

# Job Satisfaction as a Mediator in the Relationship between Job Factors and Organizational Commitment: A Study of B-School Teachers

Gunjan Mohan Sharma\*  
Dr. Feza Tabassum Azmi\*\*

## Abstract

The paper examines the mediating effect of job satisfaction between job factors (pay, promotion opportunities, supervision & work-schedule flexibility) and organizational commitment. In all 310 responses were generated from teachers of management institutes located in India through a self-administered questionnaire. SEM in LISREL was used to analyze data. Path analysis of the structural model revealed that pay satisfaction and work-schedule flexibility have a positive relationship with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Satisfaction with supervision was positively correlated to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was found to be a strong mediator in the relationship between job related factors and organizational commitment. The study is unique in the sense that it is conducted in the context of management institutes in India. Keeping in mind the fact that there is acute shortage of teaching staff in management institutes in India, the present study is both relevant and purposeful.

## Introduction

Employee commitment is seen as an important organizational dynamic because high levels of commitment lead to favorable organizational outcomes. Research studies have provided evidence of a positive correlation between organizational commitment and job performance (e.g., Meyer et al., 1989). Meta analyses indicate that commitment is positively related to job satisfaction (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005), motivation (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), and organizational citizenship behaviors (Riketta, 2002). At the same time, commitment has been negatively related to turnover (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005), absenteeism (Farrell & Stamm, 1988) and counterproductive behavior (Dalal, 2005).

While there have been many proposed antecedents to organizational commitment, job satisfaction has, perhaps, received more attention than other precursors of organizational commitment (Babakus et al., 1999). Boles et al (2007) indicate that job satisfaction is strongly related to organizational

\*Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Studies and Research, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh (UP) INDIA

\*\*Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh (UP) INDIA

Authors are grateful to the anonymous referees for comments and suggestions for improving the text and contents of the paper. Authors alone are responsible for any errors/mistakes still remaining in the paper.

commitment. Higher commitment among special educators has been strongly associated with higher levels of job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Gersten et al., 2001; Littrell et al., 1994). Commitment is also believed to be positively influenced by promotion opportunities (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006; Gaertner & Nollen, 1989), supportive and considerate leadership (DeCottis & Summers, 1987), supervision, pay and working conditions (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006).

The focus of the present study is to identify the antecedents of organizational commitment among B-schools teachers in India. Fostering organizational commitment among academic staff is of paramount importance because employees that are highly committed stay longer, perform better, miss less work, and engage in organizational citizenship behaviors (Meyer et al., 1989; Riketta, 2002). Teachers who are committed to their work place are likely to put more effort as compared to teachers with low levels of commitment (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006). Moreover, high turnover among teachers, especially when good teachers quit, can have been a cost for the education system.

## Literature Review

Research into teacher commitment and satisfaction is becoming more and more important given not only that a growing number of teachers leave the profession but also that dissatisfaction and low commitment are associated with decreased productivity (Tshannen-Moran et al., 1998). Over the last few decades, many studies have attempted to explore issues related to teachers' commitment (e.g. Chughtai & Zafar, 2006; Lam & Zhang, 2003; Riketta, 2002) and job satisfaction (e.g., Farber, 1991; Friedman & Farber, 1992; Kyriacou, 1987; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979; Lawler, 1973; Mykletun, 1984). Teacher dissatisfaction appears to be the main factor in teachers' decreased commitment and loyalty resulting in teachers leaving the profession (Huberman, 1993; Woods et al., 1997). Decline in teachers' job satisfaction can lead to increased absenteeism and high levels of claims for stress-related disability (Farber, 1991; Troman & Woods, 2000).

Locke (1976, cited in Sempene 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 (Miller et al., 2009). Among the various dimensions of job are pay, promotion, work-schedule 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 & Ilgen, 1985, p. 309).

A number of studies have identified the role of job related dimensions like pay, supervision, promotion, co workers and environment on job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Jaramillo et al., 2005; Liu & Meyer, 2005; Saif-ud-Din et al., 2010 etc.). Job satisfaction is also found to be positively related to pay practice, promotion opportunities, quality of one's relationship with their supervisor and quality of work life (Mudor & Tooksoon, 2011) whereas commitment has been positively related to promotion opportunities (Gaertner & Nollen, 1989), supportive and considerate leadership (DeCottis & Summers, 1987), supervision and pay (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006)

## Job Factors, Job Satisfaction & Commitment

Voydanoff (1980) has shown that monetary compensation is one of the most significant variables in explaining 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). Hamermesh (2001) found that changes in compensation have concomitant impact on job satisfaction of employees. Lamberti et al. (2001) found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction. 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 (Aamodt, 1999; Landy, 1989; Robbins, 1998). According to Robbins et al. (2003), when pay is perceived as equitable, satisfaction is likely to be the result. A number of studies suggest that higher wages reduce teachers' quit propensity (Brewer, 1996; Gritz & Theobald, 1996; Murnane & Olsen 1989; Theobald, 1990).

Chase (1971) revealed that teachers felt salary increases might lead to job satisfaction. Caldwell (1990) suggests that commitment is largely determined by the rewards offered by the organization, particularly financial rewards. Theobald (1990) found that salaries are positively related to decisions to continue teaching, indicating organizational commitment. McElroy (2001) as well as Lam and Zhang (2003) found that compensation is related to satisfaction and commitment of employees. Crewson (1997), Liu and Meyer (2005) and Azeem (2010) have all shown that pay satisfaction have a positive relationship with organizational commitment.

