Factors affecting job satisfaction: a case study of private universities of Pakistan.

Faquia Hanif
PhD Scholar at Greenwich university, Karachi
fouqiahanif@gmail.com

S Khurram Khan Alwi* (Corresponding Author)
Associate Professor, Greenwich University Karachi
drkhurramkhan@outlook.com

Mariyam Malik
Greenwich University
mariyammalik.gu@gmail.com

Mahnoor Farooqui
PhD scholar at Greenwich university,
Karachi
Mahnoor010@gmail.com

Abstract
This study aims to investigate how the interpersonal relationship and promotion opportunities associate with job satisfaction of academic staff permanently employed in private sector higher education institutions. It was a quantitative research with correlational research design. A questionnaire was developed to collect data from 150 permanent faculty members of the private sector higher education institutions in Karachi, Pakistan. Descriptive statistics, partial correlation, Anova and collinearity tests were used to analyze the data collected and model developed for the study. Results of the study revealed that interpersonal relationships at work and promotion opportunities are the factors positively related with the job satisfaction of the permanent academics employed in private sector higher education institutions. Future research can replicate the framework of this study in other settings and for comparative studies in other organizations. Time and Cost, two constraints kept study restricted to only 150 permanent academics employed in private sector higher education institutions of Karachi Pakistan. This paper will contribute to the existing literature about positive relationship among interpersonal relationship, promotion opportunities and job satisfaction of academics permanently employed in higher education institutions. This study will benefit management of the private sector higher education institutions and government authorities to revisit their current practices and policies related to the phenomenon investigated.
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Introduction
Dynamite of environment in modern era has posed varied challenges to organizations all around the world. To keep employees satisfied in order to be successful has become a matter of great concern for all types of enterprises (Sree and Satyavathi, 2017).

Over the past several decades employees’ job satisfaction is a preeminent research variable of numerous scholarly studies. Organizations irrespective of their field of working are keenly interested to measure the variable for ensuring the favorable attitude of employees towards their work related responsibilities (Shaju and Subhashini, 2017).

Many studies are conducted to investigate factors affecting job satisfaction of employees including reward, work itself, promotion opportunities, work conditions, work group and interpersonal relationships, leadership styles, performance appraisal in various organizations. But there is lack of empirical studies focusing the determinants of job satisfaction among permanent academic staff of the private sector institutions of higher education.

Purpose of this study was to determine that how job satisfaction of permanent academic staff of private sector higher education institutions influenced by interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities.

Higher education institutions are nurseries of knowledge creation and cultivation. They groom youth to be the leaders in their respective fields, thus aid in building a modern world where social justice prevails. In this context its becomes imperative for concerned authorities to consider various factors related to welfare of the academic staff especially those which affect their job satisfaction. Highly satisfied faculty in general is innovative and motivated, assuring a highly conducive learning environment in an educational entity (Stankovska et al., 2017).

Literature Review and hypotheses development

Job Satisfaction

(Riaz, 2016) defined job satisfaction as a perception of employees that how well they can obtain what do they feel essential from their jobs.

Job satisfaction is a multifaceted concept, comprising complete range of emotions, attitudes and feelings of individuals from positive to negative, regarding their job. During recent past it has gained immense attention of top level management, policy makers and researchers because it affects many other organizational issues and may pose challenges including organizational performance, employee related concerns like turnover, absenteeism, commitment, performance and productivity (Zhang et al., 2011; Singhai et al., 2016; Thiagaraj and Thangaswamy, 2017).

Non-financial factors like appreciation, recognition personal fulfillment, economic aspects, working conditions and interpersonal relationships, are also crucial in overcoming the feelings of displeasure among employees (Zaitouni, 2013; Shaju and Subhashini, 2017).

Organizations are struggling to retain their good talent, they are facing high turnover and low grade employees’ performance, obvious indicators of job dissatisfaction. It becomes essential for entities to understand the factors dissatisfying their human resource as
understanding such factors will get them alert regarding symptoms of this problem in advance and they can take preventive actions to overcome dissatisfaction of employees and retain their talent for long term to get improved performance (Hee et al., 2018).

During recent past education has become a prominent sub sector of economy. Therefore, large number of studies have been conducted to investigate the factors affecting the job satisfaction of academic staff in educational organizations especially higher educational institutions (Noor et al., 2015).

Studies by (Arthur, 1994; Delaney and Huselid, 1996; Gbenu et al., 2014; Prennushi et al., 1997; de Lourdes Machado-Taylor et al., 2016) reported that job satisfaction of academics enormously influences the efficacy, national and international reputation of institutions, and performance of students.

