardized coefficient (B = 0.214) and a significant t-value of 5.452, indicating that it has the strongest positive impact on overall compensation satisfaction. Similarly, C1 (B = 0.190, p = 0.000) and C4 (B = 0.179, p = 0.000) also show substantial positive influences, suggesting that these

components are critical to enhancing job satisfaction. C5 (B = 0.154) and C2 (B = 0.143) also contribute positively and significantly, though to a slightly lesser extent. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all predictors are below 5, indicating that multicollinearity is not a concern. Overall, these results demonstrate that improvements in compensation and benefits can significantly boost job satisfaction among higher education teachers, with each factor making a unique and valuable contribution.

Table 13 Professional Development Opportunities – Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.784 ^a	.615	.594	.5590	1.933

a. Predictors: (Constant), PD1, PD2, PD3, PD4, PD5

b. Dependent Variable: Professional development job satisfaction

The model summary indicates that the relationship between professional development opportunities (PD1, PD2, PD3, PD4, PD5) and job satisfaction is strong, with a correlation coefficient $R=0.784$. $R^2=0.784^2=0.615$, suggesting that these factors collectively explain 61.5% of the variance in job

satisfaction ($R^2=0.615$). The adjusted $R^2=0.594$ confirms that the model is a good fit, accounting for the number of predictors, while the Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.933 suggests no significant autocorrelation issues in the residuals.

Table 14 Professional Development Opportunities – ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	46.858	5	9.372	29.988	.000 ^b
	Residual	29.376	94	.313		
	Total	76.234	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Professional development job satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), PD1, PD2, PD3, PD4, PD5

The ANOVA table shows that the regression model for professional development opportunities and job satisfaction is statistically significant, as indicated by the F-statistic of 29.988 with a p-value of .000,

suggesting a very low probability that the observed relationship is due to chance. The model explains a significant portion of the variance in job satisfaction among teachers in higher education, as evidenced by

the regression sum of squares (46.858) compared to the residual sum of squares (29.376). This indicates that the predictors (PD1, PD2, PD3, PD4, PD5) are

meaningful contributors to explaining the overall variance in job satisfaction within the sample.

Table 15 Professional Development Opportunities – Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.816	.196		4.158	.000		
	PD1	.072	.075	.101	.966	.337	.378	2.646
	PD2	.089	.080	.122	1.111	.269	.338	2.957
	PD3	-.091	.083	-.129	-1.093	.277	.295	3.392
	PD4	.348	.092	.479	3.798	.000	.258	3.882
	PD5	.199	.074	.293	2.708	.008	.351	2.851

a. Dependent Variable: Professional development job satisfaction

The coefficient table provides insights into the individual impact of each professional development opportunity on overall job satisfaction among teachers in higher education. PD4 (B = .348, p = .000) and PD5 (B = .199, p = .008) have statistically significant positive effects on job satisfaction, suggesting that these factors are key drivers in enhancing teachers' overall job satisfaction. The

other variables, PD1 (B = .072, p = .337), PD2 (B = .089, p = .269), and PD3 (B = -.091, p = .277), do not show statistically significant effects on job satisfaction, indicating that their individual contributions are not substantial within this model. Collinearity statistics show that multicollinearity is not a major issue, with VIF values below 5 for all predictors.

Table 16 Work life Balance – Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.901 ^a	.813	.803		.392	1.775

a. Predictors: (Constant), WL1, WL2, WL3, WL4, WL5

b. Dependent Variable: Work life balance job satisfaction

The model summary for work-life balance indicates a very strong relationship between the predictors (WL1, WL2, WL3, WL4, WL5) and overall job satisfaction, as evidenced by a high correlation coefficient R=0.901. This suggests that 81.3% of the variance in job satisfaction (R²=0.813) can be explained by work-life balance factors, indicating that these factors are highly influential in

determining job satisfaction among teachers in higher education. The adjusted R²=0.803 confirms the model's robustness, accounting for the number of predictors, and the Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.775 suggests that there is no significant autocorrelation in the residuals, meaning the model's assumptions are adequately met.

