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INTRODUCTION

Role of universities in the development of human society has accepted now beyond the bare delivery of knowledge contents to nurturing talent and fulfilling the intellectual needs of the society. Institutes of higher education are responsible to forecast the upcoming challenges to a country and provide competitive human capital to meet those challenges. Higher education due to its multidisciplinary role in the development of pure, social and applied sciences, supplies the lifeblood to societal life in various aspects. Although, living spirit of society is composed of man, money, methods and materials as basic elements, but human stands fundamental to all elements, responsible for the attainment of societal objectives. Universities are the main source, responsible for human engineering and preparing human capital for all spheres of life to cater the needs of public, private and social sector. It can also be perceived that faculty having low level of stress with high level of satisfaction can help institutions of higher education to achieve these goals.

Teacher is considered a key player in teaching learning process at elementary, secondary and higher level. The objectives of teaching process cannot be materialized without fully satisfied teachers. A country like Pakistan where, physical resources at educational institutions are poor, salaries are not appropriate, discipline problems are frequent, most of the teachers are not well equipped with modern methods of teaching as well as many managerial issues, which keep the teachers stressful at workplace. At university level, expectations from teachers are very high. At the same time, they have to face very challenging and demanding tasks related to teaching and research. They face a lot of occupational stress while performing their duties. This affects their job satisfaction and adds to their stress (Johnes & Taylor, 1990; Hagedorn, 1994; Hsing et al., 2006).

The academic exposure towards new challenges has increased level of stress on faculty, which ultimately encourages the researchers of education management to study the relationship between work stress and job satisfaction of university faculty. Stress among teachers and its relationship with job satisfaction is one of the most vital areas of study for teachers, educational administrators and educational researchers. Its significance lies in the fact that occupational stress closely linked with job satisfaction, job commitment, employees’ turnover, organizational performance and productivity. Antoniou and Vlachakis (2006) brought forward the most important sources of stress which are being faced by university teachers such as students’ interaction issues, low level of interest and problematic attitude of graduates. They also found the difference in perceived stress levels in relation to their sources, like interpersonal interaction, academic burden and emotional fatigue have higher impact on female teachers. Professional mismatches cause burnout in younger faculty, while aged faculty feels stress due to less support from the concerned authorities.

According to Humphreys (1993), stress in teaching has sufficient attention of educational thinkers and researchers in present days and academic interest on this subject is expanding to various dimensions. The increased job-shift tendency in teaching profession is indicated by the trend that majority wants to leave this profession while there is decreasing trend towards joining this profession. Occupational stress is considered as root cause of this declining trend, which is one of the major causes of job stress. The newly developed workplace environment in universities like increase in female teachers and students, impacts of corporate sector and close relationship with stakeholders has made this profession very demanding, while control is rapidly moving towards low trend. Researchers have found inverse relationship as stress level is high, when demands are high and control is low, contrarily stress level is low, when demands are low and control is high. Due to recent dramatic developments in socio-economic life, the teaching profession has become highly demanding while the control (discipline)
issues have become a major problem for many educational institutions. The combination of increased demands and control difficulties has moved teaching into an exceedingly stressful occupation. In this stressful environment, only the quality teacher can cope with the situation and can better help the institutions to attain educational objectives (Anonymous, 1997). Dua (1994), in his study about newly inducted faculty, has reported more job stress of staff below senior lecturer. The same trend prevails in support staff in which staff below senior technical officer level is highly stressful. Supporting staff has shown more stress due to job significance and clerical fatigue.

Higher education sector is among the highly influenced sectors of this transition and takes major responsibility to direct the nation towards right path. Universities primarily play the role of promoting research and development, enhancing teaching capacity and developing management discipline in the countries. The faculty of universities promises to meet this great challenge of attaining objectives of higher education, which resultant brings high stress on them. The stress bearing capacity is backed by their level of satisfaction to the institutions. The highly stressed and poorly satisfied faculty cannot help the universities to compete such global challenges. The universities in Pakistan and other countries particularly of developing nations need to adopt continuous job satisfaction and occupational stress assessment programs and investigate their causal relationship. In Pakistan higher education is dominated by two sectors: private and public. The open market policy has encouraged to bring foreign universities to enter into Pakistani market. The competition has changed from bare buildings and enrolment to faculty, programs, contents, academic sources and reputation of institutes. The success of universities in near future will highly depend on the capacities and performance of their faculty. Due to the service oriented nature of the job, faculty of universities is in direct contact with graduates/customers, and highly satisfied faculty with low level of stress can produce stratified graduates and make long-term impact on university branding.

