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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The present study examines the relationship between job related dimensions and job satisfaction of teaching staff of B-schools in India using Structure Equation Modeling (LISREL 8.5).

Methodology: The study is based on a single cross-sectional survey. In all 310 responses were completed by the teachers of management institutes located in India. A self-administered questionnaire with items related to the study dimensions was employed for the study.

Originality/Value: The study is unique in the sense that it is among the very few studies conducted in the context of management institutes in India. Improving job satisfaction is one of the most important ways to deal with attrition in organizations. Since there is an acute shortage of teaching staff in management institutes in India, the present study is both relevant and purposeful.

Practical Implications: The results provide insights into the dynamics of job satisfaction. The findings also provide inputs to B-schools on how to handle issues related to teachers’ attrition which is a serious problem in India.

Research limitations: Due to vast geographical expanse of India, the study was concentrated on a limited geographical region and limited sample.

Results: The findings of the study indicated that there is a positive relationship among pay satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility and teachers’ job satisfaction. Promotion opportunities were not found to be an influential factor leading to teachers’ job satisfaction. In most Indian management institutes promotion is normally granted after a certain period of service and is not linked directly with performance as it is in the corporate sector.
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INTRODUCTION

A high quality teaching staff is the cornerstone of a successful society. Attracting and retaining high quality teachers is the primary requirement of any educational institution (Sharma and Jyoti, 2006). It is necessary to understand the factors associated with development of quality teachers in modern societies; job satisfaction is one of the important factors in this respect (Sharma and Jyoti, 2010). Teachers’ job satisfaction is a multifaceted phenomenon (Sharma & Jyoti, 2006) that is critical to absenteeism and turnover (Locke and Latham, 2000), commitment (Saif-ud-Din et al., 2010), and school effectiveness (Sharma and Jyoti, 2010).
Job satisfaction has been defined primarily as an attitudinal variable. It implies how people feel about different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs (Spector, 1997). Subsequently, teacher satisfaction refers to a teacher’s affective relation to his or her teaching role and is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from teaching and what one perceives as being offered to a teacher (Lawler, 1973). Job satisfaction of academicians is well documented across the literature (Saif-ud-Din et al., 2010) and over the last few decades, many studies have attempted to identify sources of teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979; Myklebust, 1984; Kyriacou, 1987; Farber, 1991; Friedman and Farber, 1992). Certain leading factors of satisfaction have been researched over and over indicating that work, pay, supervision, promotion, co workers and environment collectively determine the total satisfaction of a worker (Saif-ud-Din et al., 2010). It is also believed that satisfied employees tend to work harder at their jobs in order to achieve organizational objectives (Khilji and Wang, 2007), whereas a decline in teachers’ job satisfaction can lead to increased absenteeism and high levels of claims for stress-related disability (Farber, 1991; Trioman and Woods, 2000). Moreover, teacher dissatisfaction appears to be a main factor behind teachers’ leaving the profession in many countries (Huberman, 1993; Woods et al., 1997). Thus, research into teacher satisfaction is becoming more and more important given not only that a growing number of teachers leave the profession but also that dissatisfaction is associated with decreased productivity (Tshannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Having considered the fact that most of the studies on teacher satisfaction have been conducted in developed countries, one realizes the need in the available literature for similar research in developing countries as well. The evidence available from educational systems in developed countries identifies a complex picture in which job satisfaction is closely related to the other key factors of the complexities of work and life in general within a particular social context. It has been believed, though, that teacher satisfaction is produced, manifested, and coped with differently in different societies. Whatever little research had been done in developing countries was based on a set of theoretical assumptions that had been developed from findings in developed countries (Garrett, 1999). The role played by job satisfaction in the normal working life of management institutes’ teachers in developing countries (such as India) needs to be understood more fully, thus the necessity for such research is evident.

