

Work Satisfaction Aspects in Academics: An Empirical Study

¹Usama Awan, ²Gulnaz Munir and ¹Sobia Farid

¹Department of Management Sciences, COMSATS Institution of Information Technology, Vehari, Pakistan

²Institute of Management Sciences, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

Abstract: This study examines the factors are associated with the job satisfaction and determine the extent and importance of factors affecting individually on job satisfaction and explaining overall job satisfaction. The aim of the study is to analyze the levels and important determinations of job satisfaction in the higher education institutions. This is cross sectional study; data collected by using simple random sampling technique and self-administered questionnaires from 462 respondents. From the analysis of the data, results suggest that the salary and incentives, nature of the work and scheduled flexibility are only marginally related to the satisfaction. Our findings also suggest that there are positive and negative relations between supervision, working conditions, personal development and culture of the organization are present in the paper. This sample size is limited and survey is conduct from few institutions. In this study we examined few variables which are associated with job satisfaction. This paper provides an empirical evidence of important factors associated with job satisfaction in higher educational institutions of southern Punjab Pakistan. The results suggest that management should develop specific practices in order to enhance more productivity. This study may help organizations to evaluate employee's job satisfaction on the base of these environmental factors.

Key words: Job satisfaction • Working conditions • Nature of the work • Schedule flexibility • Organizational culture

INTRODUCTION

In the area of human resources, researchers expose extensive interest on how to increase employee's retention with organization through precious tactics. Now a day's organizations are not only doing efforts to magnetize personnel and implement strategies related to generating a pool of candidates, but also effort to reduce turnover by composing more value for existing employees. Job satisfaction is most important function for execution.

Research on the job satisfaction has become a matter of great interest and spanned over the periods of decades. Moreover, many research considered job satisfaction is determined the well-being of employees lives [1]. The study of Jose and Cabral [2] confirmed that job satisfaction is positively correlated with variables such as pay, type of work and number of working hours.

Countless studies are evidence for the importance of employee's satisfaction and retention. Only few studies focus on job satisfaction concern on top priority [3] and

extremely inadequate studies found on lone time are both factors. The attempt of this selective study is to verify the factors, which have Influence on employee's job satisfaction regarding environmental factors, second is through investigating educational institutions' employees, identify any other factors which have influence on job satisfaction and not originate in literature review.

Research Problem and Objective: The research question for this study is what are different factors significant contributes in job satisfaction of university teachers? The objective of the paper is to understand the factors effect on university teachers in their level of job satisfaction. The aim is to explore the job satisfaction level in the university teachers. This study contribute in the existing literature of job satisfaction level among the universities teaches and not only to educational sector but also to public and private universities to improve the performance of their faculty through adopting creative human resource practices. The enduring segments of the paper well

thought-out as follows, backgrounds on the determinants of job satisfaction are discussed, in which environmental factors identified and discuss. Furthermore, in theoretical framework, introducing the theories related to the environmental factors and argument the reasons why job satisfaction is an interesting research. In the next section, a more concise and closer look is drawn at the quality of the data, methodology, data analysis, discussion of the results, conclusion, subsequently limitations of research and future research discussed.

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction plays an important function in human resources management. Job satisfaction has a direct link with high performance, reduces turnover, increases productivity and preserves well-organized image of organization. Job satisfaction is evaluation of job.

Assortments of definitions are available for enlightening the meaning of job satisfaction. Rinehart and Short [4] have words that job satisfaction is basically any blend of psychological and environmental conditions that forces employees to articulate we are satisfy with our job. Price and Mueller [5] also exposed that, extent to which people like their jobs that is job satisfaction. There is positive relationship with the job satisfaction and working environment [6]. Job satisfaction directly associates with employee's cheerfulness. Job satisfaction term is used to measure employee's happiness and have direct link with employee productivity and safety [7].

Reaction of employees is the best indicator to measure job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a pleasing condition as a consequence of one's job experience evaluation [8]. According to Schnake [9] job satisfaction conceptualizes dimensions are intrinsic, extrinsic, social aspects and cognitive affective response of individuals in association to their work environment. According to Spector [10] job satisfaction is to what extent a person originates contentment from a job. This contentment is not restricted to salary, but can comprise factors such as employees appreciated by administration and to what extent company considers their contribution valuable. Job satisfaction is also sentimental reaction of employee regarding his or her finicky job.