Faculty is a primary resource and their satisfaction is essential for the success of a university. In modern society money is no longer a sole motivator rather the most pressing issue is how to keep academic staff satisfied with their jobs so their productivity can be improved. It is imperative for the employer to manage factors like operating procedures, pay, promotion, relationship among colleagues and supervisory style which not only will make them content with their jobs but will also reduce turnover intentions (Stankovska et al., 2017; Atencio, 2019).

(Jawabri, 2017) reported that promotion opportunities and positive interpersonal relationship enhances the job satisfaction among academic staff of universities.

Services of academic staff in higher education sector are highly valuable as they are directly responsible for developing human resource for the economy of a country. In adequacy of rewards and benefits, lack of promotion and training opportunities along with unfavorable interpersonal relationships are the factors which provoke among them feeling of dissatisfaction with their jobs (Perera and Kajendra, 2016).

Interpersonal Relationships

According to (Sias, 2008) interpersonal relationships are relationships at work place where individuals are involved while performing their jobs.

Interpersonal relationship is one of the major constituents of human relationship. It is the affiliation among individuals based on various context that may be social, legal, cultural, professional or any other stimulus. Certain degree of interdependence is an essential part of interpersonal relationship therefore, if a phenomenon affects one member then it will also influenced the other member in the relationship up to some extent (Velmurugan, 2016).

Individuals have to spend daily major part of their time at their work place, where they interrelate with each other having varied demographic background and dissimilar behavior. Commonalities among them affects their job satisfaction positively whereas dissimilarities in such elements may adversely affect their feeling of well-being and they could be frustrated and demotivated (Abe and Mason, 2016).

Relationships at work is one of the most significant aspect of every organization. Quality of such relationships and the factors changing their formation are responsible for the success or
failures of an organization. Favorable relationships among workers make them to co-operate and increase their willingness to complete assigned tasks whereas unfavorable relationships spread chaos and confusions that finally impaired their competencies and make them feel dissatisfaction with their job (Podlewska, 2016).

(Stankovska et al., 2017) reported relationship with coworkers as one of the major determinants of job satisfaction among faculty of higher learning institutions. Interpersonal relationships are crucial to develop and maintain trust and positive feelings among academics in universities. It ensures the healthy work environment and all round personality development of students (Brinia and Perakaki, 2018; Hameed et al., 2018; Mustapha and Zakaria, 2013). Hence on the basis of the findings in previous studies it is hypothesized that:

$$H_1:$$ Interpersonal relationships at work affect job satisfaction.

Promotion opportunities

(Abuhashesh et al., 2019) defined promotion as a vertical change in position within an organization from down to up with new responsibilities, more authority and ability to participate in organizational decision making whereas (Razak et al., 2018) proposed promotion as a significant phenomenon implying not only to place a right person at the right job but it is a policy planned by higher ups to motivate subordinates to develop themselves professionally for achieving heights in the organizational hierarchy.

(Miah, 2018) described promotion as an upward relocation of an employee in organizational hierarchy with more responsibilities, obligations and enhanced compensation.

Promotion is one of the many considerable factors that affects the life of employees and for many it is the key factor influencing their job satisfaction. Promotion is moving of an employee from one designation to higher one. It is important for employees to be promoted for varied reasons, some feel bored with their current position and want to do something new and exciting that can better utilize their competencies, some want power and improved status or some are not happy with their superiors or subordinates and feel promotion is the way to get out of such unhealthy work relationships etc. Lack of appropriate promotion opportunities affect the employees’ decision to continue with organization adversely but promoted employees feel honored and pay back to their organizations in terms of high commitment and loyalty (Blau, 1964; Miller and Wheeler, 1992; Ali and Ahmad, 2017).

(Bushra et al., 2011; Yousef, 2017; Pandey and Asthana, 2017) reported that employees feel satisfied when they perceive promotion possibilities ample, future growth and development prospects positive for themselves in their organization otherwise if they feel dissatisfied in this regard then their intentions to leave increased manifold.

Promotion can be used as reward for high performing employees which can become an incentive for others to show more and more productivity and it is more cost effective as compare to increase in compensation packages for keeping the employees content (Kosteas, 2011; Miah, 2018)
Academics employed in higher education institutions also feel promotion as a factor significantly affects their job satisfaction (Khan and Mishra, 2013; Sahito and Vaisanen, 2017; Olofinkua, 2020).