Knowledge Commission of India (2005) in its ‘Report of the working group on management education’ admitted that there was a very serious shortage of management faculty and it is so acute that new support facilities have to be created. Since increasing job satisfaction is one of the most important ways to reduce attrition, the study aims to explore the relationships between various job related dimensions (satisfaction with pay, promotion opportunities, supervision and work-schedule flexibility) and job satisfaction of teachers. Considering that there is a real dearth of Indian studies in the context of management institutes that comprehensively examine this ever important issue, the present study is both relevant and purposeful. The relationship between various job related dimensions and job satisfaction is examined using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) capabilities of LISREL version 8.50.

Conceptual Framework

The concept of job satisfaction is very complex (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985) and in the past few years, several studies have investigated this concept (Judge et al., 2008; Sutin et al., 2009; Heller et al., 2009; Ishitani, 2010). Interestingly, factors which may influence an industrial workers’ job satisfaction and the one of a knowledge worker may differ on degree and scale along the components which makeup the job satisfaction of the former (Saiyadain, 2003; Sampath, 2006). Job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, for example pay practice, quality of one's relationship with their supervisor and quality of work life/physical environment (Mudor and Tooksoon, 2011). Locke (1976, cited in Sempane et al., 2002) comes up with a summary of job dimensions that have been established to contribute significantly to employees’ job satisfaction. Locke’s definition appears to be the
most referenced and generally accepted description, characterizing the necessary component needed to depict what is meant by the broad construct of job satisfaction (Miller et al., 2009). Among the various dimensions are work itself, pay, promotion and supervision. This is postulated to influence employees’ opinion of “how interesting the work is, how routine, how well they are doing, and, in general, how much they enjoy doing it” (McCormick and Ilgen, 1985).

**Pay Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction**

The important relationships between job satisfaction and pay satisfaction have been well established in studies by Brown and Peterson (1993) as well as Roberts and Chonko (1996). Previous research (Voydanoff, 1980) has shown that monetary compensation is one of the most significant variables in explaining job satisfaction. Lamberti et al. (2001) found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Taylor and West (1992) found that pay levels affect job satisfaction. Groot and Brink (1999; 2000) provide contradictory evidence for the relationship between pay and job satisfaction. In their earlier research they did not find evidence for a relationship between compensation and job satisfaction, however, their subsequent research revealed the opposite. However, Hamermesh (2001) found that changes in compensation (increases or decreases) have concomitant impact on job satisfaction levels of employees. Several other authors maintain that the key in linking pay to satisfaction is not the absolute amount that is paid, but rather, the perception of fairness (Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998; Aamodt, 1999). According to Robbins et al. (2003), employees seek pay systems that are perceived as just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is perceived as equitable, is commensurate with job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to be the result. A number of studies suggest that higher wages reduce teacher quit propensity (Murnane and Olsen 1989; Theobald, 1990; Brewer, 1996; Gritz and Theodore, 1996). Low salary has often been found to be a significant predictor of teachers’ intent to leave (Liu and Meyer, 2005). Theobald (1990) found that salaries are positively related to decisions to continue teaching. With respect to extrinsic factors of job satisfaction, a study by Chase (1971) revealed that teachers felt salary increases might lead to job satisfaction. The above findings lead to the first hypothesis of the study:

**H1**: Pay satisfaction has a direct and positive import on job satisfaction

**Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities and Job Satisfaction**

An employee’s opportunities for promotion are also likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Larwood, 1984; Vecchio, 1988; Landy, 1989; Moorhead and Giffen, 1992). According to McCormick and Ilgen (1985), employees’ satisfaction with promotional opportunities will depend on a number of factors, including the probability that employees will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions. Robbins (1998) maintains that promotions provide opportunities for personal growth, increased responsibility, and increased social status. A number of researchers are of the opinion that job satisfaction is strongly related to opportunities for promotion (Pergamit and Veum, 1999; Sclafane, 1999; Peterson et al., 2003). This view is supported in a study conducted by Ellickson and Logsdon (2002) where satisfaction with promotional opportunities was found to be positively and significantly related to job satisfaction. Nonetheless, opportunities for promotion appear to have a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction (Tolbert and Moen, 1998). In a study by Jayaratne and Chess (1984 cited in Staudt, 1997), the opportunity for promotion was found to be the best and only common predictor of job satisfaction. Draake and Kossen (2002) postulate that many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are good Kreitner and Kinicki (1992) however, state that the positive relationship between promotion and job satisfaction is dependent on perceived equity by employees. This leads to the second hypothesis of the study:

**H2**: Satisfaction with promotion opportunities has a direct and positive impact on job satisfaction
Satisfaction with Supervision and Job Satisfaction

Research demonstrates that a positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and supervision (Koustelios, 2001; Peterson et al., 2003; Smucker et al., 2003). Supervision forms a pivotal role relating to job satisfaction in terms of the ability of the supervisor to provide emotional and technical support and guidance with work-related tasks (Robbins et al., 2003). According to Ramsey (1997), supervisors contribute to high or low morale in the workplace. The supervisor’s attitude and behavior toward employees may also be a contributing factor to job-related complaints (Sherman and Bohlander, 1992). Supervisors with high relationship behavior strongly impact on job satisfaction (Graham and Messner, 1998). Wech (2002) supports this view by adding that supervisory behavior strongly affects the development of trust in relationships with employees. The author further postulates that trust may, in turn, have a significant relationship with job satisfaction. A study conducted by Packard and Kauppi (1999) found that employees with supervisors displaying democratic management styles experienced higher levels of job satisfaction compared to those who had supervisors who exhibited autocratic or laissez-faire leadership styles. Brewer and Hensher (1998) contend that supervisors whose leadership styles emphasize consideration and concern for employees generally have more satisfied workers than supervisors practicing task structuring and concern for production. Bassett (1994) maintains that supervisors bring the humanistic part to the job, by being considerate toward their employees, contribute towards increasing the employee’s level of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has been linked to quality of supervision received (Arminio and Creamer, 2001; Amey, 2002; Schneider, 2002). Bradford (1981) also found that inadequate leadership/supervision contributes to teachers’ job dissatisfaction. Besides that, Skrapits (1986) found that friendly, relaxed, attentive, open-minded, and better communicating supervisors/administrators contribute to greater teacher job satisfaction. His findings were supported by Barnard (1986) who confirmed the relationship between poor interpersonal relations and job dissatisfaction. Thus, the third hypothesis of the study was derived:

H3: Satisfaction with supervision has a direct and positive impact on job satisfaction

Satisfaction with Work-schedule Flexibility and Job Satisfaction

An emerging definition of work flexibility (Kossek and Van Dyne, 2008) further subdivides this concept into duration, timing, and place flexibility. De Carufel and Schaan (1990) showed that implementation of alternative work schedules reduced absenteeism and overtime, while increasing employee job satisfaction and productivity. Hill et al. (2001) found support for the positive impact of structural changes and increased flexibility. Women who perceived more flexibility within their organization reported higher levels of job satisfaction (Scandura and Lankau, 1997). Aryee (1992) and Arora (1990) found a negative relationship between work-family conflict and job/business satisfaction. Pleck (1985) reported that when work-family conflict existed, the working women experience less job satisfaction. A meta-analysis on alternative work schedules showed decreased positive effects over time associated with flextime as it related to absenteeism, productivity, and job satisfaction (Baltes et al., 1999). This leads to the fourth hypothesis of the study:

H4: Satisfaction with Work-schedule flexibility has a direct and positive impact on job satisfaction

The Significance of the Study

Though job satisfaction is one of the most researched topics in the field of organizational behavior (Applebaum et al., 2000; Spector 1997), job satisfaction of knowledge workers needs to be extensively researched upon (Mudor and Tooksoon, 2011). Teachers’ job satisfaction has been the focus of research agenda in various developing countries for a long time (Siriama and Poipoi, 2010). A career in education is challenging and it requires a great deal of thoroughness and commitment (Akhtar et al., 2008) but if faculty members are not satisfied with their profession they will not be able to
increase their performance (Shibu, 2011).

