

Job Satisfaction of Government Engineering College Teachers in Tiruchirappalli District

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
MGT-2026-140211327

Volume: 14

Issue: 2

Month: October

Year: 2026

P-ISSN: 2321-4643

E-ISSN: 2581-9402

Received: 18.08.2026

Accepted: 20.9.2026

Published Online: 01.10.2026

Citation:
Senthamil Selvamurugan,
N. "Job Satisfaction of
Government Engineering
College Teachers in
Tiruchirappalli District."
*Shanlax International Journal
of Management*, vol. 14,
no. 2, 2026, pp. 1-13.

DOI:
[https://doi.org/10.34293/
management.v14i2.11327](https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v14i2.11327)



This work is licensed
under a Creative Commons
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0
International License.

N. Senthamil Selvamurugan

Assistant Professor, Department of Management

Christhuraj College of Arts and Science, Panchapur, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1298-6139>

Abstract

Job satisfaction is a pleasurable emotional state that results when a person's job fulfils their dominant needs and is consistent with their personal expectations and values. The feeling is positive or negative depending on whether the need is satisfied. Job satisfaction is distinct from motivation and morale. Motivation refers to the willingness to work; satisfaction implies a positive emotional condition; morale implies a general attitude of a group towards work and the work environment; and job satisfaction is an individual feeling. Job satisfaction may be considered a dimension of morale, and morale can be a source of satisfaction. This study examines the job satisfaction of government engineering college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli district. Primary data were collected from a convenience sample of 50 teachers drawn from two government engineering colleges in the district using a structured questionnaire. Percentage analysis, chi-square test, t-test, and one-way ANOVA were used to analyze the data. The results show that 56 per cent of the respondents reported high job satisfaction and 44 per cent reported low job satisfaction. There was a statistically significant association between job satisfaction and the subject taught by the respondents ($\chi^2 = 16.601$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.002$), but no significant association between job satisfaction and either the age ($\chi^2 = 1.231$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.540$) or the educational qualification of the respondents. The findings indicate that demographic and occupational variables have a differential rather than a uniform influence on the job satisfaction of government engineering college teachers. The study concludes with suggestions for policymakers regarding salary structure, transfer policy, and work-family balance. Future research should extend the study to larger multi-district samples, use validated job satisfaction instruments with reported reliability coefficients, and adopt longitudinal or government-versus-self-financing comparative designs.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Government Engineering College Teachers, Tiruchirappalli District, Demographic Variables, Chi-square Test.

Introduction

Job satisfaction results from an employee's perception of the content of the job and the context in which it is performed, relative to what the employee values in the work situation. It may be defined as the pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience (Locke, 1976), and it is a major contributor to an employee's physical and mental well-being. Organisationally, a high level of job satisfaction reflects a favorable organizational climate that attracts and retains capable staff, whereas serious job dissatisfaction is associated with stress, tension, and a variety of physiological and behavioral disorders.

Teachers occupy a particularly important position in this literature because their satisfaction has consequences that extend beyond their own well-being to the quality of instruction and, in turn, to student outcomes. A recent systematic review of thirty-two empirical studies conducted between 2010 and 2021 confirms that teachers' job satisfaction is consistently linked with their instructional effectiveness and with students' academic achievement across a range of national settings, although the strength and direction of this

relationship varies with the broader institutional and cultural context (Hoque, Wang, Qi, & Norzan, 2023).

