

Exploring Job Satisfaction of the Faculty at Bulacan Agricultural State College: Input to Enhance Performance in the New Normal

Roselle D. Urbano*, Ma. Leonora C. Sta Ana & Rhodora A. Iracta
Institute of Arts and Sciences, Bulacan Agricultural State College
San Ildefonso 3010, Bulacan, Philippines

Email: urbanorose140@gmail.com

Abstract

The goal of this study is to find out how satisfied faculty members at Bulacan Agricultural State College are with their jobs. Work environment, rank and employment status, faculty adequacy and loading, pay, fringe benefits and incentives, faculty development, and peer communication are all regarded motivating variables that have an impact on job satisfaction. The survey instrument was completed by 139 faculty members out of a total population of 186, which comprised both permanent and contract-based status academics. It seeks to get insights into the mean job satisfaction ratings of faculty respondents based on a survey. The study showed that the faculty members are generally satisfied with their current circumstances, though the college should consider factors such as training and development that will enable faculty to perform their current jobs effectively and prepare for future assignments, particularly now that the school environment is shifting to a new school environment as the new normal due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The researchers may have concluded that the college should focus more on motivating and maintaining these human resources in order to make them happier and to maximize their efforts by assuring the college's overall greatness.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, faculty, new normal, performance, motivating variables

1. Introduction

Examining job satisfaction is very indispensable to the continuing growth of educational systems. Identifying the success and failure of an institution can be measured by the job satisfaction level among its employees. The great effect caused by this satisfaction upon the performance of employees will reflect positively or negatively on the quality of institution services. Thus, effective organizations pursue to focus on achieving job satisfaction among employees, so that they feel institutional belonging that results in the loyalty and dedication of employees to achieve its objectives (Nasee & Salman, 2015).

Job satisfaction of faculty of higher education institutions is an essential motivation for the improvement of the educational systems of the institutions towards achieving efficiency and effectiveness in the progressions of learning and education. It also reinforces psychological stability for employees, which in turn reflects positively on the efficiency in accomplishing the work and the achievement of psychological, social, and professional poise when faculty members do their innumerable roles in academic institutions. The faculty must feel a high level of job satisfaction as they are the most significant pillars of educational institutions for efficiently and effectively providing students with theoretical and practical experience in

diverse fields of knowledge. Most of the research mentioned that lack of job satisfaction causes professional reluctance of institutions and employees, while on the other hand, job satisfaction positively affects the achievement of psychological adjustment, reduces the psychological distress, and also fully increases practical and professional outcomes among faculty (Nayak, 2014).

Many educational researchers paid great attention to job satisfaction because of its positive impact on achieving the psychological adjustment of the individual, raising productivity levels, and reducing the level of psychological stresses related to the work environment (Nasee & Salman, 2015). Multiple researchers also found out that when employees of any institution feel satisfied with their jobs, they are going to be more efficient, motivated, and more belong to that institution (Dave & Ravel, 2014).

Saif et al. (2012) contended that job satisfaction studies are still relevant today and that much research is still being carried out to aid in understanding and controlling the factors that influence employees' satisfaction with their jobs. Scruton and Gross (2013) also explained that a multitude of job satisfaction studies has been employed in many businesses and organizations and that they all have a common goal—to find meaningful insight into why job satisfaction/dissatisfaction ensues. The authors stated that once the factors of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction are recognized, a concerted effort can be made to isolate possible causes of dissatisfaction and develop solutions.

It is vital that colleges and universities monitor the satisfaction levels of their employees, especially in this challenging and ever-changing scenario in the environment of education to secure high levels of performance from the faculty force. Though job satisfaction has been long studied the new normal poses new challenges and demands to the main component of the teaching and learning process -the teachers, thus this is important to explore and address so as to include or serve as a one of the basis in the future conceptualization of planning in policy-making of the college.

2. Short review of relevant literature

The review of related studies was expended to give the researchers wider knowledge in the pursuance of the research topic.

Lencioni (2017) stated that the most important reason for studying job satisfaction is understanding that there is a commonality with all human beings—the fact that they must feel needed by others. He argued that humans must be reminded of their significance to others often and stated that if people think they have no impact on others' lives, they begin to deteriorate emotionally. Edington (2015) affirmed that unsatisfactory levels of job satisfaction, employee performance, and the employee's quality of life have a tremendous long-term effect on the organization.