There is strong evidence about the existence of a positive relationship between promotion opportunity and organizational commitment (Jaramillo et al., 2005). 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 & Veum, 1999; Peterson et al., 2003; Sclafane, 1999). An employee's opportunities for promotion are also likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Vecchio, 1988). According to McCormick and Ilgen (1985), employees' satisfaction with promotional opportunities will include the probability that employees will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions. This view is supported in a study conducted by Ellickson and Logsdon (2002). Opportunities for promotion appear to have a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction (Tolbert & Moen, 1998). Drafke and Kossen (2002) postulate that many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are good. 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. Kreitner and Kinicki (1992) however, state that the positive relationship between promotion and job satisfaction is dependent on perceived equity by employees. Azeem (2010) found a positive correlation between satisfaction with promotion opportunities and organizational commitment. This view is supported by Gaertner and Nollen (1989).

Satisfaction with supervision is also positively related to organizational commitment (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006; Robinson et al., 1998). Literature supports the existence of positive

relationship between satisfaction with supervision and organizational commitment (Jaramillo et al., 2005). Research also 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 (Robbins et al., 2003). According to Ramsey (1997), supervisors contribute to high or low morale in the workplace. The supervisor's attitude and behavior may also be a contributing factor to job-related complaints (Sherman & Bohlander, 1992). Supervisors with high relationship behavior strongly impact employee job satisfaction (Graham & Messner, 1998). Wech (2002) supports this view. A study conducted by Packard and Kauppi (1999) found that employees with supervisors displaying democratic management styles experienced higher levels of job satisfaction. Brewer and Hensher (1998) contend that supervisors whose leadership styles emphasize consideration and concern generally have more satisfied workers. Bassett (1994) too supports this. Job satisfaction has been linked to quality of supervision received by others too (Amey, 2002; Arminio & Creamer, 2001; Schneider, 2005). Bradford (1981) also found that inadequate leadership/supervision contributes to teachers' job dissatisfaction.

Further, work flexibility as a job related factor has also been studied in relation to commitment and job satisfaction (Baltes et al., 1999). De Carufel and Schaan (1990) showed that implementation of alternative work schedules reduced absenteeism, while increasing employee job satisfaction. An emerging definition of work flexibility (Kossek & Van Dyne, 2008) subdivides this concept into duration, timing, and place flexibility. 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 & Lankau, 1997). Aryee (1993) 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. Aryee et al. (1998) found a significant positive correlation between satisfaction with work flexibility and organizational commitment. Employees who perceived more flexibility within their organization reported higher levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Scandura & Lankau, 1997).

Based on the above discussion, the following study hypotheses were derived:

- H1: Pay Satisfaction has a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction
- H2: Pay Satisfaction has a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment
- H3: Satisfaction with promotion opportunities has a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction
- H4: Satisfaction with promotion opportunities has a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment
- H5: Satisfaction with supervision has a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction
- H6: Satisfaction with supervision has a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment
- H7: Satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility has a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction
- H8: Satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility has a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment

## Relationship of Job Satisfaction with Commitment

The topic of job satisfaction and organizational commitment are important issues because of both reflecting a positive evaluation of the job (Udo et al., 1997). Higher commitment among special educators has also been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Gersten et al., 2001; Littrell et al., 1994). If the employee does not feel satisfied with the job, he will blame the organization and thus possess a lower commitment to the job (Ahuja et al., 2002). Some researchers have established a relationship between satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover (Bluedorn, 1982).

Many past studies have reported a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Fu et al., 2009; Van Dam, 2005). Specifically, job satisfaction is found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment (Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Gaertner, 1999; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). This leads to the following hypotheses of the study:

- H9: Job Satisfaction has a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment
- H10: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between pay satisfaction and organizational commitment
- H11: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility and organizational commitment
- H12: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between satisfaction with supervision and organizational commitment
- H13: Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between satisfaction with promotion opportunities and organizational commitment

## Objectives of the Study

Although a great deal has been written about organizational commitment and job satisfaction, Mudor and Tooksoon (2011), in their recent study, demonstrated the need of studying job satisfaction and related dimensions in the context of knowledge workers. It is worthwhile in the sense that 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). Though, teacher job satisfaction has been the focus of research agenda in various developing countries for a long time (Sirima & Poipoi, 2010), there is no clear understanding on how the factors purported to be associated with organizational commitment contribute to its development or how these organizational factors can be managed to promote the development of same (Beck & Wilson, 2001). 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 this regard, identification of teachers' job satisfaction level is important (Demirtaú, 2010).

The importance of teachers' roles cannot be ignored in high quality education of manpower; in fact, fostering organizational commitment among faculty members has important consequences and implications for educational institutions (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006). National Knowledge Commission (2006-2009) in its 'Report to the Nation' has clearly stated that the

demand for management education has risen sharply in India (Agarwala, 1995) 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 & Ramachandran, 2008). In India, very little is known as to how far the teachers are satisfied and committed in their jobs (Mistry, 2010). Therefore, the understanding of factors affecting teachers' satisfaction and commitment at the workplace is of paramount importance for a successful educational system (Sharma & Jyoti, 2009).

Thus, the main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of job related factors with organizational commitment of teachers. While studying the indirect effect of job related factors on organizational commitment, the mediating role and effect of job satisfaction was also assessed. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of teachers was also unearthed in the study.

The study is concerned with providing insights into the dynamics of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among teachers of Indian B-schools. The results can provide inputs to B-schools to handle issues related to teachers' turnover which is seen as a serious problem in the context. Although job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been researched a lot in the past, the researcher has not across any published research study specifically on these aspects in the context of B-schools teachers in India. The objectives of the study were thus, to investigate the relationship between job factors (viz. pay satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion opportunities, satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility) with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and also to examine the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between job factors and organizational commitment.

## Measures of the Study

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 and dependent variable were identified.