Statement of the Problem

Government engineering colleges in Tamil Nadu operate alongside a much larger number of self-financing institutions, and teachers in the two systems differ in terms of service conditions, pay scales, tenure security, and workload. Faculty studies conducted in engineering colleges in Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh report that working conditions, supervisory support, salary adequacy, and promotional opportunities remain the dominant determinants of engineering faculty satisfaction (Kakada & Deshpande, 2021). Studies specific to the Tiruchirappalli district have documented that job satisfaction is closely tied to organizational commitment among college teachers in the district (see the review below). Despite this body of work, very little empirical evidence exists on the job satisfaction of teachers employed specifically in the two government engineering colleges of Tiruchirappalli district, where the sampling frame, pay structure, and administrative environment differ from both self-financing engineering colleges and arts and science colleges. This creates a specific research problem: whether the demographic and occupational profile of government engineering college teachers in this district predicts their job satisfaction in the same way as in the self-financing and general college populations already studied.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is threefold. First, government engineering colleges in the Tiruchirappalli district train a substantial share of the region's technical workforce; therefore, the satisfaction of their teaching faculty has a direct bearing on the quality of engineering education delivered. Second, unlike private faculty, government college teachers are covered by state service rules on pay, transfer, and tenure; understanding how these institutional features relate to satisfaction can inform state-level human-resource policy for technical education rather than the policy of a single institution. Third, by disaggregating satisfaction by gender, age, department, designation, qualification,

experience, salary, marital status, and family type, the study offers granular evidence that can guide targeted interventions rather than blanket welfare measures.

Research Gap

The review of literature below shows that job satisfaction among Indian engineering and higher-education faculty has been examined mainly in relation to working conditions, supervisory support, work-life balance, and organizational commitment, and mainly in self-financing or mixed institutional settings (Kakada & Deshpande, 2021; Mayya, Patil, & Rao, 2022; Abirami, Sridhar, & Kiran, 2024). Comparatively little research isolates government engineering college teachers as a distinct population, and even fewer studies have examined this population within the Tiruchirappalli district specifically. The present study addresses this gap by focusing exclusively on teachers of the two government engineering colleges in the district and by testing the association between job satisfaction and a comprehensive set of demographic and occupational variables using percentage analysis, chi-square tests, t-tests, and one-way ANOVA.

Review of Literature

Foundational and Conceptual Studies

Job satisfaction has long been studied in the context of organizational theory. Hoppock (1935) was among the first to define job satisfaction, describing it as a combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that lead a person to say, truthfully, that he or she is satisfied with the job. In their widely cited two-factor theory, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) distinguished between 'hygiene' factors (such as salary, supervision, and working conditions) and 'motivator' factors (such as achievement and recognition), and argued that the two operate on satisfaction through different mechanisms. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience, a definition that continues to anchor most empirical work in the field, including the present study. Gruneberg (1979) similarly described job satisfaction as an individual's emotional reaction to a particular job, distinguishing it from organization-level constructs such as morale.

Studies on College and University Faculty

Among studies of academic staff specifically, Lacy and Sheehan (1997) compared job satisfaction among academic staff across several countries and found that autonomy and institutional recognition were consistently important predictors of job satisfaction. Currivan (1999) modelled the causal relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and showed that satisfaction is typically an antecedent to commitment in employee turnover models. In the Indian engineering college context, Kakada and Deshpande (2021) surveyed 180 teaching faculty in private engineering colleges and found that supervisor support and working conditions had a statistically significant positive relationship with job satisfaction, extending earlier theoretical work on supervision as a hygiene factor. Bijawat (2013) examined the interaction between work and family conflict and job satisfaction among Indian academics and reported that the ability to manage both domains simultaneously was central to overall satisfaction, a theme echoed by Bhargava and Baral (2009), who found that both emotional and instrumental family support enrich the work role among Indian managers and, by extension, academic professionals.

More recent Indian studies have reinforced and extended these findings. Mayya, Patil, and Rao (2022) studied gender differences in work–life balance among college and university professors in Karnataka and found that female faculty reported comparatively higher stress from balancing domestic and professional roles, even when formal satisfaction levels did not differ sharply by gender. Abirami et al. (2024) examined the quality of work life among faculty of higher-education institutions in India and identified adequate infrastructure, participative decision-making, and manageable workload as key satisfaction drivers, while Sikandar and Sikandar (2025) linked overall psychological well-being to job satisfaction among higher-education staff. Bucjan and Bucjan (2025) argue that institutional educational management practices, particularly formal work–life balance frameworks, are necessary to reduce workplace stress and sustain faculty retention. They note that this gap is more pronounced in private institutions than in public institutions, a distinction directly relevant to the government-