Roznowski and Hulin (2016) believed that ascertaining levels of job satisfaction of employees is actually the most significant data employers can obtain. Truell et al. (2018) said that job satisfaction and motivation are vital components to the success of an organization and

contended that continually monitoring faculty job satisfaction in colleges is extremely significant because the information gleaned from these studies can aid in improving the college. Scruton and Gross (2013) explained that all job satisfaction studies have common goals—to find meaningful insight into why job satisfaction/dissatisfaction develops.

Various researchers have identified factors that affect job satisfaction in higher education. Tack and Patitu (2017) have identified salary, tenure, faculty rank, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, policies and administration, the person-environment fit, and collective bargaining as significant factors. They assumed that the effect that salary has on job satisfaction is debatable but consider that salary can be a great source of dissatisfaction.

Further stated that tenure, or job security, impacts job satisfaction as does faculty rank. However, they also found supervision and leadership style to be extremely important determiners of job satisfaction. contended that supervisors that are employee-centered and that take an interest in every employee contribute to job satisfaction (Tack & Patitu, 2017).

Research listed seven indicators of a healthy organization: great clarity in which there is no ambiguity regarding the mission and guiding principles; a candid and trusting culture where honest dialogue is an expectation; well-defined policies which empower people; treatment of people with respect and value; concern about results; and humbleness as an organization which realizes that there are always areas of growth. It was added that the health of an organization is the key to its greatness. He contended that the focus on health differentiates one organization from another and that a healthy organization creates a non-toxic workplace (Addington, 2013).

Research found that an employment situation where monetary raises are limited, recognition for achievement can provide faculty satisfaction. It was also mentioned that college instructors are more satisfied when they are permitted to do work that they feel is important (June, 2013).

Mansour (2018) showed that the level of job satisfaction among faculty was moderate; it also showed statistically significant differences in the level of job satisfaction according to variable of experience in favor of more experienced faculty, and variable of academic qualification in favor of those who are low qualified.

Researches also reiterated that the most important individual factors in job satisfaction of faculty are: engagement in development and training programs and cooperation with colleagues; and the most important institutional factors are: equipment and appropriate environmental conditions, rewards and incentives, security, job stability, clear institutional objectives and policies and participation in decision-making (Dave & Ravel, 2014).

Job satisfaction is an important issue of employees of any organization. This requires a special attention because when faculty members were not satisfied with their job it will directly impact on the learning of students. Institution management must create policies which lead to job satisfaction. Poor salaries and allowances, loan facilities and increase in the volume of work lead to job dissatisfaction of employees. Teachers having higher experiencing of teachers are more found more satisfied than the teachers having low experience (Terera & Ngirande, 2014).

Rewards, whether material or cash, play an important role in job satisfaction. Many researchers have found that there is a significant relationship between salary and job satisfaction. Increasing one thing must raise the other. Souza-Poza (2015) distinguished that salary is a predictor of job satisfaction. According to Miller (2017) employees with higher salary show greater job satisfaction.

Increased freedom and flexibility of academicians would have resulted in significantly greater job satisfaction (Heywood, 2016). According to Sonmezer and Eryaman (2018) salary, social status, advancement, ability utilization, administrative-employee relationship, creativity, security are the main factors that determine job satisfaction among the education sector employees.

The literature review in the field of job satisfaction indicates that there is a general trend towards job satisfaction assessment among employees in various sectors (faculty in particular), and towards identifying the effect of some variables on the level of job satisfaction for those faculties. This study will focus on identifying the level of job satisfaction among faculty of Bulacan Agricultural State College that is considered an emerging university striving to achieve the requirements of overall quality, and the top requirements to achieve a high level of job satisfaction among faculty as well as identifying the impact of some variables on the level of job satisfaction.

2.1 Objectives of the research

The main objectives of the research are:

1. To investigate the levels of job satisfaction among the faculty of BASC.
2. To determine the factors having impact on the levels of job satisfaction of the teachers.

3. Methods

This study utilized quantitative method. Data obtained from the survey were analyzed by using descriptive and correlation statistical methods to present the levels of job satisfaction as affected by the different motivator factors among the faculty.

3.1 Sources and materials

In this study, the respondents are all teaching personnel both the permanent and the contract-based status faculty. The entire faculty force was encouraged voluntarily to participate in answering the on-line survey questionnaire. They were also be enlightened how important their straightforward evaluation of the questionnaires.

