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Abstract. The current study investigates the determinants of faculty job satisfaction in private sector universities of Pakistan. Furthermore, this study inquires about the moderating role of life satisfaction on faculty job satisfaction. Approximately 500 questionnaires were distributed among the faculty members of W category private sector universities, out of 500 questionnaires, 430 were received and 396 were found to be filled as per criteria. After applying the statistical tools of SPSS 23, it was confirmed that motivational and hygienic factors have a significant and positive relationship with faculty job satisfaction. Moreover, the results proved that the impact of life satisfaction did not moderate the relationship of faculty job satisfaction with motivational factors as well as hygienic factors. The results of the study can be generalized to other universities as well as other sectors of Pakistan. The framework of the study can be applied to compare the faculty job satisfaction level of public and private sector universities.
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1. Introduction

Development and growth of higher education institutions lead the country to the peak of growth and make it economically strong (Lester, 2005). In Pakistan, public and private universities are growing under the supervision of the higher education commission (Halai, 2013). But there are some problems on many fronts and especially in terms of hiring qualified faculty (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2007). Pakistani higher institutions are facing the turnover problems of qualified faculty and the main reason behind this is the faculty job dissatisfaction (Emami & Nazari, 2012; Nazari & Emami, 2012).

In the education sector, faculty job satisfaction becomes the main concern for educational institutes, and faculty job satisfaction ultimately affects student learning (Malik, Nawab, Naeem, & Danish, 2010). Different researches conducted different studies on faculty job satisfaction and found different types of factors that lead to low faculty job satisfaction (Noor, 2009). (Cox, 2003) found that job dissatisfaction can be identified through teamwork and interpersonal work stress. There are several job dissatisfaction factors identified in previous studies like administration policy, supervision. This study is based on Herzberg's two-factor theory. (Ruthankoon & Olu Ogunlana, 2003) stated that Herzberg's two-factor theory is one of the most famous and widely used theory to investigate the relationship of job features with job satisfaction. Herzberg's two factors theory contained the two elements satisfaction and dissatisfaction and stated that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were opposite one another (Wolf, 1970).

Wahba & Bridwell (1976) stated that in the hierarchy of needs there are five stages of needs (basic needs, safety and security needs, social needs, self-esteem, and self-actualization). (Bozeman & Bretschneider, 1994) concluded that job satisfaction between private and public sector universities is different in terms of rewards, part of faculty in decision making, supervision, and organization policies. Job satisfaction is positively significant with interpersonal relations, responsibilities, and recognition (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000). Different studies stated that there is a strong relationship between motivation and hygiene factors with faculty job satisfaction (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). It was concluded in different studies that there is no impact of gender on faculty job satisfaction (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). There are two types of potential job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction components of Herzberg's two-factor theory.

Personal life stability or Instability is another factor of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction that becomes the main concern of the organizations (Victor & Cullen, 1988). Some studies show that physical stability is the most important
factor for employee performance (Fox, 1999). There are the massive effects of physical instability e.g. Unstable diet, no daily exercise, and mental disorder influence employee performance and these effects ultimately lead to employee job dissatisfaction (Binder, Storandt, & Birge, 1999). Previously, it was found that there is a high relationship between biographical factors (gender, marital status, and age), hygienic factors (job security, growth possibility, employee relations, and working conditions), and faculty job satisfaction in the public sector universities (Msuya, 2016). In 2016, a study found that the extrinsic factor of motivation increases the employee satisfaction level (Ali, Dahie, & Ali, 2016). Life satisfaction is another major factor for employee's satisfaction and there is a need to explore the moderating role of life satisfaction between motivational factors and faculty job satisfaction (Aydintan & Koç, 2016).