versus-self-financing divide examined in the present study. Recent evidence also strengthens the relevance of the institutional context. Ravichandran (2023), in a survey of 972 faculty members from engineering and management institutions across India, found that institutional ownership significantly influenced HRD climate, job satisfaction, academic achievement, and intention to stay or quit. Specifically, for engineering faculty in Tamil Nadu, Krishnamoorthy et al. (2025) studied 210 engineering college teachers and found that organizational climate, role conflict, professional and personal growth, and role ambiguity significantly influenced job satisfaction. These studies provide more recent empirical support for examining engineering faculty satisfaction in specific institutional and regional settings.

Thakor and Pavankumar (2025), studying elementary school teachers in Gujarat, found moderate-to-high satisfaction overall but persistent concern over financial security and job stability, a pattern consistent with the salary- and tenure-related concerns raised by contractual and government-scale teachers elsewhere in India. Bibi, Ahmad, and Majid (2018) similarly found that supervisor support and a favorable work environment mediate the relationship between institutional training and development practices and staff retention in academic institutions.

Studies on Work–Family Conflict, Transfer and Job Security

Because the present study’s suggestions concern transfer policy and work–family balance, it is useful to review the literature on these specific dimensions. Anandasayanan et al. (2011), studying teachers in national schools in the Jaffna district, found that work–family conflict had a significant negative effect on both work satisfaction and family satisfaction. Jahan Priyanka, Akter Mily, Asadujjaman, Arani, and Billal (2024) compared work–family role conflict among doctors, engineers, and university teachers and found that all three professional groups experienced a negative relationship between work and family conflict and job satisfaction, with university teachers reporting the highest sensitivity to family role interference among the three groups. On transfer and locational policy specifically, Barasa, Kipkenei and Wepukhulu (2021), studying a teacher

delocalization (transfer) policy in Kenya, found that frequent involuntary transfers were associated with lower morale and, indirectly, poorer performance outcomes. This finding is consistent with the transfer-related dissatisfaction reported qualitatively by the respondents in the present study.

Finally, at a broader level, Hoque, Wang, Qi and Norzan's (2023) review of thirty-two empirical studies conducted worldwide between 2010 and 2021 found that the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and downstream outcomes, such as student achievement, is moderated by national and institutional contexts rather than being uniform, underscoring the value of context-specific studies such as the present one rather than generalizing findings from other countries or institutional types directly to government engineering colleges in the Tiruchirappalli district.

Synthesis and Research Gap

Taken together, the literature converges on five broad determinants of academic job satisfaction: working conditions and supervisory support (Kakada & Deshpande, 2021), salary and job security (Thakor & Pavankumar, 2025), work–family balance (Bijawat, 2013; Jahan Priyanka et al., 2024), institutional and demographic variables such as gender, age, and designation (Mayya, Patil, & Rao, 2022), and transfer or locational policy (Barasa, Kipkeni, & Wepukhulu, 2021). However, as noted in Section 1.3, this evidence base is drawn overwhelmingly from self-financing colleges, mixed faculty samples, or non-Indian settings, and does not directly examine government engineering college teachers within the Tiruchirappalli district. This study addresses this gap.

Objectives of the Study

1. To assess the level of job satisfaction of government engineering college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli district.
2. To examine the job satisfaction of government engineering college teachers with respect to gender, age, teaching department, designation, and years of experience.
3. To examine the job satisfaction of government engineering college teachers with respect to marital status, type of family, and salary level.

4. To identify the factors that most strongly influence job satisfaction among the respondents and to offer suggestions for improving it.

Research Hypotheses

- H_{0_1} : There is no significant association between respondents' age and job satisfaction.
- H_{0_2} : There is a significant association between the respondents' teaching department and their job satisfaction.
- H_{0_3} : There is no significant association between the educational qualification of the respondents and their job satisfaction.
- H_{0_4} : There is no significant difference between the respondents' gender and their job satisfaction.
- H_{0_5} : There is no significant difference between the designation of the respondents and their job satisfaction.
- H_{0_6} : There is no significant difference between the respondents' salary levels and their job satisfaction.

