



THE ASIAN BULLETIN OF GREEN MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULAR ECONOMY

ISSN (online): 2959-0035

<http://abgmce.com/10.62019/abgmce.v4i2.111>

ISSN (Print): 2959-0027

Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Public and Private University Teachers, A case of an emerging Economy

Noor Fatima *, Muhammad Zaheer Khan, Sabahat Subhan

Chronicle

Article history

Received: July 29, 2024

Received in the revised format: Aug 16, 2024

Accepted: Aug 20, 2024

Available online: Aug 22, 2024

Noor Fatima & Sabahat Subhan are currently affiliated with National University of Modern Languages Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: noor.fatima@numl.edu.pk

Email: ssabahat@numl.edu.pk

Muhammad Zaheer Khan is currently affiliated with Department of Economics BUIEMS, Quetta, Pakistan.

Email: Zaheer.onnet@gmail.com

Abstract

It has empirically been proved that teacher job satisfaction is an important measure of school efficacy which enhances student achievement. The objective of this study is to identify and compare different factors that contribute to the levels of job satisfaction among the private and public sector university employees. A sample size of 158, conveniently selected, included teachers of private sector universities and public sector universities, located in Islamabad and Rawalpindi. Descriptive statistics, t-test, and One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) were used to analyze the data. It is concluded that public sector university teachers are more satisfied with the factors of autonomy, social status, recognition, social service, ability utilization, achievement, job security and relationship with their colleagues where as private sector university teachers are more satisfied with aspects of variety, responsibility, creativity, advancement, university policies, working conditions and compensation policies of their job. Significant mean difference was found between the overall job satisfaction of public and private sector university teachers; however private sector teachers are more satisfied with the overall job satisfaction. The mean difference among all the factors affecting job satisfaction of public and private sector university teachers is significant except those of the variety and achievement factors and factor concerning the relationship with their supervisor. Job security is the most important factor contributing to job satisfaction for public-sector teachers, whereas compensation is the most important factor for university teachers in the private sector. This suggests that, despite higher pay, private sector teachers lack the job security that public sector teachers have because of their permanent positions. To improve job satisfaction, private universities should consider implementing policies that provide permanent employment for their faculty. On the other hand, public universities should increase their compensation packages.

***Corresponding Author:**

Keywords: Job satisfaction, University teachers, Working Environmental Conditions, Social Status.

© 2024 Asian Academy of Business and social science research Ltd Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is among the most crucial attitudes in any organization. It lowers absenteeism, work-related stress, employee turnover, and productivity while also boosting employee morale—a crucial component of an organization's efficiency. Job satisfaction in businesses has drawn more attention recently (Chaudary and Banerjee, 2004). Job performance and job satisfaction appear to be positively connected, according to behavioural and social science research (Bowran and Todd, 1999). While highlighting the significance of studying teacher job satisfaction, T shannen-Moran et al. (1998) point out that job dissatisfaction is linked to lower productivity and

a high teacher turnover rate. Troman and Woods (2000) found that job dissatisfaction among teachers lowers student satisfaction. Heller et al. (1992) found that satisfied teachers were more productive at work and effectively motivated their students, both of which contributed to higher student achievement. Mertler (1992) discovered that higher levels of motivation result in greater job satisfaction among teachers. He went on to say that satisfied teachers are more productive, which leads to motivated students who achieve better results. Gautam et al. (2006) discovered that higher levels of motivation lead to increased job satisfaction among teachers, which is directly related to student achievement.

Policymakers must acknowledge that the quality of education in any country is significantly influenced by the job satisfaction of teachers; regrettably, job satisfaction is a factor that is largely disregarded in Pakistani education policy-making. "Happy teachers are better teachers," as the saying goes (Hean and Garrett, 2001). Any nation's future is determined by the effectiveness of its students. Understanding the elements that influence teachers' satisfaction—or lack thereof—is crucial to enhancing the data base required to underpin an effective educational system. Faculty members represent both the largest expense and the largest human capital resource of any university. The purpose of this study is to compare and identify the differences in job satisfaction levels between public and private sector university teachers in Pakistan. The Ministry of Education in any country should aim to maximize teacher satisfaction while minimizing dissatisfaction, not only for the benefit of teachers but also for the benefit of students.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as "an internal indicator of alignment; it reflects an individual worker's assessment of how well the work environment meets their needs" (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984, p. 55). It represents a general attitude toward one's job and is characterized by the difference between the rewards employees receive and what they believe they should receive (Rocca & Kostanski, 2001). As Solly and Hohenshil (1986) describe, "job satisfaction is an attitude individuals have toward their work, encompassing both a general or overall sense of satisfaction and various specific factors related to work reinforcement." According to Sonmezer et al. (2008), the concept of job satisfaction involves evaluating an individual from their own perspective, taking into account their feelings and emotions regarding their work, as well as whether or not their expectations and realization of those expectations are met. Generally speaking, job satisfaction gauges how much an employee enjoys their work and how much their expectations have been met in terms of their work. Mora et al. (2007) defines job satisfaction as the way individuals perceive the monetary and non-monetary rewards linked to their jobs.

