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The main objective of the study is to study the impact of demographic variables on the job satisfaction of teachers. Government and private school teachers of district Bahawalnagar comprised the population of the study. 330 teachers were selected by using two stage sampling. At first stage schools were selected by using random sampling technique and at the second stage teachers were selected conveniently. For quantitative analysis, The tool of the study was “Teachers’ Job Satisfaction- Assessment Scale”, was adopted. Data were collected by using Google forms. The primary data were used and analyzed by descriptive and inferential statistics. The empirical finding suggests that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and demographic variables including gender, age, and nature of the entity. This paper also finds an evidence of bidirectional relationship between teachers' performance and job satisfaction. It implies that working environment reinforces job satisfaction, and job satisfaction enhances working performance.

Introduction

For the progress of any organization, it is necessary that their employee enjoy their work. Job satisfaction has a direct connection with organizational commitment and both are considered important key functions for human resources management (Malik, Javed, & Hassan, 2017). This is job satisfaction. Different people define job satisfaction in different words.
In simple words, job satisfaction is the feeling of how happy a worker is during his/her work. Job satisfaction may be influenced by different factors such as suitability of working environment, employee’s relationship with their immediate boss or supervisor, and devotion towards work (Akhtar et al., 2010).

Many studies (Iqbal, Ali, Akhtar, & Ahmed, 2013; Ali, Sulaiman, & Javed. 2018) have been conducted to find out job satisfaction from different perspectives e.g. in education, engineering, banking, commerce, etc. Being an educationist, the researcher is very much interested in education. Moreover, District Bahawalnagar is a backward area of Punjab, Pakistan where the literacy rate is less than 25%. This study will particularly address the job satisfaction of teachers from the Bahawalnagar District. This study investigates only specific variables such as gender and age.

Gender

Gender is considered an important variable for most of the studies discussing job satisfaction. But the association between gender and job satisfaction is not consistent (Iqbal and Akhtar, 2020). Some studies show that gender has no impact on the job satisfaction of the employee (Mumtaz, Suleman, & Ahmad, 2016). Some studies suggest that the satisfaction level of female teachers is greater than males (Iqbal & Akhtar, 2020; Iqbal, Ali, Akhtar, & Ahmed, 2013; Ali, Sulaiman, & Javed, 2018; Mahmood, Nudrat, Asdaque, Nawaz, & Haider, 2011). It is also suggested by some studies that males are more satisfied than female teachers. (Ali, Zaman, Tabassum, & Iqbal, 2011; Batool, Farooqi, & Islam, 2018). A study conducted by Saleem, Aziz, and Quraishi (2019) shows that female teachers are more satisfied and their morale was high in comparison with male teachers.

Age

According to Berlin, Snyder, and Daniel (1998), various types of relations have been reported by various studies. Some studies reported negative linear, positive linear, u shaped, inverted u shaped, and j shaped and no significant relation. The results of this study indicated a significant but weak positive age-job relationship. The study of Blood, Ridenour, Thomas, Qualls, & Hammer (2002) indicated that job satisfaction increased with the passage of time and increasing experience.
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Related Researches

Iqbal, Ali, Akhtar, & Ahmed (2013) conducted a study to compare the job satisfaction level of government secondary school teachers. The study compares the job satisfaction level on the basis of gender, teaching experience, age, and lactation of the schools. Sample of the study comprised of Three hundred and twenty-two secondary school teachers who were randomly selected from sixty public secondary schools from district Lahore. Data were analyzed by using one-way ANOVA and t-test. The results of the study suggested that females were more satisfied as compared to males and no significant difference was found out on the basis of locality, age, and work experience.

The study of Ali, Sulaiman, & Javed, M. (2018) explored Employers’ Satisfaction with Professionally Qualified Secondary School teachers in Pakistan. The results of the study exposed employers’ partial satisfaction with the practices of professionally qualified teachers. Relatively, the practices of female teachers were more satisfactory than their male counterparts.

Hypotheses

The study was conducted for testing the following hypothesis.

H1. There is significant relationship between job satisfaction and nature of working entity of academicians.

H2. There is significant relationship between job satisfaction and gender of academicians.

H3. There is significant relationship between job satisfaction and age of academicians.

