CHAPTER – V
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

5.1 INTRODUCTION:

After the data have been collected, the researcher turns to the task of analyzing them. The analysis of data requires a number of closely related operations such as establishment of categories, the application of these categories to raw data through coding, tabulation and then drawing statistical inferences. The unwieldy data should necessarily be condensed into a few manageable groups and tables for further analysis. Thus, researcher should classify the raw data into some purposeful and usable categories. Coding operation is usually done at this stage through which the categories of data are transformed into symbols that may be tabulated and counted. Editing is the procedure that improves the quality of the data for coding. With coding the stage is ready for tabulation. Tabulation is a part of the technical procedure wherein the classified data are put in the form of tables. A great deal of data, especially in large inquiries, is tabulated by computers. Computers not only save time but also make it possible to study large number of variables affecting a problem simultaneously. Analysis of work after tabulation is generally based on the computation of various percentages, coefficients, etc., by applying various well defined statistical formulae.

In this chapter the results obtained in the study are reported and presented. The analysis of data is done with the help of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The statistical programme used for the analysis and presentation of data in this research is the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12.0.

5.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS:

According to Sekaran, descriptive statistics includes the analysis of data using frequencies, measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion so
as to obtain a feel for the data. Descriptive statistics is used in this study to understand the biographical characteristics of the sample and to determine the levels of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment of university teachers. The researcher has analysed the results of biographical questionnaire, job satisfaction questionnaire, job involvement questionnaire and organizational commitment questionnaire as follows.

5.2.1 BIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS:

The biographical characteristics of 274 university teachers are presented in tables and illustrated graphically. These characteristics include age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience.

1) AGE:

The age distribution of the respondents that participated in this study is illustrated in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 35 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and above</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.

The Figure 5.2 shows that majority of the university teachers (n = 105 or 38.32%) fall in the age category 35 - 44 years. This is followed by 85 (31.00%) of the university teachers in the age category 45 - 54 years. The age category 55 years and above, constitutes 15.69% (n = 43) of the sample. The minority of the university teachers (n = 41 or 14.96%) fall in the age category of below 35 years. From the ensuing results it can therefore be concluded that the majority of the workforce participating in the study is fairly young i.e. up to the age of 44 years old (n = 146).
2) GENDER:

The gender distribution of the respondents is presented in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.
As seen from Figure 5.2, the majority of the university teachers are male. More specifically, 72.6% (n = 199) of the university teachers are male, while only 27.4% (n = 75) are female. The large difference in gender representation reflects true differences in the population. That is, it is possible that there are a greater number of males in the teaching profession of the universities selected in this study.

3) MARITAL STATUS:

Table 5.3 and Figure 5.3 illustrates that out of the 274 university teachers who participated in the study, 238 (86.9%) of the respondents are married and 36 (13.1%) are unmarried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.

4) EDUCATIONAL LEVEL:

Table 5.4 illustrates the educational level of the respondents.
The above figure depicts that the majority of the university teachers (n = 221 or 80.7%) are having Ph.D. degree, whereas 53 (19.3%) of the university teachers do not possess Ph.D. qualification. It can therefore be concluded that the universities mostly employ individuals for teaching jobs with an educational level of Ph.D.

5) ACADEMIC POSITION:

Figure 5.5 illustrates the academic position of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Professor</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asso. Professor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.
As shown in the above figure the sample included in the study comprises 42% (n = 115) assistant professors, 31% (n = 85) associate professors and 27% (n = 74) professors.

6) INCOME LEVEL:

Table 5.6 displays distribution of monthly income of the sample. Here monthly income is nothing but the salary that university teacher receives every month.

**Table 5.6: Monthly Income Distribution.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Rs. 50,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 50,000-Rs. 64,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.65000-Rs.79000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.80,000 and above</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

Figure 5.6 indicates that the monthly income of the majority of the university teachers (n = 153 or 55.84%) is Rs. 80,000 and above. While
23.36% (n = 64) of the university teachers received a salary between Rs. 50,000 - Rs. 64,000 per month and 12.41% (n = 34) received a salary less than Rs. 50,000 per month. Only 8.39% (n = 23) of the university teachers received a salary between Rs. 65,000 - Rs. 79,000 per month.

**Figure 5.6: Monthly Income Distribution**

7) TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Table 5.7 displays distribution of the experience of the university teachers. Here experience is of university service only.

**Table 5.7: Experience Distribution.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and above</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.
Figure 5.7 shows that the majority of the university teachers (n = 115 or 42%) have experience of 15 or more years. While 89 (32.5%) of the university teachers have experience of 5 - 9 years and 49 (17.9%) of the university teachers have experience of 10 - 14 years. Only 7.7% (n = 21) of the university teachers have experience of less than five years. It is concluded that the sample represents a relatively experienced group of university teachers.

5.2.2 JOB SATISFACTION ANALYSIS:

The data collected through the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire were analysed by using frequency and percentage analysis. The responses of the university teachers based on the analysis are given in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8: Frequencies and Percentages of the Responses of University Teachers based on the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>30 (10.9%)</td>
<td>26 (9.5%)</td>
<td>23 (8.4%)</td>
<td>101 (36.9%)</td>
<td>94 (34.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.74  
Standard Deviation: 1.32
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am satisfied with career advancement scheme (CAS) for promotion.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. (Here supervisor means your HOD or superior authority)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My supervisor shows interest in the feelings of his/her subordinates.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The benefits I receive are as good as most other organizations offer. (Here benefits include insurance, vacation, medical facilities, funds for research and travel to attend conferences, grant for publication of books etc.)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There are benefits I have which I should have.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition (and/or rewards) for it that I should receive.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures do not make a good job difficult.</td>
<td>30 (10.9%)</td>
<td>138 (50.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 2.60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I don’t have too much paperwork.</td>
<td>31 (11.3%)</td>
<td>126 (46.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 2.66</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 3.85</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I find I do not have to work harder at my job because of the competence of people I work with.</td>
<td>28 (10.2%)</td>
<td>93 (33.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 2.74</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 4.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I enjoy my job.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 4.51</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Communications seem good within this university.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>41 (15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 3.77</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Work assignments are fully explained.</td>
<td>26 (9.5%)</td>
<td>62 (22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 2.93</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Item No. 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 18 were reverse scored and therefore while interpreting the results wording of these items has been reversed.