Job Satisfaction: A key to happiness and productivity of an employee

Performance and general well-being of an individual are highly dependent on their level of job satisfaction. It indicates of the positive emotional condition brought about by one's work experiences (Locke, 1976). Numerous advantages of job satisfaction have been repeatedly demonstrated by research, including: Enhanced productivity: According to Judge et al. (2001), contented workers are more effective and productive. Better mental health: Stress, anxiety, and depression are all correlated with job satisfaction (Faragher et al., 2005). Enhanced loyalty: Happy workers are

inclined to stick with their company longer, which lowers turnover rates (Hom et al., 2017). Increased creativity: According to Amabile (1988), job satisfaction encourages creativity, innovation, and problem-solving abilities. All things considered, job satisfaction is critical for people, businesses, and society at large. Prioritising job satisfaction allows us to increase productivity and happiness. Eker et al. (2007) found that employees within an organization hold varied attitudes toward different aspects of organizational life, including salary, job level, supervision, promotion opportunities, senior management, the nature of their work, recognition, compensation systems, and relationships with colleagues. Many theories have been put forth regarding job satisfaction. One of the most well-known theories was presented by Maslow and is called the job motivation theory. This theory explained the five-stage hierarchy of human needs and is currently referred to as the deprivation/gratification proposition. Its premise is that when a person's needs are not met, they will act in a way that makes them unhappy (Castillo et al. 1999).

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory is a prominent framework for understanding job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. According to Herzberg, the factors leading to job satisfaction are distinct from those causing job dissatisfaction. Factors such as achievement, recognition, the nature of the work, responsibilities, and opportunities for advancement contribute to job satisfaction and act as motivators. Hygiene factors (job dissatisfaction) are typically associated with the workplace and interpersonal relationships. According to him, the presence of motivators and the absence of hygiene factors resulted in job satisfaction. Motivating and hygiene factors can be addressed in the workplace as employees become aware of them (Moyle et al. 2003).

The theories in the literature provide an understanding of the intricate variables affecting job satisfaction. Major theories of job satisfaction include the following: According to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1943), self-actualization, safety, social, and esteem needs come after basic needs in terms of job satisfaction. According to Herzberg's 1959 Two-Factor Theory, hygiene factors (salary, work environment) and motivators (recognition, achievement, growth) have an impact on job satisfaction. Five fundamental job dimensions—skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback—that affect job satisfaction are identified by the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

According to Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), employees' desire for fair treatment results in an exchange relationship between them and their employers, which in turn leads to job satisfaction. According to Equity Theory (Adams, 1963), which compares inputs (effort) to outcomes (rewards), job satisfaction is contingent upon the perception of fairness in the employee-employer exchange. Individual personality traits and tendencies may have an impact on job satisfaction, according to Dispositional Theory (Staw & Ross, 1985). According to the Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), employees who feel competent, related, and autonomous at work will be more satisfied with their jobs. Lastly, job satisfaction is seen by the Job Demands-Resources Model (Demerouti & Bakker, 2018) as the outcome of the harmony between job demands and resources. Devaney and Chen (2003) used Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) as an analytical tool to poll 211 US financial services graduates about their job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured using metrics such as attitude towards work, relationships with coworkers, pay, and gender, all of which were found to be significant predictors. Four factors—work security, promotion potential, graduate age, and stress—were not substantially correlated with job

satisfaction in the regression analysis. They discovered that one of the key factors that has a major impact on job satisfaction is pay or income. Using a job satisfaction index, Tutuncu and Kozak (2007) assessed employee satisfaction in the Turkish hotel sector. Turkish hotel workers' overall job satisfaction was found to be influenced by factors like promotion, supervision, and the nature of the work itself. It has also been demonstrated that when a person uses their skills to a greater extent, they feel as though their need for self-actualization is met, which promotes job satisfaction. According to Chaudary and Banerjee's (2004) study, opportunities for self-improvement, job security, organizational prestige, the nature of the work, and opportunities for promotion were the factors that contributed to job satisfaction, while poor utilization of skills, poor prospects for advancement, and an inadequate response to employees' complaints against management, organizational policies, and inadequate pay and allowances were the factors that contributed to job dissatisfaction.

According to Souza and Poza (2000), work-related variables like management relationships, job interest, higher pay, job security, and independence in the workplace all play a significant role in determining job satisfaction. Eker et al. (2007) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and factors influencing job satisfaction by measuring job satisfaction among academicians in Turkey. Their findings demonstrate that academic workload and work environment have a major impact on job satisfaction. They also discovered that the aspects of their jobs that they enjoyed the most were variety, autonomy, and recognition, while the aspects that they disliked the most were pay and opportunities for advancement. Based on the job motivator and hygiene factors identified by Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, Castillo and Cano (2004) described the range of overall job satisfaction among faculty members. Teachers were found to be most motivated by the "work itself" element and least motivated by the "working conditions." A study by Chimanikire et al. (2007) sought to identify the variables influencing academic professionals' job satisfaction in Zimbabwe's postsecondary institutions. Their findings indicated that a higher percentage of the workforce was not happy in their positions, and that low pay, a heavy workload, and a lack of loan options were the main causes of this discontent.

According to research by Boamah et al. (2018), employees who are happy in their jobs perform exceptionally well at work and show greater loyalty and commitment to the company. Positive work behaviours, like enthusiasm, a focus on results, and a strong work ethic, are frequently displayed by satisfied employees, who also take pride in their roles (De Simone et al., 2018; Chadi & Hetschko, 2018). Furthermore, workers who are extremely happy in their positions are more likely to stick with the company, while unhappy workers are more likely to quit (Chiaburu et al., 2022). Asnoni et al. (2021) claim that a fixed salary can increase employee satisfaction and decrease attrition intentions.