Material and Methods

This study is quantitative in nature. The population of the study comprised 13514 teachers from the government and 12110 teachers from private schools. There is a total of 2918 schools in the district Bahawalnagar. Out of 2918, 2147 schools belong to the public sector. 579 are from private schools and 192 schools are working under the Punjab education foundation (PEF). These schools were initially working under the Punjab government but in different three phases, these were handed over to PEF. Out of 192 schools, 106 belong to boys and 86 to girls. Out of 2147 schools, 1055 schools are for males and 1092 schools are for females. Further, 37 schools (24 for females and 13 for males) named “Insaaf Afternoon Schools” are also imparting education in district Bahawalnagar (District Education Office Bahawalnagar, 2020)

Sample
There are five tehsils in district Bahawalnagar. From each tehsil, three private and three public schools were selected randomly. The questionnaire was sent to the principal of each teacher and the further principal send the link to 11 teachers who were willing to fill it. So the sample size was 330 teachers. The response rate was 89.6%.

**Theoretical framework**

Independent Variables
Dependent Variables
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*Figure 1: adopted from (Ismail & Razak, 2016)*

**Tool**

For the collection of data five-dimensional scale for teacher satisfaction “Teachers’ Job Satisfaction- Assessment Scale” was adopted as a tool. This tool was developed by Akhter (2014). 0.90 was the reliability of the instrument 30 items were included in this questionnaire. For the collection of online data, Google Forms was used. The researcher personally visited the schools and the link of the questionnaire was shared to the principles of the schools. Further, they shared the link with their staff members. This is exploratory research in which the job satisfaction of the academicians is analyzed.

**Data Analysis**

For the analysis of data-independent descriptive statistics correlation. While hypotheses were tested using regression analysis.

Here employee satisfaction is measured by demographic variables including:

- School (Nature of working entity)
- Age
- Gender

The elements of job satisfaction are measured by a quantitative method.
In findings, the researchers had indicated the major success factors of job satisfaction accomplished a wide-ranging re-evaluation of past literature variables for ascertaining the structure on the basis of this empirical investigation.

Results and Discussion

### Table 1

The Descriptive Statistics for the Underlying variables of the study

| Variable | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|----------|------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| School   | 1.214| .4110          | .169     | 1.400    | .142     | -.041    | .283     |
| Gender   | 1.403| .4914          | .241     | .396     | .142     | -.135    | .283     |
| Age      | 2.925| 1.3607         | 1.852    | .274     | .142     | -.135    | .283     |
| A        | 2.885| .5717          | .327     | -.226    | .142     | .564     | .283     |
| PQ       | 1.864| .9173          | .841     | 1.101    | .142     | .566     | .283     |
| NJ       | 1.380| .4861          | .236     | .498     | .142     | -.135    | .283     |
| M1       | 3.817| 1.0881         | 1.184    | -.1066   | .142     | .579     | .283     |
| M2       | 4.003| .8978          | .806     | -.830    | .142     | .107     | .283     |
| M3       | 4.197| .7437          | .553     | -.734    | .142     | .387     | .283     |
| P        | 4.041| .7226          | .522     | -.497    | .142     | .246     | .283     |
| M4       | 3.908| .8259          | .682     | -.740    | .142     | .315     | .283     |
| M5       | 4.122| .8760          | .767     | -.882    | .142     | .190     | .283     |
| M6       | 3.827| .9762          | .953     | -.531    | .142     | -.666    | .283     |
| M7       | 3.932| .9488          | .900     | -.682    | .142     | -.372    | .283     |
| M8       | 3.932| .8934          | .798     | -.673    | .142     | -.156    | .283     |
| M9       | 3.803| .8383          | .703     | -.488    | .142     | -.193    | .283     |
| EN       | 4.071| .8113          | .658     | -.978    | .142     | .948     | .283     |
| M10      | 4.132| .7865          | .619     | -.956    | .142     | .995     | .283     |
| M11      | 3.881| .7899          | .624     | -.706    | .142     | .433     | .283     |
| M12      | 4.136| .6865          | .471     | -.435    | .142     | .077     | .283     |
| M13      | 3.898| .9015          | .813     | -.780    | .142     | .014     | .283     |
| M14      | 4.125| .7339          | .539     | -.772    | .142     | .854     | .283     |
| M15      | 3.664| .9327          | .870     | -.272    | .142     | -.765    | .283     |
| M16      | 3.092| 1.1407         | 1.301    | .525     | .142     | -1.197   | .283     |
| M17      | 3.891| .7806          | .609     | -.631    | .142     | .340     | .283     |
| M18      | 4.024| .7886          | .622     | -.838    | .142     | .755     | .283     |
| M19      | 3.908| .8050          | .648     | -.738    | .142     | .426     | .283     |
| M20      | 3.946| .8608          | .741     | -.800    | .142     | .254     | .283     |
| M21      | 3.749| .8872          | .787     | -.545    | .142     | -.331    | .283     |
| M22      | 3.918| .8318          | .692     | -.672    | .142     | .146     | .284     |
| M23      | 3.125| 1.1344         | 1.287    | .413     | .142     | -1.306   | .283     |
| M24      | 3.563| .9522          | .907     | -.359    | .142     | -.836    | .283     |
| M25      | 3.783| .8731          | .762     | -.613    | .142     | -.171    | .283     |
| M26      | 3.780| .9380          | .880     | -.493    | .142     | -.573    | .283     |
| JS       | 3.407| 1.1652         | 1.358    | .071     | .142     | -1.468   | .283     |
| M27      | 3.664| .9894          | .979     | -.347    | .142     | -.889    | .283     |