Job satisfaction and its determinants widely examined by researches over the past few decades because Job satisfaction factors help organizations, for strategic planning about employee's retention. Lambert, Hogan and Barton [11] recognized the factors that have influence on job satisfaction, provides significant information to

management and administrator for rational decision making about conducting training programs to escalating employee's job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has a significant relation with organizations' overall efficacy. Ellickson and Spector [12] conjecture that work environment has a momentous consequence on the employee's dissatisfaction level. Environmental factors as well are assortment of employees' feeling about different job satisfaction facts such as nature of the work itself, level of pay, climate management, promotion opportunities, fairness of appraisal systems and satisfaction with co-workers [13]. According to Doll [14] compensation, fringe benefits, career counseling, employee's personal time, promotional opportunity and Partnerships potentials should consider for improvement and an increase of overall job satisfaction. Satisfaction from job, pay, co-workers, administration and endorsement are the main characteristics of job satisfaction [15]. In this study the focus is on environmental factors because work environment is a better predictor of job satisfaction [16] but some evidences show that demographic factors are also good predictors of job satisfaction.

Salary and Incentives: Salary is fundamental job characteristic that has an impact on job and employee satisfaction and dedication to the organization [17]. Organizations policies allied to salary and promotions have consequence on employee's mind-set towards work their progress towards Internal and external goals [18]. Salary has no Impact on Job satisfaction and negative correlation exist among salary and job satisfaction according these authors [19]. Salary and incentives positively related to job satisfaction Jose and Cabral but Judge *et al.*, conclude that work satisfaction is most important factor not pay level. From the above discussion the hypothesis formulated as:

Hypothesis 1: *Salary and incentives has significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers.*

Strict Supervision: Supervisors' behavior has an effect on, development of trust in employees and supervisor relationship. Job satisfaction is influenced by supervisors' attitude and behaviors. (Graham and Messner [20] argue that supervisors associations with employees go ahead to job satisfaction. Robbins *et al.* [21] revealed that supervisor support in the form of emotional and technical guidance for job related issues play an important role in employee's job satisfaction.

Supervisor plays an important role that leads to boost or reduces employees' morale [22]. Previous studies concluded that positive correlation exists among supervision and job satisfaction [23]. Packard and Kauppi [24] noted that supervisors with democratic management styles lead to higher job satisfaction as compared to those supervisors who have autocratic leadership styles. The hypothesis is constructed as

Hypothesis 2: *Strict supervision has significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers*

Working Conditions: Working environment related factors are contented place of work, airing, lighting and temperature, at ease work and office spaces. These factors have persuaded on employees' job satisfaction. Working conditions are dimension of job because it effect employee's satisfaction, enthusiasm to work consequently proficiency [25]. Job design, task complexity and variety are part of working condition, not limited to physical environment. Appropriate working conditions are the substructure for employees' job satisfaction and low job-satisfaction is the consequences of the non comfortable physical working conditions [26] (From the above discussion the hypothesis constructed as:

Hypothesis 3: *Working conditions has significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers.*

Nature and Type of Work: Employees' job satisfaction influenced by work itself Robbins *et al.*, [21] noted that work itself as "the extent to which the job provides the individual with stimulating tasks, opportunities for learning and personal growth and the chance to be responsible and accountable for results" and employees are in favor of job that provides the opportunity to carry out their competencies on assortment of tasks that are emotionally inspiring. When individuals are involved in tasks that are inspirational in nature, employees show more satisfaction and easy jobs make possible dullness and irritation [21]. Previous literature of Bender *et al.* [27] exposed that employee mainly apprehensive about type of work and Occupational psychology literature Vasileioua *et al.* [28] demonstrate that employees have main concern about other features of job for instance self-determination, empowerment and challenging tasks. Higher satisfaction with type of work leads to high job

satisfaction in short and long time period. Vitell and Davis [29] noted that there is a significant relationship among job satisfaction and work itself. Hypothesis is developed as:

Hypotheses: 4 *Nature and type of work has significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers.*

Opportunities of Personal Development: Personal development is a considerable interpreter of employees' job satisfaction [30]. Employees gain self-assurance to perform job duties and perceive it positively for career development as a result of training and provide a chance to employees to increase knowledge, abilities and skills to become more efficient and enhance personal development Jun *et al.* [31]. Employees show higher level of job satisfaction when they receive personal development training as compared to those without training [32]. Employees develop competencies through various training programs have a significant Impact on employees' job satisfaction [33]. Hypothesis is developed as:

Hypothesis 5: *Opportunities for personal development have significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers.*

Schedule and Flexibility: Schedule flexibility is permitted employees they have opportunity to adjust their starting and departure timing about day to day activities of job and schedule flexibility is a boundary-spanning resource that facilitates employees to carry out both their family and work errands [34]. Baltes *et al.* [35] revealed that work arrangement in which employees permitted to make decisions about the time of the day they start and assigned activities. Flexibility in schedule have direct link with superior dedication and performance and employees intention of turnover reduced and positively related with satisfaction and show best performance at home and reduce conflicts at work environment[36]. Schedule flexibility, has an impact on organization's productivity, absenteeism and job satisfaction and schedule flexibility have much influence on females job satisfaction and performance as compared with male s[37]. Hypothesis is developed as:

Hypothesis 6: *Schedule and flexibility have significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers.*

Table 1: Analysis of different factors associated with job satisfaction

Factors	Authors in favor	Author in opposition
Salary and Incentives	Lambert,2001 Judge <i>et al.</i> ,2011 Jose and Cabral, 2005 Abdullah <i>et al.</i> , 2011	Judge and Church,2000 Dunham and Hawak,197 Adams and Beehr, 1998
Strict Supervision	Abdullah <i>et al.</i> , 2011 Aronson <i>et al.</i> , 2005	
Working Conditions	De Troyer, 2000) Aronson <i>et al.</i> , 2005	
Nature and type of work	Vitell and Davis,1990 Jose and Cabral,2005	
Opportunities for Personal Development	Saks, 1996 Martensen and Gronholdt,2001	
Schedule Flexibility	Galinsky <i>et al.</i> , 2008 Baltes <i>et al.</i> ,1999 Hill <i>et al.</i> , 2008b Jose and Cabral,2005	
Organization Culture	Silverthorne,2004 McKinnon <i>et al.</i> , 2003	

Culture of Organization: Deshpande and Webster [38] revealed that organization culture is “the pattern of shared values and beliefs that help individuals to understand organizational functioning and thus provide them with norms for behavior in the organization”. Organizations activities (how organizations work) are recognized as a culture of any organization [39]. Organizations’ culture opinionated by organization leader values, members of the organization (Internal culture variables) and external variables There are different types of cultures originate in literature such as integration, differentiation and fragmentation, bureaucratic, supportive and innovative. Supportive, innovative and bureaucratic culture has positive correlation with employees’ job satisfaction [40] and Innovation, aggressiveness, stability and respect for people has also positive Impact on job satisfaction [41]. Employees’ job satisfaction enhances through strict control and management, professional features and result orientation. Analysis of different factors associated with job satisfaction described in Table 1. Hypothesis is developed as:

Hypotheses 7: *Culture of organization has significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers.*

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Participants: Respondents were predominantly males representing over 81.6 per cent of the sample. The majority of the respondents (62.2 per cent) were unmarried

and age groups of (25-45) are respectively 87 percent. The majority of the respondents are (70.1) professionals. Nearly respondents (34.0 percent) are occupying assistant professors and Lecturers (36.1) positions, while 29.9 per cent of respondents are administration staff. Study sample having more than 30,000 salaries are 46.6 percent and among 15,000-30,000 salary package are 31.2 percent and remaining have less than 15,000 salaries.

Instrument and Measures: This study is effort to analyze the sources of job satisfaction with reverence to environmental factors. The data for this research was collected through a self directed survey questionnaire was administered to full-time universities faculty members of three geographically diverse area of southern Punjab (Multan, D.G. khan and Bahawalpur) between March, 2013 to May 2013. A total number of 580 questionnaires were distributed to the faculty members and out of which 118 rejected due to improperly filled and for some other reasons. A total of 462 found corrected for data analysis. The surveys were distributed to a random sample of the faculty member and the participants voluntarily answer it and response rate was 79 Percent.

To test hypothesis package of social science SPSS 18.0 version and analytical techniques such as descriptive, frequencies and regression have done to find out actual determinants of job satisfaction. Instrument for this study was substantiated from the prior recognized Literature.