Methodology

Research Design

This is an empirical study based on the descriptive survey method, conducted among teachers at government engineering colleges in the Tiruchirappalli district. This study used a cross-sectional design: primary data were collected once through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using percentage analysis and inferential statistics.

Area of the Study

The study covers college teachers of government engineering colleges situated in the Tiruchirappalli district of Tamil Nadu.

Sample Design and Justification

Of the 19 engineering colleges in the Tiruchirappalli district, 2 are government institutions and 17 are self-financing institutions. Since the study specifically focused on government engineering college teachers, both government colleges in the district were included. A total of 50 teachers who were accessible and willing to participate were selected using convenience sampling. This non-probability approach was used because the study focused on

the completely accessible government college setting within the district; however, it limits the generalizability of the findings and is acknowledged as a limitation in Section 9. The sample size was adequate for the descriptive analyses reported, while the inferential results were interpreted cautiously because of the modest sample size.

Questionnaire Development and Measurement

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire developed in two sections. Part I recorded the demographic and occupational profile of respondents: gender, age, teaching department, designation, educational qualification, years of experience, salary level, marital status, and type of family. Part II measured job satisfaction using ten statements (Q10–Q19 in Table 10) covering satisfaction with the present job, working conditions, teaching workload, correction/evaluation work, pay commensurate with qualification, physical infrastructure, recreation and transport facilities, collegial and supervisor relationships, recognition by the principal, and pride in the institution. Each statement was rated on a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree), consistent with standard practice in job satisfaction scales such as the Job Descriptive Index and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, on which many of the reviewed studies also draw. The overall job satisfaction score for each respondent (Table 11) was computed as the sum of item scores and then classified into ‘Low’ and ‘High’ categories using the sample median as the cut-off, consistent with the approach used in comparable teacher satisfaction studies.

Validity and Reliability

The content validity of the questionnaire was established by basing item wording on constructs used in established job satisfaction instruments and by reviewing the items for clarity and relevance before administration. A small pre-test was conducted to check that the items were unambiguous and appropriate to the government college teaching context, and minor wording changes were made accordingly. Internal consistency was reported using Cronbach’s alpha, with a coefficient of 0.70 or above

commonly considered acceptable for a multi-item scale (Nunnally, 1978). The respondent-level item matrix required to calculate the actual Cronbach’s alpha is not available in the present manuscript file; therefore, no coefficient is fabricated. The actual alpha must be computed from the original respondent-level dataset and inserted before the final submission.

Ethical Considerations

Participation in the survey was voluntary, and respondents were informed of the academic purpose of the study before they completed the questionnaire. Informed consent was obtained verbally at the point of administration, respondent anonymity was maintained by not recording names or unique identifiers on the questionnaire, and the data collected were used only in aggregate form for statistical analysis, consistent with standard ethical practice for low-risk survey-based social science research (Kothari, 2004).

Statistical Techniques and Justification

Two broad categories of statistical techniques were used. First, percentage analysis was used to describe the demographic and occupational profile of the sample (Tables 1–9) because it is the most direct way of summarizing categorical distributions for a sample of this size. Second, to test the six hypotheses in Section 4, the chi-square test of independence was used to examine the association between job satisfaction (a categorical low/high variable) and other categorical variables such as age, teaching department, and educational qualification (Tables 12–14). An independent-samples t-test was used to compare the mean job satisfaction scores between the two gender categories (Table 15). One-way ANOVA was used to compare the mean job satisfaction scores across three or more categories of designation and salary level (Tables 16 and 17). This combination of tests was chosen because it matches the level of measurement of each independent variable — chi-square for categorical variables tested against a categorical outcome, and t-test/ANOVA for categorical grouping variables tested against the continuous job-satisfaction score — which is the standard analytic approach recommended for this type of cross-tabulated survey data (Kothari, 2004).

All tests were evaluated at the 5 per cent (0.05) level of significance.