Valid N (list wise)

Table 2
### Correlation Analysis

| School | Gender | Significance | Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------|--------|--------------|-------------|----------------|
| PQ     | 1      | 0.295*       | 0.468**     | 0.000          |
| NJ     | 1      | 0.155*       | 0.343*      | 0.000          |
| M1     | 0.26   | 0.071        | 0.179        | 0.000          |
| M2     | 0.07   | 0.035        | 0.351       | 0.000          |
| M3     | 0.11   | 0.108        | 0.500        | 0.000          |
| P      | 0.07   | 0.131        | 0.264       | 0.000          |
| M5     | 0.10   | 0.078        | 0.145        | 0.000          |
| M6     | 0.05   | 0.013        | 0.125        | 0.000          |
| M7     | 0.06   | 0.041        | 0.123        | 0.000          |
| M8     | 0.20   | 0.068        | 0.051        | 0.000          |
| M9     | 0.18   | 0.082        | 0.073        | 0.000          |
| EN     | 0.30   | 0.005        | 0.012        | 0.000          |
| M10    | 0.112  | 0.214        | 0.168        | 0.000          |
| Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-------------|----------------|
| M1 Pearson Correlation | .056 .000 .004 .020 .094 .000 .010 .000 .000 .000 .000 .001 .000 .027 .001 .000 |
| M2 Pearson Correlation | .025 .059 .051 .019 .022 .161 -.124 .248 .256 .228 .261 .155 .184 .199 .289 .352 .309 |
| M3 Pearson Correlation | .666 .314 .383 .741 .704 .006 .035 .000 .000 .000 .000 .008 .002 .001 .000 .000 .000 |
| M4 Pearson Correlation | .046 .066 .150 -.119 -.076 .188 .346 .374 .291 .331 .228 .347 .316 .235 .410 .388 |
| M5 Pearson Correlation | .431 .263 .010 .043 .197 .001 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 |
| M6 Pearson Correlation | .022 -.008 -.072 -.042 -.072 .225 .248 .214 .248 .175 .204 .284 .304 .356 .392 .251 .204 |
| M7 Pearson Correlation | .705 .895 .218 .478 .219 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 |
| M8 Pearson Correlation | -.213 -.176 -.210 -.154 -.101 .289 .353 .502 .438 .341 .608 .341 .453 .417 .452 .311 .392 |
| M9 Pearson Correlation | .000 .003 .000 .009 .087 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 |
| M10 Pearson Correlation | .040 .023 .007 .072 -.021 .182 .084 .116 .222 .208 .152 .168 .184 .191 .280 .238 .126 |
| M11 Pearson Correlation | .502 .701 .910 .221 .720 .002 .152 .049 .000 .000 .000 .009 .004 .002 .001 .000 .000 .032 |
| M12 Pearson Correlation | .084 .572 .077 .076 .007 .198 .096 .762 .033 .204 .232 .092 .009 .872 .052 .418 .516 |
| M13 Pearson Correlation | -.020 -.058 .000 -.028 -.075 .193 .220 .284 .295 .329 .392 .304 .430 .342 .357 .310 .293 |
| M14 Pearson Correlation | .740 .324 .986 .634 .200 .001 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 |
| M15 Pearson Correlation | .022 -.087 .060 .044 -.035 .184 .168 .221 .273 .332 .342 .147 .311 .246 .268 .284 .329 |
| M16 Pearson Correlation | .704 .141 .308 .454 .147 .002 .004 .000 .000 .000 .000 .012 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 |
| M17 Pearson Correlation | .071 -.045 -.076 -.044 -.106 .239 .207 .225 .343 .380 .281 .154 .238 .305 .320 .361 .286 |