3.2 Data collection techniques, sampling procedure

The instrument employed in gathering the data needed for this study was composed of six motivating factors each with seven benchmark statements adapted from the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines, Inc. (AACCUP) program accreditation Instrument specifically for area II, faculty.

The data gathered from the research instruments were presented in tabular forms. The tabulated data was served as the basis of presenting results of the analysis. In processing these data statistical software such Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was employed.

Appropriate statistical treatment was utilized to analyze the data. For this study, means and standard deviation were measured as the descriptive statistical tool.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Variables		Frequency	%
Gender	Male	55	39.6
	Female	84	60.4
Age	21-30	57	41.0
	31-4	47	33.8
	41-50	18	12.9
	51 and above	17	12.2
Years of Experience	1-5	15	10.8
	6-10	11	7.9
	11-15	5	3.6
	16-20	7	5.0
	21-25	13	9.4
	26 and above	88	63.3
Civil Status	Single	49.6	69
	Married	45.3	63
	Widow	3.8	5
	Separated	1.3	2
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor Degree	21	15.1
	Units in Master	48	34.5
	Master Degree	28	20.1
	Units in Doctorate	26	18.7
	Doctorate Degree	16	11.5
Present Position	Instructor	105	75.5
	Assistant Professor	16	11.5
	Associate Professor	16	11.5
	Professor	2	1.5

Table 1 presents the demographic statistics of 139 faculty respondents out of total of 186 faculty of the Bulacan Agricultural College, with a response rate of 75%. The majority of respondents are female and single, within the age group of 21-30 which comprised 41% (57) of the total respondents. It can also be deduced from the table that the majority of the faculty members have 1-5 years of experience. Further, it can be gathered from this data that the majority of the faculty respondents are neophytes and on a contract basis status. The collected information also included the academic rank since all the respondents are teaching personnel: 15.1% were Bachelor's degree holders, 20.1% finished their Masters degrees and 11.5% were Ph.D. holders. Finally, 75.5% of the respondents were holding instructor positions, both assistant professors and associate professors were 11.5% and 1.5% were professors.

Table 2. Mean Rating of Faculty Responses to Job Satisfaction Survey

Item Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Descriptive Rating
WORK ENVIRONMENT			
a. The institution is dedicated to gender equality	4.11	0.54	MS
b. The institution has an amazing work culture	4.51	0.62	VS
c. The institution positively influences the faculty	3.83	0.67	VS
d. The institution has a safe, comfortable and clean work environment	4.66	0.65	VS
e. The institution has employee-friendly policies	4.33	0.72	MS
f. The institution operates in a socially responsible manner	4.16	0.56	MS
RANK AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS			
a. The institution implements the system of promotion in rank and salary based on existing policies and issuances (e.g., NBC 461).	4.33	0.59	MS
b. Retirement, separation or termination benefits are implemented in accordance with institutional and government (CSC, GSIS/DBM) policies and guidelines.	4.67	0.44	VS
c. The faculty are officially informed of their rank and tenure after evaluation of their credentials and performance	4.83	0.40	VS
d. The faculty concerned are officially informed of the extension, renewal, or termination of their appointments.	4.54	0.55	VS
e. The Institution implements a Merit System and Promotion Plan (MSPP) which emphasizes quality teaching performance, research, creative work extension, and production services.	4.67	0.53	VS
f. The probationary period or temporary status required before permanent status is granted to the faculty in accordance with Civil Service and institutional policies and guidelines.	4.42	0.38	MS
FACULTY ADEQUACY AND LOADING			
a. Faculty-student ratio meets the program requirements and standards.	4.5	0.56	MS
b. There is a provision on incentives for overload teaching in accordance with the CMO of the program and/or institutional guidelines.	3.85	0.76	MS
c. Workload provides the faculty sufficient time for teaching, and/or research, extension, production and other assigned tasks.	2.73	0.81	S
d. There is equitable, measurable and fair distribution of teaching load and other assignments	3.50	0.76	S