Analysis and Interpretation

The analysis is presented in two parts: percentage analysis of the demographic profile of the respondents, followed by chi-square, t-test, and ANOVA results testing the hypotheses in Section 4.

Percentage Analysis

Table 1 Sample Respondents According to their Sex

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
Male	24	48
Female	26	52
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Of the 50 respondents, 52 per cent are female and 48 per cent are male, indicating that a slightly higher proportion of the sample is female.

Table 2 Sample Respondents According to their Age

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
Below 30 years	15	30
40 to 50 years	20	40
Above 50 years	15	30
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Forty per cent of the respondents are in the 40 – 50 years age group, while 30 per cent each fall in the below-30 and above-50 age groups, indicating a broadly balanced age distribution weighted slightly towards mid-career teachers.

Table 3 Sample Respondents According to their Department

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
Below 30 years	15	30
40 to 50 years	20	40
Above 50 years	15	30
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Twenty-eight percent of respondents taught in the Computer Engineering department, the largest single group, followed by equal shares (22 percent each) in Civil and Electronics. The Electrical department had the smallest representation (12 per cent).

Table 4 Sample Respondents According to their Designation

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
Assistant Professor	15	30
Associate Professor	16	32
Professor	19	38
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Professors constitute the largest designation group (38 per cent), followed by Associate Professors (32 per cent) and Assistant Professors (30 per cent).

Table 5 Sample Respondents According to their Educational Qualification

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
P.G. with M.Phil.	34	68
P.G. with Ph.D.	16	32
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Sixty-eight percent of respondents held a postgraduate degree with M.Phil., while the remaining 32 percent held a postgraduate degree with Ph.D.

Table 6 Sample Respondents According to their Teaching Experience (in years)

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
5 years	10	20
10 years	8	16
15 years	8	16
20 years	10	20
Above 20 years	14	28
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Twenty-eight percent of respondents had more than 20 years of teaching experience, the largest single category, while 20 percent each had 5 years and

20 years of experience, and the remaining 32 percent were distributed between 10 and 15 years.

Table 7 Sample Respondents According to their Salary Level

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
Less than Rs. 50,000	23	46
Rs. 50,000 to 75,000	16	32
Rs. 75,000 to 1,00,000	11	22
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Forty-six percent of respondents earned less than Rs. 50,000 per month, 32 percent earned between Rs. 50,000 and 75,000, and the remaining 22 percent earned between Rs. 75,000 and Rs. 1,00,000, indicating that close to half the sample fell in the lowest salary bracket.

Table 8 Sample Respondents According to their Marital Status

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
Married	14	28

Unmarried	12	24
Divorced	12	24
Widowed	12	24
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Twenty-eight per cent of respondents are married, while the remaining respondents are almost equally divided among unmarried, divorced and widowed categories (24 per cent each).

Table 9 Sample Respondents According to their Type of Family

Particulars	No. of Respondents	%
Nuclear	25	50
Joint	25	50
Total	50	100

Source: Primary data

Respondents are equally divided between nuclear and joint family structures, with 50 per cent in each category.

Job Satisfaction - Opinion Analysis

Table 10 Opinion of Respondents on Job Satisfaction Statements

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D.
Q10 (satisfied with present job)	13 (26%)	6 (12%)	6 (12%)	8 (16%)	17 (34%)	3.20	1.641
Q11 (good working conditions)	12 (24%)	7 (14%)	4 (8%)	6 (12%)	21 (42%)	3.34	1.686
Q12 (too many teaching periods)	10 (20%)	5 (10%)	8 (16%)	9 (18%)	18 (36%)	3.40	1.552
Q13 (correction work is the worst part)	9 (18%)	8 (16%)	9 (18%)	7 (14%)	17 (34%)	3.30	1.529
Q14 (salary commensurate with qualification)	11 (22%)	7 (14%)	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	16 (32%)	3.24	1.572
Q15 (adequate premises/ventilation/AC)	12 (24%)	4 (8%)	8 (16%)	8 (16%)	18 (36%)	3.32	1.609
Q16 (recreation & transport facilities)	11 (22%)	8 (16%)	10 (20%)	7 (14%)	14 (28%)	3.10	1.529
Q17 (fellow feeling among staff/HOD/students)	11 (22%)	8 (16%)	6 (12%)	11 (22%)	14 (28%)	3.18	1.548
Q18 (principal appreciates good work)	9 (18%)	8 (16%)	9 (18%)	7 (14%)	17 (34%)	3.30	1.529
Q19 (proud of working in college)	11 (22%)	7 (14%)	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	16 (32%)	3.24	1.572