Table 5.8 revealed the following information:

The analysis of responses of the university teachers on ‘I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do’, revealed that 94 (34.3%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 101 (36.9%) agree that they are satisfied with ‘I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do’, while 23 (8.4%) are undecided. 26 (9.5%) and 30 (10.9%) of them disagree and strongly disagree respectively showing their dissatisfaction. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.74 with standard deviation 1.32.
In the case of ‘I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases’ the analysis revealed that 66 (24.1%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 128 (46.7%) agree that they are satisfied with their chances for salary increases. While 36 (13.1%) neither agree nor disagree, 36 (13.1%) of the university teachers disagree showing their dissatisfaction and 8 (2.9%) strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.76 with standard deviation 1.05.

Regarding the aspect ‘those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted’ revealed that 38 (13.9%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 130 (47.4%) agree that they are satisfied with ‘those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted’. While 49 (17.9%) are undecided, 28 (10.2%) disagree showing their dissatisfaction and 29 (10.6%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.44 with standard deviation 1.17.

Regarding the statement ‘I am satisfied with career advancement scheme (CAS) for promotion’, 44 (16.1%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 133 (48.5%) agree with the statement, 41 (15.0%) neither agree nor disagree about the matter, 37 (13.5%) of the university teachers disagree with the aspect and 19 (6.9%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.53 with standard deviation 1.12.

In the case of ‘my supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job (Here supervisor means your HOD or superior authority)’, 41 (15.0%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 125 (45.6%) agree that they are satisfied with the competency of their supervisor and 69 (25.2%) of the university teachers are undecided. While 23 (8.4%) disagree and 16 (5.8%) of the university teachers showed strong disagreement with this aspect. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.55 with standard deviation 1.03.

With regard to ‘my supervisor shows interest in the feelings of his/her subordinates’, 14 (5.1%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 98 (35.8%) agree with ‘my supervisor shows interest in the feelings of his/her subordinates’,
and 51 (18.6%) are undecided about this. But 83 (30.3%) of the university teachers disagree and 28 (10.2%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 2.95 with standard deviation 1.13.

Regarding the statement ‘the benefits I receive are as good as most other organizations offer’, 37 (13.5%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 112 (40.9%) agree that they are satisfied with ‘the benefits I receive are as good as most other organizations offer’, and 38 (13.9%) are in a neutral position. But 51 (18.6%) disagree and 36 (13.1%) strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.23 with standard deviation 1.27.

In the case of ‘there are benefits I have which I should have’, 52 (19.0%) of the university teachers agree with this statement and 54 (19.7%) are undecided. But 153 (55.8%) of the university teachers disagree with this and 15 (5.5%) of them strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 2.52 with standard deviation 0.86.

With regard to the ‘when I do a good job, I receive the recognition (and/or rewards) for it that I should receive’, 38 (13.9%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 123 (44.9%) agree with the statement and 63 (23%) showed neutral opinion. While 30 (10.9%) of the university teachers disagree with this aspect and 20 (7.3%) expressed strong disagreement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.47 with standard deviation 1.09.

The responses on the aspect ‘I feel that the work I do is appreciated’ showed that 35 (12.8%) of the university teachers strongly agree with this, 92 (33.6%) agree and 51 (18.6%) are undecided about this aspect. But 88 (32.1%) of university teachers disagree and 8 (2.9%) strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.21 with standard deviation 1.12.

In the case of ‘many of our rules and procedures do not make a good job difficult’, 20 (7.3%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 48 (17.5%) agree and 38 (13.9%) are undecided about this. While 138 (50.4%) disagree and 30 (10.9%) of the university teachers strongly disagree with the statement ‘many
of our rules and procedures do not make a good job difficult’. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 2.60 with standard deviation 1.12.

With regard to ‘I do not have too much paperwork’, 20 (7.3%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 55 (20.1%) agree and 42 (15.3%) showed neutral opinion. But 126 (46.0%) university teachers disagree and 31 (11.3%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 2.66 with standard deviation 1.14.

When the university teachers are asked about ‘I like the people I work with’, 55 (20.1%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 138 (50.4%) agree and 67 (24.5%) neither agree nor disagree. But 14 (5.1%) university teachers disagree and 0 (0%) university teachers strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.85 with standard deviation 0.79.

In the case of ‘I find I do not have to work harder at my job because of the competence of people I work with’, 23 (8.4%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 32 (11.7%) agree and 98 (35.8%) are undecided. But 93 (33.9%) disagree and 28 (10.2%) university teachers strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 2.74 with S. D. 1.07.

With regard to ‘I feel a sense of pride in doing my job’, 117 (42.7%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 133 (48.5%) agree. It is also seen that 24 (8.8%) of the university teachers are neutral about this statement. There are no university teachers who disagree and strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 4.34 with standard deviation 0.63.

In the case of ‘I enjoy my job’, 160 (58.4%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 93 (33.9%) agree with this and 21 (7.7%) are undecided. There are no university teachers who disagree and strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 4.51 with standard deviation 0.64.

When the university teachers are asked about ‘communications seem good within this university’, 51 (18.6%) of the university teachers strongly
agree and 150 (54.7%) agree. It is also seen that 32 (11.7%) of the university teachers are undecided over this aspect and 41 (15.0%) disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.77 with standard deviation 0.92.

With regard to ‘work assignments are fully explained’, 95 (34.7%) of the university teachers agree with this and 91 (33.2%) are of neutral opinion. While 62 (22.6%) disagree with this, 26 (9.5%) university teachers strongly disagree with ‘work assignments are fully explained’. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 2.93 with standard deviation 0.98.

The mean values and standard deviation of the various dimensions or facets of job satisfaction of university teachers are computed which are depicted in Table 5.9. The arithmetic mean for the total job satisfaction of the sample is 3.38 with a standard deviation of 0.49. The small value of standard deviation for the overall level of job satisfaction indicates that most respondents are close to the mean.