e. The faculty are assigned to teach their major/minor fields of specialization, with none of them assigned to more than four (4) different subject/preparations within a semester.	4.17	0.78	MS
f. Workload assignments and number of preparations follow existing workload guidelines.	2.67	0.64	S
SALARIES, FRINGE BENEFITS, AND INCENTIVES			
a. The following fringe benefits are granted:	4.33	0.43	MS
a.1 study leave (with or without pay);	3.33	0.47	S
a.2 vacation leave;	2.83	0.72	S
a.3 Performance-based bonus (PBB);	3.67	0.47	MS
a.4 honoraria/ incentives for conducting research or production of scholarly works;	3.50	0.58	S
a.5 compensatory leave credit;	4.33	0.74	MS
a.6 de loading to finish thesis/dissertation; and	4.17	0.45	MS
a.7 thesis/dissertation aid	2.38	0.35	MD
b. Policies on salaries/benefits and other privileges are disseminated to the faculty.	3.7	0.34	MS
c. Salaries are paid regularly and promptly.	4.8	0.67	VS
d. Teaching assignments beyond the regular load are compensated (e.g., overload pay, service credits, etc.)	3.3	0.48	S
e. Faculty who are actually involved in the production of scholarlmaterials are given credits for their work.	3.7	0.36	MS
f. Faculty with outstanding performance are given recognition/awards and incentives.	4.30	0.55	MS
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT			
a. The Institution implements a sustainable Faculty Development Program based on identified priorities/needs	4.50	0.71	MS
b. The Institution supports the professional growth of the faculty through attendance in educational lectures, symposia, seminars, workshops, conferences and other forms of training.	4.16	0.74	MS
c. The institutional conducts in-service training activities regularly at least once per term	3.84	0.77	MS
d. Selection of deserving faculty members to be granted scholarships, fellowships, seminars, conferences and/or training grants is done objectively.	3.33	0.68	S
e. Opportunities for the faculty members to attend/participate in capability-building and enhancing activities are fairly distributed	3.67	0.70	MS
f. A tuition fee privilege and other forms of assistance are available for faculty members pursuing advanced (master's and/or doctoral) degrees.	4.33	0.68	MS
PEER COMMUNICATION			
a. There is a good team work and cooperation in the institution	2.84	0.55	S
b. Sufficient encouragement is provided by the members of the institution	3.23	0.48	S
c. Institute meetings are conducted regularly	4.12	0.33	MS

d. Individual differences are respected (age, gender, education)	3.67	0.38	MS
e. All the faculty are friendly and supportive	3.55	0.35	MS
f. All the information is shared equally in the institution	3.87	0.45	MS
OVERALL	3.27	0.53	S

Legend:

Descriptive Rating	Range	Description
(VS)	4.51 – 5.00	– very satisfied
(MS)	3.51 – 4.50	– moderately satisfied
(S)	2.51 – 3.50	– satisfied
(MD)	1.51 – 2.50	– moderately dissatisfied
(VD)	1.00 – 1.50	– very dissatisfied

Summarized in Table 2 the job satisfaction mean ratings of the faculty respondents on the given six motivating factors, namely: work environment; rank and employment status; faculty adequacy and loading; salaries, fringe benefits, and incentives; faculty development; and peer communication.

As reflected from the table for the motivating factor number 1, work environment, the statement, *"The institution has a safe, comfortable and clean work environment,"* marked the highest mean which is 4.66, and a standard deviation of 0.65 with a descriptive rating of very satisfied while the statement, *"The institution positively influence the faculty,"* registered the lowest mean rating of 3.83 and standard deviation of 0.67 with a descriptive rating of moderately satisfied. According to Mabaso and Dlamini (2017) elements like conditions of the work environment in which people work have a tremendous effect on their level of pride for themselves and for the work they are doing. Even a nice chair can make a world of difference to an individual's well-being. Thus, learning institutions should look more to provide facilities like a personal room with modern computer facilities to avoid overcrowding and allow them to use their own personal space so that they can give more time for their research work besides their regular class. They should also provide clean washroom facilities.

The motivating factor#2, rank and employment status, revealed the computed mean ratings for six out of seven statements are within the descriptive rating of very satisfied with only one with a rating of moderately satisfied for the statement, *"The institution implements the system of promotion in rank and salary based on existing policies and issuances (e.g. NBC)."* which is 4.33 with a standard deviation of 0.59 while a 4.83 mean rating was registered for the statement, *"The faculty concerned are officially informed of their rank and tenure after evaluation of their credentials and performance."* Parallel to the findings of Asl et al. (2013) that investigated the job satisfaction rate and its related factors on the performance of Medical Sciences faculty reported that the nature of the work, the lack of encouragement, and appropriate feedback system as reasons for the highest and lowest level of job satisfaction respectively. As can be deduced from the results a good feedback mechanism will really affect the satisfaction of an individual as being a good practiced by the college.