A scientific and bias free promotion system is an essential requirement to curtail the feeling of dissatisfaction and low performance of faculty in higher education institutions (Perera and Kajendra, 2016; Hesampour et al., 2016). On the basis of previous studies, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H_2 \text{ Promotion opportunities influence job satisfaction.} \]

This research attempts to study the association among interpersonal relationships, promotion opportunities and job satisfaction among permanent academic staff in private sector higher education institutions. Figure 1 depicts the hypothesized model for this research. Interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities are independent variables and job satisfaction is dependent variable.

![Figure 1 Hypothesized Model](image)

**Methodology**

*Research design, Sampling and Instrumentation*

The type of research for the study was Quantitative research. Research design of the study was correlational. Interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities were the independent variables and Job Satisfaction was the dependent variable. Using simple random sampling technique 5% of total permanent teachers of various private sector higher education institutions of Karachi, Pakistan were chosen as a sample of the study. Questionnaires were personally submitted to heads of the department of the institutions which were distributed later to the randomly selected permanent teachers. Out of 170 questionnaires distributed, 150 questionnaires were collected and used for analysis. The response rate was 88 percent.

Self-administered survey questionnaire was used to collect data. Questionnaire had two sections. Section A was meant to collect demographic information and section B had 25 statements with five point Likert scale ranging from 1- Very Strongly Disagree to 5- Strongly
Agree for measuring the variables of the study. The items on the questionnaire were taken according to the purpose of the study on the basis of literature review.

Data analysis

SPSS version 24 was used to analyze the data collected for drawing conclusions regarding acceptance or rejection of hypotheses of the study. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to test the reliability of the instrument. Descriptive statistics was used to describe the demographic information collected. Partial Correlation was used to test correlation among variables of the study. Analysis of Variance was also run to test the goodness of model fit. Collinearity test was also run to test the correlation among independent variables in the model developed for the study.

Findings

Instrument reliability

Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.756 showing that 25 items on instrument used to collect responses were internally consistent as the calculated value is higher than standard value of 0.70 (Zikmund et al., 2013; Alsemeri, 2016; Pham, 2017; Miah, 2018; Olofinkua, 2020).

Demographic Information

Table 1 shows the demographic distribution of the participants. On the basis of Gender out of 150 participants of the study 102 or 68% were male and 89 or 59.3% were single. Age wise distribution of participants shows 105 or 70% of the participants were in age group of 30-39 years. 93 or 62% participants held master’s degree and 108 or 72% of participants were employed in their institutions for 24 months and above.

TABLE 1-PARTICIPANTS’ DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>12-23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 and above</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses Testing

Partial correlation test was used to test influence of independent variables, interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities on dependent variable job satisfaction of the study. Demographic features including gender, marital status, age, education and experience of the participants were controlled for testing the correlation among variables of the study. Table 2 and 3 show correlation among sub factors of independent variables and total job satisfaction.

Table 2 shows sub factors of interpersonal relationships (IPR 1-IPR3, IPR 6, IPR8-IPR 10) are positively correlated with total job satisfaction while sub factors of interpersonal relationships (IPR 4, IPR 5& IPR 7) are negatively correlated with total job satisfaction.

TABLE 2-INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Superior-Subordinate Relationship</th>
<th>TJS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender, Marital Status, Age, Education &amp; Experience</td>
<td>IPR3 Friendly</td>
<td>Correlation .171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPR7 Inconsiderate</td>
<td>Correlation -.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPR8 Enlightening</td>
<td>Correlation .349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPR9 Encouraging</td>
<td>Correlation .424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPR10 Empowerment</td>
<td>Correlation .461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues’ Relationship</td>
<td>IPR1 Courteous</td>
<td>Correlation .295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPR2 Co-operative</td>
<td>Correlation .305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPR4 Bickering</td>
<td>Correlation -.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed) .025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows sub factors of Promotion opportunities (PO1-PO5, PO7, PO9&PO 10) are positively correlated with total job satisfaction while sub factors of promotion opportunities (PO6 & PO 8) are negatively correlated with total job satisfaction.