**Statement of Problem**

The impact of occupational stress on job satisfaction is examined in various business and social sectors across the world. This relationship in university settings of Pakistan is missing in literature. The study is designed to investigate what is the overall levels of work stress and job satisfaction, and the relationship between these two variables in public and private sector university teachers.

**Objectives of the Study**

This study aims to investigate the relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction in public and private sector university teachers in Pakistan. The main objectives of the study are to:

- To observe overall faculty stress level;
- To detect weights of different factors of job satisfaction;
- To discern overall faculty job satisfaction level; and
- To examine relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction.

**Significance of the Study**

Firstly, research studies have widely discussed about the relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction of teachers. The work done in this regard covers broad range of disciplines like elementary and secondary education, but very less attention is paid to higher education with respect to teacher satisfaction and job stress. The developing country like Pakistan, where literacy rate is very low, resources are limited, and very little percentage of students reach to the university level. It requires imperative attention of higher management towards teaching system and faculty assigned to impart the promised knowledge. The faculty members as front-line players in the entire value-chain of universities carry greater responsibility, and play a significant role in overall institutional success. The satisfied faculty can help the university to achieve its desire goals and meet the educational objectives. Contrarily, teachers' high level of job stress creates the big gap between promised and actual levels of educational quality. The scenario raises the need for a comprehensive study, to investigate the relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction of university teachers.

Secondly, quality education is the most important issue all over the world. Like other third world countries, most of the educational problems in Pakistan are quantitative in nature. Less has been studied about faculty satisfaction and job stress to improve the quality of education at the university level. This is an established fact that the dream of quality education at any level cannot materialize without satisfying the teachers and reducing their job stress. It is the need of time to find out the relationship, if any between the stress and job satisfaction of university teachers. In the light of this study, we will be able to give recommendations to manage the stress for the entire satisfaction of the university teachers to meet the challenges of quality education in the present era. This study will be worthwhile contribution to improve the efficiency and performance of university teachers. For these reasons and others, Stress and job satisfaction of university teachers is an important topic, valuable for investigation at present moment in Pakistan. Lastly, Malik (1998) at doctoral level has tried to explore the causal factors in teacher stress and moral in Pakistan has conducted only one study. According to available literature, no effort was made to find out the relationship between the occupational stress and job satisfaction of university teachers in Pakistan. Therefore, this study may fill the important literature gap, particularly in the context of Pakistan to explore relationship between the occupational stress and job satisfaction.

**Organization of the Study**

This study proceeds with introduction, followed by extensive literature review, research methodology, results and discussion, conclusion, limitations of the study, and research gap for future research. The study also develops recommendations and managerial implication for policy makers in higher education. Finally, this study explores further possibilities of research in the subject and suggests areas of future investigation. The findings of study carry high values for the management of universities in both public and private sector along with fruitful addition in the academic literature of the world.

**Literature Review**

The academicians have shifted their attention from occupational drivers of manufacturing concerns to service oriented professions. Number of academic authors particularly attempted the occupational stress and job satisfaction in the university settings and tried to explore the impacts on teaching performance (Sim, 1990; Wisniewski, 1990; Iiacqua & Schumacher, 1995; Wu, et.al, 1996; Fatma, 2003).

Occupational stress and job satisfaction among university teachers is direly needed to improve the quality of education. Since various studies across the globe have referred that stress and job satisfaction of faculty members affect their performance, productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. It is worthwhile to find out the relationship between these two variables to improve the quality of education at university level.
Bibi et al. (2004) conducted a research study to find out the effects of stress on job satisfaction of head teachers at elementary level. Sample of study consisted thirty heads (fifteen male and fifteen female) of elementary schools of Lahore city. Results indicated that most of the head teachers at elementary level are in stress and it is negatively affecting their job satisfaction.

In some cases, females are more stressed and in some cases male heads are more stressed resulting decreasing their level of job satisfaction.

Terpstra and Honoree (2004) has attempted to explore the job satisfaction level of university faculty and surveyed almost 500 respondents in various disciplines of colleges and universities in the U.S.A and found the job satisfaction as essential variable.