**Table 5.9: Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

With respect to the dimensions of job satisfaction assessed by the JSS, the arithmetic means for the pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent
rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work and communication vary from 2.63 to 4.42. University teachers are most satisfied with the nature of their work (4.42) followed by pay (3.75), promotion opportunities (3.49), communication (3.35), contingent rewards (3.34), coworkers (3.30) and supervision (3.25). They are least satisfied with operating procedures (2.63) and fringe benefits (2.88). The standard deviations for all the dimensions of the JSS are relatively low, indicating similarity in responses obtained on the JSS from the sample.

The university teachers can be grouped into three levels, viz., high, average and low based on their job satisfaction scores obtained through the Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. The mean (M) and standard deviation (σ) of the total score were calculated. Those getting scores at or above ‘M+σ’ are grouped as ‘high job satisfaction group’ and those getting scores below ‘M-σ’, are grouped as ‘low job satisfaction group’. Those getting scores between ‘M+σ’ and ‘M-σ’, are grouped as ‘average job satisfaction’ (Kalarani T. G., 2011). Here ‘M’ is mean and ‘σ’ is standard deviation.

Table 5.10: Level of Job Satisfaction of University Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>65.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean = 3.38 and Standard Deviation = 0.49.

Source: Primary Data.

From Table 5.10, it is clear that 49 (17.88%) of the university teachers have high job satisfaction, 179 (65.33%) have average job satisfaction and 46 (16.79%) have low job satisfaction. This clearly shows that majority of the university teachers have moderate job satisfaction. The graphical representation of the level of Job satisfaction of the university teachers is given in Figure 5.8.
5.2.3 JOB INVOLVEMENT ANALYSIS:

The data collected through the Job Involvement Questionnaire were analysed by using frequency and percentage analysis. The responses of the university teachers based on the analysis are given in Table 5.11.

**Table 5.11: Frequencies and Percentages of the Responses of University Teachers based on the Job Involvement Questionnaire.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To me, my job is not only a small part of who I am.</td>
<td>13 (4.7%)</td>
<td>105 (38.3%)</td>
<td>44 (16.1%)</td>
<td>92 (33.6%)</td>
<td>20 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 3.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I very much involved personally in my job.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5)</td>
<td>145 (52.9%)</td>
<td>125 (45.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 4.44</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I live, eat and breathe my job.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>33 (12.0%)</td>
<td>31 (11.3%)</td>
<td>125 (45.6%)</td>
<td>85 (31.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 3.96</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most of my interests are centered around my job.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (5.1%)</td>
<td>45 (16.4%)</td>
<td>135 (49.3%)</td>
<td>80 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mean: 4.03</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.8: Level of Job Satisfaction of University Teachers.**
I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>23 (8.4%)</td>
<td>47 (17.2%)</td>
<td>145 (52.9%)</td>
<td>59 (21.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:** 3.88 **Standard Deviation:** 0.84

Most of my personal life goals are job oriented.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (2.9%)</td>
<td>43 (15.7%)</td>
<td>40 (14.6%)</td>
<td>134 (48.9%)</td>
<td>49 (17.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:** 3.63 **Standard Deviation:** 1.04

I consider my job to be very central to my existence.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>29 (10.6%)</td>
<td>45 (16.4%)</td>
<td>126 (46.0%)</td>
<td>74 (27.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:** 3.89 **Standard Deviation:** 0.92

I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (2.9%)</td>
<td>19 (6.9%)</td>
<td>38 (13.9%)</td>
<td>158 (57.7%)</td>
<td>51 (18.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:** 3.82 **Standard Deviation:** 0.91

**Total Job Involvement - Mean: 3.83 and Standard Deviation: 0.55**

**Note:** Item No. 1 was reverse scored and therefore while interpreting the results wording of this item has been reversed.

Table 5.11 revealed the following information:

In the case of ‘to me, my job is not only a small part of who I am’, 20 (7.3%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 92 (33.6%) agree with this statement. 44 (16.1%) of the university teachers are of the neutral opinion. But 105 (38.3%) university teachers disagree and 13 (4.7%) university teachers strongly disagree with this aspect. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.00 with standard deviation 1.10.

With regard to ‘I very much involved personally in my job’, 125 (45.6%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 145 (52.9%) agree with this and 4 (1.5%) are undecided about this. There are no university teachers who either disagree or strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 4.44 with standard deviation 0.53.

When the employees are asked to respond on ‘I live, eat and breathe my job’, 85 (31.0%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 125 (45.6%) agree that they live, eat and breathe their job. It is found that 31 (11.3%) neither agree nor disagree with this. But 33 (12%) university teachers disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.96 with S. D. 0.95.
In the case of ‘most of my interests are centered around my job’, 80 (29.2%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 135 (49.3%) agree that most of their interests are centered around their job. While 45 (16.4%) of the university teachers are undecided and 14 (5.1%) disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 4.03 with standard deviation 0.81.

With regard to ‘I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break’, 59 (21.5%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 145 (52.9%) agree with this while 47 (17.2%) are undecided. But 23 (8.4%) of the university teachers disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.88 with standard deviation 0.84.

The responses of the employees on the statement ‘most of my personal life goals are job oriented’, showed that 49 (17.9%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 134 (48.9%) agree with this statement, while 40 (14.6%) of university teachers are of neutral opinion. But 43 (15.7%) disagree and 8 (2.9%) strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.63 with standard deviation 1.04.

When the university teachers are asked to respond on ‘I consider my job to be very central to my existence’, 74 (27.0%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 126 (46.0%) agree that they consider their job to be very central to their existence. It is found that 45 (16.4%) of the university teachers neither agree nor disagree with this. But 29 (10.6%) of the university teachers disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.89 with standard deviation 0.92.

In the case of ‘I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time’, 51 (18.6%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 158 (57.7%) agree with ‘I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time’. While 38 (13.9%) are undecided, 19 (6.9%) disagree and 8 (2.9%) strongly disagree with this. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.82 with standard deviation 0.91.