### TABLE 3-PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>TJS</th>
<th>PO1 Promotion policies Implementation</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance (2-tailed)</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Marital Status, Age, Education &amp; Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO2 Frequency of Promotion</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO3 Promotion Criteria-Performance</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO4 Promotion Criteria-Experience</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO5 Promotion Criteria-Post Holding Tenure</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO6 Biasness- group pressure.</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO7 Promotion Criteria- age.</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PO8 Biasness-Gender discrimination</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 shows sub factors of job satisfaction (JS I-JS5) are positively correlated with total interpersonal relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>JS1</th>
<th>JS2</th>
<th>JS3</th>
<th>JS4</th>
<th>JS5</th>
<th>TIPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER, MARITAL STATUS, AGE, EDUCATION, EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>Congeniality</td>
<td>Current designation</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Continue with current organization</td>
<td>TOTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows sub factors of job satisfaction (JS I-JS5) are positively correlated with total promotion opportunities.
TABLE 5-PARTIAL CORRELATION-PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>JS1</th>
<th>JS2</th>
<th>JS3</th>
<th>JS4</th>
<th>JS5</th>
<th>TPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER &amp; MARITAL STATUS &amp; AGE &amp; EDUCATION &amp; EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>Congeniality</td>
<td>Current designation</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Continue with current organization</td>
<td>TOTAL PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the two independent variables of the study are positively correlated with each other. The Dependent variable of the study i.e. job satisfaction and independent variables i.e. Interpersonal relationships and Promotion opportunities of the study do have positive correlation.

TABLE 6-PARTIAL CORRELATION-INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>TOTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>TOTAL PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>TOTAL JOB SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER, MARITAL STATUS, AGE, EDUCATION &amp; EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>. .000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT OF THE HYPOTHESESIZED MODEL-GOODNESS OF FIT

Table 7 indicates the value of $F$ is 28.640. When this value is greater than 10, the model is acceptable and best fits between independent and dependent variables (Dhakal, 2018)

**TABLE 7-ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</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>19.024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.512</td>
<td>28.640</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>48.823</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67.848</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAL JOB SATISFACTION
b. Predictors: (Constant), TOTAL PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES, TOTAL INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP

ASSESSMENT OF THE HYPOTHESESIZED MODEL-COLINEARITY DIAGNOSTIC

In Table 8-model summary, the value of correlation coefficient $R$ is .530 which shows that all variables are positively correlated. Value of $R$ Square is .280 indicates that interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities cause 28.0% variation in the job satisfaction of permanent academics in private sector higher education institutions. In Table 9-Coefficientbeta value for interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities are 0.424 and 0.186 indicating that increase or decrease by one unit or more in interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities will cause parallel variation in job satisfaction of academics. The interpersonal relationship ($p = 0.000 < \alpha$ value 0.05) and promotion opportunities ($p = 0.017 < \alpha$ value 0.05) indicating that the chosen independent variables do significantly influence job satisfaction of academic staff. VIF value are more than 1 but less than 10 which means that predictors are moderately correlated (Dhakal, 2018)

**TABLE 8-MODEL SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$ Square</th>
<th>Adjusted $R$ Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R$ Square Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussions
Demographic information presented in Table 1 showed that participants of the study were noticeably different as per demographic features including gender, marital status, age, education and experience. The data collected is the reflection of the participant’s majority who were male, unmarried, in age bracket of 30-39, holding Master’s degree and working for more than 24 months in their institutions. Many studies have shown that dissimilar demographic features of academics make their preferences, attitudes, responsibilities and approach towards work significantly different affecting their satisfaction at work placedifferently (Amarasena et al., 2015; Duong, 2016; Hussain and Ghulam, 2017; Milledzi et al., 2018; Shrestha, 2019).

To investigate the relationship among variables of the study without an impact of demographic factors, partial correlation technique was used, as this technique eliminates the impact of other related variables while testing the relationship among variables of the study (Kothari, 2004; Geoffrey and David, 2005; Hasegawa and Ueda, 2016; Mas-Machuca et al., 2016; Suchyadi, 2018; Thuku et al., 2018; Apriyani et al., 2019; Yoo et al., 2019; Pentri et al., 2020).

Table 6 show positive correlation between two independent variables of the study, interpersonal relationship and promotion opportunities therefore collinearity between the two, was also tested and they were found moderately correlated indicating no serious issue with the model’s goodness of fit as shown in Table 7 (Zikmund et al., 2013; Türkoğlu et al., 2017; Yee, 2018; Dhamija et al., 2019).
The aim of the study was to examine how does job satisfaction of permanent academic staff of private universities influenced by interpersonal relationships and promotion opportunities at their work place. Research model and hypotheses were developed in this regard.

First hypothesis developed for the study:

\[ H_1 \] Interpersonal relationships at work affect job satisfaction.