Research on Job Satisfaction Among University Teachers

Numerous studies have investigated job satisfaction among university teachers in both public and private sectors, revealing key findings. In the public sector, teachers tend to report lower job satisfaction due to bureaucratic constraints, limited resources, and heavier workloads (Ehrenberg et al., 2001). Although they value autonomy and academic freedom, public university teachers often face restrictions due to government regulations (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Their job satisfaction is also influenced by compensation, benefits, and job security, which are often lower

compared to private sector institutions (Katz, 1973). Conversely, private university teachers generally report higher job satisfaction owing to greater autonomy, better resources, and more flexible work environments (Kinman & Garbutt, 2017). They often have lighter teaching loads and more opportunities for student interactions, further contributing to higher job satisfaction (Umbach, 2007). Additionally, private university teachers perceive greater institutional support and access to resources, enhancing their job satisfaction (Sorcinelli, 1994). Comparative studies consistently show that private university teachers report higher job satisfaction than their public sector counterparts (Ehrenberg et al., 2001; Kinman & Garbutt, 2017). Nonetheless, common predictors of job satisfaction for both sectors include factors like autonomy, workload, and institutional support (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

According to a study by Cockburn (2000), having good relationships with coworkers is crucial for teachers' mental health because they are viewed as sources of friendship and social and emotional support; on the other hand, when these relationships are absent, teachers experience intense feelings of dissatisfaction. Zhongshan (2007) demonstrated that the majority of Shanghai's elementary school teachers are content with their positions. The teachers stated that while they were unhappy with their pay and opportunities for advancement, they were generally content with their jobs, collegial relationships, and school principals. Sonmezer et al. (2008) discovered a difference in the job satisfaction levels of teachers employed in public schools versus those of teachers who left the public sector to work in private schools as a result of retirement or resignation. They came to the conclusion that, in general, teachers in the private sector are happier than those in the public sector. The primary reasons for these differences were the salary, social standing, reputation, and advancement, as well as the ability to use skills, manage employee affairs, and creativity. It can be challenging to identify a single factor as the only indicator of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction because job satisfaction is a multifaceted phenomenon.

The above-mentioned literature on job satisfaction shows the factors which significantly contribute towards job satisfaction or dissatisfaction among the employees of any organization. These factors are work environment, workload, freedom and autonomy or independence to perform the job, compensation/salary, sense of achievement and accomplishment, job content (i.e., the work itself), job context (i.e., the working conditions in which the job is being performed), chances of advancement or promotional policies, organization structure, rewards, flexible working hours, relationship with management, interpersonal relationships, provision of loans, housing facilities, ability utilization, management response toward employees' complaints, prestige of organization, nature of work, job security, supervision, work stress, feedback on the work performance, employee competence to do the job, and administrative control.

The purpose of this study is to examine and compare the different factors that affect university teachers job satisfaction in the public and private sectors in Pakistan. It also aims to ascertain whether Pakistani university teachers at public and private institutions have varying degrees of overall job satisfaction. The study will try to determine the underlying causes if such differences are discovered. In addition, the study will identify the causes of low levels of job satisfaction among university instructors in the public and private sectors.

Significance of the Study

It is possible to identify disparities in institutional features, management styles, and work environments by analyzing the job satisfaction differences between university

instructors in the public and private sectors (Ehrenberg et al., 2001). Investigating how university instructors in both sectors view academic freedom and autonomy, and how this affects their methods of instruction and job satisfaction (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001). Comparing job satisfaction can help identify differences in workload, stress, and burnout between university teachers in the public and private sectors, informing workload management and wellness initiatives (Kinman & Garbutt, 2017). Research findings may help to influence decisions on funding, resource allocation, and regulatory environments made by public and private universities, which may, in turn, affect student outcomes and teacher job satisfaction (Zumeta, 2011).

Following are the research questions addressed in this study

- What is the satisfaction level of teachers of public and private sector university teachers for different dimensions of the job?
- To assess the difference between the overall job satisfaction level of public and private sector university teachers in Islamabad and Rawalpindi.
- What is the difference in the critical factors influencing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among the university teachers of public and private sector?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Framework

The research framework utilized in this study is based on the approach of Sonmezer and Erayaman (2008), who employed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss et al. (1967), to determine whether the differences exist between job satisfaction levels of public-school teachers and of teachers who transferred to private education institutions from public schools due to retirement or resignation, and find out the causes of these differences. Their study aimed to examine differences in job satisfaction levels between public school teachers and those who transitioned to private educational institutions due to retirement or resignation, as well as to investigate the reasons behind these differences. The MSQ is a comprehensive instrument consisting of one hundred questions that assess both internal and external job satisfaction, covering 20 factors related to work and environmental conditions. This scale allows for the identification of both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, as well as the underlying causes of dissatisfaction. The 20 dimensions represented by the MSQ scales are detailed as follows: (Weiss et al, 1967).

Table 1.