The main intention of the study was to present some empirical findings on general job satisfaction levels of university faculty regarding academic discipline and geographic region. The significant relationships are found between job satisfaction, pay rank and geographical area.

In the context of UK higher education institutions, Oshagbemi (2003) conducted a study at university level and tried to find out the relationship in job satisfaction among different job cadres i.e. Lecturer, senior lecturer, reader and professor.

The study concluded that job satisfaction has a direct positive relationship with cadre like rank and occupational level. He also have called intrinsic satisfaction as major contributor in job satisfaction over the worker job period and paid attention to length of service of university teacher.

He raised the question of relationship between job satisfaction and length of services and found significant relationship; positively in the first half of job period and negatively in the second half, which constitutes a U shape.

Sargent and Hannum (2003) have conducted a study in China to improve students learning in the context of developing countries. It speculated that teachers in less remote locales with better resources—economic, social, and organizational—would be more satisfied. At the individual level, they anticipated that the attachment of young and female teachers to local community is more, and less-qualified teachers would be more satisfied.

In context of Pakistani educational settings, Khan and Muneer (2001) conducted a study on job satisfaction of female primary school teachers of rural areas of Lahore district. Fifty female primary teachers from 10 government girls’ primary schools of rural areas of Lahore district have selected as a sample for this study.

Study found that majority of teachers is not satisfied with their workload, economic benefits and with the behavior of the officers of the education department. Majority is satisfied with their social status and is willing to adopt the teaching profession.

Oshagbemi (2000) reported that female faculty is found more satisfied as compared to their male counterparts, and senior teachers’ carries higher level of satisfaction than juniors. The satisfaction level is significantly related with rank and gender and insignificant with age variations.

Robbins (1996) figured while describing the relationship between performance and stress with reference to various literatures explored that performance and stress have inverted-U relationship.

Figure 1 shows that reasonably low to modest level of stress inspires the body and amplifies its capacity to response. Primarily high performance is backed by moderate stress level resulted in quick and efficient working style. However, excess from bearable capacity, the stress leads to mental distortion and low performance.

Dua (1994) stated that, in terms of job cadres, junior faculty is suffering with higher stress because of less support facilitates available to them and support staff of the universities face high stress due to their extensive involvement in clerical activities. Sim (1990) found that dissatisfy faculty pays less attention to students’ requirements, perform their task half-hearted and consequently make negative impact on students’ motivation, learning capacity, achievement rate and desire to excel. Classroom environment also found to be prominent in contributing teacher satisfaction. He further recommended that senior teachers are more optimistic as compared to their younger colleagues, and in order to make teaching an enjoyable activity, stress level of teachers has to be minimized if not eradicated.

**Theoretical framework**

**Occupational stress**

Occupational stress refers to the incapability of worker to respond to the dynamic work requirement. Work related health problems are generally caused by occupational stress and considered as one of ten leading health problems. Stress disorders have negatively affected the industry, causing loss over US$ 150 billion because of decreased productivity, absenteeism and incapability (Blix et al., 1994). By working on occupational stress, we can make substantial improvements in reducing the lost time and productivity of university faculty (Rocca & Kostanski, 2001).

Occupational stress is one of the largely discussed areas by various educationists, researchers, psychiatrists, physicians and management gurus. They have highlighted different sources and symptoms of stress faced by various professionals. Dictionary gives definitions of occupational stress as "any stimulus that disturbs or interferes with the normal physiological equilibrium of an organism" (Duke, 1990). Griffin (1990.) defined the stress as "an individual’s adaptive response or physical demands on that person and stimulus that induces stress is usually called a stressor. Stressors can be either psychological or physical".

Blix et al. (1994) in their research on “occupational stress among university teachers” found out that two third of the university faculty reported that they perceived job stress at least half of the scheduled time. Faculty also expressed burnout, health problems caused by job stress, decreased work output, low capacity to manage the work stress and basis of job change.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction can be described as a person’s common approach towards assigned task. Satisfaction indicates the
extent of people likeliness, emotional response to their job in
correspondence to actual versus deserved outcome. Number of
visible factors like remuneration, security, endorsement,
performance, work independence develops the symptoms of
satisfaction such as showing respectful attitude, feeling of self-
actualization and identification with institute (Robbins, 2001).