Schedule flexibility two items adopted from Bond *et al.* [43]. study To Identify flexible work arrangements issues in Alliance for Work-Life Progress (AWLP). Organizational culture has three items adopted from the study of Bigliardi *et al.* [44] to explore the relationship among job satisfaction and organization culture.

Questionnaire was divided into three sections first, demographic factors was consisted seven items, second portions about working environment related factors and consisted of seventeen different items and third portion was for measuring overall satisfaction of employees with job. Items revised after little restraint into the items according to the study context and reliability of items found to be good that is 0.799. Above 0.70 reliability measures are consider adequate for research intention [45]. All environmental factors related items are measured on five point likert scale and ranging from 5= strongly agree to 1=strongly disagree. Demographic factors measure through different options i.e., gender have two options male=1 and female=2 and highest education measure on the base of certificate=1, Diploma=2, bachelor=3 and professional=4. Respondent's marital status on the base of single=1 and married=2 and other information related to age, salary and tenure related data collect using different range of facts.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Frequency analysis is conducted to identify the satisfaction level of employees with particular job. Frequencies (percentage) Analysis of Environmental Factors (Table 2) Employee's satisfaction results regarding "Overall Salary and incentives" are 1.5% strongly agree, 38.8% agree, 41.8% natural, 16.4

disagree and 1.5 % strongly disagree. Large no of employees regarding salary and benefits are neutral and limited no of employees disagree with salary package and treated unfairly if compared with colleges.

The statement "Supervisor consideration for subordinate's feelings, opportunity to participate in decision making and communication with supervisor" results are in favor of supervisors because 16.4% strongly agree, 53.7% agree, 25.4% natural and only 4.5% disagree with their supervisors. Results related to "organization have clear path for promotion and all employees are treated fairly as compared with colleges for promotion opportunities" are 17.9% employees strongly agree with this statement, 50.7% agree, 23.9% natural and 7.5% disagree.

Whereas "Working conditions and sufficient resource availability" is natural that proved by data analysis because data demonstrate that 6% are strongly agree, 32.8% agree, 46.3% natural and 14.9% disagree with working conditions. Results related to "Competition, backbiting exists among workers and competent people in organization with whom they work" are 62.2% agree, 9% strongly agree, 26.9% natural and 1.5% disagree. Employees are 9% strongly agree with this statement "organization provides chances, adequate resources for personal development and all employees fairly treated for providing this opportunity" 43.3 agree, 31.3 natural and 16.4 disagree. Data analysis revealed that 1.5 % employees are strongly agree with this statement "Work varied and each day employees have different work activities to perform, employees have opportunity to work independently and job goals are clear, for which job duties we are responsible" 38.8% agree, 38.8 % natural and 20.9% disagree with this statement.

Table 2: Frequencies (percentage) Analysis of Environmental Factors

Variable	Strongly Agree% (SA)	agree% (A)	Neutral% (N)	Disagree% (D)	Strongly Disagree% (SD)
Salary and Incentives	1.5	38.8	41.8	16.4	1.5
Strict supervision	16.4	53.7	25.4	4.5	0
Working conditions	6	32.8	46.3	14.9	0
Opportunities for Personal development	9	43.3	31.3	16.4	0
Nature of work	1.5	38.8	38.8	20.9	0
Schedule Flexibility	10.5	46.2	40.3	3.0	0
Culture of organization	3	47.6	27	20.9	1.5
Overall job satisfaction	19.3	47.8	22.4	9.0	1.5

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Salary and Incentives	1	.423**	.072	.511**	.306**	-.090	.515**	.499**
2. Supervision		1	.166**	.380**	.469**	-.430**	.445**	.656**
3.Working conditions			1	.062	-.048	.274**	-.120**	.227**
4.Personal development				1	.521**	.059	.576**	.621**
5.Nature of work					1	.18**	.615**	-.532**
6.Schedule Flexibility						1	.091*	.037
7.Culture of organization							1	.67**
8.Over all job satisfaction								1

**Correlation is the significant at the 0.01 level (2 tailed) *Correlation is the significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed)

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig
salary and Incentives	462	2	5	3.48	.677	-3.340	.001
Strict Supervision	462	2	5	3.89	.727	.818	.414
working conditions	462	2	5	3.06	.757	11.350	.000
Opportunities Personal development	462	2	5	3.29	.881	3.505	.001
Nature and type of work	462	2	5	3.28	.738	7.509	.000
Schedule and Flexibility	462	1	4	2.47	.650	-.113	.910
Culture of Organization	462	2	5	3.36	.816	.576	.565