| M18 Pearson Correlation | .230 .441 .198 .455 .072 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .009 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 |
| M19 Pearson Correlation | .059 -.045 .039 .089 -.032 .199 .313 .356 .232 .187 .213 .287 .297 .269 .261 .214 .153 |
| M20 Pearson Correlation | .316 .450 .512 .132 .592 .001 .000 .000 .000 .001 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 |
| M21 Pearson Correlation | .128 .871 .476 .180 .871 .039 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .005 .001 .000 .000 .000 .003 .004 |
| M22 Pearson Correlation | .031 -.015 .054 .032 -.012 .189 .225 .294 .247 .261 .282 .209 .292 .290 .282 .257 .181 |
| M23 Pearson Correlation | .594 .794 .364 .590 .833 .001 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .002 |
| M24 Pearson Correlation | .025 -.025 -.011 .013 .037 -.075 .041 .071 .042 .039 .042 -.012 .030 -.073 .116 .056 -.012 |
| M25 Pearson Correlation | .666 .672 .849 .825 .532 .205 .489 .231 .475 .512 .472 .844 .608 .217 .048 .344 .837 |
| M26 Pearson Correlation | .211 -.055 -.077 .187 .007 .129 .176 .147 .107 .194 .168 .210 .225 .298 .256 .170 .075 |
| M27 Pearson Correlation | .000 .354 .188 .001 .907 .028 .003 -.012 .069 .001 .004 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .004 .020 |
| M28 Pearson Correlation | .000 -.061 .023 .013 .038 .092 .169 .105 .028 .111 .289 .251 .225 .178 .207 .208 .182 |
| M29 Pearson Correlation | .995 .300 .696 .827 .514 .118 .004 .076 .637 .059 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .002 |
| M30 Pearson Correlation | .041 -.081 .056 -.025 .057 .123 .212 .090 .062 .076 .254 .230 .241 .208 .179 .172 .218 |
| M31 Pearson Correlation | .489 .167 .339 .670 .334 .036 .000 .127 .292 .194 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .002 .003 .000 |
| M32 Pearson Correlation | .019 -.040 .027 .029 -.009 .039 .105 .048 .029 .022 .192 .161 .178 .157 .182 .118 .054 |
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Table 2, suggests that M2, M10 is significantly correlated with gender and age. While P, M5, M8, M12, with age. M4 is significantly correlated with only variables of gender. M9 and M24 with variable of school. M6, M10 and M24 appear to be highly significantly correlated with variable of school, gender and age.

Table 3
Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .850             | 37         |

Table 3 shows that Cronbach's alpha was used to check the reliability of the all underlying variables of study. Cronbach's alpha is 0.850, which indicates a highest level of internal consistency for variables.

Table 4
The Value of Cronbach's Alpha for Each Item of Underlying Study

| Gender | .853 |
|--------|------|
| Age    | .862 |
| A      | .850 |
| PQ     | .854 |
| NJ     | .851 |
| M1     | .845 |
| M2     | .844 |
| M3     | .844 |
| P      | .844 |
| M4     | .844 |
| M5     | .841 |
| M6     | .844 |
| M7     | .841 |
| M8     | .842 |
| M9     | .842 |
| EN     | .843 |
| M10    | .845 |
| M11    | .845 |
| M12    | .843 |
| M13    | .842 |
| M14    | .841 |
The hypothesized relationship among variables may be written as:

\[ D_S = \alpha + \beta_1 NJ + \beta_2 JS + \beta_3 A + \beta_4 PQ + \beta_5 EN + \beta_6 P + \beta_7 M1 + \beta_8 M2 + \beta_9 M3 + \beta_{10} M4 + \beta_{11} M5 + \beta_{12} M6 + \beta_{13} M7 + \beta_{14} M8 + \beta_{15} M9 + \beta_{16} M10 + \beta_{17} M11 + \beta_{18} M12 + \beta_{19} M13 + \beta_{20} M14 + \beta_{21} M15 + \beta_{22} M16 + \beta_{23} M17 + \beta_{24} M18 + \beta_{25} M19 + \beta_{26} M20 + \beta_{27} M21 + \beta_{28} M22 + \beta_{29} M23 + \beta_{30} M24 + \beta_{31} M25 + \beta_{32} M26 + \beta_{33} M27 \]…(EQ 1)

Where dependent variables are:

\[ D_S = \text{Demographic characteristics-nature of school} \]

\[ D_S = \alpha + \beta_{1.150} + \beta_{2.029} + \beta_{3.054} + \beta_{4.256} + \beta_{5.040} + \beta_{6.000} + \beta_{7.060} - \beta_{8.004} - \beta_{9.072} - \beta_{10.065} + \beta_{11.015} + \beta_{12.076} + \beta_{13.099} + \beta_{14.028} - \beta_{15.138} + \beta_{16.036} + \beta_{17.13} - \beta_{18} .029 + \beta_{19.026} + \beta_{20.177} - \beta_{21.013} - \beta_{22.015} - \beta_{23.058} + \beta_{24.006} + \beta_{25.123} + \beta_{26.032} + \beta_{27.107} - \beta_{28.167} + \beta_{29.060} + \beta_{30.171} - \beta_{31.071} - \beta_{32.019} + \beta_{33.004} \ldots \text{EQ 2} \]

Table 5 for demographic variable regression for ‘school’ shows the estimated R square is .651, indicating that 65.1% changes in school (dependent) are due to changes in independent variable are reliable. Moreover, the result shows there are significant variables that influence job satisfaction with respect to school. The Durbin–Watson test results are 1.264; which implies that there is a positive serial correlation among the residuals from the regression investigation.
Hence, Eq. (2) for B-coefficient of underlying variable ‘school’ shows that it is .029 for JS which suggests that an increase in entity identity differences has a positive impact on the JS variable. The percent increase in entity identity, school type, leads to a proportional increase in the level of job satisfaction among academicians. Generally, the findings of this study are in parallel to a number of previous studies including Sönmezer, & Eryaman (2008) that indicate a correlation between job satisfaction levels of public and private school teachers. While the relationship of TE, M4, M9, EN, M13, M14, M15, M16, M17, M22, M25, M26 is negative with the dependent variable ‘school’ as depicted in Eq. (4). The finding of this study confirms the significant impact of job satisfaction differences among levels of public and private school teachers (Gius, 2015). Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

Table 6

| Model | Standardized Coefficients |
|-------|---------------------------|
|       | Beta | T    | Sig. |
| 1     | (Constant) | 5.388 | .000 |
| A     | .054 | .953 | .341 |
| PQ    | .256 | 4.323 | .000 |
| TE    | -.040 | -.648 | .517 |
| NJ    | .150 | 2.486 | .014 |
| M1    | .060 | .996 | .320 |
| M2    | -.001 | -.014 | .989 |
| M3    | -.072 | -1.043 | .298 |
| P     | .000 | .005 | .996 |
| M4    | -.065 | -1.019 | .309 |
| M5    | .015 | .188 | .851 |
| M6    | .076 | 1.311 | .191 |
| M7    | .099 | 1.500 | .135 |
| M8    | .028 | .403 | .687 |
| M9    | -.138 | -2.128 | .034 |
| EN    | -.004 | -.062 | .950 |
| M10   | .036 | .592 | .554 |
| M11   | .013 | .196 | .845 |
| M12   | .029 | .392 | .696 |
| M13   | -.026 | -.404 | .687 |
| M14   | -.177 | -2.323 | .021 |
| M15   | -.013 | -.245 | .807 |
| M16   | -.015 | -.270 | .787 |
| M17   | -.058 | -.825 | .410 |
| M18   | .006 | .073 | .942 |
| M19   | .123 | 1.653 | .100 |
| M20   | .032 | .463 | .643 |
| M21   | .107 | 1.621 | .106 |
Table 7

| Model | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .169     | .062              | .4756                     | 1.618         |