### Independent Variables: Job related factors

Locke (1976, cited in Sempene et al., 2002) comes up with a summary of job related dimensions that have been established to contribute significantly to employees' job satisfaction and commitment. Among the various dimensions are work itself, pay, promotion and supervision (Luthans, 1998; Mudor & Tooksoon, 2011).

**Pay Satisfaction (PS):** Pay satisfaction was measured with an adapted version of a 6-item scale developed by Spector (1994). Some of the questions in the original scale were reworded to fit in the requirements of the present study. 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). Some of the questions in the original scale were reworded to fit in the requirements of the present study. 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). Some of the questions in the original scale were reworded to fit in the requirements of the present study. 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: Organizational Commitment (OC)

Commitment was measured with an adapted version of a 6-item scale. The items were derived from Lincoln and Kallerberg's (1996) study on work commitment. A sample item is "I feel loyal to this institute".

### Mediating Variable: Job Satisfaction (JS)

On the basis of suggestions by previous researchers (e.g. Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Fu et al., 2009; Van Dam, 2005), the present research model assumes a mediating variable in the link between job related factors and organizational commitment i.e. job satisfaction.

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".

To measure the variables, 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 (e.g. Ali, 2007; Budhwar & Sparrow, 1997; Carmeli, 2004; Jabnoun & Fook, 2001; Karakus & Aslan, 2008; Koustelios, 2001). Content and face validity of the research instrument was also carried out during this stage.

## Research Methodology

The present study is descriptive and based on single cross-sectional research design. B-schools based in the state of Uttar Pradesh (UP) and NCR (Delhi) region were covered. The demand and number of B-schools offering degree courses in management education has risen gradually in this region and they are now rightly considered as important and major contributors in providing management education in India.

Lists of B-Schools having AICTE (All India Council for Technical Education) 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. 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. 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). 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.

### Analysis of Findings

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.

### Measurement Model: Unidimensionality, Reliability and Validity

Specifying the measurement model consist of assigning indicators to a latent variable or construct (Garver & 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 & Gerbing, 1991; Steenkamp & Trijp, 1991).

**Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA):** Each of the five constructs was subjected to 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 in each run. As a result, only four items in the SU scale were retained which gave a unidimensional scale.

**Indicator and Scale Reliability:** Scales were statistically measured for indicator reliability and scale reliability. By convention, indicator reliability should preferably be 0.5 or closer (Long, 1983; Schumacker & Lomax, 2004; Wu, 2005). As can be seen from Table 1, it can be concluded that the indicator reliability for indicators in each scale was satisfactory.

Scale reliability is operationalized as internal consistency, which is the degree of inter-correlations among the items that constitute the scale (Nunnally & 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 & Bernstein, 1994). Apart from Cronbach's alpha, SEM-based Construct-Reliability (CR) and Average Variance-Extracted (AVE) measures for scale reliability were also estimated as suggested by Garver and Mentzer (1999). 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 & Larcker, 1981). The Cronbach alpha, CR and AVE values are given in Table 2. All values suggest high scale reliability.

**Convergent and Discriminant Validity:** A scale has validity if it measuring the concept that it was intended to measure (Bagozzi, 1981; Malhotra & Dash, 2011). Since unidimensionality and reliability have been established, the next step involves assessing validity. Various forms of construct validity i.e. convergent, discriminant and predictive were assessed. 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, as suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). Ahire et al. (1996), Green et al. (2006) recommended assessing convergent validity using the Bentler-Bonett (1980) coefficient with values greater than 0.9 indicating strong convergent validity. In the present case, all the scales have t-values well above the required minimum of 2 and Bentler-Bonett coefficient (i.e. NFI and NNFI) of greater than 0.9 as given in Table 3, thus indicative of high convergent validity.

Fornell and Larcker (1981) present a method for assessing the discriminant validity of two or more factors by comparing 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 exist for all the scales.

### Structural Equation Model

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 fit indices exceeded the recommended values, indicating a good fit. The relative chi-square/degree of freedom of 1.92 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 Exhibit 1

Pay satisfaction had a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction as indicated by the path from PS to TS ( $\beta=0.47$ ). Thus hypothesis H1 was not rejected.

Pay satisfaction had a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment as indicated by the path from PS to OC ( $\beta=0.17$ ). Thus hypothesis H2 was not rejected.

Satisfaction with promotion opportunities did not have a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction as indicated by the non-significant path from PR to TS ( $\beta = -0.25$ ). Thus hypothesis H3 was rejected.

Satisfaction with promotion opportunities did not have a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment as indicated by the non-significant path from PR to OC ( $\beta = -0.12$ ). Thus hypothesis H4 was rejected.

Satisfaction with supervision had a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction as indicated by the significant path from SU to TS ( $\beta = 0.27$ ). Thus hypothesis H5 was not rejected.

Satisfaction with supervision did not have a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment as indicated by the non-significant path from SU to OC ( $\beta = -0.15$ ). Thus hypothesis H6 was rejected.

Satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility had a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction as indicated by the significant path from WSF to TS ( $\beta = 0.40$ ). Thus hypothesis H7 was not rejected.

Satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility had a direct and positive relationship with organizational commitment as indicated by the significant path from WSF to OC ( $\beta = 0.08$ ). Thus hypothesis H8 was not rejected.

### Criterion Validity

Criterion validity is a measure of how well scales representing the various independent (predictor) variables are related to measures of dependent (criteria) variable. The relationship between independent and dependent variables in the present study, as assessed by SEM, have already been discussed at length above. The results of hypotheses testing provide sufficient evidence towards criterion-validity.

### Mediation Analysis

Mediation analysis was conducted to test the effect of job satisfaction (TS) as a mediator in the relationships between various job related factors (PS, PR, SU & WSF) and organizational commitment (OC) respectively.