Table 5: Linear Analysis Results

Model	Standardized Coefficients				95% Confidence Interval for B	
	β	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	-.651	.195	-3.340	.001	-1.035	-.268
salary and Incentives	.037	.045	.818	.414	-.052	.126
Strict Supervision	.476	.042	11.350	.000	.393	.558
working conditions	.120	.034	3.505	.001	.053	.187
Personal development	.274	.036	7.509	.000	.202	.345
Nature of work	-.005	.046	-.113	.910	-.096	.086
Schedule and Flexibility	.024	.041	.576	.565	-.057	.105
Culture of Organization	.351	.043	8.163	.000	.267	.436

The results for Schedule is flexible shows that 10.5% are strongly agree, 46.2% agree, 40.3% natural and 3% disagree with this statement. Respondents are 3% strongly agree with “Employees get feeling of accomplishment from job duties, have chance to perform job duties with own method and use own abilities to do something” 47.6% agree, 27% natural, 20.9% disagree and 1.5% strongly disagree. In data analysis I found that 19.3% employees are strongly agree, 47.8% agree, 22.4 % natural, 9.0% disagree and 1.5 % strongly disagree with job satisfaction.

Correlation matrix and Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3 and 4 respectively. Descriptive analysis results of Environmental factors are: salary and incentives (X=3.48; SD=.677), Supervision(X= 3.89; SD=.727), working conditions, (X=3.06; SD=.757), personal development(X=3.29; SD=.881), nature of the work (X=3.28; SD=.738), Schedule Flexibility(X=2.47; SD=.650) culture of the organization(X=3.36; SD=.816).

From the matrix it can be seen that there is some positive and negative correlation exists in variables at significance level $p=0.01$ and $p=0.05$. Salary and incentives are positively correlate ($r=.42, p<0.05$) and positive correlated with schedule flexibility ($r=.499, p<0.05$). Working conditions are negatively correlated with ($r=-0.48, p<0.05$) the nature of the work. Furthermore, it is positively correlated with the scheduling and flexibility. Supervision is strong negatively correlated with scheduling and flexibility ($r=-.430, p<0.05$) further more it has positive correlation relationship with the culture of the organization($r=.445, p<0.05$). Personal development is positively correlated with the schedule and flexibility. These results are generally are in line with the hypothesis.

Linear regression analysis (Table 5) is conducted to recognize the key and major determinants of job satisfaction in academics. In the model seven environmental variables entered in the model.

The results from the model summary shows R square is 0.67. From the table it is concluded that salary and incentives have insignificant ($P= .414$ and $t=.818$) impact on job satisfaction of employees. We can consider results significant if ($P<0.05$, $t>1.96$) and insignificant ($P>0.05$, $t<1.96$). Employees job satisfaction most strong predictor is supervision where ($P= 0.000$, $t=11.350$). Working conditions significant level is ($P=0.001$, $t=3.505$) and Employees Personal development significant level is ($P=0.000$, $t= 7.509$), Nature of the work insignificant level is ($P=.910$, $t=-.113$).

CONCLUSION

This study takes an important step to identify the key determinants factors of job satisfaction in educational institutions including the different aspects of job satisfaction. The research question address that what are the different aspects of the job satisfaction? The present study revealed that working condition, nature and type of work are significant impact on the job satisfaction level. It is concluded that hypothesis 1,2 and 3 are accepted. However, there is significant variance in the job satisfaction level among the variables. In this study the flexibility and scheduling, culture of organization does not have any significant impact on the job satisfaction level. This is consistent with the studies Dadgar *et al.* [46] of From the result the hypothesis 6 and 7 schedule and flexibility have significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers and culture of organization have significant impact on job satisfaction level of university teachers respectively are rejected.

Dehaghi [47] suggest that employee's satisfaction in educational institution is most important because education sector employees generate most valuable assets and prosper talent. Literature and research on job satisfaction of Educational sector employees is supportive for educational planners and policymakers. This study is in line with the Abdullah *et al.* [30] and Personal development Martensen and Gronholdt [33]. Research results revealed that nature of worker, salary and incentives and schedule flexibility are the week predictors to determine the job satisfaction and supervision, personal development and culture of the organization are the strong predictors to determine the employee's job satisfaction. Schedule flexibility results are negative correlated and previous literature expose that schedule flexibility have much influence on females job satisfaction and performance as compared with males Carlson *et al.* [37]. This study may help organizations to evaluate employee's job satisfaction on the base of these

environmental factors. On the base of these findings researcher recommend other organizations they can determine their employees job satisfaction on the base of supervision, nature of the work, personal development and culture of the organizations. Organization should focus on these factors if they are interested to improve the employee's job satisfaction.