Attribute	Definition
Ability Utilization	The opportunity to utilize my skills
Achievement	The sense of achievement I derive from the work
Activity	Staying engaged and productive at all times
Advancement	The opportunities for career progression in this role
Authority	The opportunity to provide direction to others.
Company policies and Practices	The execution of company policies
Compensation	The compensation I receive for my work
Co-workers	The relationships and interactions among my coworkers
Creativity	The chance to use my own methods for performing the job
Independence	The opportunity to work independently on the job
Moral Values	Being able to perform tasks that align with my values and beliefs
Recognition	The recognition I receive for a job well done
Responsibility	The autonomy to make decisions based on my own judgment
Security	The stability of employment that my job offers
Social Service	The chance to help and contribute to others

Social Status	The opportunity to establish a presence and make a difference in the community.
Supervision- Human Relations	The way my boss manages his team
Supervision- Technical	The effectiveness of my supervisor in decision-making
Variety	The opportunity to engage in a variety of tasks occasionally.
Working Conditions	The work environment

Sampling & Data Collection

The study has been carried out in cities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi of Pakistan. These two cities have been selected considering the capital city and then adjacent city upon convenience. Convenience sampling, a non-probability sampling technique where samples are selected based on their ease of access and availability, Convenience sampling is often employed in exploratory research due to its simplicity, speed, and cost-effectiveness" (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). The data were gathered from male and female lecturers of public and private universities, the universities included in the survey are Quaid-e Azam University, International Islamic University Islamabad, Arid Agriculture University, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Iqra University, Muhammad Ali Jinnah University, Air University, Hamdard University and Bahria University. 225 questionnaires have been distributed, 25 questionnaires to each of the nine universities. A total of 158 completed questionnaires were received back giving a response rate of 70.2%.

Table 2.

No.	Name of University	Sector	No of Respondents
1	Arid University	Public	22
2	Fatimah Jinnah	Public	17
3	Islamic University	Public	17
4	QAU	Public	23
5	Bahria University	Private	22
6	Iqra University	Private	17
7	Hamdard University	Private	13
8	MAJU	Private	11
9	Air University	Private	16
		Private Sector	79
		Public Sector	79
	Total		158

Research Instrument

The 100 questions from Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire have been modified according to the context of teacher's job satisfaction, so that it would be convenient for the respondent (teachers) to fill the questionnaire. Some questions related to demographic variables have also been added to the original questionnaire. The instructions for the MSQ, state the purpose of the survey being to find out how the participant feels about their current job, with the hope of understanding the specific aspects employees like and dislike about their occupations. (Weiss et al., 1967). The original MSQ's factor structure was modified to better fit the university teaching context, and some items were reworded to better suit the university teaching context, such as changing "work" to "teaching" or "research" (Kinman & Garbutt, 2017). Modifications are made to ensure the MSQ is relevant. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is a popular tool for measuring job satisfaction because it assesses a person's contentment with a variety of work-related factors (Weiss et al., 1967). The MSQ has 20 items in total, divided into two subscales: Extrinsic Satisfaction, which has 8 items measuring satisfaction with external factors such as salary, benefits, and work environment, and Intrinsic Satisfaction, which has 12 items measuring

satisfaction with the work itself, such as autonomy, challenge, and independence. Because the MSQ has been shown to be highly reliable and valid in numerous studies, it is especially useful in the study of job satisfaction. Additionally, the MSQ facilitates comparisons across different groups, such as public and private sector employees (Ehrenberg et al., 2001). Researchers have utilized the MSQ to examine job satisfaction predictors, identifying factors like autonomy, feedback, and work-life balance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), compare job satisfaction across groups, and investigate differences between public and private sector employees or different occupations (Ehrenberg et al., 2001). The frequency scale ranges from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), and a high score reflects high satisfaction. The questionnaire used is attached in the appendix.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Data analysis was conducted using version 13.0 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics, independent sample t-tests, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were employed, with a significance level (α) set at 0.05. The independent sample t-test was used to determine whether there are significant differences in overall job satisfaction and related factors between public and private sector universities.

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics of the comparative analysis of job satisfaction of public and private sector university teachers is given in table 3. Descriptive statistics indicate that the average level of overall job satisfaction among public sector university teachers is 3.843, which is lower than the 4.041 reported by private sector university teachers. This suggests that public sector university teachers are generally less satisfied with their jobs compared to their counterparts in the private sector. In terms of specific factors, public sector university teachers report higher average job satisfaction with the independence factor (4.076) compared to private sector university teachers (3.832). Conversely, satisfaction with the variety factor is lower in the public sector (3.730) than in the private sector (3.857). Public sector university teachers also report greater satisfaction with the social status factor (4.122) compared to private sector university teachers (3.747). Similarly, the recognition factor shows higher satisfaction levels in the public sector (4.262) than in the private sector (3.759).

Satisfaction with the social service factor is also higher among public sector teachers (4.122) compared to private sector teachers (3.819). However, public sector university teachers report lower satisfaction with the ability utilization factor (3.622) compared to private sector teachers (4.232). Satisfaction with the responsibilities factor is also lower in the public sector (3.321) compared to the private sector (3.958). Furthermore, public sector teachers report significantly lower satisfaction with the creativity factor (2.823) compared to private sector teachers (4.063). On a more positive note, public sector university teachers have higher average satisfaction with the achievement factor (3.854) compared to private sector teachers (3.759). In contrast, the advancement factor shows lower satisfaction levels in the public sector (2.557) compared to the private sector (3.038). Satisfaction with university policies is also lower among public sector teachers (2.785) compared to private sector teachers (3.241). Regarding relationships with colleagues, public sector university teachers report higher satisfaction (4.245) compared to their private sector counterparts (3.882).

Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics related to job satisfaction and factors affecting Job Satisfaction among university teachers

	Sector	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Overall. Job satisfaction	Public	3.843	0.426	0.048
	Private	4.041	0.458	0.052
Independence	Public	4.076	0.450	0.051
	Private	3.832	0.508	0.057
Variety	Public	3.730	0.620	0.070
	Private	3.857	0.691	0.078
Social status	Public	4.122	0.478	0.054
	Private	3.747	0.678	0.076
Recognition	Public	4.262	2.067	0.233
	Private	3.759	0.753	0.085
Social service	Public	4.122	0.648	0.073
	Private	3.819	0.828	0.093
Ability utilization	Public	3.622	0.551	0.062
	Private	4.232	0.347	0.039
Responsibilities	Public	3.321	0.695	0.078
	Private	3.958	0.496	0.056
Creativity	Public	2.823	0.862	0.097
	Private	4.063	0.400	0.045
Achievement	Public	3.854	0.526	0.059
	Private	3.759	0.650	0.073
Advancement	Public	2.557	0.483	0.054
	Private	3.038	0.601	0.068
University policies	Public	2.785	0.792	0.089
	Private	3.241	0.773	0.087
Colleagues	Public	4.245	0.388	0.044
	Private	3.882	0.495	0.056
Working conditions	Public	3.325	0.660	0.074
	Private	3.954	0.419	0.047
Security	Public	4.059	0.452	0.051
	Private	3.270	0.755	0.085
Compensation	Public	2.350	0.608	0.068
	Private	3.135	0.657	0.074
Relationship with Head	Public	3.705	0.712	0.080
	Private	3.595	0.701	0.079

However, satisfaction with working conditions is lower in the public sector (3.325) compared to the private sector (3.954). Job security appears to be higher in the public sector, with an average satisfaction level of 4.059 compared to 3.270 in the private sector. Conversely, satisfaction with compensation is lower among public sector teachers (2.350) compared to private sector teachers (3.135). Finally, public sector university teachers report higher satisfaction with their relationship with the head of the department (3.705) compared to private sector teachers (3.595).

Independent Sample t.-test

In order to check whether this difference in means is significant independent sample t-test is applied. Results are shown in table 4. The negative mean difference of -0.197 indicates that public sector university teachers are less satisfied overall than private sector university teachers. therefore, we will reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, and conclude that there is a significant difference in the overall job satisfaction level of public and private sector university teachers. Under the "t-test for equality of means," a significant difference was found in the job satisfaction levels concerning the independence factor, with public sector university teachers showing greater satisfaction (mean difference = 0.244). Therefore, we will reject the

null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is a difference in the job satisfaction level of public and private sector university teachers with the independence factor in their job. Positive mean difference (0.244) shows that public sector university teachers are more satisfied than private sector university teachers. However, there was no significant difference in job satisfaction levels regarding job variety between public and private sector university teachers. Therefore, we will accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction level of public and private sector university teachers with the variety in their job.

A significant difference was observed in job satisfaction related to social status, where public sector university teachers were more satisfied (mean difference = 0.376). Similarly, for the recognition factor, public sector university teachers reported higher satisfaction (mean difference = 0.502). Under the "t- test for equality of means", "Equal variances not assumed" that the P-value (sig. 2- tailed: 0.011) is less than a (0.05), therefore we will reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference in the job satisfaction level of public and private sector university teachers with the social service they provide with their job. Significant differences were also found in job satisfaction concerning social service, with public sector university teachers again being more satisfied (mean difference = 0.304). Conversely, public sector university teachers were less satisfied with their ability utilization (mean difference = -0.610).

The data indicates a significant difference in job satisfaction related to job responsibilities, with public sector university teachers being less satisfied (mean difference = -0.637). A similar trend was seen for the creativity factor, where public sector university teachers reported lower satisfaction (mean difference = -1.241). No significant difference was found in job satisfaction concerning achievement between the two sectors. However, a significant difference was identified for advancement opportunities, with public sector university teachers being less satisfied (mean difference = -0.481). There was also a significant difference in satisfaction with university policies, where public sector university teachers were less satisfied (mean difference = -0.481). In terms of relationships with colleagues, public sector university teachers reported higher satisfaction (mean difference = 0.363).

Working conditions also showed a significant difference, with public sector university teachers being less satisfied (mean difference = -0.629). Regarding job security, public sector university teachers were more satisfied (mean difference = 0.789). However, they were less satisfied with compensation (mean difference = -0.785).

Finally, there was no significant difference in job satisfaction related to the relationship with supervisors between public and private sector university teachers. As the Levene's test for equality of variances shows that F (0.059) is not significant as Sig. (0.809) is greater than a (0.05), therefore the "Equal variances assumed" row will be used for the t-test. Under the "t- test for equality of means", "Equal variances assumed" shows that the P-value (sig. 2- tailed: 0.331) is greater than a (0.05), therefore we will accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction level of the public and private sector university teachers with relationship with their supervisors.