Mediation exists if the coefficient of the direct path between the independent variable and the dependent variable is reduced when the indirect path via the mediator is introduced into the model (Bontis et al., 2007). The indirect effect can be estimated by the product of direct effect ( $\beta$  value) of independent variable on mediator variable and direct effect of mediator variable on dependent variable. (Cheung, 2007; Cheung, 2009; MacKinnon, 2000). For example, the indirect effect of PS on OC via TS was obtained by multiplying the direct effects ( $\beta$  value) of PS on TS and TS on OC respectively.

The direct and indirect effects of each of the independent variable on the dependent variable was calculated individually and the results are provided in Table 6.

Job Satisfaction had a direct and positive impact on organizational commitment as indicated by the path from TS to OC ( $\beta = 1.03$ ). Thus hypothesis H9 was not rejected.

The role of job satisfaction as a mediator in the relationship between pay satisfaction and organizational commitment was examined. Table 6 shows that the standardized beta of the direct path from PS to OC was 0.17 and 0.48 after job satisfaction was introduced as a mediator. Thus, hypothesis H10 was not rejected. Job satisfaction partially mediated the relationship between satisfaction with promotion opportunities and organizational commitment as the standardized beta of the direct path from PR to OC was -0.12 and -0.25 after job satisfaction was introduced as a mediator. As far as the relationship between supervision and commitment was concerned, the standardized beta of the direct path which was -0.15 changed to 0.27 after job satisfaction was introduced as a mediator. Thus, hypothesis H12 was not rejected. Further, the standardized beta of the direct path from WSF to OC was 0.08. It was 0.41 after job satisfaction was introduced as a mediator. Thus, job satisfaction was found to be a strong mediator in the relationship between satisfaction with work-schedule and commitment. Thus, hypothesis H13 was not rejected.

Therefore, it can be safely concluded that findings supported the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship between job related factors and organizational commitment.

### Findings and Discussions

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

Study finding suggesting that satisfaction with promotion opportunities do not have a direct and positive relationship with job satisfaction is inconsistent with the findings of Ellickson and Logsdon (2002), Oshagbemi (1997), Pergamit and Veum (1999), Peterson et al., (2003) and Sclafane (1999) where satisfaction with promotion opportunities is directly linked with job satisfaction. Satisfaction with promotion opportunities was not found to be an important factor influencing overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment of teachers. This could be because of the reason that in most Indian management institutes, promotion is normally granted after a certain period of service and is not linked directly with performance as is seen in the corporate sector.

As illustrated in the Exhibit 1, it was found that pay satisfaction and work-schedule flexibility had a significant, direct and positive impact on organizational commitment. The findings of the study corroborate with earlier researches on the relationship of pay satisfaction with organizational commitment (Azeem,

2010; Crewson, 1997; Lam & Zhang, 2003) as well as relationship between satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility and organizational commitment (Aryee et al., 1998; Scandura & Lankau, 1997). Job satisfaction had a significant, direct and positive impact on organizational commitment. Previous researches have also come up with the same findings (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Gersten et al., 2001; Littrell et al., 1994).

The study findings reflect the positive association of job related factors with organizational commitment and job satisfaction of teachers in a manner that has clear potential for implications in policy and practice. What is now required is serious consideration of how this understanding may be meaningfully applied. Unfortunately, teacher satisfaction and commitment are often the critically ignored factors in education policy-making. Teachers come to work with strong values and beliefs that constitute, in the aggregate, a set of commitment norms that may significantly benefit not only the educational institute but its students as well. Therefore, an objective of any management institute should be to continuously reassess the work environment and lay a conscious emphasis on job related factors in a manner that may influence teachers' decisions and behavioral outcomes related to, for example, quitting, self-determined involvement in teamwork, and school management—all of which have significant implications for B-schools and students.

Although the impact of organizational commitment on other organizational outcomes such as absenteeism and teacher turnover was not examined in this study, previous researches has indicated that employee turnover is negatively related with commitment (Addae et al, 2006; Pare & Tremblay, 2007; Zhao et al., 2007). Therefore, in light of this evidence, it can be argued that highly committed faculty members would have a stronger desire to come to work and make a positive contribution to their respective institutions. Thus, it can be concluded that B-schools which seek to retain their faculty members by building strong organizational commitment are in a better position to reap the benefits of a more dedicated, motivated, and reliable teaching staff.

### Limitations and Future Directions

Although efforts were made to carry on a research that was theoretically and empirically sound, the study does suffer from a 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.

Such research could provide further insight into the nature of teacher job satisfaction and organizational commitment, both generally and particularly in the context of developing countries. Factors that transform teachers' perceptions from satisfaction to

dissatisfaction over time, especially in the context of developing countries can be explored. The relationships of job related factors and organizational commitment with various behavioral outcomes also needs to be explored by future researchers; while studies should also be conducted to test similar relationships in the context of other industries too.