Allen et al. (1998) have based their study on Herzberg et al.
(1959) Motivation-Hygience Theory. Number of other scholars
recommended these theories to explore new facets of job
satisfaction and dissatisfaction of faculty members. Herzberg et
al. (1959) presented the view of two different sets of factors,
which cause job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. One set of
factor; motivators are composed of various job related elements
and other hygiene factors include different aspect related to
environment of the job. The first set of factors, called
motivators, contained components related to the job itself. The
second set of factors, called, contained elements related to the
job environment. The researchers, who have taken the
Hertzberg’s theory, also reported contrary views and empirically
disproved the philosophy of the two distinguishing factors.
Therefore, Oshagbemi (1997) reported different conclusions and
wrote; "our findings do not support Herzberg’s theory which
says that the factors that lead to job satisfaction are separate and
distinct from those that lead to job dissatisfaction. Rather, the
results of our own investigation appear to support the situational
occurrences theory, which argues that any given factor, e.g. the
work itself or salary, can result in either job satisfaction or
dissatisfaction. In effect, both hygiene’s and motivators can
contribute to job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction".

Model 01
Model 01 demonstrates relationship between occupational
stress and job satisfaction determined through the faculty of
HEC recognized universities in Pakistan. This faculty contains
different demographic characteristics which are also incorporated in the model.

![Model Diagram](image)

Research methodology
Population and sample
This study aims to analyze the relationship between
occupational stress and job satisfaction of faculty of HEC
recognized public and private universities in Pakistan. For this
purpose, the views of faculty of universities in three big cities of
Punjab are collected. The study develops an estimate of six
universities of Punjab, a province of Pakistan, comprised of
three public and three private universities. Five hundred (500)
university teachers were included in the sample, including 150
of private and 350 of public universities. Five hundred targeted
respondents were considered quite reasonable and highly
representative of the university settings. The sampling
methodology was based on geographically scattered universities
in the three cities of Punjab: Lahore, Multan and Bahawalpur.
Therefore, stratified random sampling procedure was used to
approach the sampled faculty private and public universities.

The population is primarily characterized with number of
distinguishing factors such as; institutional status, targeted
segment of student, serving approach in education, university
structure, public reputation, perceived culture and quality of
education being delivered. The above mentioned population
identities have caused us to stratify our sample into two major
groups of private and public sector universities of Punjab.
Faculties were further segregated according to discipline and
distributed over targeted sample. Moreover, it was assured that
various demographic variables i.e. gender, cadre, nature of job,
work experience, and age groups should be included in study.
The difference between stress and job satisfaction was also
measured across these demographic variables. The overall
scheme of research was designed through the extensive literature
review; consultations with experts, direction and guidance of
supervisor carried out according to recommendations of doctoral
committee, board of studies, and advanced board of studies.

Research Instrument and Pilot Testing
In order to measure job satisfaction, one mostly cited
version of Texas university instrument was taken. The
instrument is composed of 22 items related to five variables;
administrative, economic, working environment and factors
related to peer-relationship. To measure occupational stress
of university teachers, the commonly used professional life stress
scale adapted by Fontana (1989) from The British Psychological
Society and Routlegde London. The instrument of stress
includes 24 test items and constitutes an overall stress score. The
test has standardized methods as people score 01-15 falls under
“low stress”, 16-30 fall “under moderate stress”, and scores
between 31-45 are in “existent of high stress” and people
scoring 45-60 are in “serious stress” category. The both
instruments are finalized after pilot testing, ensuring validity and
reliability of scale.

The pilot run was carried out over 40 faculty members
randomly selected from private and public universities, who are
not approached in final survey. In the light of pilot survey,
various errors of language, structure, phrasing and modifications
were removed. To response the local requirements, few
modifications are made while keeping the instruments in
original form and concept. The both instruments are
standardized established reliability and validity, particularly the
job satisfaction instrument used in higher education of Pakistan.
The internal consistency of scale indicate the adequate validity
of scale as alpha score of occupational stress instrument is 0.71
and of job satisfaction scale is 0.84, which is highly satisfactory
in the perception related studies. The validity of scale was also
ensured through the eight experts’ opinion generated on the both
research instruments.