A study was conducted and revealed that poor administration system, distrust, job insecurity, weak social interaction, and lack of appreciation for work done to cause the faculty job dissatisfaction (Sahito & Vaisanen, 2017). Another comparative study between Islamic and conventional insurance was conducted to analyze the two-factor theory factors affecting job satisfaction (Rahman, Akhter, & Khan, 2017). As per available literature, there is a deficiency in research work related to two-factor theory and job satisfaction in private universities of Pakistan with the moderating role of life satisfaction. Therefore, based on the above-mentioned reasons, this study is being conducted to fill the gap by investigation of Motivational & Hygiene determinants of faculty job satisfaction: the moderating role of Life satisfaction in private universities of Pakistan.

It was analyzed that faculties are not satisfied in Pakistani universities due to certain factors (Khalid, Irshad, & Mahmood, 2012) these factors ultimately increase the switching behavior of the faculty from one university to other university or in other sectors which directly or indirectly influence the students' performance and hence their future (Fredman & Doughney, 2012). There is limited literature available on this topic in Pakistan and many researchers are dissatisfied with the progress of research on job satisfaction (Saba, 2011). Most studies did not analyze the factors properly and generate the final results due to the fast switching rate of the faculty (Syed & Bhat, 2013). A high turnover rate of faculty severely affecting student learning and it is creating a gap between faculty way of teaching and student learning that is not beneficial for the students' overall growth, grooming, and career development (Yang, 2004).

Organizations are trying to discover the factors that are subconsciously affecting the employees' performance and ultimately decreasing the satisfaction of the employees (Proctor, 2014) due to dissatisfaction the employees
organizations are facing the turnover problem that is ultimately switching the skilled employees from education sectors to the other sectors (Gwavuya, 2011). The study aims to investigate the impact of motivational and hygienic factors on faculty job satisfaction in Pakistan, especially among private sector universities. Furthermore, this study will analyze the moderating role of life satisfaction.

2 Literature Review

The subsequent sections shed light on the issue in detail.

2.1 Herzberg’s Two Factor Motivational-Hygienic Theory

The two-factor theory also called motivation-hygiene theory was developed by Fredrick Herzberg in 1950. This theory provides a picture of the motivational factors and how these factors will increase or decrease the performance of the employees (Ajang, 2007). Herzberg’s identified some dissatisfaction factors and their effects on employees performance (Tan & Waheed, 2011).

Herzberg interviewed 200 engineers and accountants working in the manufacturing industry and collect data about which factors satisfied them and which factors dissatisfied them (Sergiovanni, 1967) and identify the effects of motivation-hygiene factors on employee performance and productivity (Umstot, Bell, & Mitchell, 1976). Herzberg’s identified that employees behave well when they are in a good environment and behave badly when they are in a bad environment (Dartey-Baah & Amoako, 2011). Both motivational and hygiene factors have a different impact on employees' performance (Herzberg, 1968).

Motivational factors help the organization to improve the performance of the employees and employees performance increases through their satisfaction and affiliation with the job (Ramlall, 2004) and on another side, according to (Herzberg, 2005) some hygiene factors ultimately increase the employees' dissatisfaction and decrease the performance and increase the downfall of the organization. (Moyle, Skinner, Rowe, & Gork, 2003) stated that motivational factors create the job and satisfaction and hygiene factors create the job dissatisfaction (Tietjen & Myers, 1998). Attitude towards the work of the employees shows that they are satisfied or dissatisfied (Lam, Zhang, & Baum, 2001).

2.2 Motivational factors and job satisfaction

According to Herzberg’s in his theory, employees job satisfaction comes through motivational factors and these factors leads to employee commitment and ultimately organizations achieve the goals (Sandhya & Kumar, 2011), on the other hand, if employees are not taking interest in their job then intrinsic
factors can provide an effective platform to the employees to take a decision (Wright, 2007).

2.2.1 Achievements and job satisfaction

Achievement is the effective motivational factor that enhances the employees' satisfaction, increases performance, and maintain employee involvement in work (Manzoor, 2012). According to (Good, Aronson, & Harder, 2008) high level of achievement push the employees to perform well as compare to a low level of achievement. It is said by (Schunk, 1995) that Achievers are self-motivated and can perform complex tasks efficiently.