Table 17 Work life Balance – ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	62.564	5	12.513	81.534	.000 ^b
	Residual	14.426	94	.153		
	Total	76.990	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Work life balance job satisfaction.

b. Predictors: (Constant), WL1, WL2, WL3, WL4, WL5

The ANOVA table for work-life balance and job satisfaction shows that the regression model is statistically significant, as indicated by an F-statistic

of 81.534 with a p-value of .000, suggesting that the model reliably predicts job satisfaction based on work-life balance factors. The model explains a

substantial portion of the variance in job satisfaction, as indicated by the regression sum of squares (62.564) being significantly larger than the residual sum of squares (14.426). This result suggests that the

predictors (WL1, WL2, WL3, WL4, WL5) collectively have a meaningful impact on job satisfaction among teachers in higher education.

Table 18 Work life Balance – Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.020	.164		.125	.901		
	WL1	.102	.042	.138	2.429	.017	.614	1.630
	WL2	.211	.050	.279	4.178	.000	.448	2.230
	WL3	.135	.050	.201	2.707	.008	.363	2.758
	WL4	.139	.040	.203	3.485	.001	.589	1.697
	WL5	.282	.056	.298	4.998	.000	.562	1.778

a. Dependent Variable: Work life balance job satisfaction.

The coefficient table for work-life balance reveals that all the predictors (WL1, WL2, WL3, WL4, WL5) have significant positive effects on overall job satisfaction among teachers in higher education. Specifically, WL5 (B = .282, p = .000) has the most substantial impact, followed by WL2 (B = .211, p = .000), indicating that these factors are particularly important in influencing job satisfaction. WL4 (B = .139, p = .001), WL3 (B = .135, p = .008), and WL1

(B = .102, p = .017) also contribute significantly, although to a lesser extent. The standardized coefficients (Beta) show that WL5 (.298) and WL2 (.279) have the highest relative impact among the predictors. Collinearity statistics, with VIF values ranging from 1.630 to 2.758, suggest that multicollinearity is not a significant concern, indicating that each variable provides unique information to the model.

Table 19 Recognition and Reward Systems - Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.787 ^a	.620	.599	.525	2.010

a. Predictors: (Constant), R1, R2, R3, R4, R5

b. Dependent Variable: Recognition and reward related job satisfaction.

The model summary for recognition and reward systems indicates a strong relationship between the predictors (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5) and overall job satisfaction, with a correlation coefficient R=0.787. This suggests that 62% of the variance in

job satisfaction (R²=0.620) is explained by these factors, with the adjusted R²=0.599 confirming the model's effectiveness, while the Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.010 suggests no significant autocorrelation in the residuals.

Table 20 Recognition and Reward Systems ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42.137	5	8.427	30.629	.000 ^b
	Residual	25.863	94	.275		
	Total	68.000	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Recognition and reward related job satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), R1, R2, R3, R4, R5

The ANOVA table for Recognition and Reward Systems indicates that the regression model is statistically significant, with an F-statistic of 30.629 and a p-value of .000, meaning that the model effectively explains the variation in job satisfaction based on the recognition and reward systems. The regression sum of squares (42.137) is considerably

larger than the residual sum of squares (25.863), highlighting that the predictors (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5) account for a significant portion of the variability in overall job satisfaction. This demonstrates that the model is a strong predictor of job satisfaction among teachers in higher education, based on recognition and reward factors.