Table 4.
Independent Sample t-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t -test for Equality of Means				
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2 tailed)	Mean Diff	
Overall, Job Satisfaction							
Equal variances assumed			-2.808	156	0.006	-0.197	0.070
Equal variances not assumed	1.098	0.296	-2.808	155.17	0.006	-0.197	
Independence							
Equal variances assumed			3.193	156	0.002	0.244	0.076
Equal variances not assumed	0.213	0.645	3.193	153.796	0.002	0.244	
Variety							
Equal variances assumed			1.211	156	0.228	-0.127	0.104
Equal variances not assumed	2.485	0.117	1.211	154.211	0.228	-0.127	
Social Status							
Equal variances assumed			4.025	156	0.000	0.376	0.093
Equal variances not assumed	3.403	0.067	4.025	140.1993	0.000	0.376	
Recognition							
Equal variances assumed			2.029	156	0.044	0.502	0.248
Equal variances not assumed	0.077	0.781	2.029	98.3361	0.045	0.502	
Social Service							
Equal variances assumed			2.568	156	0.011	0.304	0.118
Equal variances not assumed	7.404	0.007	2.568	147.4162	0.011	0.304	
Ability Utilization							
Equal variances assumed			8.324	156	0.000	-0.610	0.073
Equal variances not assumed	8.207	0.005	8.324	131.5946	0.000	-0.610	
Responsibilities							
Equal variances assumed			6.633	156	0.000	-0.637	0.096
Equal variances not assumed	15.206	0.000	6.633	141.1169	0.000	-0.637	
Creativity							
Equal variances assumed			11.60	156	0.000	-1.241	0.107
Equal variances not assumed	44.683	0.000	11.60	110.0562	0.000	-1.241	

		Achievement					
Equal variances assumed	1.714	0.192	1.009	156	0.314	0.095	0.094
Equal variances not assumed			1.009	149.51	0.314	0.095	
		Advancement					
Equal variances assumed	3.668	0.057	-	156	0.000	-0.481	0.087
Equal variances not assumed			5.544	148.9916	0.000	-0.481	
		University Policies					
Equal variances assumed	0.009	0.926	-	156	0.000	-0.456	0.125
Equal variances not assumed			3.659	155.914	0.000	-0.456	
		Colleagues					
Equal variances assumed	1.591	0.209	5.130	156	0.000	0.363	0.071
Equal variances not assumed			5.130	147.4894	0.000	0.363	
		Working Conditions					
Equal variances assumed	18.963	0.000	-	156	0.000	-0.629	0.088
Equal variances not assumed			7.145	132.1382	0.000	-0.629	
		Security					
Equal variances assumed	19.246	0.000	7.969	156	0.000	0.789	0.099
Equal variances not assumed			7.969	127.5741	0.000	0.789	
		Compensation					
Equal variances assumed	1.598	0.208	-	156	0.000	-0.785	0.101
Equal variances not assumed			7.790	155.0846	0.000	-0.785	
		Relationship with H.O. D					
Equal variances assumed			0.976	156	0.331	0.110	0.112
Equal variances not assumed	0.059	0.809	0.976	155.96	0.331	0.110	

One Way – ANOVA

One way- ANOVA is a statistical technique used for testing mean differences between two or more independent groups on a single dependent variable. One way- ANOVA has been applied here to find whether data from public and private sector university teachers have a common mean. This is to determine that whether the groups are actually different in the measured characteristics. The t- test is a special case of the one way - ANOVA. One way ANOVA examines means differences' using the F- statistic, whereas t-test reports the t- statistic. Therefore, the t- test and One- Way ANOVA produces the same results but present in a different way.

If we examine the One- Way Variance Analysis table above, its findings is analogous to the t- statistic result. Above table showed that there is a significant difference(P value: 0.000 < α : 0.05) between the group averages of overall job satisfaction and the factors affecting job satisfaction among the public and private sector university teachers, however no significant difference is found between the group averages in the case of satisfaction associated with the factor of variety (P value:0.228 > α : 0.05), achievement (P value:0.314 > α : 0.05) and relationship with H.O.D (P value: 0.331 > α : 0.05) among the public and private sector university teachers, which is similar to the result of independent sample t- test.

Table 3.
One- Way Anova

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall.jobsat	Between Groups	1.540	1	1.540	7.882	0.006
	Within Groups	30.484	156	0.195		
	Total	32.024	157			
Independence	Between Groups	2.345	1	2.345	10.196	0.002
	Within Groups	35.884	156	0.230		
	Total	38.230	157			
Variety	Between Groups	0.633	1	0.633	1.468	0.228
	Within Groups	67.280	156	0.431		
	Total	67.913	157			
Socialstatus	Between Groups	5.570	1	5.570	16.199	0.000
	Within Groups	53.643	156	0.344		
	Total	59.213	157			
Recognition	Between Groups	9.959	1	9.959	4.116	0.044
	Within Groups	377.468	156	2.420		
	Total	387.427	157			
Social service	Between Groups	3.646	1	3.646	6.596	0.011
	Within Groups	86.217	156	0.553		
	Total	89.862	157			
Ability Utilization	Between Groups	14.684	1	14.684	69.283	0.000
	Within Groups	33.063	156	0.212		
	Total	47.746	157			
Responsibilities	Between Groups	16.034	1	16.034	44.002	0.000
	Within Groups	56.847	156	0.364		
	Total	72.881	157			
Creativity	Between Groups	60.785	1	60.785	134.646	0.000
	Within Groups	70.425	156	0.451		
	Total	131.210	157			
Acheivement	Between Groups	0.356	1	0.356	1.019	0.314