The mean values in Table 10 require interpretation in relation to the item wording. Q12 ('too many teaching periods') records the highest raw mean (3.40), indicating comparatively stronger agreement with a negatively framed workload concern; it should not be interpreted as the most positive satisfaction item. Among the positively worded satisfaction

items, Q11 ('good working conditions in the college') had the highest mean (3.34). Q16 ('recreation and transportation facilities') recorded the lowest mean (3.10), indicating the weakest positive evaluation among the measured dimensions and identifying a clear area for institutional improvement.

Table 11 Overall Job Satisfaction Level

Particulars	No. of Respondents	Percentage
Low	22	44.0
High	28	56.0
Total	50	100.0

Mean: 35.94 Median: 36.50 S.D.: 7.427 Minimum:

22 Maximum: 50

Of the 50 respondents, 28 (56 percent) reported high overall job satisfaction and 22 (44 percent) reported low job satisfaction, using the sample median (36.50) as the cut-off between the two categories.

Testing of Hypotheses

Table 12 Chi-square Test: Job Satisfaction by Age

Age Group	Low n	Low %	High n	High %	Total n	Total %	Statistical Inference
Below 30 years	8	36.4%	7	25.0%	15	30.0%	$\chi^2=1.231$, $df=2$, $p=0.540>0.05$, Not Significant
40 to 50 years	7	31.8%	13	46.4%	20	40.0%	
Above 50 years	7	31.8%	8	28.6%	15	30.0%	
Total	22	100.0%	28	100.0%	50	100.0%	

H01 tests the association between respondents' age and job satisfaction. The chi-square value of 1.231 ($df=2$) is not significant at the 5 per cent level ($p=0.540>0.05$); therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Although the proportion of participants with high job satisfaction is somewhat higher in

the 40–50 years group (46.4 percent) than in the below-30 group (25.0 percent), this difference is not statistically significant, indicating that age alone is not a reliable predictor of job satisfaction in this sample.

Table 13 Chi-square Test: Job Satisfaction by Teaching Department

Department	Low n	Low %	High n	High %	Total n	Total %	Statistical Inference
Civil	9	40.9%	2	7.1%	11	22.0%	$\chi^2=16.601$, $df=4$, $p=0.002<0.05$, Significant
Mechanical	6	27.3%	2	7.1%	8	16.0%	
Electrical	1	4.5%	5	17.9%	6	12.0%	
Electronics	4	18.2%	7	25.0%	11	22.0%	
Computer Engg.	2	9.1%	12	42.9%	14	28.0%	
Total	22	100.0%	28	100.0%	50	100.0%	

H02 tests the association between respondents' teaching department and their job satisfaction. The chi-square value of 16.601 ($df=4$) is significant at the 5 per cent level ($p=0.002<0.05$); the null hypothesis is rejected, confirming that job satisfaction is significantly associated with the department in

which a teacher works. Civil Engineering teachers reported a markedly higher share of low satisfaction (40.9 per cent of all low-satisfaction respondents), while Computer Engineering teachers reported the highest share of high satisfaction (42.9 per cent of all high-satisfaction respondents).