### References

1. Aamodt, M.G. "Applied Industrial/Organisational Psychology Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company Administrators. (1999)
2. Addae H M, Parboteeah K. P, Davis E. E. "An examination of the moderating effects of psychological contract breach in Trinidad and Tobago". *International journal of organizational analysis*, 14 (3), 225-238. (2006)
3. Agarwala, P.N. "Trends in management education", *The Economic Times*, 14 November, p. 7. (1995)
4. Ahire, S., Golhar, D. and Waller, M. "Development and validation of TQM implementation constructs". *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 23-56. (1996)
5. Ahuja, M., Katherine, M., George, J.F., Kacmar, C., & McKnight, H. "Overworked and isolated? Predicting the effect of work-family conflict, autonomy, and workload on organizational commitment and turnover virtual workers". *Proceeding of the 35th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. (2001)
6. Akhtar, I., Muniruddin, G. & Sogra, K.J. "A trend Analysis of faculty turnover at the private universities in Bangladesh: A business school perspective". *Journal of Business Studies*, Vol, IV, No 1. (2008)
7. Ali, N. "Factors Affecting Overall Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention". *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, Volume II, Number 2. (2007)
8. Amey, M. J.. "Unwritten rules: Organizational and political realities of the job". (2002)
9. Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. "Predicting the performance of measures in a confirmatory factor analysis with a pretest assessment of their substantive validities". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 732-740. (1991)
10. Anderson, J.C. and Gerbing, D.W. "Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach". *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 103 No. 3, pp. 411-23. (1988)
11. Arminio, J., & Creamer, D. G. "What supervisors say about quality supervision". *College Student Affairs Journal*, 21(1), 35-44. (2001)
12. Arora, R., Hartman, R.I. and Stoner, C.R. "Work-home role conflict in female owners of small business: an exploratory study". *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 30-38. (1990)
13. Aryee, S. "Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among married professional women: evidence from Singapore". *Human Relations*, Vol. 45 No. 8. 1982
14. Aryee, S., Luk, V. and Stone, R. "Family-responsive variables and retention-relevant outcomes among employed parents". *Human Relations*, Vol. 51 No. 1, pp. 73-87. (1998)
15. Azeem, S. M. "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Employees in the Sultanate of Oman". *Psychology*, 1, 295-299. (2010)
16. Babakus, E., Cravens, D.W., Johnston, M. and Moncrief, W.C. "The role of emotional exhaustion in sales force attitude and behavior relationships". *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 58-70. (1999)

17. Bagozzi, R.P.. "An examination of the validity of two models of attitude". *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 18, pp. 133-45. (1981)
18. Baltes, B.B., Briggs, T.E., Huff, J.W., Wright, J.A., & Neuman, G.A. "Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 496-513. (1999)
19. Bassett, G . "The case against job satisfaction" [Electronic version], *Business Source Premier*, 37(3), 61-68. (1994)
20. Beck, K. & Wilson, C. "Have we studied, should we study, and can we study the development of commitment? Methodological issues and the developmental study of work related commitment". *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol.11, pp. 257-278. (2001)
21. Billingsley, B.S., & Cross, L.H. "Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in teaching: A comparison of general and special educators". *Journal of Special Education*, 25(4), 453-472. (1992)
22. Bluedorn, A.C. A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human relations*. Vol.35. (1993)
23. Boles, James, Ramana, Madupalli, Brian, Rutherford & John Andy Wood. "The relationship of facets of salesperson job satisfaction with affective organizational commitment". *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 22/5, pp. 311-321. (2007)
24. Bontis, N, Booker, L.D. & Serenko, A. "The mediating effect of organizational reputation on customer loyalty and service recommendation in the banking industry". *Management Decision*, Vol. 45 No. 9, pp. 1426-1445. (2007)
25. Bradford, J. S.B. "An investigation into job satisfaction among teachers within eastern Baton Rouge parish system". *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 41, p. 3793. (1981)
26. Brewer, A.M., & Hensher, D.A. "The importance of organizational commitment in managing change". *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 38, 117-130. (1998)
27. Brown, S. and R. A. Peterson. "Antecedents and Consequences of salesperson Job Satisfaction: Meta-Analysis and Assessment of Causal Effect". *Journal of Marketing Research*. 30 (1): 63-77. (1993)
28. Budhwar, P.S. and Sparrow, P.R. "Evaluating levels of strategic integration and devolvement of human resource management in India". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 476-94. (1997)
29. Caldwell, D.F. "Building organizational commitment: a multi-firm study". *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 63, 245-261. (1990)
30. Carmeli, A., & Freund, A. "Work commitment, job satisfaction and job performance: An empirical investigation". *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*. (2004)
31. Ch'ng, H.K., Chong, W.K. and Nakesvari. "The Satisfaction Level of Penang Private Colleges Lecturers". *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, Vol. 1, No. 2. (2010)
32. Chase, F. S. "Factors for satisfaction in teaching". *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 33 Nov. pp. 127-132. (1971)
33. Cheung, M.W.L. "Comparison of approaches to constructing confidence intervals for mediating effects using structural equation models". *Structural Equation Modeling*, 14, 227-246. (complete data, syntax and output). (2007)
34. Cheung, M.W.L. "Comparison of methods for constructing confidence intervals of standardized indirect effects". *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 425-438. (PDF file) (complete data, syntax and output) (2009)
35. Chughtai, Aamir Ali & Zafar, Sohail.. "Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment Among Pakistani University Teachers". *Applied H.R.M. Research*, Volume 11, Number 1, pages 39-64. (2006)
36. Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. "The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework". *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(2), 241-259. (2005)
37. Crewson, P. E. "Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect". *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 7 pp.499-518. (1997)
38. Cross, L. H., & Billingsley, B. "Testing a model of special educators' intent to stay in teaching". *Exceptional Children*, 60(5), 411-421. (1994)
39. Dailey, R. C., Kirk, D. J. "Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover". *Human Relations*, 45 (3), 305-318. 1992
40. Dalal, R. S. "A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255. (2005)
41. DeCarufel, A., Schaan, J.-L., "The impact of compressed workweeks on police job involvement", *Canadian Police College Journal*, 14(2), 81-97. (1990)
42. DeCotiis, T. A., & Summers, T. P. 'A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment". *Human Relations*, 40(7), 445-470. (1987)
43. Demirtaú, Zülfü. "Teachers' job satisfaction levels". *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1069-1073. (2010)
44. Doctor, Gayatri and Ramchandran, Smitha.D. "Space@IBSA: knowledge sharing in a management institute". *VINE: The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 42-52. (2008)
45. Drafke, M.W., & Kossen, S. "The human side of organizations" (8th edition). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. Economics, 14(2), 313-339. (2002)
46. Ellickson. M.C., & Logsdon, K. "Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees". [Electronic version]. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(3), 343-358. (2002)
47. Farber, B. A. "Crisis in Education: Stress and Burnout in the American Teacher". Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. (1991)
48. Farrel, D., & Stamm, C. L. (1988). "Meta-analysis of the correlates of employee absence". *Human Relations*, 41, 211-227.
49. Fornell, C. and D. Larcker. "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error". *Journal of Marketing Research* (18)1, pp. 39-50. (1981)
50. Fornell, C. and F. L. Bookstein. "Two Structural Equation Models: LISREL and PLS Applied to Consumer Exit-Voice Theory". *Journal of Marketing Research* (19)4, pp. 440-4. (1982)
51. Friedman, I. A. and Farber, B. A. "Professional self-concept as a predictor of teacher burnout", *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 86, pp. 28-35. (1992)
52. Fu, F. Q., W. Bolander and E. Jones. "Managing The Drivers of Organizational Commitment and Salesperson Effort: An Application of Meyer and Allen's Three-Component Model". *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 17 (4): 335-350, (2009)
53. Gaertner, K. N., & Nollen, S. D. "Career experiences, perceptions of employment practice and psychological commitment to the organization". *Human Relations*, 42, 975-91. (1989)
54. Gaertner, S. "Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models". *Human Resource Management Review*, 9 (4), 479-493. (1999)
55. Garver, M.S. and Mentzer, J.T. "Logistics research methods: employing structural equation modeling to test for construct validity". *Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 33-57. (1999)