This study has certain limitations such as limited time period and second is lack of generalizability of results because data used for this study and all the universities of Southern Punjab were not included in the sample size. Employee's family, job background and personal characteristics also are an important aspect to determine the employees' job satisfaction with job that unnoticed in this research. In future study can be expanded to a larger sample such as other educational institutions which shares the same characteristics. Secondly, explore other factors that have significant impact on job satisfaction and consider employees' family, job background and personal characteristics to determine job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

1. Judge, T.A., R.F. Piccolo, N.P. Podsakoff, J.C. Shaw and B.L. Rich, 2011. The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2): 157-167.
2. Jose, A. and V. Cabral, 2005. Skill mismatches and job satisfaction, *Economics Letters*, 89(1): 39-47.
3. Spytak, J.M., D.W. Marsland and D. Ulmer, 1999. Job Satisfaction: Putting Theory into Practice, *Family Practice Management*, 6(9): 26-30.
4. Rinehart, J.S. and P.M. Short, 1993. Job Satisfaction and Empowerment among Teacher Leaders, Reading Recovery Teachers and Regular Classroom Teachers. *Education*, 114(4): 570-580.
5. Price, J. and C. Mueller, 1981. Professional Turnover: The Case of Nurses, SP Medical and Scientific, New York, NY.
6. Zarbakhsh, B.M., S.M. Langrudi and S. Hosseini, 2013. Relationship of Work Environment Variables and Job Satisfaction of Employees with Counterproductive Work Behaviors: A Study of Non-Governmental Non-Benefit Islamic Azad University Employees in West Mazandar, *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(12): 1812-1815.
7. Harter, J.K., F.L. Schmidt and T.L. Hayes, 2002. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement and business outcomes: a meta analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2): 268-79.