2.2.2 Recognition and job satisfaction

It is said by (Ratna & Chawla, 2012) that employees need appreciation and recognition to perform well. Throughout the work, employees want to support and an appraisal from the supervisor, co-workers and want a comfortable environment (Brad Shuck, Rocco, & Albornoz, 2011). Recognition is one of the most powerful motivational tools to accelerate and enhance the productivity of the employees and produces effective results (Manzoor, 2012).

2.2.3 Responsibility and job satisfaction

Responsibility is another motivational tool that shows the employees' engagement and involvement in the procedure and completion of the work (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Employees want empowerment and responsibility to complete the work (Herrenkohl, Judson, & Heffner, 1999). (Leach & Sitaram, 2002) analyzed that responsibility work as a fuel for the employees and they feel pleasure when they have decision-making power.

2.2.4 Growth possibility and job satisfaction

Energetic and hardworking employees always expect that their organization will appreciate their work and provide the facility of promotion (Hofstede, 1980). An employee who has a strong educational background, as well as professional skills, is promoted quickly (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990). Employees with quality knowledge and having effective skills can run the organization efficiently and these types of organizations can achieve their vision and mission (Jones & Jones, 2010).

2.2.5 Work itself and job satisfaction

Work itself is one of the motivational factors that influence employees' performance (Hackman, 1980). Quality Human resource of the organization
helps the organization to achieve the goals (Jiang, Lepak, Hu, & Baer, 2012). (Zhu, Chew, & Spangler, 2005) Concluded there is a positive impact on human capital and managerial communication on organization performance.

2.3 Hygienic factors and job satisfaction

Hygiene factors are external factors that decrease the employees' job satisfaction (Aziri, 2011), intensity of hygiene factors severely affects employee’s higher performance (Islam & Zaki Hj. Ismail, 2008). The higher level and strict extrinsic factors affect the employee's satisfaction negatively (Stringer, 2006). (Sergiovanni, 1967) states that motivational factors are a source of satisfaction while hygiene factors are reasons of dissatisfaction that affect the employee's job satisfaction. (George & Zhou, 2007) found a negative impact of supervisor bad behavior on employee’s job performance. A study conducted by (Staufenbiel & König, 2010) shows that job insecurity affects workers' performance and increase turnover. A quantitative study conducted by (Bashir, 2011) and results show that strict organizational policies affect the employees' performance badly and ultimately affect the organizational goals.

2.3.1 Organizational policies

Organizational policies play an important role in the performance appraisal and promotion system (Parvin & Kabir, 2011). As per the literature review, most of the studies show that employees are less satisfied with organization policies (Mosadeghrad, Ferlie, & Rosenberg, 2008). According to (Saltzstein, Ting, & Saltzstein, 2001) study, it was found that the main reason behind the dissatisfaction is policies that are outdated for a long time.

2.3.2 Supervision and job satisfaction

The engagement and involvement of employees depend on the supervisor-employee relationship (Therkelsen & Fiebich, 2004). Employee negative behavior, bad work performance, and low affiliation with work determine that supervisor is not supportive (Parker, Axtell, & Turner, 2001). The negative attitude of managers toward employees increases job dissatisfaction and negatively affect job performance (Bushra, Ahmad, & Naveed, 2011). (Komposo & Sridevi, 2010) recommended that manager-employee relations must be strong to enhance productivity.

2.3.3 Salary and job satisfaction

Higher education provides rewards in the shape of a good salary to the employees (Janssen, 2000). Employees with higher salary are more satisfied as compared to low salary employees (Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid, & Sirola, 1998). Most higher education people seek a job with effective rewards and other
benefits (Armenti*, 2004). A quantitative study conducted by (Dhanapal, Subramaniam, & Vashu, 2013) to investigate the impact of pay and faculty job satisfaction. (Dhanapal et al., 2013) found an insignificant and negative relationship between pay and faculty job satisfaction.