56. Gersten, R., Keating, T., Yovanoff, P., & Harniss, M. K.. "Working in special education: Factors that enhance special educators' intent to stay". *Exceptional Children*, 67(4), 549-567. (2001)
57. Graham, M.W., and Messner, E. "Principals and job satisfaction". *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(5), 196-202. (1998)
58. Green, K.W., Cindy, W.H., Whitten, D. and Medlin, B. "The impact of strategic human resource management on firm performance and HR professionals' work attitude and work performance". *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 559-79. (2006)
59. Gritz, R. M., & Theobald, N. D. "The effects of school district spending priorities on length of stay in teaching". *Journal of Human Resources*, 31(3), 477-512. (1996)
60. Groot, W. & Maassen van den Brink, H. "Job satisfaction wages and allocation of men and women". In D. Kluwer (Ed). *Advances in Quality of Life Theory and Research*. Netherlands: Kluwer. (2000)
61. Hair, J.F., Jr I Anderson, R. E.; Tatham, R. L.; & Black, W. C. "Multivariate data analysis with readings", 5th ed.. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. (1998)
62. Hamermesh, D. "The changing distribution of job satisfaction". *Journal of Human Resources*, 56(1), 1-30. (2001)
63. Hargreaves, A., *Changing Teachers, "Changing Times"*, Cassell, London. (1994)
64. Hean, S., & Garrett, R. "Sources of job satisfaction in science secondary school teachers in Chile", *Compare*, 31, 363-379. (2001)
65. Hill, J., Hawkins, A., Ferris, M. & Weitzmann, M. "Finding an Extra Day a Week: The Positive Influence of Perceived Job Flexibility on Work and Family Life Balance". *Family Relations* 50, 49-54. (2001)
66. Ho, C & Au, W. "Teaching satisfaction scale: measuring job satisfaction of teachers". *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66 (1), 172-185. (2006)
67. Huberman, M., "The Lives of Teachers", Cassell, London. (1993)
68. Jabnoun, N. and Fook, C. Y. "Job satisfaction of secondary school teachers in Selangor, Malaysia", *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, Vol. 11, No. 3 & 4. (2001)
69. Jaramillo, F., Nixon, R., & Sams, D. "The effect of law enforcement stress on organizational commitment". *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategy and Management*, 28(2), 321-336. (2005)
70. Karakus, M. and Aslan, B. "Teachers' commitment focuses: a three-dimensional view", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 28 No. 5, pp. 425-438. (2008)
71. Kossek, E. & Van Dyne, L. "Face time matters: A cross level model of how work life flexibility influences work performance of individuals and groups". In *Work Family Handbook*. In D. Lero, & K. Korabick, and D. Whitehead, Editors, Amsterdam, Elsevier, Ltd. 305-330. (2008)
72. Koustelios, A.D. "Personal characteristics and job satisfaction of Greek teachers". *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(7), 354-358. (2001)
73. Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. "Organisational behavior" (2nd edition). New York: Irwin. (1992)
74. Kyriacou, C. "Teacher stress and burnout: An international review". *Educational Research*, Vol. 29, 146-152. (1987)
75. Kyriacou, C. and Sutcliffe, J. "Teacher stress and satisfaction". *Educational Research*, Vol. 21, 89-96. (1979)
76. Lam, T. & Zhang, H. Q. "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong fast food industry". *Internal Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. Vol. 15/4. (2003)
77. Lamberti, E.G., Hogan, N.L., Barton, A., & Lubbock, S.M. "The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: A test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers". *Social Science Journal*, 38(2), 233-251. (2001)
78. Landy, F.J. "Psychology of work behavior" (4th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth. (1989).
79. Larwood, L. (1984), "Organisational behavior and management". Boston: Kent Publishing Company.
80. Lawler, E. E., III (1973), "Motivation in Work Organizations" Brooks/Cole, Monterey, CA.
81. Lincoln, J. R, Kallerberg A. L. (1996), "Commitment, quits, and work organization in Japanese and U.S. plants". *Industrial and Labor Review*, Vol. 50(1): 39-59.
82. Littrell, P., Billingsley, B., & Cross, L. (1994). "The effects of principal support on special and general educators' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching". *Remedial and Special Education*, 15(5), 297-310.
83. Liu, X. S. "The effect of teacher influence at school on first-year teacher attrition: A multilevel analysis of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999-2000". *Educational Research and Evaluation*. (2007)
84. Liu, X. S., & Meyer, J. P. "Teachers' perceptions of their jobs: A multilevel analysis of the teacher follow-up survey for 1994-95". *Teacher College Record*, 107(5), 985-1003. (2005)
85. Long, J.S. "Covariance structure models: An introduction to LISREL". Beverly Hills: Sage. (1983)
86. MacKinnon, D.P. "Contrasts in multiple mediator models". In J. S. Rose, L. Chassin, C.C. Presson, & S.J. Sherman (Eds.), *Multivariate applications in substance use research: (ew methods for new questions* (pp. 141-160). Mahwah, N. J.; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (2000)
87. Malhotra, N. K. & Dash, S. "Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation". New Delhi: Pearson Education. (2011)
88. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. "A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment". *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194. (1990)
89. McCormick, E.J., & Ilgen, D.R. "Industrial and Organisational Psychology". (8th ed.). London: Allen & Unwin. (1985)
90. McElroy, J. C. "Managing workplace commitment by putting people first". *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 327-335. (2001).
91. Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. "Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 152-156. (1989)
92. Mistry, Milan T., "A Study for Teachers Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Mental Health Awareness", *Journal of Advances in Developmental Research*, Volume 1, No.2. (2010)
93. Moorhead, G. & Griffen, R.W. "Organisational behavior". (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. (1992)
94. Mudor, Hamdia and Tooksoon, Phadett, "Conceptual framework on the relationship between human resource management practices, job satisfaction, and turnover", *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp.41-49. (2011)
95. Murnane, R. J., & Olsen, R. J. "The effects of salaries and opportunity costs on duration in teaching: Evidence from Michigan". *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71, 347-352. (1989)
96. Mykletun, R. J. "Teacher stress: Perceived and objective sources, and quality of life", *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 28, pp. 17-45. (1984)
97. Nunnally, J.C. and