Data Collection and Statistical Analysis
For survey purpose, two instruments have been used and
data collected through professionally trained surveyors to
minimize the response biasness. From the 500-targeted sample,
310 responses of both universities private (78) and public (232)
were achieved. In further scrutinizing process, five questionnaire
were rejected due to carelessly filled up and finally 305 taken in
data analysis, which constitute 60% of response rate. The 305
number of participants in an opinion generating and perception
related research is considered highly satisfactory and adequate.
The HEC website, HEC officials, registrar of respective
universities and coordination offices were used as data sources
and faculty was sampled through their provided information.

The study uses descriptive statistics to report overall pattern
of data and underlined response and behavioral pattern of
sample in a specified situation. To investigate the significance of relationship, bivariate analysis of correlation (r) is used. The overall satisfaction score are developed into three categories based on means score and classified as high level, moderate and low level of satisfaction. Correlation between satisfaction categories and overall stress scores is also explored using bivariate analysis. The frequency distribution is tabulated to portray the overall participation of sampled respondent. To explore the relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction, the Pearson product correlation coefficient is used.

Results and discussion

Respondents profile

A total 305 university teachers from both public and private sectors participated in the study. The composition of survey participants shows in Table 01 regarding their age, gender, type of university, cadres, experiences, and nature of jobs. The statistics of respondents show that male respondents are (61%, 185) and female (39%, 120), belonging to the private sector (25%, 76) and the public sector (75%, 229). Majority of the respondents fall in the age bracket 20 to 40 years (65%). The survey includes the participation of lecturers (53%, 163), assistant professor (26%, 81), associate professors (11%, 33) and professor (9%, 28). The respondents hold experiences of up to 03 years (35%, 106), 4-12 years (39%, 118), 13-20 years (14%, 44) and above 20 years (12%, 37). The selected sample is also composed of visiting faculty (3%, 10), faculty on contact (25%, 75) and permanent: the highest proportion (72%, 305).

Overall Faculty Occupational Stress Score

The faculty’s perception towards their stress level is computed in Table 02 using accumulated scoring, directed by the author of study scale. The figures indicate moderate levels of stress (30%, 92), experienced by university teachers, which leads to majority response (67%, 206) indicating that stress is not a big problem in the environment of higher education institutions. Only (2%, 7) respondents rate stress as a real problem for them, which is negligible in the sample of 305 cases.

Weighted Scores of Job Satisfaction Factors

The satisfaction scale is composed of 4 variables and 22 items, measuring the satisfaction of faculty members of universities. The weighted scores are developed to analyze the comparative position of different variables, leading to the level of satisfaction in university teachers. That statistics show that administrative factors contribute the most in increasing the level of satisfaction. Working environment is rated as second major contribute of satisfaction, followed by peers relationship. The university faculty rates economic factor as least important variable with respect to level of satisfaction in faculty members (Table 03).

Job Satisfaction across the Items

To compute the mean scores of items studied under four variables; peer relationship, working environment, administrative and economic factors (Tables 4). The items having mean scores above one are classified into most important and equal to or below one are rated as least important contributors of satisfaction in faculty members of universities. In the case of peer relationship items, three items are likely to contribute in the university faculty satisfaction.

Among the highly contributing items are; friendly attitude of management, good working relationship and supporting attitude of colleagues. In case of working environment, highly important factors include; increasing belongingness over the period, friendly work environment, comparatively better working conditions, good flow of information, appreciating and rewarding good performance, adequate resources for task accomplishment respectively. Training and development is considered as least important for satisfaction by the faculty of universities of Pakistan. The administrative factors which highly contribute in satisfaction are encourage suggestion for improvement, promote positive attitude for complaints, encourage freedom of speech, inspiring fairness and honesty, ensure effective communication and encouraging on teamwork. The factors related to administration like observing keenly, selection on merit, making timely promotion and selection are perceived as least important in making the faculty highly satisfied. Last variable of table is economic factor, which is composed of highly contributing items like good comparative pay scale, sufficient and enough pay and least contributing like ‘pay as major source of satisfaction’ in increasing satisfaction level of faculty.

Overall Job Satisfaction Level

The statistic of overall satisfaction level, exhibited by faculty members of higher education institutions is presented in Table 19. The statistics show that 46% (141) faculty members expressed a high level of satisfaction, while 36% (109) are moderately satisfied. Only 18% (55) respondents reported a low level of satisfaction, which is significant for the attention of helm of the affairs in higher education.