8. Locke, E.A., 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction, in Dunnette, N.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL, pp: 1297-349.
9. Schnake, M.E., 1983. "An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organizational climate, *Personnel Psychology*, 36(4): 791-807.
10. Spector, P., 1996. *Industrial and Organisational Psychology Research and Practice*, John Wiley, New York.
11. Lambert, E.G., N.L. Hogan and S.M. Barton, 2001. The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of structural measurement model using a national sample of workers, *Social Science Journal*, 38(2): 233-51.
12. Ellickson, M. and K. Logsdon, 2001. Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees, *State Local Government Review*, 33(3): 173-84.
13. Schermerhorn, J., J. Hunt and R. Osborn, 2005. *Organizational Behavior*, 9th ed., John Wiley, New York, NY.
14. Doll, B.F., 1983. Staff Turnover: How to Manage It, *Journal of Accountancy*, 156(1): 76-81.
15. Jafar, R., J. Kavousian, A. Beigy, M. Emami and A. Hadavizadeh, 2010. The study of job satisfaction among Bandar Abbas Islamic Azad university staff, *Journal of Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, (5): 258-261.
16. Carlan, P., 2007. The search for job satisfaction: a survey of Alabama policing, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(1-2): 74-86.
17. Siong, Z.M.B., D. Mellor, A. Kathleen and M.L. Firth, 2006. Predicting intention to quit in the call centre industry: does the retail model fit?, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(3): 231-43.
18. Thierry, H., 1992. Pay and payment systems. In J. Hartley and G. Stephenson (Eds.), *Employment relations: The psychology of influence and control at work*. Oxford: Blackwell.
19. Adams, G.A. and T.A. Beehr, 1998. Turnover and retirement: A comparison of their similarities and differences", *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 51(3): 643-665.
20. Graham, M.W. and P.E. Messner, 1998. Principals and job satisfaction, *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(5): 196-202.
21. Robbins, S.P., A. Odendaal and G. Roodt, 2003. *Organizational behavior* (9th ed.), Prentice-Hall International, Cape Town. R.D. Ramsey, 1997. Employee morale: Does it matter anymore? *Supervision*, 58(9): 6-8.
22. Aronson, K.R., J.P. Laurenceau, N. Sieveking and W. Bellet, 2005. Job satisfaction as a function of job level, *Journal Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, 32(3): 285-291.
23. Packard, S.H. and D.R. Kauppi, 1999. Rehabilitation agency leadership style, *Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin*, 43(1): 5-7.
24. Sengupta, S. and A. Gupta, 2011a. Application of Herzberg's theory in the BPO industry: identification of hygiene factors and motivators, *IMS Manthan: International Journal of Innovation*, 4(33): 248-273.
25. De Troyer, M., 2000. The hospital sector in Europe-introductory report, *TUTBSAL TSA Conference*, Brussels, pp: 25-7.
26. Bender, K., S.M. Donohue and J.S. Heywood, 2006. Job satisfaction and gender segregation", *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57(3): 479-496.
27. Vasileioua, E., J. Theodossiou and A. Skalli, 2008. Jobs as Lancaster goods: Facets of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction, *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(5): 1906-1920.
28. Vitell, S.J. and D.L. Davis, 1990. The relationship between ethics and job satisfaction, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9(6): 489-495.
29. Abdullah, J., R. Djebarni and K. Mellahi, 2011. Determinants of job satisfaction in the UAE. *Personnel Review*, 40(1): 126-146.
30. Jun, M., S. Cai and H. Shin, 2006. TQM practice in maquiladora: antecedents of employee satisfaction and loyalty, *Journal of Operations Management*, 24(6): 791-812.
31. Saks, A.M., 1996. The relationship between the amount and helpfulness of entry training and work outcomes", *Human Relations*, 49(4): 429-51.
32. Martensen, A. and L. Gronholdt, 2001. Using employee satisfaction measurement to improve people management: an adaptation of Kano's quality types", *Total Quality Management*, 2(7/8): 949-57.
33. Hill, E.J., J.G. Grzywacz, S. Allen, V.L. Blanchard, C. Matz-Costa, S. Shulkin and M. Pitt-Catsoupes, 2008a. Defining and conceptualizing workplace flexibility, *Community, Work and Family*, 11: 149-63.
34. Baltes, B.B., T.E. Briggs, J.W. Huff, J.A. Wright and G.A. Neuman, 1999. Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: a meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4): 496-513.
35. Jones, B.L., P. Scovile, E.J. Hill, G. Childs, J.M. Leishman and K.S. Nally, 2008. Perceived.

36. versus used workplace flexibility in Singapore: predicting work-family fit, *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(5): 774-83.
37. Carlson, D.S., J.G. Grzywacz and K.M. Kacmar, 2009. The relationship of schedule flexibility and outcomes via the work-family interface, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(4): 330-355.
38. Deshpande, R. and F.E. Webster, 1989. Organizational culture and marketing: defining the research agenda, *Journal of Marketing*, 53(1): 3-15.
40. Kristof, A., 1996. Person-organization fit: an integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement and implications", *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1): 1-49.
41. Silverthorne, C., 2004. The impact of organizational culture and person-organization fit on organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Taiwan, *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25: 592-9.
42. McKinnon, L.J., L.G. Harrison, W.C. Chow and A. Wu, 2003. Organizational culture: association with commitment, job satisfaction, propensity to remain and information sharing in Taiwan, *International Journal of Business Studies*, 11(1): 25-44.
43. Hasin, H.H. and N.H. Omar, 2007. An Empirical Study on Job Satisfaction, Job-Related Stress and Intention to Leave Among Audit Staff in Public Accounting Firms in Melaka, *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 5(1): 21-39.
44. Bond, J.T., C. Thompson, E. Galinsky and D. Prottas, 2003. *National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute, pp: 1-9.
45. Bigliardi, B., F. Galati and G. Schiuma, 2012. The impact of organizational culture on the job satisfaction of knowledge workers", *The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, 42(1): 36-51.
46. Nunnally, J.C., 1978. *Psychometric Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
47. Dadgar, H., F. Barahouei, M. Mohammadi, M. Ebrahimi and A. Ganjali, 2013. The Relationship between Organizational Culture, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Intention to Stay of Health Personnel's of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(8): 1220-1228.
48. Dehaghi, R.M., A. Rouhani and S. Salahshour, 2013. Effects of Motivational Factors on Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study on Islamic Azad University's Faculty Members. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(6): 894-901.