Table 7 for demographic variable regression for ‘gender’ shows the estimated R square is .169, indicating that 16.9% of changes in gender (dependent) is due to changes in independent variable are reliable. Moreover, the result shows there are significant variables (p=.027) that influence job satisfaction with respect to gender. The Durbin–Watson test results are 1.618; which implies that there is a positive serial correlation among the residuals from the regression investigation.

\[ D_g = \alpha + \beta_1NJ + \beta_1JS + \beta_1A + \beta_1PQ + \beta_1EN + \beta_1M1 + \beta_1M2 + \beta_1M3 + \beta_1M4 + \beta_1M5 + \beta_1M6 + \beta_1M7 + \beta_1M8 + \beta_1M9 + \beta_1M10 + \beta_1M11 + \beta_1M12 + \beta_1M13 + \beta_1M14 + \beta_1M15 + \beta_1M16 + \beta_1M17 + \beta_1M18 + \beta_1M19 + \beta_1M20 + \beta_1M21 + \beta_1M22 + \beta_1M23 + \beta_1M24 + \beta_1M25 + \beta_1M26 + \beta_1M27 \ldots EQ3 \]

Table 8

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| 1     | Regression     | 11.819 | 33  | .358  | 1.583 | .027b |
|       | Residual       | 58.140 | 257 | .226  |       |      |
|       | Total          | 69.959 | 290 |       |       |      |

a. Dependent Variable: Gender

b. Predictors: (Constant), M27, JS, NJ, M3, M15, A, M23, M6, M24, M1, M11, M16, M21, M10, PQ, M13, M26, M8, EN, M2, M18, M9, M7, M20, M4, P, M22, M17, M14, M12, M19, M5, M25
Hence, Eq. (4) for B-coefficient of underlying variable ‘gender’ shows that it is -.027 for JS which suggests that an increase in gender differences has a positive impact on the JS variable. The percent increase in gender differences leads to a proportional decrease in the level of job satisfaction among academicians. Generally, the findings of this study are contrary to a number of previous studies including (Oshagbemi, 2000) that found no correlation between job satisfaction and job differences. While the relationship of A, PQ, NJ, EN, P, M5, M6, M7, M8, EN, M12, M13, M15, M19, M21, M23, M24 are positive with the dependent variable ‘gender’ as depicted in Eq. (5). The finding of this study confirms the significant impact of gender differences in evaluating a level of job satisfaction among academicians (Al-Ajmi, 2006). It was concluded that hypothesis 2 is accepted.

| Model | Standardized Coefficients | Beta | T    | Sig.  |
|-------|---------------------------|------|------|-------|
| 1     | (Constant)                |      | 5.276| .000  |
|       | A                         | .092 | 1.358| .176  |
|       | PQ                        | .024 | .341 | .733  |
|       | NJ                        | .104 | 1.614| .108  |
|       | M1                        | -.017| -.236| .814  |
|       | M2                        | -.126| -1.678| .095 |
|       | M3                        | -.051| -.627| .531  |
|       | P                         | .038 | .475 | .635  |
|       | M4                        | -.168| -2.224| .027 |
|       | M5                        | .068 | .721 | .471  |
|       | M6                        | .104 | 1.510| .132  |
|       | M7                        | .113 | 1.445| .150  |
|       | M8                        | .069 | .833 | .406  |
|       | M9                        | -.071| -.918| .360  |
|       | EN                        | .044 | .604 | .546  |
|       | M10                       | -.122| -1.709| .089 |
|       | M11                       | -.040| -.518| .605  |
|       | M12                       | .029 | .336 | .737  |
|       | M13                       | .014 | .189 | .850  |
|       | M14                       | -.143| -1.573| .117 |
|       | M15                       | .039 | .608 | .544  |
|       | M16                       | -.024| -.364| .716  |
|       | M17                       | -.012| -.139| .890  |
|       | M18                       | -.061| -.682| .496  |
|       | M19                       | .089 | 1.001| .318  |
|       | M20                       | -.038| -.464| .643  |
|       | M21                       | .053 | .676 | .500  |
|       | M22                       | -.003| -.037| .970  |
Table 10

