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ABSTRACT
Job satisfaction is a universal issue and no organization of any size and sector has escape from considering Job Satisfaction. Likewise several factors have been unearthed as the determinants of Job Satisfaction. This paper presents the empirical findings on the impacts of participation and role conflict on the higher level academics in Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan. The results give significant view of the relationship between predictors and job satisfaction. There is high level of correlation as well as $R^2$ from regression analysis confirms the interdependence of the independent and criterion variables.
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INTRODUCTION
Job satisfaction is a complicated phenomenon. Several motives play their roles in the satisfaction of employees. Given the theory of motivation by Alfred Maslow (1943), as the employee's lower level motives are comparatively satisfied, he/she looks for the realization of higher level motives. Thus, the satisfaction point is lifted to upper level of motives like, status and role (Rosser, 2005). This research, therefore, attempts to observe the relationship and impact of higher level motives like, participation in decision making and mental conformity with the role or role conflict on the satisfaction of employees (university-teachers) expressed on the scale for job salience.

Researchers say, that the satisfaction of an individual receives from employment is largely dependent upon the extent to which the job and every thing associated with it meet their needs and wants (Valentine et al., 2011). Wants are continuous desires for things or condition that an individual believes will provide satisfaction (Zembylas, & Papanastasiou, 2005). There are many factors which affect job satisfaction (Beauchamp, & Thomas, 2009; Dales, 2002).

Given the view that 'job satisfaction depends on many factors', this research
aims at exploring motivation and job satisfaction in the context of knowledge workers, such as, professors of Gomal university.

**Gomal University DIKhan, PAKISTAN**

Gomal University, DIKhan was setup through an Act in 1974. Currently academic activities are performed in the Faculty of Arts, Science, Pharmacy and Agriculture. Faculty of Management and Administrative Sciences is in the offing and several new departments are about to be added.

**Job Satisfaction**

According to researchers in the organizational behavior, "an employee’s attitude about his/her job stems from a variety of aspects of job. (Beijaard et al., 2004; Bolin, 2007 and Callister, 2006). Further details of job satisfaction, job salience and job satisfaction and motivation are given in the literature review.

**Problem statement**

Employees satisfaction is based on the degree of his/her being motivated by the organizational incentives. When biological needs are comparatively met, the higher level motives begin to determine the job satisfaction of employees. This is very much true in the case of 'knowledge-workers.' This research unearths the relationship between the teachers job satisfaction with reference to the higher-level motives at Gomal University.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Research on job satisfaction is wide spread, several global principles and applications have been developed however, job satisfaction is substantively a localized or organization-related issue. Global aspects are given as under:

**Motivational Factors for Involvement**

Abraham Maslow (1943) published an article introducing a 'hierarchy of needs' which can be used to understand 'how employees are or can be motivated to work. According to Maslow's research, the motivation of a worker changes as his needs change. That is, when lower level needs have been satisfied and there is no or minimum danger of being deprived of these needs, workers look for the higher needs. Whose basic requirements (i.e., salary and pension plan) have been met, that employee looks for higher motives (i.e., friends at work or participation, job-title or status in the organization and does not satisfy with boring, routine jobs rather
those involving responsibility and challenge so that a distinction among the colleagues is achieved (Creswell, 2007; Cybulski et al., 2005; Danielson, 2007).

Out of pilot study, it was found that Gomal university teachers get handsome salaries in comparison to the same scales in many other organizations. Similarly, excluding those teachers who are working on contract basis, all the teachers have comparatively no fear of job security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Examples</th>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Organizational Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Self actualization</td>
<td>Challenging Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Job title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td>Friends at Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Pension Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>Basic Salary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 1. Maslow Hierarchy of Needs

**Job satisfaction (Job Salience)**

Usually individuals differ in their job satisfaction. Satisfaction is affected by two factors. First, individual’s value that defines what they want or desire as well as the importance of desire. Second perceptions that define how much individuals believe they are receiving the discrepancy between the desire and perceived work facts as well as the importance of facts determine the level of satisfaction (Danielson, 2007).

Eckman (2004) and Eyupoglu & Saner (2009) have suggested that performance leads to job satisfaction. They postulate that employees may derive rewards from their performance that is the source of satisfaction. An employee’s attitude about his/her job stems from a variety of aspects of job, for example, pay, promotion opportunity, supervisor’s policy, coworker, all affects employees satisfaction about their job.