Table 21 Recognition and Reward Systems - Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.690	.217		3.181	.002		
	R1	.056	.067	.080	.828	.410	.436	2.292
	R2	.214	.087	.289	2.467	.015	.295	3.390
	R3	.188	.082	.239	2.313	.023	.380	2.633
	R4	.121	.074	.145	1.622	.108	.506	1.978
	R5	.104	.069	.155	1.511	.134	.383	2.610

a. Dependent Variable: Recognition and reward related job satisfaction

The coefficients table for recognition and reward systems indicates that R2 (B = .214, p = .015) and R3 (B = .188, p = .023) are statistically significant predictors of overall job satisfaction, suggesting that these factors have a meaningful positive impact on satisfaction levels among teachers in higher education. Although R1 (B = .056, p = .410), R4 (B = .121, p = .108), and R5 (B = .104, p = .134) show positive coefficients, they are not statistically

significant, indicating that these predictors do not have a substantial individual effect on job satisfaction within this model. The standardized coefficients show that R2 (Beta=.289) has the greatest relative impact, followed by R3 (Beta=.239). The variance inflation factor (VIF) values range from 1.978 to 3.390, suggesting that multicollinearity is not a major issue, and each predictor provides distinct information to the model.

Table 22 Job Satisfaction - Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.729 ^a	.531	.506	.503	2.176

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work environment, Compensation, Professional development, Work life balance, Recognition and reward.

b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The model summary for job satisfaction indicates a strong relationship between the predictors (Recognition and Reward, Work Environment, Compensation, Professional Development, Work-Life Balance) and job satisfaction, with a correlation coefficient R=0.729 R = 0.729 This means that

53.1% of the variance in job satisfaction (R²=0.531) is explained by these factors, and the adjusted R²=0.506 suggests a good fit, while the Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.176 indicates no significant autocorrelation in the residuals.

Table 23 Job Satisfaction ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.965	5	5.393	21.314	.000 ^b
	Residual	23.785	94	.253		
	Total	50.750	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), (Recognition and Reward, Work Environment, Compensation, Professional Development, Work-Life Balance)

The ANOVA table for job satisfaction shows that the regression model is statistically significant, as indicated by an F-statistic of 21.314 with a p-value of .000, demonstrating that the predictors collectively have a meaningful impact on job satisfaction. The regression sum of squares (26.965)

compared to the residual sum of squares (23.785) indicates that the model explains a substantial portion of the variance in job satisfaction among the participants. This significant result suggests that the factors of Recognition and Reward, Work Environment, Compensation, Professional

Development, and Work-Life Balance are important determinants of job satisfaction for teachers in higher education.

Table 24 Job Satisfaction Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics		
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	.566	.269		2.108	.038		
	Work environment	.159	.076	.179	2.097	.039	.681	1.467
	Compensation	.132	.055	.201	2.385	.019	.699	1.430
	Professional development	.149	.071	.182	2.091	.039	.658	1.519
	Work life balance	.221	.073	.272	3.032	.003	.618	1.619
	Recognition	.132	.075	.152	1.756	.082	.662	1.510

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The coefficients table for job satisfaction indicates that four of the five predictors—Work Environment (B = .159, p = .039), Compensation (B = .132, p = .019), Professional Development (B = .149, p = .039), and Work-Life Balance (B = .221, p = .003)—are statistically significant, suggesting that these factors have a positive and significant impact on job satisfaction among teachers in higher education. Work-Life Balance has the highest standardized coefficient (Beta=.272), indicating that it has the greatest relative impact on job satisfaction compared to the other predictors. While Recognition (B = .132, p = .082) also shows a positive effect, it is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level, suggesting that its impact on job satisfaction is less substantial within this model. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all predictors range from 1.430 to 1.619, indicating low multicollinearity, meaning each predictor provides unique information to the model. Overall, these results highlight the importance of creating a supportive work environment, providing fair compensation, offering professional development opportunities, and maintaining a good work-life balance to enhance job satisfaction.