2.3.4 Working conditions and job satisfaction

Organizational culture creates behavior and values for employees that are having differences in their cultures (McSweeney, 2002). Often, it is difficult for an employee to adjust to a multicultural environment and that's why employees express negative behavior about the work environment (Pasca & Wagner, 2011). (Hunjra, Chani, Aslam, Azam, & Rehman, 2010) Conducted a study on the employees in Pakistani banks to investigate the impact of working conditions on employee’s job satisfaction and found that there is a negative relationship between working conditions and employee’s satisfaction.

2.3.5 Interpersonal relations and job satisfaction

A positive relationship with co-workers is important for an individual to work effectively (Sherony & Green, 2002). Relationship with peers can be defined through personal interaction and working interaction (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998). Friendly and cooperative peers are the big source of job satisfaction among the faculty (Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie, & Alam, 2009). It is said by (Furnham & Taylor, 2011) that bad relationship or rude behave from co-workers increase job stress and ultimately decreased job satisfaction.

2.4 Moderating variables

2.4.1 Influence of life satisfaction on motivational factors and faculty job satisfaction

In 1961, the word Life satisfaction construct was conceptualized and researched by Neugarten (Adelman, 1991). This study was based on actual and expected life satisfaction (Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis, 1998). When a person is happy and positively reacting with others then he has maximum life satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998). Fulfillment of expectations and goals leads to life satisfaction (Emmons, 1986). It was researched by (Cohn, Fredrickson, Brown, Mikels, & Conway, 2009) that the positive actions of a person show life satisfaction.

2.4.2 Influence of life satisfaction on hygienic factors and faculty job satisfaction

Numerous studies have been conducted to analyze the relationship between life satisfaction and job satisfaction (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Organizations are
showing maximum attention to employees' job satisfaction as well as life satisfaction because job satisfaction is affected due to bad life satisfaction (Hart, 1999). A study by Diener and Diener (1996) shows Some people are satisfied with their job but dissatisfied with their life. (Judge & Watanabe, 1994) revealed a negative relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

2.5 **Job satisfaction**

The concept of job satisfaction was studied in 1911 with the research of Taylor (Locke, 1970). Taylor identified the factors which include pay, supervision, environment, and coworkers and these factors are eventually increases the employees' job satisfaction (Tella, Ayeni, & Popoola, 2007). Numerous researches defined the term job satisfaction. (Weiss, 2002) defined that Job satisfaction is the emotional state that shows the positive or negative aspect of job experiences. It is said by (Bushra et al., 2011) that job satisfaction shows that employees have a positive response to the job. Locke (1969) stated that Job satisfaction is related to working conditions, features, and different aspects of the job.

It is said by (Oshagbemi, 1999) that Response towards job shows that job satisfaction. The work has been started to measure job satisfaction among different fields. Job satisfaction came from a situation list perspective (Kombo, 2015). The situation list perspective states that there are different types of job factors and job environment factors that affect the employees' job satisfaction (Donavan, Brown, & Mowen, 2004). This view attracts massive attention in different studies and lots of researchers identify different types of factors in which there are some good factors and some bad for employees and these factors are directly affecting the employees' work performance (Rynes, Gerhart, & Minette, 2004).

2.6 **Hypothesis**

H1: Motivational factors have a positive influence on faculty job satisfaction

H2: Hygienic factors have a negative influence on faculty job satisfaction

H3: Hygienic factors are more significant than motivational factors

H4: Life satisfaction moderates the relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction

H5: Life satisfaction moderates the relationship between hygienic factors and job satisfaction
2.7 Conceptual framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Factors</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Possibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Itself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hygiene Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational policy and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Conceptual Framework

3. Methodology

3.1 Population of the study

The target population of this study is the faculty staff of private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. The selected cities are Lahore, Islamabad, and Gujrat. The faculty staff is selected in this study based on four reasons. The first reason is faculties are the core assets of any educational institution (Yeh & Ta, 2005). The second reason is faculty staff of higher education institutions plays important role in the growth and development of the country (Bloom, Canning, & Chan, 2006). The third reason, Pakistan is a developing country and the satisfaction of faculty staff should be a priority of the universities (Arif & Ilyas, 2013) and the fourth reason is that the satisfaction level of faculty in the private sector and public universities seem to be different.