	Within					
	Groups	54.506	156	0.349		
	Total	54.862	157			
Advancement	Between					
	Groups	9.139	1	9.139	30.740	0.000
	Within					
	Groups	46.380	156	0.297		
	Total	55.519	157			
University Policies	Between					
	Groups	8.203	1	8.203	13.392	0.000
	Within					
	Groups	95.550	156	0.612		
	Total	103.752	157			
Colleagues	Between					
	Groups	5.201	1	5.201	26.315	0.000
	Within					
	Groups	30.833	156	0.198		
	Total	36.034	157			
Workingconditions	Between					
	Groups	15.613	1	15.613	51.046	0.000
	Within					
	Groups	47.713	156	0.306		
	Total	63.326	157			
Security	Between					
	Groups	24.591	1	24.591	63.506	0.000
	Within					
	Groups	60.408	156	0.387		
	Total	84.999	157			
Compensation	Between					
	Groups	24.329	1	24.329	60.689	0.000
	Within					
	Groups	62.537	156	0.401		
	Total	86.866	157			
Relationship with H.O.D	Between					
	Groups	0.475	1	0.475	0.952	0.331
	Within					
	Groups	77.924	156	0.500		
	Total	78.399	157			

The results of independent sample t-test re consistent with the results of one way-ANOVA.

CONCLUSION

The quality and consistency of teaching have a direct impact on student learning, so it is imperative that teachers are satisfied in their careers. Compared to teachers who are unhappy with different aspects of their work, those who are extremely satisfied with their careers are less likely to move to another school or quit the profession altogether (Choy et al., 1993). Such staff turnover disturbs the learning environment and takes funds away from instruction in favour of expensive staff replacement initiatives. The study found a statistically significant difference in overall job satisfaction between public and private university teachers. Teachers in private universities are more satisfied with their jobs than those in public universities. This finding is consistent with Bas and Ardic's (2002) study, which found that private university academics are more satisfied with their jobs than those at public universities. The study also found that public and private sector teachers have different levels of satisfaction with various job factors. There were significant differences in satisfaction levels with respect to independence, social status, recognition, social service, ability utilisation, responsibilities, advancement, university policies, relationships with colleagues, working conditions, job security, compensation, and relationships with the

department head. There were no significant differences in levels of satisfaction with job variety, achievement, or supervisory relationships. Sonmezer et al. (2008) discovered that salary, social ranking, reputation, ability to apply skills, administrator-employee relations, and creativity were all important factors in determining job satisfaction differences between public and private school teachers. University teachers in the public sector are more satisfied with their independence, social status, recognition, social service, ability utilisation, and job security. In contrast, private-sector university teachers report higher levels of satisfaction with their responsibilities, creativity, advancement opportunities, working conditions, and pay.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Job security is the most important factor contributing to job satisfaction for public-sector teachers, whereas compensation is the most important factor for university teachers in the private sector. This suggests that, despite higher pay, private sector teachers lack the job security that public sector teachers have because of their permanent positions. To improve job satisfaction, private universities should consider implementing policies that provide permanent employment for their faculty. On the other hand, public universities should increase their compensation packages. Furthermore, creativity and improved working conditions significantly increase job satisfaction among private-sector university teachers. As a result, public university teachers should be given more opportunities to try out new teaching methods and have access to better facilities like labs, computers, and instructional materials.

DECLARATIONS

Acknowledgement: We appreciate the generous support from all the contributor of research and their different affiliations.

Funding: No funding body in the public, private, or nonprofit sectors provided a particular grant for this research.

Availability of data and material: In the approach, the data sources for the variables are stated.

Authors' contributions: Each author participated equally to the creation of this work.

Conflicts of Interests: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Consent to Participate: Yes

Consent for publication and Ethical approval: Because this study does not include human or animal data, ethical approval is not required for publication. All authors have given their consent.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963) 'Towards an understanding of inequity', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), pp. 422-436.
- Amabile, T. M. (1988) 'A model of creativity and innovation in organizations', *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10, pp. 123-167.
- Asnoni A., Sambung R., Milwan M. (2021). The influence of pay satisfaction, job satisfaction, competence, and turnover intention on the service quality of honorary employees in the Airport Operational Unit Office of Class III North Kalimantan. *Jurnal Organisasi dan Manajemen*, 17(1), 99–110.
- Baldwin, R. G. and Chronister, J. L. (2001) *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bas, T., Ardic, K. (2002). A comparison of job satisfaction between public and private university academicians in Turkey. *METU Studies in Development*, 29(1-2), 27-46.
- Blau, P. M. (1964) *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.