Conclusions

Results indicate: a moderate level of stress is perceived by university teachers (30%, 92). University teachers (67%, 206), which leads to majority response, indicate that stress is not a big problem in the environment of higher education institutions. Only (2%, 7) respondents rate stress as a real problem for them, which is negligible in the sample of 305 cases; administrative factors contribute the most in increasing the level of satisfaction. Working environment is rated as second major contribute of satisfaction, followed by peers relationship. The university faculty rates economic factor as least important variable with respect to level of satisfaction in faculty members; faculty members 46% (141) expressed a high level of satisfaction, while 36% (109) are moderately satisfied. Only 18% (55) respondents reported a low level of satisfaction, which is significant for the attention of helm of the affairs in higher education; and insignificant relationship is found between occupational stress and job satisfaction.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to the sampled universities of Punjab province, which excludes institutions of higher education of other provinces of Pakistan and areas like federal territory, Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Quetta and Karachi. The representative sample also delimits the researcher for wide coverage of views and to the faculty members of universities only. The time and budget were among the other constraints, which limited the scope and subject coverage of the research. The universe of the research is still less documented, which may deviate to some extent from the characteristics of sampled respondents. The secondary data in the context of Pakistan, related to subject is not available, which undermines literature contribution of this perspective.

Future Research

The study attempted a detail analysis of empirical investigation and secondary research findings under limited scope, period and sample. The analysis identifies number of issues, should be researched by the academicians in future. This study has collected the views of faculty of the universities,
locate Punjab province of Pakistan. In future other provinces could be sampled in Pakistan or other countries to enhance the generalization of the findings. The management perspective also could be added along with faculty universities. The future research should also investigate the causes of low satisfaction and over stress in universities teachers. The future research also should incorporate the qualitative method of inquiry along with quantitative survey. The other scales of satisfaction and stress may reveal more significant insights of the phenomena, if used in future research.

**Recommendations and Managerial Implications**

Policy makers of universities should ensure the participation of university teachers in policy making process; should take decisions in line with the input given by faculty of university; should allocate abundant funding for research; should offer market competitive salaries packages; and should make strategies to cope with stress and dissatisfaction of faculty. Deans of universities should provide abundant research funds; should facilitate supportive and collaborative culture; should launch training for stress and time management; should launch specific training to manage the behaviors of disruptive people; should provide leisure facilities to the faculty; and should encourage involvement of faculty in decision-making.

The study also explores valued guidelines for managerial perspective along with fruitful addition in scholarly work of occupational stress and job satisfaction. There are number of practical aspects of the thesis, which can help managers to improve their administrative activities and enhance operational efficiency and effectiveness. The managers can make their performance better, while taking following into considerations:
1. Chalk out plan to manage with stress of faculty members;
2. Take preventive measures to avoid overwhelming stress;
3. Introduce relaxation training programs;
4. Discourage work assignments after scheduled times;
5. Encourage participative culture;
6. Extensive training on stress management techniques;
7. Adequate infrastructural support;
9. Ensure appropriate teaching support in audio-visual aids; and
10. Specific facilities for female and special teachers.
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### Table 01: Frequency and Percentage of Respondents’ Across Selected Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadre of job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 &amp; Above</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 02: Frequencies, Percentages and Stress Levels of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress levels</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress is not big problem</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate stress level</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress is a real problem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 03: Weighted Scores of Job Satisfaction Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peers relationship factors</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working environment factors</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator factors</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic factors</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 04
Mean Scores and Standard Deviation of Job Satisfaction across the Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relationship Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly attitude of colleagues</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working relationship</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting attitude of colleagues</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Environment Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing belongingness over the time period</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly work environment</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparatively better working conditions</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good flow of information</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating and rewarding good performance</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resource for task accomplishment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage suggestion for improvement</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote positive attitude for complaints</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage freedom of speech</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring fairness and honesty</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure effective communication</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging on team work</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observing keenly</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection on merit</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely promotion and selection</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good comparative pay scale</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient and enough pay</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay as major source of satisfaction</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** 0 = disagree  1 = undecided  2 = agree

### Table 05
Frequency and Percentage of Overall Levels of Faculty Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of satisfaction</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate level of satisfaction</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of satisfaction</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 06
Correlations between Overall Occupational Stress and Overall Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Occupational Stress</th>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>