In motivating factor #3, faculty adequacy and loading, the highest marked mean rating of 4.50 with a descriptive rating of moderately satisfied was registered by the statement, *"Faculty-student ratio meets the program requirements and standards."* On the other hand, the lowest mean with a descriptive rating of satisfactory of 2.67 and a standard deviation of 0.64 indicates how close the responses of the faculty among each other registered on the statement, *"Workload assignments and the number of preparations follow existing workload guidelines."* It may imply the usual scenario in state colleges and universities of creating multiple sections and accepting students that in a way affects the loading system of assignment to faculty. Congruent with the findings of Hee et al. (2019) stated that faculty members are most dissatisfied with course allocation as they claim that sometimes it creates an extra burden for them and further reiterated that universities are not utilizing their expertise; rather courses are distributed depending on demand. In this case, it may not be possible to ignore the demand of any course, but faculty members may be informed earlier to take necessary preparation before starting the semester.

According to Mafini and Dlodlo (2014) remuneration which is among financial compensation has been explored to have an effect on the job satisfaction of faculty members in higher institutions of learning. This is evident from the table in considering the motivating factor #4, salaries, fringe benefits, and incentives. The section statements that referred to the granting of fringe benefits comprising 11 sub-items registered a mean rating of 2.38 with a standard deviation of 0.35 and with an equivalent descriptive rating of moderately dissatisfied. As reflected in the study done by Mustafa (2013), a good salary structure, proper remunerations, and opportunities for promotion should be considered for faculty members to have job satisfaction. This will enhance the faculty member's job satisfaction in institutions of higher learning and very essential due to its effect in motivating the delivery of quality performance. Thus, it can be ascertained how important to carefully consider giving benefits in one way or another to faculty on a contract basis status since the majority of the faculty respondent are in this category, and in practice, they are not receiving most of the incorporated different forms of fringe benefits in the instruments employed. Also reflected in the table the highest mean rating registered of 4.80 and a standard deviation of 0.67 with a descriptive rating of very satisfied from the statement, *"Salaries are paid regularly and promptly."* The timely release of salary added to the feeling of satisfaction of the respondents as shown from the data.

In motivating factor #5, faculty development, six out of seven benchmark statements are with moderately satisfied descriptive rating, with the statement, *"The institution implements a sustainable faculty development program based on identified priorities/need"* marked the highest mean rating of 4.50 while statement, *"Selection of deserving faculty members to be granted scholarships, fellowships, seminars, conferences and/or training grants is done objectively"* showed the lowest mean rating of 3.33 and with standard deviation value of 0.68. This with an equivalent descriptive rating of satisfactory.

A study of professional development for online teachers, conducted by Rice and Dawley (2019) found that 62% of teachers had no training in how to teach online before they taught online, few had formal academic training in online teaching, and most faculty members learned on the job. Noted also that faculty should be enthusiastic, interested, and skilled to develop excellent online courses. Other researchers noticed that online teachers may often feel unprepared for the challenges of teaching online, and also feel they lack the tools or pedagogical skills necessary to be effective. Faculty members who teach online require formal training in hardware, software, and distance course design (Jackowski & Akroyd, 2012). The studies showed how important the trainings and conferences on faculty development so as to feel confident and

satisfied in performing their primary function as educators.

This may suggest that the college must work to develop their faculty members through training and development that will enable the faculty to perform their present jobs effectively and to prepare for future assignments specifically now that the school environment is gearing for a new school environment as the new normal as brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Finally, in motivating factor #6, peer communication, two statements registered a mean rating with a descriptive rating of satisfactory. These statements stated as "*There is a good teamwork and cooperation in the institution*" and "*Sufficient encouragement is provided by the members of the institution*" 2.84 and 3.23 respectively. The statement, "*Institute meetings are conducted regularly*" marked the highest mean rating of 4.12 and a standard deviation of 0.33 with the descriptive rating of moderately satisfied. Chandrasekar (2014) argued that human-to-human interactions and relations are playing a more dominant role in overall job satisfaction. Another study by Catillo and Cano (2012) on the job satisfaction level among faculty members of colleges showed that if proper attention is given to interpersonal relationships, recognition, and supervision, the level of job satisfaction would rise. It can be deduced from here the importance to improve the interpersonal relationships of faculty which may contribute to improve the satisfaction of the faculty force.

Conclusion

This study made an attempt to explore the job satisfaction of faculty members of Bulacan Agricultural State College and their selected demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, age, years of experience, civil status, highest educational attainment, and academic rank). The study finds the overall job satisfaction mean rating of 3.27 and a standard deviation of 0.53 with a descriptive rating of satisfactory. Thus, these results may imply that the academic members of the college are quite satisfied with their job.