3.2 Sampling technique

Non-probability sampling technique is used for data collection of this research because this research has constraints of self-financed and limited time and it was difficult to apply the probability sampling technique. Non-probability sampling According to (Raschke, Krishen, Kachroo, & Maheshwari, 2013) is
useful where the problems of time and resources are prevailing. So, the non-probability sampling technique is the proposed method for data collection.

### 3.3 Sampling design

Convenience sampling technique was used for data collection from the faculty of selected private sector universities because it was an easy method for the researcher to collect data from the respondents (Keengwe, 2007). Furthermore, a quota of 100 questionnaires was filled by targeted universities.

### 3.4 Sample of the study

The sample size of this study is the faculty staff of private sector universities of Lahore, Gujrat, and Islamabad. The below-mentioned universities are selected because these universities are well established and accessible. The researchers will be able to get better results about the faculty job.

Sample size was selected on the basis of two reasons. The first reason is about the rule of thumb that was introduced by (Roscoe) stated that for social sciences sample size between 30-500 is the best sample for data collection (Nikbin, Ismail, Marimuthu, & Armesh, 2012). The second reason is Raosoft online sample size calculator, in which 5% was margin error and confidence interval was 95%.

### 3.5 Statistical software for data analysis

SPSS (statistical package for social sciences) version 23 was used for data analysis which includes reliability, correlation, simple, and multiple regression, and moderated regression analysis for this study.

### 3.6 Data collection method

Method of Questionnaire was used for data collection. In quantitative design, questionnaires are the best way to collect numeric data and analyze for the purpose of inferences through systematic and statistical techniques (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). A total number of 500 questionnaires were personally distributed and administered among the faculty staff of 5 selected private sector universities of Lahore, Gujrat, and Islamabad. Out of 500 questionnaires, 430 were returned and 396 questionnaires were filled and left for further analysis.
## Table 1 Demographics of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40-49K</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>50-59K</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>MS/</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>60-69K</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>70-79K</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-Above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>80-Above</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.7 Reliability analysis

The reliability analysis is used to check the internal consistency of the data (Downing, 2004). Reliability shows to what extent instruments and their results are reliable and consistent for further analysis (Cook & Beckman, 2006). Cronbach alpha is a reliable test in SPSS that is used to measure the consistency of the variables (Dunn, Baguley, & Brunsden, 2014) High value of alpha reliability shows that results will produce more reliable results.

Table 2 Scale Reliability Cronbach Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. Of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Factors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygienic factors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 Correlation and regression analysis

To test the hypothesis, the Pearson correlation test was conducted to find the relationship between motivational factors, hygienic factors, and job satisfaction. These variables are individually addressed and results are mentioned below:

H1 Motivational Factors and Job Satisfaction

$H_{10}$ There is no positive relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction.

$H_{11}$ There is a positive relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction.
Table 3  
**Testing the Determinants of Motivational Factors and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Factors</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction (N=396)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Possibility</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that there is a positive relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction. All the determinants of motivational factors show the significant relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction. The p-value of determinants is less than 0.01. 3 out of 5 correlations of the motivational factors and job satisfaction are between 0.2-0.4 that shows the low correlations and the remaining 2 correlations of the determinants are between 0.4-0.5 that shows the moderate correlations between motivational factors and job satisfaction. So, the null hypothesis H1₀ is rejected. Motivational factors are independent variables and job satisfaction is the dependent variable, multiple regression analysis was conducted and results are given below:

Model: $R = 0.445$, $R^2 = 0.198$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.196$, $\beta = 0.713$, $F = 97.435$, $P = 0.000$

According to results attained from regression analysis shows that all the independent variables seem to explain 19.8% variances in the dependent variable ($R^2 = 0.198$). The $R^2 = 0.198$ shows that the regression model is effective and explained the variance well. The negative beta value shows the negative impact of the independent variable on the dependent variable but here beta value is positive. Thus, there is a positive influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable and P-value 0.000 shows that model is statistically significant.