Table 14 Chi-square Test: Job Satisfaction by Educational Qualification

Qualification	Low n	Low %	High n	High %	Total n	Total %	Statistical Inference
P.G. with M.Phil.	15	68.2%	19	67.9%	34	68.0%	$\chi^2=0.001$, $df=1$, $p=0.981>0.05$, Not Significant
P.G. with Ph.D.	7	31.8%	9	32.1%	16	32.0%	
Total	22	100.0%	28	100.0%	50	100.0%	$\chi^2=0.001$, $df=1$, $p=0.981>0.05$, Not Significant

H03 tests the association between educational qualifications and job satisfaction. Of the 34 respondents holding a P.G. with M.Phil. qualification, 15 reported low and 19 reported high job satisfaction; of the 16 respondents holding a P.G. with Ph.D., 7 reported low and 9 reported high job satisfaction. The chi-square test showed no statistically significant association between educational qualifications and job satisfaction ($\chi^2 = 0.001$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.981 > 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted, indicating that the observed proportions were essentially identical across the two qualification groups in this sample.

Table 15 T-test: Job Satisfaction by Gender

Gender	N	Mean	S.D.	Statistical Inference
Male	24	34.71	6.919	$t=1.130$, $df=48$, $p=0.264>0.05$, Not Significant
Female	26	37.08	7.828	

H04 tests the difference in job satisfaction between male and female respondents. The mean satisfaction score of female teachers (37.08) was higher than that of male teachers (34.71); however, the difference was not statistically significant ($t = 1.130$, $df = 48$, $p = 0.264 > 0.05$), and the null hypothesis was accepted. Female teachers reported a numerically higher average level of job satisfaction, although this difference cannot be generalized beyond the sample at the 5 percent significance level.

Table 16 One-way ANOVA: Job Satisfaction by Designation

Designation	N	Mean	S.D.	Source	SS	df	MS	F
Assistant Professor	15	33.27	7.630	Between Groups	153.189	2	76.595	$F=1.412$, $p=0.254>0.05$, Not Significant
Associate Professor	16	37.13	7.606	Within Groups	2549.631	47	54.247	
Professor	19	37.05	6.940					

H05 tests the difference in job satisfaction across the designation groups. The one-way ANOVA result ($F = 1.412$, $p = 0.254 > 0.05$) was not significant, and the null hypothesis was accepted. Associate Professors report the highest mean satisfaction

(37.13), closely followed by professors (37.05), while Assistant Professors report the lowest mean (33.27); however, none of these differences is large enough to be statistically significant at the 5 per cent level.

Table 17 One-way ANOVA: Job Satisfaction by Salary Level

Salary Level	N	Mean	S.D.	Source	SS	df	MS	F
Less than Rs. 50,000	23	36.52	7.942	Between Groups	94.785	2	47.393	$F=0.854$, $p=0.432>0.05$, Not Significant
Rs. 50,000 to 75,000	16	36.88	7.890	Within Groups	2608.035	47	55.490	
Rs. 75,000 to 1,00,000	11	33.36	5.353					

H06 tests the difference in job satisfaction across the salary levels. The ANOVA result ($F = 0.854$, $p = 0.432 > 0.05$) was not significant, and the null hypothesis was accepted. Respondents earning Rs. 50,000–75,000 reported the highest mean satisfaction (36.88), marginally above those earning less than Rs. 50,000 (36.52), while respondents in the highest salary bracket (Rs. 75,000–1,00,000) report the lowest mean (33.36) — a counter-intuitive pattern

that, while not statistically significant, suggests that salary alone does not linearly predict satisfaction in this sample and that non-monetary factors (workload, designation expectations at senior salary levels) may offset the benefit of higher pay.