In this study, the data obtained through questionnaires were all self-administered for determining which aspects were satisfying and dissatisfying; hence, the findings may be subject to the response consistency effect. In terms of future research directions, it is proposed to expand the study to use other research approaches that is for example qualitative case studies to determine the impact of the selected demographic factors in this study and other variables on the overall job satisfaction of the faculty members in the state colleges and universities.

At the end of the study, the researchers may have summed up with the view that the college may give more attention to motivating and maintaining these human resources to make them more contented and to make the most of their effort by ensuring overall excellence of the college.

Acknowledgement

The authors were very grateful of their College President, Dr. Jameson H. Tan, for continuous support and encouragement to spontaneously engage to research, cultivating the research culture to each and everyone in the institution. More so in gratitude with their families for being always there to smile and serve inspirations.

References

- Accreditation system. <https://www.usep.edu.ph/uac/wp-content/uploads/sites/39/2019/02/Accreditation-System.pdf>
- Addington, T. (2013). Leading from the sandbox: Seven indicators of a healthy organization. <http://leadingfromthesandbox.blogspot.com/2013/01/seven-indicators-of-healthy-organizations>
- Dave, F., & Ravel, T. (2014). New theoretical perspectives on job satisfaction and motivation: Challenging Herzberg and linking with professional development. <http://www.education.leeds.ac.uk/assets/files/staff/papers/my-paper.doc>
- Edington, D. (2015). Positive organizational health. *Corporate wellness magazine.com*. <http://www.corporatewellnessmagazine.com/others/positive-organizational-health>
- Eryaman, S. (2018). *Motivating teachers for excellence*. <http://www.ericdigest.org/pre-921/motivating.htm>
- Gross, D. (2013). *Psychosocial risks and job performance*. http://oshwiki.eu/wiki/Psycho-social_risks_and_job_performance
- Hee, O. C., Ong, S. H., Ping, L. L., Kowang, T. O., & Fei, G. C. (2019). Factors influencing job satisfaction in the higher learning Institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 10–20.
- Heywood, C. (2016). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 6-16. <http://synchronit.com/downloads/freebooks/Herzberg.pdf>
- June, W. (2013). Colleges begin to reward professors for doing work that actually matters to them. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A25-A26.
- Lencioni, P. (2017). *The three signs of a miserable job: A fable for managers and their employees*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mansour, C. (2018). *New rural community faculty members and job satisfaction*. *Community College review*. <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mimOHCZ/is232/ain8689906/print>
- Miller, B. (2017). Why organizational health trumps everything else in Business. *Forbes*. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/danschawbel/2012/03/26/why-organization-health-trumps-everything-else-in-business>
- Nasee, F. & Salman S. (2015). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline type and by geographic region. *Education* [On-line]. http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200404/ai_n93445191/pg.2
- Nayak, N. (2014). Telecommuting, professional isolation, and employee development in public and private organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 511-532. doi: 10.1002/job. 145
- Roznowski, J. & Hulin, T. (2016). Job satisfaction of Greek university professors: Is it affected by demographic factors, academic rank and problems of higher education? In G. K. Zarifis, (Ed.). *Educating the Adult Educator: Quality Provision and Assessment in Europe, Conference Proceedings, ESREAReNAdET. Thessaloniki: Grafima Publications*, 535 – 545.

- Saif, S. K., Nawaz, A., Jan, F. A., & Khan, M. I. (2012). Synthesizing the theories of job-satisfaction across the cultural/attitudinal dimensions (sic). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. <http://www.journal-archives14.webs.com/1382-1396.pdf>
- Scruton, K., & Gross, J. (2013). *Dissatisfaction and attrition among female faculty in American universities: An analysis of the national study of postsecondary faculty* [e-book]. Lewiston.
- Souza-Poza, L. (2015). Junior professors question job policies. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(50), A10. (ERIC Document^[1]Reproduction Service No. EJ777677) ERIC database. (EJ777677).
- Tack, J., & Patitu, K. (2017). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril*. Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development. ERIC database. (BB B27915).
- Terera, M., & Ngirande, B. (2014). *Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline type and by geographic region*.
- Truell, A. D., Price, W. T., Jr., & Joiner, R. L. (2018). Job satisfaction among^[1]community college occupational-technical faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(2), 111-122.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).