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1     | .691 | .477     | .410              | 1.0505                     | 1.693         |

Table 10 for regression of demographic variable ‘Age’ shows the estimated R square is .477, indicating that 47.7% of changes in gender (dependent) are due to changes in independent variable are reliable. Moreover, the result shows there are significant variables (p=.000) that influence job satisfaction with respect to age. The Durbin–Watson test results are 1.693; which implies that there is a positive serial correlation among the residuals from the regression investigation.

\[ D_A = \alpha + \beta_1 NJ + \beta_1 JS + \beta_1 A + \beta_1 PQ + \beta_1 EN + \beta_1 P + \beta_1 M1 + \beta_1 M2 + \beta_1 M3 + \beta_1 M4 + \beta_1 M5 + \beta_1 M6 + \beta_1 M7 + \beta_1 M8 + \beta_1 M9 + \beta_1 M10 + \beta_1 M11 + \beta_1 M12 + \beta_1 M13 + \beta_1 M14 + \beta_1 M15 + \beta_1 M16 + \beta_1 M17 + \beta_1 M18 + \beta_1 M19 + \beta_1 M20 + \beta_1 M21 + \beta_1 M22 + \beta_1 M23 + \beta_1 M24 + \beta_1 M25 + \beta_1 M26 + \beta_1 M27 \ldots EQ5 \]
Hence, Eq. (6) for B-coefficient of underlying variable ‘Age’ shows that it is .017 for JS which suggests that an increase in age differences has a positive impact on the JS variable. The percent increase in age differences leads to a proportional increase in the level of Job satisfaction among academicians. Generally, the findings of this study are parallel to a number of previous studies including (Ang, Goh, & Koh, (1993); Baş, & Ardiç, (2002); Ghafoor, (2012)) that found a correlation between job satisfaction and gender differences. While the relationship of M1, M2, M3, M7, M8, M10,M11,M12,M15,M18,M19,M20,M22,M25,M26,M27 is positive with dependent variable ‘age’ as depicted in Eq. (6). The finding of this study confirms the significant impact of AGE differences in evaluating a level of job satisfaction among academicians (Hickson, & Oshagbemi, (1999). The significant value of hypothesis 3 is under .05 so it’s accepted.

### Table 12

| Model | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|---------------------------|---|-----|
|       | Beta                      |   |     |
| 1     | (Constant)                | 4.746 | .000 |
|       | A                         | -.005 | -.100 | .920 |
|       | PQ                        | -.310 | -5.641 | .000 |
|       | NJ                        | -.377 | -7.346 | .000 |
|       | M1                        | .050 | .895 | .372 |
|       | M2                        | .136 | 2.293 | .023 |
|       | M3                        | .137 | 2.114 | .035 |
|       | P                         | -.009 | -.139 | .890 |
|       | M4                        | -.072 | -1.198 | .232 |
|       | M5                        | -.111 | -1.483 | .139 |
|       | M6                        | -.125 | -2.287 | .023 |
|       | M7                        | .044 | .714 | .476 |
|       | M8                        | .104 | 1.582 | .115 |
|       | M9                        | .036 | .589 | .556 |
|       | EN                        | -.073 | -1.276 | .203 |
|       | M10                       | .060 | 1.063 | .289 |
|       | M11                       | .012 | .191 | .849 |
|       | M12                       | .042 | .611 | .542 |
|       | M13                       | -.125 | -2.095 | .037 |
Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper is giving the importance to three demographic variables i.e. age, gender and nature of entity regarding job satisfaction. Meanwhile considering job satisfaction and performance a two basic premises for growth of academic industry in Bahawalnagar. This study indicated the importance of three demographic factors for successful development of educational institutions.

This study could be strengthen more by using more powerful tool for data analysis. Although the regression analysis was deemed acceptable, an advance statistical technique would have allowed us to run more powerful authenticated results. Secondly, current research is limited to the region of district Bahawalnagar i.e. job satisfaction level among the academicians of district Bahawalnagar. Future work should consider other regions and entities of southern Punjab including colleges and universities as well.
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