The demand for management education has risen sharply in India (Agarwala, 1995) and a phenomenal growth in it had been recorded by National Knowledge Commission (2006-2009) as well in its ‘Report to the Nation’. It can be observed that the parameter ‘Intellectual Capital and Faculty’ is given the highest weightage while evaluating the quality of these management institutions and thus, there exists a need for a mechanism to capture, preserve, retrieve and make visible this intellectual capital of the management institute (Doctor and Ramachandran, 2008). The importance of teachers’ roles cannot be ignored in high quality education of manpower. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction in teachers’ works affect their performance. In this regard, identification of teachers’ job satisfaction level is important (Demirtaș, 2010). Teachers’ job satisfaction is one of the key factors in institutional dynamics and is generally considered to be primary dependent variable in terms of which effectiveness of an organization’s human resource is evaluated. Thus, the understanding of factors affecting teachers’ satisfaction at the workplace is of paramount importance for a successful educational system (Sharma and Jyoti, 2010). The nature of job satisfaction of college lecturers and its relationships with management support, salary and promotion opportunities still remain ambiguous and need to be investigated further (Ch’ng et al., 2010) in India, very little is known as to how far the teachers are satisfied in their jobs (Mistry, 2010).

The study is concerned with providing insights into the dynamics of job satisfaction among teachers of Indian B-schools. The results provide inputs to B-schools to handle issues related to teachers’ turnover which is seen as a serious problem in this context. Although job satisfaction has been a popular research topic in the past, the researcher never came across any published researched study specifically on the job satisfaction of teachers of Indian B-schools.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The study is based on a single cross-sectional survey. A self-administered questionnaire with items related to the study dimensions was deployed for the study. Scale uni-dimensionality, reliability and validity were also assessed. Analysis of the data was conducted through LISREL 8.5, statistical software for Structural Equation Modeling. The study objectives, measures of the study and the sampling procedure adopted for the present study are detailed below.

**Study Objectives**

The focus of this study is to investigate the impact of job related dimensions on job satisfaction of ‘B-schools’ teachers. The objectives can be identified as under:

- To investigate the impact of pay satisfaction on job satisfaction
- To investigate the impact of satisfaction with promotion opportunities on job satisfaction
- To investigate the impact of satisfaction with supervision on job satisfaction
- To investigate the impact of satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility on job satisfaction

**Study Measures and Research Instrument**

In order to collect primary data, a research instrument was designed. Based on an extensive review of literature, measures and items related to both independent variable (job dimensions) and dependent variable (job satisfaction) were identified.

**Independent Variables: Job Dimensions**

Locke (1976, cited in Sempane et al., 2002) comes up with a summary of job related dimensions that have been established to contribute significantly to employees’ job satisfaction. Among the various dimensions are work itself, pay, promotion and supervision. According to Mudor and Toojson (2011) job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors, for example pay practice, quality of one's relationship with their supervisor and quality of work life/the physical environment.
Luthans (1998) mentions work itself, pay, supervision, coworkers, and promotion as factors impacting job satisfaction.

**Pay Satisfaction (PS)**
Pay satisfaction was measured with an adapted version of a 6-item scale developed by Spector (1994). A sample item is “I am satisfied with what my institute pays me”.

**Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities (PR)**
Satisfaction with promotion opportunities was measured with an adapted version of a 6-item scale developed by Spector (1994). A sample item is “I am satisfied with my chances of promotion”.

**Satisfaction with Supervision (SU)**
Satisfaction with supervision was measured with an adapted version of a 7-item scale developed by Spector (1994). A sample item is “I am satisfied with the quality of supervision”.