Table 5.11 also indicates that the arithmetic mean for the total job involvement of the sample is 3.83 with a standard deviation of 0.55. The small
value of standard deviation for the overall level of job satisfaction indicates that most respondents are close to the mean.

Table 5.12 shows the grouping of university teachers into three levels, viz., high, average and low based on their job involvement scores obtained through the Job Involvement Questionnaire.

**Table 5.12: Level of Job Involvement of University Teachers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Job Involvement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Job Involvement</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>70.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Job Involvement</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Mean = 3.83 and Standard Deviation = 0.55.

**Source:** Primary Data.

The graphical representation of the level of job involvement of the university teachers is given in Figure 5.9.

![Figure 5.9: Level of Job Involvement of University Teachers.]

From Table 5.12, it is clear that 40 (14.60%) of the university teachers have high job involvement, 193 (70.44%) have average job involvement and 41 (14.96%) have low job involvement. This clearly shows that majority of the university teachers have moderate job satisfaction.
5.2.4 ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT ANALYSIS:

The data collected through the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire were analysed by using frequency and percentage analysis. The responses of the university teachers based on the analysis are given in Table 5.13.

Table 5.13: Frequencies and Percentages of the Responses of University Teachers based on the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This university has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>8 (2.9%)</td>
<td>13 (4.7%)</td>
<td>45 (16.4%)</td>
<td>157 (57.3%)</td>
<td>51 (18.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 3.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I would be happy to spend the rest of my career in this university.</td>
<td>13 (4.7%)</td>
<td>31 (11.3%)</td>
<td>42 (15.3%)</td>
<td>116 (42.3%)</td>
<td>72 (26.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I really feel as if this university’s problems are my own.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>29 (10.6%)</td>
<td>38 (13.9%)</td>
<td>129 (47.1%)</td>
<td>78 (28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel “emotionally attached” to this university.</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>40 (14.6%)</td>
<td>61 (22.3%)</td>
<td>92 (33.6%)</td>
<td>77 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 3.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my university now.</td>
<td>19 (6.9%)</td>
<td>41 (15.0%)</td>
<td>56 (20.4%)</td>
<td>120 (43.8%)</td>
<td>38 (13.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This university deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>19 (6.9%)</td>
<td>42 (15.3%)</td>
<td>157 (57.3%)</td>
<td>56 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my university now.</td>
<td>10 (3.6%)</td>
<td>58 (21.2%)</td>
<td>83 (30.3%)</td>
<td>80 (29.2%)</td>
<td>43 (15.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean: 3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation: 1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would not leave my university now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It would be hard for me to leave my university right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>16 (5.8%)</td>
<td>75 (27.4%)</td>
<td>64 (23.4%)</td>
<td>72 (26.3%)</td>
<td>47 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I had not already put so much of myself into this university, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
<td>20 (7.3%)</td>
<td>98 (35.8%)</td>
<td>109 (39.8%)</td>
<td>39 (14.2%)</td>
<td>8 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>One of the few negative consequences of leaving this university would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td>7 (2.6%)</td>
<td>70 (25.5%)</td>
<td>121 (44.2%)</td>
<td>64 (23.4%)</td>
<td>12 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my university right now.</td>
<td>11 (4.0%)</td>
<td>50 (18.2%)</td>
<td>80 (29.2%)</td>
<td>82 (29.9%)</td>
<td>51 (18.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:** 3.39 **Standard Deviation:** 1.12

Note: Item No. 4 was reverse scored and therefore while interpreting the results wording of these items has been reversed.

Table 5.13 revealed the following information:

In the case of ‘this university has a great deal of personal meaning for me’, 51 (18.6%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 157 (57.3%) agree. 45 (16.4%) of the university teachers are undecided. But 13 (4.7%) of the university teachers disagree and 8 (2.9%) strongly disagree with this aspect. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.84 with standard deviation 0.88.

With regard to ‘I would be happy to spend the rest of my career in this university’, 72 (26.3%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 116 (42.3%) agree with this and 42 (15.3%) are undecided about this. But 31 (11.3%) of the university teachers disagree and 13 (4.7%) strongly disagree with the above
statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.74 with standard deviation 1.11.

When the employees are asked to respond on ‘I really feel as if this university’s problems are my own’, 78 (28.5%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 129 (47.1%) agree. It is found that 38 (13.9%) of the university teachers neither agree nor disagree with this. But 29 (10.6%) university teachers disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.93 with standard deviation 0.92.

In the case of ‘I feel emotionally attached to this university’, 77 (28.1%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 92 (33.6%) agree with ‘I feel emotionally attached to this university’. 61 (22.3%) of the university teachers are of neutral opinion. But 40 (14.6%) of the university teachers disagree and 4 (1.5%) strongly disagree with this. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.72 with standard deviation 1.07.

With regard to ‘I would feel guilty if I left my university now’, 38 (13.9%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 120 (43.8%) agree with this while 56 (20.4%) are undecided. But 41 (15%) of the university teachers disagree and 19 (6.9%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.43 with standard deviation 1.11.

In the case of ‘this university deserves my loyalty’, 56 (20.4%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 157 (57.3%) agree with this and 42 (15.3%) are undecided. But 19 (6.9%) of the university teachers disagree with this. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.91 with standard deviation 0.79.

With regard to ‘even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my university now’, 43 (15.7%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 80 (29.2%) agree and 83 (30.3%) are undecided about this. But 58 (21.2%) of the university teachers disagree and 10 (3.6%) employees strongly disagree with the above statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.32 with standard deviation 1.09.
When the university teachers are asked to respond on ‘I would not leave my university now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it’, 50 (18.2%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 86 (31.4%) agree that they feel strong sense of belonging to their organisation. It is found that 73 (26.6%) of the university teachers neither agree nor disagree with this. But 52 (19%) of the university teachers disagree and 13 (4.7%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.39 with S. D. 1.12.

In the case of ‘It would be hard for me to leave my university right now, even if I wanted to’, 47 (17.2%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 72 (26.3%) agree and 64 (23.4%) are undecided. But 75 (27.4%) of the university teachers disagree and 16 (5.8%) strongly disagree with this statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.22 with standard deviation 1.19.