V. Summary of Findings

1. Demographics of Higher Education Teachers:

The study reveals that the majority of higher education teachers are aged between 31-40 years, representing 52% of the sample. Smaller proportions of teachers fall into the 41-50 age range (22%), followed by those aged 21-30 (13%). The least represented group is the 51-60 age bracket, comprising only 12% of the sample. Gender distribution shows a significant female majority,

with 76% of teachers being female and 24% male. No participants identified as "Others."

2. Institutional Affiliation and Professional Roles:

A substantial portion of teachers work in unaided colleges, accounting for 57% of the sample. In comparison, government colleges employ 19% of the teachers, and aided colleges employ 24%. In terms of professional roles, the vast majority (95%) are Assistant Professors, with a minimal 5% serving as Associate Professors. Notably, there were no participants holding the positions of Professor or Principal, indicating a concentration of teaching staff in junior academic roles.

3. Support and Respect from Colleagues:

Teachers reported feeling strongly supported by their colleagues, with a mean score of 4.37 out of 5. They also feel respected within their work environment, reflected by a mean score of 4.24. However, the satisfaction levels drop concerning administrative support and the availability of resources, which scored lower at 3.55 and 3.56, respectively. This suggests that while interpersonal relationships are positive, institutional support structures may require improvement.

4. Satisfaction with Salary and Compensation:

Teachers expressed moderate satisfaction with their salary, which scored a mean of 3.02. Their satisfaction with compensation relative to the effort they put into their work was similar, with a mean score of 3.07. While there was some contentment with the competitiveness of their compensation packages (mean score of 3.37), there was notable dissatisfaction with health and retirement benefits, which scored the lowest with a mean of 2.79. This indicates that financial compensation and benefits are areas of concern for these educators.

5. **Professional Development and Mentoring:**

The study shows that teachers generally have positive feelings toward the support they receive for attending conferences, which has a mean score of 3.64. They also appreciate the encouragement they get for professional development, scoring 3.58 on average. However, their satisfaction with feedback and mentoring opportunities is mixed, with lower mean scores of 3.34 and 3.44, respectively. This suggests that while opportunities for growth are present, the quality and availability of feedback and mentoring may need enhancement.

6. Work-Life Balance and Job Flexibility: Teachers reported relatively high satisfaction levels with leave and vacation time, scoring a mean of 3.75. They also feel fairly content with their ability to balance work and personal life, as indicated by a mean score of 3.58. However, satisfaction decreases when it comes to workload and flexible work arrangements, which have mean scores of 3.32 and 3.20, respectively. This highlights a need for better workload management and more flexible work options to improve work-life balance further.

7. Appreciation and Recognition: The study found that teachers generally feel appreciated for their work, with a mean score of 3.67. Despite this, satisfaction with formal recognition systems and feedback mechanisms is lower, with mean scores of 3.33 and 3.36, respectively. The effectiveness of the reward system in terms of motivating teachers is particularly low, with a mean score of 3.09. These findings suggest that while teachers feel valued, the formal systems for recognition and rewards could be improved to enhance motivation and job satisfaction.

8. Work Environment Factors and Job Satisfaction: The analysis reveals that work environment factors account for approximately 74.2% of the variance in job satisfaction among higher education teachers. The model is statistically significant, with an F-value of 54.107 and a p-value of 0.000, indicating the importance of these factors. Among the various factors, WE5 has the most significant positive impact on job satisfaction, followed by WE2 and WE3. In contrast, WE1 and WE4 do not show statistically significant effects individually. The VIF values indicate no substantial multicollinearity, ensuring that each factor contributes uniquely to the model. This emphasizes the critical role of specific work environment factors, particularly those represented by WE2, WE3, and WE5, in enhancing job satisfaction.

9. Compensation and Benefits as Predictors of Job Satisfaction: The study indicates that compensation and benefits explain approximately 94.5% of the variance in job satisfaction related to compensation among higher

education teachers. The model is statistically significant, with an F-value of 320.307 and a p-value of 0.0001. All five predictors—C1, C2, C3, C4, and C5—are statistically significant, with C3 exerting the strongest positive influence on satisfaction. C1 and C4 also have considerable positive effects, while C5 and C2 contribute positively but to a lesser extent. The VIF values suggest that multicollinearity is not an issue, highlighting the distinct and valuable contribution of each factor. These findings underscore the critical role of compensation and benefits in enhancing job satisfaction.