**Satisfaction with Work-Schedule Flexibility (WSF)**
Work-schedule flexibility is measured with a 6-item scale developed by Rothausen (1994). It measures the extent to which an employee feels he or she has flexibility in scheduling work, in doing part-time or flexible work, and in balancing family and work related responsibilities. A sample item is “I am satisfied with my work schedule”.

**Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction**

**Job Satisfaction (JS)**
Job satisfaction was measured with a 5-item scale developed by Ho and Au (2006). A sample item is “I am satisfied with being a teacher”.

Some of the questions on the above-cited original scales were reworded to fit in the requirements of the present study. The instrument utilized a 5-point Likert scale anchored with end points labeled as *Strongly Agree* (5) and *Strongly Disagree* (1). Five-point scale has been commonly used by other researchers too in the same area (Budhwar and Sparrow, 1997; Jabnoun and Fook, 2001; Koustelios, 2001; Carmeli, 2004; Ali, 2007; Karakus and Aslan, 2008;). The research instrument was developed in four phases. Content and face validity of the research instrument was also carried out during this stage. Figure 1 illustrates the four phases of research instrument development.

---

**Figure 1**: Phases of research instrument development
Sample and Survey Procedures

B-schools based in the state of Uttar Pradesh (UP) and NCR2 (Delhi) region were covered. – U.P. is the most populous state of India and is one of the largest in terms of geographical area covered (Census Report, 2001). It comes third in terms of total number of management institutes in India offering degree courses and first in terms of number of institutes offering post graduate diploma in management (www.aicte-india.org). Also, with a combined output of around 30,000 management graduates/undergraduates every year, U.P. is a major feeder to the ever rising demand of management graduates in the corporate world of India. On the other hand, there has been a tremendous growth in the infrastructure and economy of NCR (Delhi) region and it is now the home to major international and domestic companies, be it in the manufacturing or service sectors. MNCs and corporate bodies from all over the world are turning their heads towards NCR (Delhi) owing to manpower and skilled labor resource. The demand and number of B-schools offering degree courses in management education has risen gradually in this region and NCR (Delhi) is now rightly considered as another important and major contributor in providing management education in India.

Though, NCR (Delhi) comprises a number of cities, the most prominent cities of the region that were considered for the study- keeping in mind the degree of economic/infrastructural growth and number of B-schools located in these areas- are Delhi, Gurgaon, Noida, Ghaziabad and Faridabad. These cities have been grouped under one class by the Government of India as well (www.gov.nic.in). Similarly, most of the management institutes/B-schools of U.P. are located in A, B-1 and B-2 classes of cities, considering which ‘C’ class cities of U.P. were excluded from the study. Lists of B-Schools having AICTE3 approval in the state of U.P. and NCR (Delhi) were procured from the AICTE’s website. Both the lists were then combined and alphabetically sorted. The combined list gave a total of 302 B-schools. This list was considered as the sampling frame for the study. Having vested with statutory powers, AICTE is a premier body involved in planning, formulation and maintenance of norms and standards, accreditation, funding of priority areas, monitoring and evaluation of courses/programmes in the field of management/technical education. In the absence of a suitable sampling frame that could provide a consolidated list of B-schools in U.P. and NCR (Delhi) region, the AICTE list of accredited management institutes/B-schools was deemed as the most authentic and reliable sample frame.

In order to collect data from the teaching staff of B-Schools, systematic random sampling approach was adopted. Every 15th B-School was picked up from the list. Thus, in all, 20 B-schools were targeted. Addresses of the B-Schools were obtained from AICTE’s/B-Schools’ websites. Sampling elements were the teaching staff of these B-schools. Data was collected from the sample elements primarily by contacting them personally. This methodology has been used by other researchers in the area too (Randhawa, 2007). B-Schools were personally visited by the researcher and the teachers were contacted while they were relatively free or in between breaks. To collect data from all those who could not be contacted, due to their absence or other practical constraints, questionnaires were sent to them through e-mails. Their contacts details were taken from the official records of the B-school/website/peer group. Out of 20 B-schools targeted, only 17 B-schools agreed to participate while other three B-schools showed their disinterest in the survey. Thus, 402 teachers were actually contacted from the 17 B-schools and with 310 usable responses generated (285 through physical contact and 25 through e-mails); the response rate comes out to be close to 78% which can be considered very high.