With regard to ‘If I had not already put so much of myself into this university, I might consider working elsewhere’, 8 (2.9%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 39 (14.2%) agree with this while 109 (39.8%) of the university teachers are of neutral opinion. But 98 (35.8%) of the university teachers disagree and 20 (7.3%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 2.69 with standard deviation 0.90.

When the employees were asked to respond on ‘one of the few negative consequences of leaving this university would be the scarcity of available alternatives’, 12 (4.4%) of the university teachers strongly agree and 64 (23.4%) agree. It is found that 121 (44.2%) neither agree nor disagree with this. But 70 (25.5%) of the university teachers disagree and 7 (2.6%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.01 with standard deviation 0.88.

In the case of ‘too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my university right now’, 51 (18.6%) of the university teachers strongly agree, 82 (29.9%) agree and 80 (29.2%) are of neutral opinion. But 50 (18.2%) of the university teachers disagree and 19 (6.3%) strongly disagree with the statement. The arithmetical mean of this statement is 3.41 with S. D. 1.11.
The mean values and standard deviation of the three dimensions of organizational commitment of university teachers are computed which are depicted in the following table.

**Table 5.14: Descriptive Statistics for the Dimensions of Organizational Commitment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

Table 5.14 indicates that the arithmetic mean for the total organizational commitment of the sample is 3.47 with a standard deviation of 0.60. The small value of standard deviation for the overall level of organizational commitment indicates that most respondents are close to the mean. The respondent scored higher on ‘affective commitment scale’ with a mean of 3.81 and scored lower on ‘normative commitment scale’ with a mean of 3.08. The mean value of ‘continuance commitment scale’ found to be 3.51.

Table 5.15 shows the grouping of university teachers into three levels, viz., high, average and low based on their organizational commitment scores obtained through the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire.

**Table 5.15: Level of Organizational Commitment of University Teachers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>67.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>274</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Mean = 3.47 and Standard Deviation = 0.60.

**Source:** Primary Data.
From Table 5.15, it is clear that 52 (18.98%) of the university teachers have high organizational commitment, 184 (67.15%) have average organizational commitment and 38 (13.87%) have low organizational commitment. This clearly shows that majority of the university teachers have moderate organizational commitment. The graphical representation of the level of organizational commitment of university teachers is given in Figure 5.10.

![Figure 5.10: Level of Organizational Commitment of University Teachers.](image)

5.3 INFERENTIAL STATISTICS:

Hair et al. (2003) stated that inferential statistics enable the researcher to draw conclusions about a population from a sample. The inferential statistical methods used in this research include the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, T-Test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Regression Analysis. These methods are used for testing the stated research hypotheses.

5.3.1 DIFFERENCE IN THE LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION BASED ON BIOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES:

**Hypothesis 1:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience).”
This hypothesis was tested by subdividing it into following subsidiary hypotheses (hypothesis 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f and 1g).

**Hypothesis 1a:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on age.”

Table 5.16 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job satisfaction based on age.

**Table 5.16: ANOVA to Determine Age Differences in Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 35 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and above</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.381</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>11.288</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>58.850</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.231</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.  

*p < 0.01

Table 5.16 explains that ‘F’ value (11.288) for the mean scores of job satisfaction level of university teachers of different age category is significant at 0.01 level (as p < 0.01), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on age is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on age. University teachers in the age category ‘35 - 44 years’ evidenced the highest level of job satisfaction with a mean score of 3.53 and a standard deviation of 0.52, followed by university teachers in the age category ‘45 - 54 years’ (mean score
3.42) and university teachers in the age category ‘below 35 years’ (mean score 3.21), while university teachers in the age category ‘55 years and above’ indicated the lowest level of job satisfaction with a mean score of 3.09 and a standard deviation of 0.47.

**Hypothesis 1b:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on gender.”

Table 5.17 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in job satisfaction based on gender.

**Table 5.17: T-Test to Determine Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-1.535</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

The results from Table 5.17 indicate that ‘t’ value (-1.535) for the mean scores of job satisfaction level of male and female university teachers is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on gender is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on gender. It was further found that the mean score of job satisfaction of female university teachers (3.45) is higher than that of male university teachers (3.35). But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Hypothesis 1c:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on marital status.”

Table 5.18 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in job satisfaction based on marital status. The results from the table indicate that ‘t’
value (0.733) for the mean scores of job satisfaction level of unmarried and married university teachers is not significant at 0.05 level (as $p > 0.05$), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on marital status is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on marital status. It was further found that the mean score of job satisfaction of unmarried university teachers (3.44) is higher than that of married university teachers (3.37). But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Table 5.18: T-Test to Determine Marital Status Differences in Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data.*

**Hypothesis 1d:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on educational level.”

**Table 5.19: T-Test to Determine Educational Level Differences in Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ph.D.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.937</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data.*

* $p < 0.01$

Table 5.19 illustrates that ‘t’ value (2.937) for the mean scores of job satisfaction level of university teachers without Ph.D. and with Ph.D. is significant at 0.01 level (as $p < 0.01$), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on educational level is rejected and it is concluded that there is
significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on educational level. It was further found that the mean score of job satisfaction of university teachers without Ph.D. (3.56) is higher than that of university teachers with Ph.D. (3.33).

**Hypothesis 1e:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on academic position.”

Table 5.20 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job satisfaction based on academic position.

**Table 5.20: ANOVA to Determine Academic Position Differences in Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>1.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.231</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

The results from Table 5.20 indicate that ‘F’ value (1.526) for the mean scores of job satisfaction level of university teachers of different academic position is not significant at 0.05 level (as \( p > 0.05 \)), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on academic position is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on academic position. Assistant professors evidenced
the highest level of job satisfaction with a mean score of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 0.49, followed by professors (mean score 3.41), while associate professors indicated the lowest level of job satisfaction with a mean score of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 0.53. But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Hypothesis 1f:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on income.”

Table 5.21 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job satisfaction based on income.