- Boamah, S. A., Laschinger, H. K. S., Wong, C., & Clarke, S. (2018). Effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction and patient safety outcomes. *Nursing outlook*, 66(2), 180-189.
- Bowran, J., Todd, K. (1999) 'Job stressor and job satisfaction in a major metropolitan public EMS service', *Prehospital and disaster medicine*, 14(4), pp.236-239.
- Castillo, J. X., Cano, J. (1999) 'A Comparative Analysis of Ohio Agriculture Teachers level of Job Satisfaction', *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 40(4), pp. 67-79.
- Castillo, J. X., Cano, J. (2004) 'Factors Explaining Job Satisfaction among Faculty', *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), pp. 65-74.
- Chaudary, S., Banerjee, A. (2004) 'Correlates of job satisfaction in medical officers', *MJAFI*, 60(4), pp. 329-332.
- Chimanikire, P., Mutandwa, E., Gadzirayi, C. T., Muzondo, N., Mutandwa, B. (2007) 'Factors affecting job satisfaction among academic professionals in tertiary institutions in Zimbabwe', *African Journal of Business Management*, 1 (6), pp. 166-175.
- Choy, S. P., Bobbitt, S. A., Henke, R. R., Medrich, E. A., Horn, L. J., and Lieberman, J. 1993. *America's Teachers: Profile of a profession*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 93-025.
- Cockburn, A. D. (2000) 'Elementary teachers' needs: Issues of retention and recruitment', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(2), pp. 223-238.
- Davis, R. V. and Lofquist, L. H. (1984) *A psychological theory of work adjustment*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. (2000) 'The "what" and "why" of goal pursuit: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior', *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), pp. 227-268.
- Demerouti, E. and Bakker, A. B. (2018) 'Burnout and work engagement: An etiological model', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(3), pp. 381-395.
- DeVaney, S.A., Chen Z.S. (2003). Job Satisfaction of recent graduates in Financial services, US Department of Labour. Bureau of Labour Statistics, Compensation and Working Conditions Online.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., Kasper, H. T. and Rees, D. I. (2001) 'Faculty turnover and retention in the academy', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(2), pp. 139-155.
- Eker, M., Anbar, A., Kirbiyik, L. (2007) 'Job satisfaction of Academicians in Turkey and the Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction,' *The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, 9(4), pp. 66-90.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A. and Alkassim, R. S. (2016) 'Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling', *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), pp. 1-4.
- Faragher, E. B., Cass, M. and Cooper, C. L. (2005) 'The relationship between job satisfaction and health: A meta-analysis', *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 62(2), pp. 105-112.
- Gautam., Mandal, M.K., Dalal, R.S. (2006) ' Job satisfaction of faculty members of veterinary sciences: an analysis', *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 18(6), pp. 35-43.
- Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1976) 'Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory', *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), pp. 250-279.
- Hean, J., & Garrett, R. (2001). Sources of Job Satisfaction in Science Secondary School Teacher in Chile. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 31, 363-379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920120098491>
- Heller, H. W., Clay, R., Perkins, C. (1992) 'Factors related to teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction' *Journal of School Research and Information*, 10(1), pp. 20-24.
- Herzberg, F. (1959) *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- Hom, P. W., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W. and Griffeth, R. W. (2017) 'An integration of current theories of job turnover', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 30(2), pp. 151-173.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E. and Patton, G. K. (2001) 'The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review', *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), pp. 376-407.

- Katz, D. A. (1973) 'Faculty salaries, promotions, and productivity at a large university', *American Economic Review*, 63(2), pp. 469-477.
- Kinman, G. and Garbutt, S. (2017) 'Work-life balance and wellbeing in UK university staff', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 39(5), pp. 539-554.
- Locke, E. A. (1976) 'The nature and causes of job satisfaction', in Dunnette, M. D. (ed.) *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 1297-1349.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943) 'A theory of human motivation', *Psychological Review*, 50(4), pp. 370-396.
- Mertler, C. A. (1992) *Teacher motivation and job satisfaction of public school teachers*. Unpublished MSc thesis. The Ohio State University.
- Mora, J.G., Aracil, A.G., & Vila, L.E. (2007). Job satisfaction among young European higher education graduates. *Higher Education* 53, 29-59.
- Moyle, W., Skinner, J., Rowe, G., Gork, C. (2003) 'Views of Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in Australian long term care', *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 12 (4), pp. 168-176.
- Rocca, A. D., Kostanski, M. (2001) 'Burnout and job satisfaction amongst victorian secondary school teachers: a comparative look at contract and permanent employment', ATEA Conference, Melbourne, 24-26 September. pp 151-176
- Solly, D. C., Hohenshil, T. H. (1986) 'Job satisfaction of school psychologist in a primary rural state', *School Psychology Review*, 15(1), pp. 119-126.
- Sonmezer, M. G., Eryaman, M. Y. (2008) 'A Comparative analysis of job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers', *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 4(2), pp. 189-212.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994) 'Effective approaches to new faculty development', *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, 5(1), pp. 5-22.
- Sousa-Poza A., Sousa-Poza A. A. (2000) 'Well-being at Work A Cross- National Analysis of the Levels and Determinants of Job Satisfaction', *Journal of Social Economics*, 12, pp. 517-538.
- Staw, B. M. and Ross, J. (1985) 'Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job attitudes', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(3), pp. 469-480.
- Troman, G., Woods, P. (2000) 'Careers under stress: Teacher adaptations at a time of intensive reform', *Journal of Educational Change*, 1(3), pp 253-275.
- Tshannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., Hoy, W. (1998) 'Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure', *Review of Educational Research*, 68 (2), pp 202-248.
- Tutuncu, O., Kozak, M. (2007) 'An investigation of factors affecting job satisfaction', *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 8 (1), pp. 1-19.
- Umbach, P. D. (2007) 'How effective are they? Exploring the impact of faculty members on student learning', *Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), pp. 569-594.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W. and Lofquist, L. H. (1967) *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis, MN: Vocational Psychology Research.
- Zhongshan, Z. (2007) 'Study of Job satisfaction Among Elementary School Teachers in Shanghai', 40 (5), pp. 40-46.
- Zumeta, W. M. (2011) 'What does it mean to be a "public" university, anyway? A century of debate', *The Review of Higher Education*, 35(1), pp. 1-28.