Data Analysis

The relationship between dependent and independent variables was measured using SEM
in LISREL 8.50. For proceeding with SEM, Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) method was employed. SEM is a multivariate statistical technique based on regression, and it can be utilized to confirm the causal relations among latent variables. This study follows a two-step procedure proposed by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The first step involves developing a good measurement model with high goodness of fit, while the second step analyzes the structural model.

**Testing of the Measurement Model**

Measurement model describes how well the observed indicators serve as a measurement instrument for the latent variables. Specifying the measurement model consist of assigning indicators (e.g., actual measures or questionnaire items) to a latent variable or construct (Garver and Mentzer, 1999). The first step in the statistical process is to test constructs in the measurement model for unidimensionality. Once each construct/scale is assessed to be unidimensional and reliable the researcher can test for validity (Anderson and Gerbing, 1991; Steenkamp and Trijp, 1991).

**Scale Unidimensionality:** Each of the five constructs was subjected to Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) individually. On the basis Of Eigen-value greater than 1 heuristic (Delgado-Ballester et al., 2003), one principal component was extracted that accounted for majority of the total variance in the case of all scales except the SU scale. Thus, all scales except the SU scale were proved to be unidimensional after the analysis. For the SU scale, items with low loadings on the principal factor were deleted. As a result, only four items in the SU scale were retained which gave a unidimensional scale.

**Assessment of Reliability:** Once the unidimensionality of all the scales was established, scale reliability estimates were generated. Reliability can reflect the internal consistency of the indicators measuring a given factor. Scales were statistically measured for indicator reliability and scale reliability. By convention, indicator reliability should preferably be 0.5 or greater (Long, 1983; Schumacker and Lomax, 2004). Even values close to the recommended are considered acceptable (Wu, 2005). From the illustration provided in table 1, it can be concluded that the indicator reliability for indicators in each scale was well supported in the study.

Scale reliability is operationalized as internal consistency, which is the degree of inter-correlations among the items that constitute the scale (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). A value of Cronbach's alpha of 0.6 or more is used as a criterion for a reliable scale (Hair et al., 1998; Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Fornell and Bookstein (1982) stated that CR value higher than 0.6 implies that there is high internal consistency. AVE at 0.5 or close to it is generally considered acceptable (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). The Cronbach alpha, CR and AVE values are given in table 2. From the table it is clear that all values suggest high scale reliability.

**Assessment of Validity:** A scale has validity if it measuring the concept that it was intended to measure (Bagozzi, 1981; Malhotra, 2010). Since unidimensionality and reliability have been established, the next step involves assessing validity. Various forms of construct validity i.e. convergent (through t-values and Bentler-Bonett Coefficient), discriminant (through average variance extracted and shared variance estimates), predictive (through correlation between the study variables) and criterion validity were assessed. While convergent, discriminant, predictive validity was measured with the help of the measurement model; criterion validity was measured through the structural model. Anderson and Gerbing (1988) stated that convergent validity is assessed through t-values for the factor loadings. It is to be noted that in all cases, t-values were more than 2, thus, indicating that convergent validity was high (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). The convergent validity can also be measured using the Bentler-Bonett Coefficient (Bentler-Bonett, 1980) in LISREL. Ahire et al. (1996), Green et al. (2006) recommended assessing convergent validity using the Bentler-Bonett coefficient with values greater than 0.9 indicating strong convergent validity. In the present case all the scales have a Bentler-Bonett coefficient (i.e. NFI
and NNFI) of greater than 0.9 as given in table 3, thus indicative of high convergent validity.