- Bernstein, I.H. "Psychometric Theory", McGraw-Hill, New York, NY. (1994),
98. Oshagbemi, T. "Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in higher education" [Electronic version]. *Education and Training*, 39(8/9), 354-359. (1997)
  99. Packard, S.H., & Kauppi, D.R. "Rehabilitation agency leadership style" [Electronic version]. *Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin*, 43(1), 5-7. (1999)
  100. Paré, Guy & Tremblay, Michel. "The influence of high-involvement human resources practices, procedural justice, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors on information technology professionals' turnover intentions". *Group Organization Management*. (2007)
  101. Pergamit, M.R., & Veum, J.R. "What is a promotion" [Electronic version]? *Industrial & Labour Relations Review*, 52(4), 21. (1999)
  102. Peterson, D.K., Puia, G.M., & Suess, F.R. , "Yo Tengo La Camiseta (I have the shirt on): An exploration of job satisfaction and commitment among workers in Mexico" [Electronic version]. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(2), 73-88. (2003)
  103. Pleck, J. "Working Wives/Working Husbands, Sage", Beverly Hills, CA. (1985)
  104. Pollard, A., Broadfoot, P., Croll, P. Osborn, M. & Abbott, D. "Changing English primary schools? The impact of the education reform act at key stage one" (London, Cassell). (1994)
  105. Ramsey, R.D. "Employee morale: Does it matter anymore?" [Electronic version]. *Supervision*, 58(9), 6-8. (1997)
  106. Randhawa, Gurpreet., "Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions : An Empirical Analysis", *Indian Management Studies Journal*, Vol. 11, 149-155. (2007)
  107. Ricketta, M. "Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 257-266. (2002)
  108. Robbins, S.P. "Organisational behavior". (8th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall. (1998).
  109. Robbins, S.P., Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. "Organizational behavior" (9th ed.). Cape Town: Prentice-Hall International. (2003)
  110. Roberts, J. A., Coulson, K. R., Chonko, L. B. "Salesperson perceptions of equity and justice and their impact on organizational commitment and intent to turnover". *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 7 Winter, 1-16. (1999)
  111. Robinson, D., Porporino, F., & Simourd, L. "The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers". *Crime & Delinquency*, 43, 60-77. (1997)
  112. Rothausen, T.J. "Job satisfaction and the parent worker: the role of flexibility and rewards", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 44, pp. 317-36. (1994)
  113. Scandura, T.A. and Lankau, M.J. "Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexible work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18, pp. 377-91. (1997)
  114. Schneider, B., Gunnarson, S. K., & Wheeler, J. K. "The role of opportunity in the conceptualization and measurement of job satisfaction". In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), *Job satisfaction* (pp. 195-217). New York: Lexington Books. 1992.
  115. Schumacker, R.E. and Lomax, R.G. "A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling", 2nd ed., Erlbaum, Mahwah NJ. (2004)
  116. Sclafane, S. "MGA managers in sync with employees on job satisfaction issues, survey finds", *National Underwriter*, 103(22), 4-24. (1999).
  117. Sharma, R. D. and Jyoti, J. "Job Satisfaction of University Teachers: An Empirical Study", *Journal of Services Research*, 9 (2). (2009),
  118. Sherman, A.W., & Bohlander, G.W., "Managing human resources" (9th edition), Ohio: South Western Publishing Co. (1992)
  119. Shibu, N.S. "Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members of Private Engineering Colleges - In Context of Tamilnadu, India", *Global Journal of Finance and Management*, Volume 3, Number 1, pp. 1-13. (2011)
  120. Sirima, Lornah C. Nakera. and Poipoi, Moses Wesang'ula (2010). "Perceived factors influencing public secondary school teachers' job satisfaction in Busia district, Kenya". *Educational Research* ,Vol. 1(11), pp. 659-665.
  121. Smucker, M.K., Whisenant, W.A., & Pedersen, P.M. "An investigation of job satisfaction and female sports journalists" [Electronic version]. *International Sports Journal*, 49(7/8), 401-407. (2003)
  122. Spector, P. E. "Using self-report questionnaires in OB research: A comment on the use of a controversial method". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 385-392. (1994)
  123. Staudt, M. "Correlates of job satisfaction in school social work. *Social Work in Education*", 19(1) 43-52. (1997)
  124. Steenkamp, B. and van Trijp, H. "The use of LISREL in validating marketing constructs", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 8, pp. 283-99. (1991)
  125. Theobald, N. "An examination of the influence of personal, professional and school district characteristics on public school teacher retention". *Economics of Education Review*, 9, 241-250. (1990)
  126. Tolbert, P.S., & Moen, P. "Men's and women's definitions of "good" jobs", *Work & Occupations*, 25(2), 168-195. (1998)
  127. Troman, G. and Woods, P. "Careers under stress: Teacher adaptations at a time of intensive reform", *Journal of Educational Change*, Vol. 1, pp. 253-275. (2000)
  128. Tshannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A. and Hoy, W. "Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 68, pp. 202-248. (1998)
  129. Udo, G. J., Guimaraes, T., & Igbaria, M. "An investigation of the antecedents of turnover intention for manufacturing plant managers". *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 17(9), 912. (1997)
  130. VanDam, K. "Employee Attitudes toward Job Changes: An Application and Extension of Rusbult and Farrell's Investment Model", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 78 (2): 253-273. (2005)
  131. Vecchio, R.P. "Organisational behavior". New York: Dryden Press. (1988)
  132. Voydanoff, P. "Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction among men and women". *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 177-185. (1980)
  133. Wech, B.A. "Trust context: Effect on organizational citizenship behavior, supervisory fairness, and job satisfaction beyond the influence of leader-member exchange" [Electronic version], *Business and Society*, 41(3), 353-360. (2002)
  134. Woods, P., Jeffrey, B., Troman, G. and Boyle, M. "Restructuring Schools; Reconstructing Teachers: Responding to Change in the Primary School", Open University Press, Buckingham. (1997)
  135. Wu WY. "Business research methods" (2nd ed.) Taiwan: Hwa Tai Publishing. (2005)
  136. Zhao, H., Wanyne S.J., Glibkowski B.C. & Bravo J. "The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: a meta-analysis". *Personal psychology*, 60, 647-680. (2007)