Job satisfaction also stems from factors present in work environment, the supervisor style, organizational policies, procedures, work group affiliation, working conditions and fringe benefits. However there is evidence to suggest that job satisfaction is more intrinsic to the
person than to the job (Gappa & Austin, 2010; Houtte, 2006).

**Participation in Decision Making**

As said above, this research aimed at unfold the impacts on the satisfaction of teachers emanating from higher motives (upper 3 in Maslow hierarchy) particularly:

1. Participation in decision making
2. Role (Job title, Status) and Role Conflict

The idea is supported by the researchers in the fields of administration and management too. For example, Barnard (1937) writes in his book “the functions of the executive”, "participation fosters a sense of identification with the firm, a positive quality of working life and enhanced mental health as needs for autonomy, responsibility and material well being are fulfilled. Participation results in higher productivity decreased turnover and increased job satisfaction."

Likewise, (Malik, 2011; Hughe et-al. 2006 and Hurren, 2006) assert that participative decision making render following advantages:

1. Reduction in turnover, absenteeism and tardiness.
2. Reduction in number of grievances and more peaceful manager-subordinate and manager-union relations.
3. A greater readiness to change.

More recently, Luthans (2005) notes, "modern participation techniques emphasize participative decision making pushed down to the worker level in terms of empowerment and use of work groups or self managed teams." He further reports a research study, which found that informal participation has positive effect on employee’s productivity and satisfaction.

**Role Conflict**

In simple language, "role is defined as a position that has expectations evolving from established norms. Roles such as assembly line worker, clerk, supervisor, salesperson, engineer, systems analyst, vice president, chairperson, principals, vice chancellors, department head, and teachers often carry conflicting demands and expectations (Nadeem, & Abbas, 2009; Nguni, et al., 2006; Luthans, 2005 and Owens, 2004).
Pilot Study

Applied aspects of the topic were explored through a pilot study using ten questionnaires. It helped a lot in operationalizing the research variables.

Concepts & Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Brief Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job Salience (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>How far an employee is satisfied with his/her job expressed through the importance he/she attaches with the job, duties and responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participation in Decision Making</td>
<td>How do university professors evaluate their participation in decision making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>No matter what role a teacher is playing, is it the same career he/she was looking for and does the job go according to his/her wishes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 2. List of Defined Variables (working concepts)

Theoretical Framework

Figure: 1. Schematic Diagram of Theoretical Framework

Hypothesis

This research tested the following hypotheses:

1. There is POSITIVE correlation between participation in decision making and job satisfaction.

2. ROLE CONFLICT is NEGATIVELY correlated with JOB SATISFACTION.

3. Participation in Decision-Making and Role Conflict have no significant IMPACTS on JOB SATISFACTION (expressed as...
Job Salience in this research) of the teachers.

Population & Sampling

The population of this study was teaching staff of Gomal University (working in BPS-19 and above). They are 154 in total. The other detail is given in Table: 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professors (BPS-21)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Associate Professors (BPS-20)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assistant Professors (BPS-19)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 3. Population Distribution

In this study sample size was 35 which was selected according to the convenience of time available for data collection, analysis, and compilation and reporting.

Data Collection, Analysis & Interpretation

Data has been collected primarily through questionnaires that were used both at the pilot study as well as main study levels. Secondary data was also collected to identify basic variables, their operational definitions, relationships between the variables and so on. Major source of analytical data, however, were the questionnaires.

Both qualitative and quantitative analysis is used to make sense of the raw data collected from books, reports, and questionnaires. For statistical analysis of data, a data matrix was prepared.

A statistical tool, correlation and regression, has been used to TEST HYPOTHESES about the relationships/impacts between/of the two independent variables (participation in decision making and role conflict) and one dependent variable (job satisfaction).
### RESEARCH FINDINGS

#### Descriptive Statistics (Crosstabulations)

#### Gender * Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ast. Prof.</th>
<th>At. Prof.</th>
<th>Lec.</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 5

#### Gender * No of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Five</th>
<th>More than Five</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 6

#### Gender * Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
<th>10 Years</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 7
Gender * Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 8

Gender * Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 9

Hypothesis Testing

The relationships between the job salience (satisfaction) and participation in decision making and role conflict was calculated through the application of Pearson correlation analysis and regression analysis.

Testing of Hypothesis No 1.
There is POSITIVE correlation between participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction.