Table 1: Indicator reliability of the study scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>WSF</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Scale reliability estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSF</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Indicators of convergent validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSF</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fornell and Larcker (1981) present a method for assessing the discriminant validity of two or more factors. Here, a researcher compares the AVE of each construct with the shared variance between constructs. If the AVE for each construct is greater than its shared variance with any other construct, discriminant validity is supported. From table 4 it can be inferred that discriminant validity does exists for all the scales.

Ahire et al. (1996) and Garver and Mentzer (1999) recommended assessing predictive validity by determining whether the scale of interest correlate as expected. SEM was used to ascertain the correlation and determine predictive validity. All correlation values were found to be positive and significant thus giving proof of predictive validity as presented in figure 2. The curved lines between the two latent variables represent the correlation between these variables.

Structure Equation Modeling: Path Coefficients and Hypotheses Testing

The standardized paths coefficients of the structural model were estimated by LISREL 8.50. It was found that the structural model fits the data well. The fit indices values are given in table 5.

The global fit statistics indicate the structural model represent the data structure well. The RMSEA value (0.05) falls well below the maximum recommended value of 0.08 or 0.10 and values for NFI (0.924), NNFI (0.955) and CFI (0.960) all exceeded the recommended 0.90 level, indicating a good fit. The relative chi-square/degree of freedom of 1.96 was less than the recommended maximum of 3.00.

The path coefficients of the structural model indicate the magnitude and direction of relationships and thus are used for testing the hypotheses as given in figure 3.

### Table 4: Average variance extracted and shared variance estimates for determining discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>SU</th>
<th>WSF</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlations are below the shaded diagonal, squared correlations are above the diagonal, and AVE estimates are presented on the diagonal.
Figure 2: Measurement model with correlations
Table 5: SEM fit indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIT INDICATORS</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square /Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>618.09/314 = 1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Structural model and path coefficients
**H1:** Pay satisfaction has a direct and positive impact on teachers’ job satisfaction

Pay satisfaction has a direct, significant and positive impact on teacher satisfaction as indicated by the significant path from PS to TS ($\beta=0.46$). Thus hypothesis H1 was not rejected.

**H2:** Satisfaction with promotion opportunities has a direct and positive impact on teachers’ job satisfaction

Satisfaction with promotion opportunities does not have a direct, significant and positive impact on teacher satisfaction as indicated by the non-significant path from PR to TS ($\beta=-0.24$). Thus hypothesis H2 was rejected.

**H3:** Satisfaction with supervision has a direct and positive impact on teachers’ job satisfaction

Satisfaction with supervision has a direct, significant and positive impact on teacher’s job satisfaction as indicated by the significant path from SU to TS ($\beta=0.27$). Thus hypothesis H3 was not rejected.

**H4:** Satisfaction with Work-schedule flexibility has a direct and positive impact on teachers’ job satisfaction

Satisfaction with Work-schedule flexibility has a direct, significant and positive impact on teacher’s job satisfaction as indicated by the significant path from WSF to TS ($\beta=0.40$). Thus hypothesis H4 was not rejected.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

As illustrated in figure 3, the three independent variables, namely pay satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility were found to have a direct, significant and positive impact on job satisfaction. The findings of the study corroborate with earlier researches on the relationship of pay satisfaction with job satisfaction (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Roberts and Chonko, 1996). satisfaction with supervision and job satisfaction (Graham and Messner, 1998; Koustelios, 2001; Wech, 2002; Peterson et al., 2003; Smucker et al., 2003) as well as satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility and job satisfaction (De Carufel and Schaan, 1990; Baltes et al., 1999).