H2  Hygienic Factors and Job Satisfaction

H2₀  There is no negative relationship between hygienic factors and job satisfaction.

H2₁  There is a negative relationship between hygienic factors and job satisfaction.
The below correlation table shows the links between hygienic factors and job satisfaction.

**Table 4 Testing the Determinants of Hygienic Factors and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hygienic Factors</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction (N=396)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration policies</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that there is a positive relation between hygienic factors and job satisfaction. All the determinants of hygienic factors show the significant relationship between hygienic factors and job satisfaction. The p-value of determinants is less than 0.01. 3 out of 5 correlations of the motivational factors and job satisfaction are between 0.3 to 0.6 shows moderate correlations and the remaining 2 correlations of the determinants are between 0.6 to 0.7 shows moderately strong correlations between hygienic factors and job satisfaction. So, the null hypothesis H$_2$ is accepted.

Hygienic factors are independent variables and job satisfaction is the dependent variable, multiple regression analysis was conducted and results are given below:

Model: R = 0.676, R$^2$ = 0.457, Adjusted R$^2$ = 0.456, $\beta$ = 0.850, F = 331.520, P = 0.000

The results attained from the regression analysis show that all the independent variables seem to explain 0.457% variances in the dependent variable ($R^2 = 0.0457$). The $R^2 = 0.457$ shows that the regression model is effective and explained the variance well. The negative beta value shows the negative impact of the independent variable on the dependent variable but here beta value is positive. Thus, there is a positive influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable and P-value 0.000 shows that model is statistically significant.

**H3** Motivational Factors and Hygienic Factors with Job Satisfaction

**H3**$_0$ Hygienic factors are more significant as motivational factors.
H3<sub>1</sub> Hygienic factors are less significant as motivational factors.

Table 5 Correlation of Motivational and Hygienic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction (N=396)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Factors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygienic factors</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (p-value)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that the p-value of both motivational and hygienic factors is less than 0.001 which is highly significant. The correlation between motivational factors and job satisfaction is less (0.445) than from hygienic factors and job satisfaction (0.676). The correlation between hygienic factors and job satisfaction is higher (0.676) than motivational factors and job satisfaction (0.445). Both sets of correlation are between 0.4 and 0.7 that is highly significant. So, the null hypothesis H3<sub>0</sub> is accepted.

Motivational factors and hygienic factors are independent variables and job satisfaction is the dependent variable, multiple regression analysis was conducted and results are given below:

Model: R = 0.667, R<sup>2</sup> = 0.458, Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = 0.455, F = 165.928, P = 0.000

The results attained from the regression analysis show that all the independent variables seem to explain 0.458% variances in the dependent variable (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.0458). The R<sup>2</sup> = 0.455 shows that the regression model is effective and explained the variance well. P-value 0.000 shows that model is statistically significant.

3.9 Moderation Analysis

Moderator is a variable that increases or decreases the strength of the independent variable and dependent variable. Moderator works as an interaction variable between the independent variable and dependent variable.

H4 Life Satisfaction as a Moderator between Motivational Factors Job Satisfaction

H4<sub>0</sub> There is no moderating effect of life satisfaction between motivational factors and job satisfaction

H4<sub>1</sub> There is a moderating effect of life satisfaction between motivational factors and job satisfaction.
Table 6 Moderated Regression of Life Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>H1 (Accepted/Rejected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF*LS</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MF = Motivational Factors, LF = Life Satisfaction

Table 6 is about the moderating effect of life satisfaction between motivational factors and job satisfaction. The interaction effect of MF*LS is statistically insignificant because the p-value is 0.677 more than the standard value of 0.05. So, the null hypothesis H4₀ is accepted.

H₅ Life Satisfaction as a Moderator between Hygienic Factors Job Satisfaction

H₅₀ There is no moderating effect of life satisfaction between hygienic factors and job satisfaction.