Table 1: Indicator Reliability of the Study Scales

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>PS</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SU</i>	<i>WSF</i>	<i>TS</i>	<i>OC</i>
1	.67	.42	.45	.48	.56	.61
2	.60	.51	.44	.41	.63	.71
3	.66	.36	.30	.59	.57	.56
4	.53	.60	.51	.50	.62	.61
5	.61	.37	--	.36	.59	.71
6	.48	.58	--	.58	--	.65

Table 2: Scale Reliability Estimates

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Cronbach Alpha</i>	<i>Construct Reliability</i>	<i>Average Variance Extracted</i>
<b>PS</b>	.86	.86	.52
<b>PR</b>	.77	.77	.37
<b>SU</b>	.60	.56	.30
<b>WSF</b>	.78	.79	.38
<b>TS</b>	.83	.83	.49
<b>OC</b>	.89	.89	.58

Table 3: Convergent Validity of Scales

<i>SCALE</i>	<i>Unidimensionality and Internal Consistency</i>	<i>T-value Range</i>	<i>NFI</i>	<i>NNFI</i>
<b>PS</b>	Established	11.42-15.58	0.978	0.975
<b>PR</b>	Established	8.52-13.01	0.940	0.921
<b>SU</b>	Established	4.84-7.32	0.968	0.956
<b>WSF</b>	Established	8.54-13.01	0.979	0.985
<b>TS</b>	Established	12.36-13.94	0.992	0.998
<b>OC</b>	Established	13.05-17.27	0.989	0.991

Table 4: Discriminant Validity - AVE and Shared Variance

<i>Variable</i>	<i>PS</i>	<i>PR</i>	<i>SU</i>	<i>WSF</i>	<i>OC</i>	<i>TS</i>	<i>Evidence of discriminant validity</i>
<i>PS</i>	<b>.52</b>	.49	.03	.10	.18	.14	<b>Strong</b>
<i>PR</i>	.70	<b>.34</b>	.04	.18	.29	.23	<b>Strong</b>
<i>SU</i>	.18	.22	<b>.25</b>	.23	.15	.30	<b>Moderate</b>
<i>WSF</i>	.32	.43	.48	<b>.38</b>	.36	.33	<b>Strong</b>
<i>OC</i>	.43	.54	.39	.60	<b>.58</b>	.47	<b>Strong</b>
<i>TS</i>	.38	.48	.55	.58	.69	<b>.49</b>	<b>Strong</b>

Note: Correlations are below the diagonal, squared correlations are above the diagonal, and AVE estimates are presented on the diagonal.

Table 5: SEM Fit Indices

<i>FIT INDICATORS</i>	<i>Value</i>
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)	0.850
Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)	0.820
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	0.937
Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)	0.964
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.967
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)	0.055
Chi-Square /Degrees of Freedom	925.58/480 = 1.96

Table 6: Mediation Analysis-Direct and Indirect Effects

Independent Variables (Job related factors)	Direct Effect on OC	Indirect Effect on OC (through TS)
<i>Pay satisfaction (PS)</i>	0.17	0.48
<i>Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities (PR)</i>	-0.12	-0.25
<i>Satisfaction with Supervision (SU)</i>	-0.15	0.27
<i>Work Schedule Flexibility (WSF)</i>	0.08	0.41

Exhibit 1: Structural Model and Path Coefficients