Participation in Decision Making = X  
Job Salience (satisfaction) = Y

\[
\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma x}{n} = \frac{124.39}{35} = 3.554
\]

\[
\bar{Y} = \frac{\Sigma y}{n} = \frac{152.27}{35} = 4.3505
\]

SD(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma dx^2}{n}} = \sqrt{\frac{31.080}{35}} = 0.9423

SD(y) = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma dy^2}{n}} = \sqrt{\frac{8.4007}{35}} = 0.4899

r = \text{Average of products}
= \frac{((SU(x)) * (SU(y)))}{n} = \frac{16.2748}{35}
= 0.4649
The above results show that greater the participation in decision making, higher is the job satisfaction resulting into higher scores on job salience. These results give a detailed view of the correlations between the two variables alongwith results from the application of correlation analysis. The result is 0.46 (positive)

SO  →  There is POSITIVE correlation between PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING and JOB SALIENCE (job satisfaction).
Thus, 1st Hypothesis is substantiated and accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis No. 2

ROLE CONFLICT is NEGATIVELY correlated with JOB SATISFACTION.
Role conflict is something that relates more to the person than to the organization. No matter what is the source of role conflict, it ends up with disturbance in the mind of a teacher thereby creating a conflict between the inside and outside of the person. So greater the score on ROLE CONFLICT, lower is the job satisfaction, below calculations prove this hypothesis. The results is -0.46

Role Conflict  = X
Job Salience (satisfaction)  = Y

\[
\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma x}{n} = \frac{124.35}{35} = 3.55
\]

\[
\bar{Y} = \frac{\Sigma y}{n} = \frac{152.27}{35} = 4.3505
\]

\[
SD(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma dx^2}{n}} = \sqrt{\frac{0.4923}{35}} = 0.5475
\]

\[
SD(y) = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma dy^2}{n}} = \sqrt{\frac{8.4007}{35}} = 0.4899
\]

\[
r = \frac{\text{Average of products}}{\frac{((SU(x)) \times (SU(y)))}{n}} = \frac{-16.1432}{35} = -0.4612
\]

SO  →  There is NEGATIVE correlation between ROLE CONFLICT and JOB SALIENCE (job satisfaction).
That is, the higher scores in role conflict have lower scores in job satisfaction and vice versa. Thus, HYPOTHESIS 2 is also proved correct and substantiated.

Testing of Hypothesis No. 3

The 3rd hypothesis is that “Participation in Decision-Making and Role Conflict have no significant IMPACTS on the JOB SATISFACTION (expressed as Job Salience in this research) of the teachers.”
Regression analysis is done to know the influence of $X_1$, $X_2$ over $Y$, where

Job Salience (satisfaction) = $Y$
Participation in Decision Making = $X_1$
Role Conflict = $X_2$

To calculate the regression all computations were done according to Simple Regression

Model: $Y = \hat{\lambda} + \hat{\beta}_{1} X_1 + \hat{\beta}_{2} X_2 + \epsilon_i$

Where $\epsilon = \text{Residual Term} = Y - \hat{Y}$

LS Regression Estimate: $\hat{Y} = \hat{\lambda} + \hat{\beta}_{1} X_1 + \hat{\beta}_{2} X_2$

where $\hat{\lambda} = Y - \bar{\beta}_{1} \bar{X_1} - \bar{\beta}_{2} \bar{X_2}$

and $\hat{\beta}_{1} = \frac{(\Sigma X_1 \bar{y}) (\Sigma X_2^2) - (\Sigma X_2 \bar{y}) (\Sigma X_1 \bar{x_2})}{(\Sigma X_1^2) (\Sigma X_2^2) - (\Sigma X_1 \bar{x_2})^2}$

$\hat{\beta}_{2} = \frac{(\Sigma X_2 \bar{y}) (\Sigma X_1^2) - (\Sigma X_1 \bar{y}) (\Sigma X_1 \bar{x_2})}{(\Sigma X_1^2) (\Sigma X_2^2) - (\Sigma X_1 \bar{x_2})^2}$

After computing the variables and calculating their arithmetic means and sum following results were obtained:

$\hat{\beta}_{1} = 0.52$
$\hat{\beta}_{2} = 0.66$
$\hat{\lambda} = 0.64$

Thus, Least Square Regression Estimate is: $\hat{Y} = \hat{\lambda} + \hat{\beta}_{1} \bar{X_1} + \hat{\beta}_{2} \bar{X_2}$

$\hat{Y} = 0.06 + 0.52 X_1 + 0.66 X_2$

This reflects that job satisfaction depends on participation in decision making and role conflicts. However, to test the significance we carryout the test of regression as given below:

Total Residual or Error: $\text{SST} = \Sigma(y_i - \bar{y})^2 = \Sigma y^2 - n \bar{y}^2 = 131.28 - 13(3.12)^2 = 4.73$

Where $\text{SSE} = \Sigma(y_i - \hat{y}_i) = \Sigma y^2 - \hat{\lambda} \Sigma y - \hat{\beta}_{1} \Sigma x_1 y - \hat{\beta}_{2} \Sigma x_2 y$

$\text{SSE} = 184.18 - (0.64)(79.56) - (0.52)(285.46) - (0.66)(255.87) = 4.02$

So, $\text{SSE} = 184.18 - (0.64)(79.56) - (0.52)(285.46) - (0.66)(255.87) = 4.02$

and Regression $\text{SSR} = \text{SST} - \text{SSE} = 4.73 - 4.02 = 0.71$
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**ANOVA TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOV</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SSR = 0.56</td>
<td>MSR = SSR/2 = 0.71/2 = 0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>SSE = 4.02</td>
<td>MSE = SSE/32 = 4.02/32 = 0.13</td>
<td>( F = \frac{MSR}{MSE} = \frac{0.35}{0.13} = 2.73 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>SST = 4.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 10

While

1. \( H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0 \) i.e. non of the repressors is significant
2. \( \nu s \)
3. \( H_1: \) at least one of the \( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \) is not zero
4. \( \lambda = 0.01 \) (i.e. Level of significance = 1%)
5. Test Statistic \( F = \frac{MSR}{MSE} = 2.73 \)
6. \( CR: \) Reject \( H_0 \) if \( F_{Cal} \geq F_{(.01, 2, 32)} = 5.39 \) (taken from the table of \( F \)-distribution), as \( 2.73 < 5.18 \)
7. P-value: In this case, \( F = 2.73 \) (0.35/0.13), since \( F \) value is significant at the 0.01. As calculated \( F \) value 2.73 is greater than the tabulated \( F \) value 2.44, so \( H_0 \) is not substantiated and rejected while \( H_A \) is accepted, this means that Participation in Decision Making and Role Conflict have significant impacts on Job Satisfaction.

**Summary of the Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>HYPOTHESES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participation in Decision Making is POSITIVELY correlated with the Job Satisfaction.</td>
<td>Proved CORRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Role Conflict is NEGATIVELY correlated with Job Satisfaction.</td>
<td>Proved CORRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participation in Decision-Making and Role Conflict have no significant IMPACTS on JOB SATISFACTION (expressed as Job Salience in this research) of the teachers.</td>
<td>NOT SUBSTANTIATED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 12. Results of Hypothesis Testing
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

Conclusions
The research findings indicate that majority of respondents are of the view that both variables ‘participation in decision making’ and ‘role conflict’ have impacts on job satisfaction. Moreover the finding show that participation in decision making is positively correlated with job satisfaction and second variable role conflict is negatively correlated with job satisfaction. In light of above paragraph, it is inferred that participation in decision making and role conflict has significant impacts on job satisfaction of Gomalian teachers.

There are many factors which have impact on job satisfaction of teachers, but in this case of Gomal University, researchers tested only two high level factors, of job satisfaction i.e. participation in decision making and role conflict. So on the basis of collected facts and figure, researchers conclude that if given an opportunity to teachers to participate in decision making, they feel some pleasure and the degree of their job satisfaction increases. Moreover, if the system of decision making is autocratic and there is no consultation with teachers then it decreases the degree of job satisfaction of teachers. This means that participation in decision making is a high level factor of job satisfaction, and it has impacts on job satisfaction, similarly role conflict is also a high level factor of job satisfaction.

When teacher dislikes more aspects of job and likes very little, there is role conflict. And on the basis of collected facts and figure we can conclude that if role conflict increases the job satisfaction decreases and when role conflict decreases the job satisfaction increases. It means that there is negative correlation between role conflict and job satisfaction. This study proves that when the degree of participation by teachers in decision making increases, the job satisfaction also increases and when participation decreases the job satisfaction of teachers’ also goes down. It means that there is positive correlation between participation in decision making and job satisfaction.

Recommendations
Following recommendations have been made by the respondents to increase the degree of job satisfaction of the university teachers.

1. Consultative and participative approach
should be adopted by the university high-ups in decision making and teachers should be given an opportunity to participate.

2. There is need to make compatible policies and guideline for teachers.

3. To create good and friendly environment, the authorized officers should try to minimize the role conflict of teachers.
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