H₅₁ There is a moderating effect of life satisfaction between hygienic factors and job satisfaction.

Table 7 Moderated Regression of Life Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>H₁ (Accepted/Rejected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF*LS</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HF = Hygienic Factors, LS = Life Satisfaction

Table 7 is about the moderating effect of life satisfaction between motivational factors and job satisfaction. The interaction effect of HF*LS is statistically insignificant because the p-value is 0.175 more than the standard value of 0.05. So, the null hypothesis H₅₀ is accepted.
3.9 Hypothesis summary

Table 8  Hypothesis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Motivational factors have a positive influence on job satisfaction</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Hygienic factors have a negative influence on job satisfaction</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Hygienic factors are less significant as compare to motivational factors</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Life satisfaction moderates the relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Life satisfaction moderates the relationship between hygienic factors and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Discussion

This study investigates the impact of motivational factors and hygienic factors on faculty job satisfaction under the moderating role of life satisfaction and gender in private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. It is said by (Wright & Kim, 2004) that for the development and growth of the businesses, organizations must be sincere about the job satisfaction of the intellectual human workforce Because human workforce satisfaction leads organizations to the peak of success.

4.1 Motivational factors and job satisfaction

Based on previous studies this study also hypothesized that there are a positive relationship and impact of motivational factors like achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth opportunities, and work itself on employee's job satisfaction. In this study after implementing the analysis tools, the results of the correlation analysis show that all the determinants of the motivational factors are positively correlating with faculty job satisfaction. The regression analysis shows that motivational factors are 0.198 % regress in faculty job satisfaction. So, the H11 hypothesis is accepted. The findings of this study are completely associated with previous studies.

4.2 Hygienic factors and job satisfaction

The study hypothesized that there are a positive relationship and impact of Hygienic factors like organizational policies and administration, supervision, salary, working conditions, and co-workers on employee's job satisfaction. In this study after implementing the analysis tools, the results of the correlation analysis show that all the determinants of the hygienic factors are positively correlating with faculty job satisfaction. The regression analysis shows that
motivational factors are 0.456 \% regress faculty job satisfaction. So, the H21 hypothesis is rejected. The findings of this study are completely aligned with previous studies.

### 4.3 Significant factors (motivational or hygienic)

This study hypothesized that hygienic (extrinsic) factors are more significant as compare to motivational (intrinsic) factors. The results obtained from quantitative data show that hygienic factors are more significant as compare to motivational factors. The quantitative results of the motivational and hygienic factors are 0.445 and 0.676. So, the H31 hypothesis is rejected. The finding of this study is aligning with the study that was conducted by (Alsemeri, 2016) who found that intrinsic factors are less significant as compared to extrinsic factors.

### 4.4 Moderating role of life satisfaction

In this study, it was hypothesized that there is a moderating role in life satisfaction between motivational factors and faculty job satisfaction. Results of this study show that life satisfaction is statistically insignificant and has failed to act as a moderator between motivational factors and faculty job satisfaction. So, the H41 hypothesis is rejected. The results of life satisfaction show that if employees are getting proper intrinsic motivation from the organization and they are less satisfied with their life it will not increase or decrease the strength of the relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction in the education sector. Besides, it was also analyzed the moderator role of life satisfaction between hygienic factors and faculty job satisfaction, and results were still insignificant. So, the H51 hypothesis is rejected.