**Table 5.21: ANOVA to Determine Income Differences in Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Rs. 50,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 50,000-Rs. 64,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 65000-Rs. 79000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 80,000 and above</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.981</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.994</td>
<td>8.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60.250</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.231</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data. *p < 0.01

Table 5.21 illustrates that ‘F’ value (8.934) for the mean scores of job satisfaction level of university teachers having different income is significant at 0.01 level (as p < 0.01), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on income is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant
difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on income. University teachers in the income bracket ‘Rs. 65,000 - Rs. 79,000’ reported the highest level of job satisfaction indicating a mean of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.51, followed by university teachers in the income bracket ‘Rs. 50,000 - Rs. 64,000’ (mean score 3.45) and university teachers in the income bracket ‘Rs. 80,000 and above’ (mean score 3.32), while university teachers earning ‘below Rs. 50,000’ indicated the lowest level of job satisfaction with a mean score of 3.23 and a standard deviation of 0.58.

**Hypothesis 1g:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on experience.”

Table 5.22 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job satisfaction based on experience.

**Table 5.22: ANOVA to Determine Experience Differences in Job Satisfaction.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 years</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and above</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.709</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>8.490</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60.522</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.231</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

* *p < 0.01

‘F’ value (8.490) for the mean scores of job satisfaction level of university teachers having different experience is significant at 0.01 level
(as p < 0.01), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on experience is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on experience. University teachers with ‘10 - 14 years’ of experience evidenced the highest level of job satisfaction with a mean score of 3.59 and a standard deviation of 0.43, followed by university teachers with ‘5 - 9 years’ of experience (mean score 3.40) and university teachers having experience of 15 years and above (mean score 3.34), while university teachers with ‘10 - 14 years’ of experience indicated the lowest level of job satisfaction with a mean score of 2.98 and a standard deviation of 0.47.

On the basis of the analysis of 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f and 1g, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience) is accepted partially. It is accepted for gender, marital status and academic position, whereas it is rejected for age, educational level, income and experience.

5.3.2 DIFFERENCE IN THE LEVEL OF JOB INVOLVEMENT BASED ON BIOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES:

Hypothesis 2:

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience).”

This hypothesis was tested by subdividing it into following subsidiary hypotheses (hypothesis 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, 2f and 2g).

Hypothesis 2a:

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on age.”
Table 5.23 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job involvement based on age.

**Table 5.23: ANOVA to Determine Age Differences in Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 35 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and above</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>81.664</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83.256</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

As ‘F’ value (1.755) for the mean scores of job involvement level of university teachers of different age category is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on age is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on age. University teachers in the age category ‘45 - 54 years’ evidenced the highest level of job involvement with a mean score of 3.93 and a standard deviation of 0.50, followed by university teachers in the age category ‘35 - 44 years’ (mean score 3.82) and university teachers in the age category ‘below 35 years’ (mean score 3.78), while university teachers in the age category ‘55 years and above’ indicated the lowest level of job involvement with a mean score of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 0.48. But mean differences could not reach the significance level.
**Hypothesis 2b:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on gender.”

Table 5.24 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in job involvement based on gender.

**Table 5.24: T-Test to Determine Gender Differences in Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

The results from Table 5.24 indicate that ‘t’ value (-0.253) for the mean scores of job involvement level of male and female university teachers is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on gender is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on gender. It was further found that the mean score of job involvement of female university teachers (3.85) is higher than that of male university teachers (3.82). But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Hypothesis 2c:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on marital status.”

Table 5.25 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in job involvement based on marital status. The results from Table 5.25 indicate that ‘t’ value (-0.663) for the mean scores of job involvement level of unmarried and married university teachers is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on marital status is accepted and it
is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on marital status. It was further found that the mean score of job involvement of married university teachers (3.84) is higher than that of unmarried university teachers (3.77). But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Table 5.25: T-Test to Determine Marital Status Differences in Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.663</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

**Hypothesis 2d:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on educational level.”

Table 5.26 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in job involvement based on educational level.

**Table 5.26: T-Test to Determine Educational Level Differences in Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ph.D.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

As the ‘t’ value (0.504) for the mean scores of job involvement level of university teachers without Ph.D. and with Ph.D. is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on educational level is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on educational level. It
was further found that the mean score of job involvement of university teachers without Ph.D. (3.87) is higher than that of university teachers with Ph.D. (3.82). But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Hypothesis 2e:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on academic position.”

Table 5.27 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job involvement based on academic position.

**Table 5.27: ANOVA to Determine Academic Position Differences in Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>81.664</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83.256</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

The results from Table 5.27 indicate that ‘F’ value (2.641) for the mean scores of job involvement level of university teachers of different academic position is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on academic position is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on academic position. Professors evidenced the
highest level of job involvement with a mean score of 3.95 and a standard deviation of 0.54, followed by assistant professors (mean score 3.79), while associate professors indicated the lowest level of job involvement with a mean score of 3.78 and a standard deviation of 0.48. But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Hypothesis 2f:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on income.”

Table 5.28 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job involvement based on income.

**Table 5.28: ANOVA to Determine Income Differences in Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Rs. 50,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 50,000-Rs. 64,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.65000-Rs.79000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.80,000 and above</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.862</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.954</td>
<td>10.721</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>74.394</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.256</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data. *p < 0.01

Table 5.28 illustrates that ‘F’ value (10.721) for the mean scores of job involvement level of university teachers having different income is significant at 0.01 level (as p < 0.01), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on income is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant
difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on income. University teachers in the income bracket ‘Rs. 65,000 - Rs. 79,000’ reported the highest level of job involvement indicating a mean of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.44, followed by university teachers earning ‘below Rs. 50,000’ (mean score 4.00) and university teachers earning ‘Rs. 80,000 and above’ (mean score 3.82), while university teachers in the income bracket ‘Rs. 50,000 - Rs. 64,000’ indicated the lowest level of job involvement with a mean score of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 0.62.

**Hypothesis 2g:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on experience.”

Table 5.29 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in job involvement based on experience.