Interpersonal relationship sub-factors used for testing the \( H_1 \) were superior-subordinate relationship and colleagues’ relationship. Test results in Table 2, 4 and 6 evidenced that job satisfaction does vary because of interpersonal relationship positively. Highest positive correlation is (0.461) of IPR10 and lowest positive correlation (0.171) of IPR3 with total job satisfaction are shown in Table 2. It may be said that the most significant sub factor affecting job satisfaction of employees positively is empowerment and least affecting factor is friendliness of superiors. Table 4 shows that total interpersonal relationship has highest positive correlation (0.409) of job satisfaction sub factor JS3. It may be stated that the interpersonal relationships at work significantly affects employees interest in their job which makes them satisfied or dissatisfied. Table 6 evidenced that total interpersonal relationship is positively correlated with total job satisfaction of the participants. Therefore, on the basis of the findings of the study hypothesis, \( H_1 \) is accepted.

Second hypothesis developed for the study:

\[ H_2 \] Promotion opportunities influence job satisfaction.

Sub factors of promotion opportunities used to test \( H_2 \) were promotion policies implementation, frequency of promotions, Promotion criteria, Biasness, adequacy and review of promotion policies. Test results in Table 3, 5 and 6 evidenced that job satisfaction does vary because of promotion opportunities positively. Highest positive correlation is (0.455) of PO1 with total job satisfaction are shown in Table 3. It may be said that the most significant sub factor affecting job satisfaction of employees positively is uniformity in implementation of promotion policies and procedures and least affecting factors are adequacy and review of promotion policies. Table 5 shows that total promotion opportunities have highest positive correlation (0.364) with sub factor of job satisfaction JS2. It may be stated that the employees feel satisfied if they perceive that promotion system is fair in their organization. Table 6 evidenced that total promotion opportunities are positively correlated with total job satisfaction of the participants. Therefore, on the basis of the findings of the study hypothesis, \( H_2 \) is accepted.

Results of this study are in the line of previous studies that interpersonal relationship and promotion opportunities have linear relationship with job satisfaction of workforce. It is also evident from the findings of the study that job satisfaction of the permanent academics employed in higher education institutions of private sector is also influenced by the two independent variables of the study (Malik et al., 2012; Tai and Chuang, 2014; Nas, 2016; Asan and Wirba, 2017; Jawabri, 2017; Tadesse, 2017; Hameed et al., 2018).
Limitations of the study

1. This study was restricted only to private universities of Karachi, Pakistan because of time and cost constraints.
2. Sample size can be increased which was not possible for the study because of time constraint.
3. Participants’ majority was male academic staff which may affect the results as male and female do differ in their approach and preferences.
4. Participants majority was single. This may affect the results as personal responsibilities of married and single individuals are varied making their job perceptions noticeably different.
5. Other factors like work load, leadership styles, work conditions etc. affects the job satisfaction but only two factors were investigated because of time constraint.
6. Focused interviews were not conducted which could add some new perspectives to the findings of the study.

Implications, Recommendations and Conclusion

Findings of this research offer many implications. First of all, it added an empirical evidence to the existing body of knowledge regarding the variables and their association studied in this research. It also supports the significance of positive interpersonal relationship at work and ample promotion opportunities are significant for employees. Job satisfaction is emphasized that in educational organization prevailing policies and practices related to variables of the study are to be reviewed at regular interval only then faculty feel satisfied.

This research also indicates many directions for future research. The framework of this study can be used to investigate that how demographic diversity among faculty in higher education institutions brings the variation in the relationship of the interpersonal relationship, promotion opportunities and faculty job satisfaction.

Outline of the study can be replicated in other organizations like public sector universities. Comparative studies among various universities or other settings can be conducted by using the outline of this research.

In nutshell academics in higher education institutions are different from workforce of other organizations. They have to exhibit communication, conflict managing and problem solving skills while educating demographically diversified students. Management of higher education institutions and other concerned bodies are responsible to identify and take necessary measures to handle the factors influencing job satisfaction in the best interest of the academic staff. In the light of the findings of this study some recommendations are:

1. Comprehensive orientation sessions for new appointees to familiarize them with their work responsibilities, prevailing culture and values of the institution.
2. Arrange general academic staff meetings at least once in a month, where complete freedom is given to staff for sharing their ideas, grievances and reservations.
3. Arrange regular social gatherings where employees interact informally to better understand outlook of each other.
4. Appoint Permanent promotion board comprising all heads of department to review the promotion system regularly.
5. Feedback and self-appraisal system should be installed for employees.
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