10. Professional Development Opportunities and Job Satisfaction: The model summary shows that professional development opportunities account for 61.5% of the variance in job satisfaction related to professional development among higher education teachers, with an R value of 0.784. The model is statistically significant, with an F-value of 29.988 and a p-value of 0.000. Among the predictors, PD4 and PD5 have statistically significant positive effects on job satisfaction, with PD4 having the strongest impact. However, PD1, PD2, and PD3 do not show significant individual effects. The VIF values indicate that multicollinearity is not a concern, ensuring each predictor contributes uniquely to the model. These results emphasize the crucial role of specific professional development opportunities, particularly those represented by PD4 and PD5, in enhancing job satisfaction.

11. Work-Life Balance Factors and Their Impact on Job Satisfaction: The relationship between work-life balance factors and job satisfaction is very strong, with an R value of 0.901, indicating that 81.3% of the variance in job satisfaction is explained by these factors. The model is robust, with an adjusted R² of 0.803. All five predictors—WL1, WL2, WL3, WL4, and WL5—have significant positive effects, with WL5 having the strongest influence, followed by WL2. The VIF values indicate no significant multicollinearity issues, ensuring that each predictor contributes uniquely to the model. These findings underscore the critical role of work-life balance in enhancing job satisfaction, with WL5 and WL2 being particularly influential.

12. Recognition and Reward Systems as Predictors of Job Satisfaction: The model summary for recognition and reward systems shows a strong relationship with recognition and reward-related job satisfaction, with an R value of 0.787, explaining 62% of the variance in job satisfaction. The model is statistically significant, with an F-value of 30.629 and a p-value of 0.0001. Among the predictors, R2 (B = .214, p = .015) and R3 (B = .188, p = .023) have statistically significant positive impacts on job satisfaction, with R2 having the

strongest relative effect. Although R1, R4, and R5 also show positive coefficients, their effects are not statistically significant within this model. The VIF values suggest that multicollinearity is not a concern, ensuring that each predictor contributes uniquely to the model. These findings highlight the importance of recognition and reward systems, particularly factors R2 and R3, in enhancing job satisfaction.

13. **Overall Job Satisfaction Model:** The analysis reveals a strong correlation between job satisfaction and the key predictors (Work Environment, Compensation, Professional Development, Work-Life Balance, and Recognition), with an R value of 0.729, meaning these factors explain 53.1% of the variance in job satisfaction. The model is well-fitted, with an adjusted R² of 0.506, and shows no significant autocorrelation issues, as indicated by the Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.176. The ANOVA results confirm that the regression model is statistically significant, with an F-statistic of 21.314 and a p-value of 0.0001. Among the predictors, Work-Life Balance has the greatest relative impact on job satisfaction. Although Recognition also has a positive effect, it is not statistically significant in this model. The low VIF values indicate minimal multicollinearity, ensuring that each predictor provides unique information to the model. These findings emphasize the importance of creating a supportive work environment, providing fair compensation, offering professional development opportunities, and maintaining a healthy work-life balance to enhance job satisfaction among higher education teachers.

VI. Conclusion

The findings from the study on job satisfaction among higher education teachers reveal significant insights into various aspects that influence their satisfaction levels. The majority of teachers are aged 31-40 and are predominantly female. Most work at unaided colleges, with a substantial number holding the position of Assistant Professor. Teachers feel well-supported by colleagues and respected, but they express lower satisfaction with administrative support, resources, and benefits, particularly health and retirement plans. Satisfaction with salary and compensation is moderate, and while teachers appreciate support for professional development, they have mixed feelings about feedback and mentoring.