**Table 5.29: ANOVA to Determine Experience Differences in Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and above</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.852</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>6.804</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>77.404</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.256</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data. *p < 0.01
Table 5.29 shows that ‘F’ value (6.804) for the mean scores of job involvement level of university teachers having different experience is significant at 0.01 level (as $p < 0.01$), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on experience is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on experience. University teachers having experience of ‘15 years and above’ evidenced the highest level of job involvement with a mean score of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.54, followed by university teachers having experience of ‘below 5 years’ (mean score 3.88) and university teachers with ‘10 - 14 years’ of experience (mean score 3.87), while university teachers with ‘5 - 9 years’ of experience indicated the lowest level of job involvement with a mean score of 3.62 and a standard deviation of 0.53.

On the basis of analysis of 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, 2f and 2g, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience) is accepted partially. It is accepted for age, gender, marital status, educational level and academic position, whereas it is rejected for income and experience.

5.3.3 DIFFERENCE IN THE LEVEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT BASED ON BIOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES:

**Hypothesis 3:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience).”

This hypothesis was tested by subdividing it into following subsidiary hypotheses (hypothesis 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3f and 3g).
**Hypothesis 3a:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on age.”

Table 5.30 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in organizational commitment based on age. ‘F’ value (16.883) for the mean scores of organizational commitment level of university teachers of different age category is significant at 0.01 level (as p < 0.01), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on age is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on age.

**Table 5.30: ANOVA to Determine Age Differences in Organizational Commitment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 35 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and above</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.778</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.259</td>
<td>16.883</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>84.111</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99.889</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.  

* *p < 0.01

University teachers in the age category ‘below 35 years’ evidenced the highest level of organizational commitment with a mean score of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 0.74, followed by university teachers in the age category ‘35 - 44 years’ (mean score 3.58) and university teachers in the age category
‘45 - 54 years’ (mean score 3.54), while university teachers in the age category ‘55 years and above’ indicated the lowest level of organizational commitment with a mean score of 2.91 and a standard deviation of 0.60.

**Hypothesis 3b:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on gender.”

Table 5.31 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in organizational commitment based on gender. As the ‘t’ value (-1.288) for the mean scores of organizational commitment level of male and female university teachers is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on gender is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on gender. It was further found that the mean score of organizational commitment of female university teachers (3.55) is higher than that of male university teachers (3.44). But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

**Table 5.31: T-Test to Determine Gender Differences in Organizational Commitment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-1.288</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.

**Hypothesis 3c:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on marital status.”

Table 5.32 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in organizational commitment based on marital status.
Table 5.32: T-Test to Determine Marital Status Differences in Organizational Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.

The results from Table 5.32 indicate that ‘t’ value (1.342) for the mean scores of organizational commitment level of unmarried and married university teachers is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on marital status is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on marital status. It was further found that the mean score of organizational commitment of unmarried university teachers (3.59) is higher than that of married university teachers (3.45). But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

Hypothesis 3d:

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on educational level.”

Table 5.33 indicates the results of T-Test illustrating differences in organizational commitment based on educational level.

Table 5.33: T-Test to Determine Educational Level Differences in Organizational Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ph.D.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>0.046**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data. **p < 0.05

Table 5.33 illustrates that ‘t’ value (2.007) for the mean scores of organizational commitment level of university teachers without Ph.D. and with
Ph.D. is significant at 0.05 level (as \( p < 0.05 \)), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on educational level is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on educational level. It was further found that the mean score of organizational commitment of university teachers without Ph.D. (3.62) is higher than that of university teachers with Ph.D. (3.43).

**Hypothesis 3e:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on academic position.”

Table 5.34 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in organizational commitment based on academic position.

**Table 5.34: ANOVA to Determine Academic Position Differences in Organizational Commitment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.960</td>
<td>5.535</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>95.969</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.889</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.  

*p < 0.01

The results from Table 5.34 indicate that ‘F’ value (5.535) for the mean scores of organizational commitment level of university teachers of different academic position is significant at 0.01 level (as \( p < 0.01 \)), so the null
hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on academic position is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on academic position. Assistant professors evidenced the highest level of organizational commitment with a mean score of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 0.58, followed by professors (mean score 3.40), while associate professors indicated the lowest level of organizational commitment with a mean score of 3.34 and a standard deviation of 0.65.

**Hypothesis 3f:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on income.”

Table 5.35 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in organizational commitment based on income.

**Table 5.35: ANOVA to Determine Income Differences in Organizational Commitment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Rs. 50,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.50,000-Rs. 64,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.65000-Rs.79000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs.80,000 and above</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Primary Data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data.*
Table 5.35 illustrates that ‘F’ value (10.107) for the mean scores of organizational commitment level of university teachers having different income is significant at 0.01 level (as p < 0.01), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on income is rejected and it is concluded that there is significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on income. University teachers in the income bracket ‘Rs. 65,000 - Rs. 79,000’ reported the highest level of organizational commitment indicating a mean of 3.92 and a standard deviation of 0.39, followed by university teachers earning ‘below Rs. 50,000’ (mean score 3.74) and university teachers in the income bracket ‘Rs. 50,000 - Rs. 64,000’ (mean score 3.49), while university teachers earning ‘Rs. 80,000 and above’ indicated the lowest level of organizational commitment with a mean score of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 0.58.

**Hypothesis 3g:**

“There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on experience.”

Table 5.36 indicates the results of ANOVA illustrating differences in organizational commitment based on experience. ‘F’ value (0.848) for the mean scores of organizational commitment level of university teachers having different experience is not significant at 0.05 level (as p > 0.05), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on experience is accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on experience. University teachers having experience of ‘below 5 years’ evidenced the highest level of organizational commitment with a mean score of 3.58 and a standard deviation of 0.70, followed by university teachers with ‘10 - 14 years’ of experience (mean score 3.52) and university teachers with ‘5 - 9 years’ of experience (mean score 3.50), while university teachers having experience of
‘15 years and above’ indicated the lowest level of organizational commitment with a mean score of 3.40 and a standard deviation of 0.68. But mean differences could not reach the significance level.