Study finding suggesting that satisfaction with promotion opportunities do not have a direct and positive impact on job satisfaction is inconsistent with the findings of Ellickson and Logsdon (2002), Oshagbemi (1997), Pergamit and Veum (1999), Peterson et al., (2003) and Sclafani (1999) where satisfaction with promotion opportunities is directly linked with job satisfaction.

The likely explanation for the findings of this study is that the top management of B-schools in India should provide adequate educational policies and administration in terms of reasonable payment and fringe benefits to ensure faculty members satisfaction. Also, flexible work arrangements should be offered, to help teachers balance work and family demands. B-schools’ management should aim at designing flexible and compressed work week schedules, since it was found that availability of flexible work schedules is an important antecedent variable for teachers’ job satisfaction. Moreover, quality of supervision, in terms of personal qualities of the supervisor, human touch and consideration for subordinates problems and impartial and justifiable treatment imparted to faculty members is one major area that B-schools’ management should look to ensure while making efforts to keep their teaching staff satisfied and motivated. Promotion opportunities were not found to be an important factor influencing overall job satisfaction of teachers. The reason is that in most Indian management institutes, promotion is normally granted after a certain period of service and is not linked directly with performance as it is in the corporate sector.

The study highlights the job dimensions involved in understanding teacher job satisfaction in a manner that has clear potential for implications in policy and practice. There is a need for a serious consideration of how this understanding may be meaningfully applied. Unfortunately, teacher satisfaction is often a critically ignored factor in education policy-making. However, improving teachers’ job satisfaction is not an optional extra, but a central component of effective policy-making (Hargreaves, 1994; Pollard et al., 1994). It is
often assumed that happier teachers are better teachers (Hean and Garrett, 2001). Therefore, an objective of any management institute should be to maximize teachers’ job satisfaction and minimize dissatisfaction not only for the benefit of teachers themselves but for the sake of students as well.

CONCLUSION

Measurement model was assessed for all five scales viz. Pay satisfaction (PS), Satisfaction with promotion opportunities (PR), Satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility (WSF) & Job satisfaction (JS). The results obtained in EFA showed that all the scales were unidimensional in nature, except the SU scale. To purify the SU scale, items with low loadings on the principal factor were deleted. PS scale had 6 items, PR scale had 6 items, Purified SU scale had 4 items, WSF scale had 6 items and JS scale had 5 items each.

Indicator reliability for all the scales was found to be satisfactory and falling within the recommended zone. Scale reliability was assessed in three ways i.e. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha, construct reliability and variance extracted measures. All five scales exhibited acceptable scale reliability.

Various forms of construct validity i.e. convergent, discriminant predictive and criterion validity were assessed. While the first three were the part of the measurement model, the last was part of structural model. Evidence of all forms of validity was found in the study.

SEM was used to establish the relationship between job related factors (PS,PR,SU and WSF) as exogenous variables, and JS as endogenous variable. Although the structural model did converge, mixed support was found for the hypothesized relationships between each of the constructs. In majority of the cases significant, direct and positive relationship existed between exogenous and endogenous variable.

Limitations and Recommendations

Although efforts were made to carry on a research that was theoretically and empirically sound, the study does suffer from few limitations. Due to very vast and varied geographical expanse of India, the respondents in the study represent only a certain geographical region. A more diverse coverage of geographic regions could have given more generalizable results. Since no updated centralized data of B-schools’ teachers is available to the researcher and practically it was not feasible to contact all the teachers in the sample frame either, the study was based on a limited sample. It might have suffered from a relatively small sample size related problems.

Teacher satisfaction is an area that continues to evoke debate. Studies that can provide further insight into the nature of teacher job satisfaction both generally and particularly in the context of developing countries are still few and far between. There is a need for such studies on a larger scale. Factors that transform teachers’ perceptions from satisfaction to dissatisfaction over time, especially in the context of developing countries need to be explored. Unearthing the relationships of job related dimensions and job satisfaction with various job outcomes is a potent area for further research.
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