The work environment is a critical factor, accounting for 74.2% of the variance in job satisfaction, with specific aspects such as respect, support, and resources being particularly influential. Compensation and benefits explain a significant

94.5% of the variance, with certain elements like fairness and competitiveness of pay being strong predictors of satisfaction. Professional development opportunities and work-life balance also play crucial roles, accounting for 61.5% and 81.3% of the variance, respectively. Recognition and reward systems contribute to job satisfaction but are less impactful than other factors.

Overall, the study highlights that a supportive work environment, fair compensation, opportunities for professional growth, and a healthy work-life balance are vital in enhancing job satisfaction among higher education teachers, with work-life balance emerging as the most influential factor.

Bibliography

- [1]. Anastasiou, S., & Papakonstantinou, G. (2014). Factors affecting job satisfaction, stress, and work performance of secondary education teachers in NW Greece. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(5), 47-57.
- [2]. Barkhuizen, N., & Rothmann, S. (2013). Occupational stress of academic staff in South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i1.1083>
- [3]. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [4]. Gomera, A. R., & Anwar, J. (2019). Determinants of job satisfaction among higher education faculty: Evidence from public universities in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 6(1), 105-122. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v6i1.1745>
- [5]. Kinman, G., & Jones, F. (2008). Effort-reward imbalance, over-commitment, and work-life conflict: Testing an expanded model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(3), 236-251. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810861365>
- [6]. Kooij, D. T. A. M., Jansen, P. G. W., Dijkers, J. S. E., & De Lange, A. H. (2013). The role of future time perspective in managing aging workers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(2), 104-121. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1851>
- [7]. Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. Jossey-Bass.
- [8]. Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-

- group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281-342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x>
- [9]. 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). Rand McNally.
- [10]. Lund, D. B. (2003). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 18(3), 219-236. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0885862031047313>
- [11]. Maher, A., & Gibbons, M. (2019). Gender, teaching, and satisfaction in higher education: The intersectionality of gender, race, and institutional type. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41(1), 43-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1526722>
- [12]. Mehboob, F., Sarwar, M. A., & Bhutto, N. A. (2012). Factors affecting faculty job satisfaction: A case of universities in Pakistan. *Business and Management Review*, 2(2), 13-19.
- [13]. Murphy, W. M., & Thompson, M. (2017). The impact of mentoring on career success and satisfaction. *Career Development International*, 22(5), 469-482. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2017-0134>
- [14]. Naz, S. (2017). Faculty job satisfaction and self-efficacy: A study on the relationship among faculty in higher education institutions in Karachi. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(3), 385-399. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2015-0110>
- [15]. Ng, E. S. W., & Burke, R. J. (2014). Human resource management practices and work-life balance practices: Determinants and outcomes. In A.-S. Antoniou & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The psychology of the recession on the workplace* (pp. 183-202). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [16]. Oshagbemi, T. (1997). Job satisfaction profiles of university teachers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12(1), 27-39. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683949710164235>
- [17]. Sahito, Z., & Vaisanen, P. (2015). Factors affecting job satisfaction of teacher educators: Empirical evidence from the universities of Sindh province of Pakistan. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 4(1), 25-42.
- [18]. Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46(3), 539-556. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2009.04.015>
- [19]. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- [20]. Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2009). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 361-388. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131213>
- [21]. Smart, J. C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, 31(5), 405-424. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992710>
- [22]. Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679804100306>
- [23]. Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(2), 149-171. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022084214674>
- [24]. Wong, S. S., & Heng, T. N. (2009). Job satisfaction of Malaysian university lecturers. *Asian Social Science*, 5(8), 20-26. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v5n8p20>
- [25]. Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179-201. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011>
- [26]. Zhao, H., & Sapp, D. (2021). The relationship between salary satisfaction and job satisfaction: The moderating effect of employee motivation. *Management Science Letters*, 11(2), 575-586. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.9.037>