Table 5.36: ANOVA to Determine Experience Differences in Organizational Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and above</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Primary Data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the basis of analysis of 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3f and 3g, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience) is accepted partially. It is accepted for gender, marital status and experience, whereas it is rejected for age, educational level, academic position and income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB INVOLVEMENT:

Table 5.37 indicates the relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement.
Table 5.37: Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.351*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.351*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.  * Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.37 shows that Pearson correlation coefficient ($r = 0.351$) between job satisfaction and job involvement of university teachers is significant at 0.01 level (as $p < 0.01$) and it is concluded that there is significant relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement of university teachers. Based on a guideline developed by Cohen (1988) about the interpretation of correlation coefficient, it can be said that the correlation between job satisfaction and job involvement was moderate and positive.

5.3.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT:

Table 5.38 indicates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Table 5.38: Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.434*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.434*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data.  * Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.38 shows that Pearson correlation coefficient ($r = 0.434$) between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of university teachers
is significant at 0.01 level (as p < 0.01) and it is concluded that there is significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of university teachers. The correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was moderate and positive.

5.3.6 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT:

Table 5.39 indicates the relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment.

Table 5.39: Correlation between Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.585*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.585*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data. * Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.39 shows that Pearson correlation coefficient (r = 0.585) between job involvement and organizational commitment of university teachers is significant at 0.01 level (as p < 0.01) and it is concluded that there is significant relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment of university teachers. The correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment was large and positive.

5.3.7 REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB INVOLVEMENT:

Hypothesis 4:

“Job satisfaction does not statistically explain the variance in job involvement of university teachers.”
For the purpose of determining the extent to which job satisfaction explains the variance in job involvement of university teachers, regression analysis was performed.

**Table 5.40: Regression Analysis between Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6.971</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.971</td>
<td>38.217</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>49.612</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.582</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.321</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>8.705</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>6.182</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Primary Data.  
*p < 0.01*

Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction  
Dependent Variable: Job Involvement

Results of regression analysis indicate that the correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and job involvement is 0.351. The R-Squared value (also known as coefficient of determination) of 0.123 indicates that job satisfaction explains 12.30% of the variance in job involvement. The F-statistic of 38.217 is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (as p < 0.01). So the null
hypothesis stating that job satisfaction does not statistically explain the variance in job involvement of university teachers is rejected and it is concluded that job satisfaction statistically explains the variance in job involvement of university teachers. With a Beta value of 0.351, job satisfaction reaches a statistical significance at 0.01 level (as \( p < 0.01 \)) and therefore job satisfaction is the significant predictor of job involvement.

The regression equation of job involvement on job satisfaction can be written as,

\[
\text{Job Involvement} = 2.321 + 0.440 \times (\text{Job Satisfaction})
\]

5.3.8 REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT:

**Hypothesis 5:**

“Job satisfaction does not statistically explain the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers.”

Table 5.41 indicates the results of regression analysis between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Results of regression analysis indicate that the correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is 0.434. The R-Squared value (i.e., coefficient of determination) of 0.188 indicates that job satisfaction explains 18.80% of the variance in organizational commitment. The F-statistic of 63.098 is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (as \( p < 0.01 \)). So the null hypothesis stating that job satisfaction does not statistically explain the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers is rejected and it is concluded that job satisfaction statistically explains the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers. With a Beta value of 0.434, job satisfaction reaches a statistical significance at 0.01 level (as \( p < 0.01 \)) and therefore job satisfaction is the significant predictor of organizational commitment.
Table 5.41: Regression Analysis between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11.885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.885</td>
<td>63.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>51.233</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.118</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.602</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.913</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>7.943</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data. *p < 0.01

Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction

Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

The regression equation of organizational commitment on job satisfaction can be written as,

Organizational Commitment = 1.602 + 0.574 (Job Satisfaction)

5.3.9 REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN JOB INVOLVEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT:

Hypothesis 6:

“Job involvement does not statistically explain the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers.”
Table 5.42 indicates the results of regression analysis between job involvement and organizational commitment.

**Table 5.42: Regression Analysis between Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>21.632</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.632</td>
<td>141.833</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>41.486</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.118</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.254</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>11.909</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data.*

*p < 0.01

Predictors: (Constant), Job Involvement

Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

Results of regression analysis indicate that the correlation coefficient between job involvement and organizational commitment is 0.585. The R-Squared value (i.e., coefficient of determination) of 0.343 indicates that job involvement explains 34.30% of the variance in organizational commitment. The F-statistic of 141.833 is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (as p < 0.01). So the null hypothesis stating that job involvement does not
statistically explain the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers is rejected and it is concluded that job involvement statistically explains the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers. With a Beta value of 0.585, job involvement reaches a statistical significance at 0.01 level (as $p < 0.01$) and therefore job involvement is the significant predictor of organizational commitment.

The regression equation of organizational commitment on job involvement can be written as,

$$\text{Organizational Commitment} = 1.294 + 0.618 \times \text{Job Involvement}$$

Table 5.43 shows the summary of hypothesis testing.

**Table 5.43: Summarized Results of Hypothesis Testing.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is no significant difference in the level of job satisfaction of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience).</td>
<td>Partially Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is no significant difference in the level of job involvement of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience).</td>
<td>Partially Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is no significant difference in the level of organizational commitment of university teachers based on biographical variables (namely, age, gender, marital status, educational level, academic position, income and experience).</td>
<td>Partially Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job satisfaction does not statistically explain the variance in job involvement of university teachers.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Job satisfaction does not statistically explain the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Job involvement does not statistically explain the variance in organizational commitment of university teachers.</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 CONCLUDING REMARK:

This chapter presented the results of data analysis in tabular form. The data gathered through Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, Job Involvement Questionnaire and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire were statistically analysed by means of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Statistical analysis involved both descriptive and inferential statistics (T-Test, Analysis of Variance, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Regression Analysis). The biographical characteristics of the sample were studied. The differences in job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment based on biographical variables were identified. The relationships between job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment were studied. The extent to which job satisfaction explains variances in job involvement and organizational commitment and also the extent to which job involvement explains variance in organizational commitment were determined.