### 5. Conclusion

This study was based on two-factor theory and the main purpose of this study is to analyze the impact of motivational factors (achievement, recognition, responsibility, the possibility of growth and work itself) and hygienic factors (organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary, working conditions and co-workers) on faculty job satisfaction under the moderating role of life satisfaction and gender. The first two objectives were to check the impact of motivational and hygienic factors on faculty job satisfaction. The results show that motivational and hygienic factors are statistically significant and both have a positive impact on faculty job satisfaction. According to the results, the highest motivational factors were recognition and growth possibility but the review of the literature shows that achievement, responsibility, and work itself play an important role to increase employee satisfaction (Alsemeri, 2016). The highest-ranked hygienic factors were organizational policies, salary,
and working conditions. In this study organizational policies are satisfying the faculty but the previous studies indicate that organizational policies are showing a low correlation between employee's job satisfaction. The lowest-ranked hygienic factors were supervision and co-workers. However, the study found that the hygienic factors are more significant as compare to motivational factors. The third objective was to analyze the significant level of motivation and hygienic factors and results show that hygienic factors are more significant as compare to motivational factors and some previous studies are supporting the results of this study. The next two objectives were to analyze the moderating role of life satisfaction between motivational factors and faculty job satisfaction as well as the moderating role of life satisfaction between hygienic factors and faculty job satisfaction. The results indicate that there is statistically insignificant moderation of life satisfaction between motivational factors and faculty job satisfaction as well as hygienic factors and faculty job satisfaction.

6. Future Recommendations

The results of the study show that hygienic factors are more significant as compare to motivational factors and results are align with previous studies but motivational factors are also important for the satisfaction of the employees. Countless studies were conducted and concluded that motivational factors are more significant as compare to hygienic factors. The results of the research will be helpful for the Human resource department to become proactive to overcome the weak points of the strategies and add some effective points to increase the job satisfaction of the faculty staff in educational sectors. Human resource management should try to focus on the determinants of motivational and hygienic factors that are showing low job satisfaction.

As per the results of this study, the hygienic (extrinsic) factors are more significant as compare to motivational (intrinsic) factors. So, the human resource management should try to increase the level of satisfaction in the determinants that are showing a low level of satisfaction. The results of the study indicate a low level of satisfaction regarding the supervision, organization policies, and coworkers' relations. The review of the literature indicates that job satisfaction, productivity, and commitment are influenced badly due to inflexibility in the organizations' policies (Babnik, Trunk Širca, & Breznik, 2012; Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001; Kaya, Koc, & Topcu, 2010).

The two determinants of hygienic factors (supervision and coworkers) are also having unique importance in the literature. As per literature, most of the employee's job satisfaction depends on the supervisor's behavior and coworker's relations (Alsemeri, 2016; Liu, Mitchell, Lee, Holtom, & Hinkin, 2012; Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006) but the results are less from moderate
level. It means that the environment and relationship should be friendly between supervisor and subordinates.

The results of the research will be helpful for the human resource management of the universities that they should be sensitive in terms of the relationship between employees and to teach the supervisors and coworkers regarding the positive behavior at work to overcome these issues. There are some motivational factors like achievement, recognition, and work itself that are highlighting the low level of satisfaction between employees. Countless studies found a positive relationship between achievement, recognition, work itself, and job satisfaction. A study conducted by (Tan & Waheed, 2011) that achievement, recognition, and work itself lead to job satisfaction and less intention to leave (Alasmari & Douglas, 2012).

In light of the above-mentioned weak points, the human resource department of the universities should try to overcome these issues for faculty job satisfaction. By focusing on and overcoming the above-mentioned recommendation, faculty job satisfaction could be achieved.

7. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Studies

The limitation of this study could be sample size, classification of motivational and hygienic factors, and survey questions. The limitations of this study are noted and point to some recommendations for future researches. The study only surveyed the faculty of selected public sector universities. It may be useful to conduct a study on faculty of the public sector universities to check their level of satisfaction regarding the education sector. The objective of this research was to analyze the impact of motivational and hygienic factors on job satisfaction under the moderating role of life satisfaction in the education sector. As per researcher knowledge, there are no or limited studies with the same objective in Pakistan. This study is having the potential to conduct in other sectors of Pakistan to check the job satisfaction level under the mentioned moderating role of life satisfaction. The study was only targeting the private sector universities of Pakistan. In the future, the study is having the potential of comparative analysis to check the job satisfaction level between public and private sector universities. This future direction will provide a clear picture of job satisfaction between public and private sector universities. The last limitation is the determinants of motivational and hygienic factors are regressing 46% in job satisfaction. The future study can take up the initiative to explore the remaining job satisfaction determinants.
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