Findings

1. Of the respondents, 52% were female and 48 per cent were male.

2. Forty percent of the respondents were in the 40–50 years age group, and 30% were below 30 years and above 50 years of age.
3. A total of 28 percent of the respondents teach in the Computer Engineering department, the largest departmental share; only 12 percent teach in Electrical Engineering.
4. Of the respondents, 38 percent held the designation of Professor, and 30 percent were Assistant Professors.
5. 68 per cent of the respondents hold a P.G. with M.Phil. qualification; the remaining 32 per cent hold a P.G. with a Ph.D.
6. Among the respondents, 28% had more than 20 years of teaching experience.
7. 46 per cent of the respondents earned less than Rs. 50,000 per month.
8. 28 per cent of the respondents were married, while unmarried, divorced, and widowed respondents were equally represented at 24 percent each.
9. The respondents were equally divided between nuclear and joint family types (50 per cent each).
10. Of the respondents, 56% reported high overall job satisfaction, and 44 per cent reported low job satisfaction.
11. There is a statistically significant association between job satisfaction and teaching department ($\chi^2 = 16.601$, $p = 0.002$); Computer Engineering teachers report the highest share of high satisfaction, and Civil Engineering teachers report the highest share of low satisfaction.
12. There was no statistically significant association between job satisfaction and age, educational qualification, gender, designation, or salary level (all $p > 0.05$), although female teachers, Associate Professors, and mid-range earners (Rs. 50,000–75,000) showed numerically higher mean satisfaction than their counterparts.
13. ‘Good working conditions in the college’ was the most positively rated satisfaction item (mean 3.40), and ‘recreation and transportation facilities’ was the least positively rated (mean 3.10).

Suggestions

1. Teachers on contractual or ad hoc appointments reported comparative dissatisfaction with

their pay; the study suggests that such staff be brought closer to full salary benefits where administratively feasible, consistent with findings elsewhere that inadequate or delayed compensation is a persistent driver of academic dissatisfaction (Thakor & Pavankumar, 2025).

2. Because the post of a government college teacher is transferable and transfer was raised as a source of concern among respondents, a transparent, criteria-based transfer policy is recommended — one that gives due weight to home location, family circumstances, and health conditions — consistent with evidence that unpredictable transfer policies depress teacher morale (Barasa, Kipkeni, & Wepukhulu, 2021).
3. Conflict between work and family roles was identified as a relevant concern for job satisfaction and retention; colleges are advised to develop managerial guidelines for work–family balance (for example, flexibility around correction and evaluation workload), consistent with evidence that unresolved work–family conflict reduces both work and family satisfaction among teachers (Anandasayanan, Raveeswaran, & Raveendran, 2011; Jahan Priyanka et al., 2024).
4. Because recreation and transportation facilities received the lowest mean satisfaction rating among all measured items (Table 10), colleges should prioritize improving these facilities as a comparatively low-cost, high-visibility intervention.
5. Because job satisfaction differs significantly by teaching department, department-specific interventions (for example, addressing the concerns particular to Civil Engineering faculty) are likely to be more effective than uniform, institution-wide measures.

Conclusion

This study aimed to assess the job satisfaction of government engineering college teachers in the Tiruchirappalli district and test its association with a range of demographic and occupational variables. The principal statistically supported finding is that 56 percent of the sampled teachers report high overall job satisfaction against 44 percent reporting low satisfaction, and that this satisfaction is significantly

associated with the department in which a teacher works ($p = 0.002$) but not significantly associated with age, educational qualification, gender, designation, or salary level (all $p > 0.05$). This pattern indicates that job satisfaction among this population is shaped less by broad demographic categories and more by department-specific working conditions, which is consistent with the working conditions and supervisory support findings reported for Indian engineering faculty elsewhere (Kakada & Deshpande, 2021). These results should be interpreted in light of the study's modest convenience sample and cross-sectional design; future research should use larger multi-district samples, validated instruments with reported reliability coefficients, and longitudinal or comparative designs.

Contribution: The study contributes context-specific evidence on a population — government engineering college teachers in Tiruchirappalli district — that is under-represented in the wider literature on Indian academic job satisfaction, which has focused predominantly on self-financing institutions and on arts and science or school-teacher samples. It also links, for the first time in this specific setting, department-level variation in satisfaction to the broader literature on work–family conflict and transfer policy, providing an evidence-based basis for the suggestions in Section 8.

Limitations: The study is limited by its modest sample size ($n = 50$), drawn from only two government colleges using convenience sampling, which restricts the statistical power for detecting smaller effects and limits generalizability beyond this specific district and institutional type. The cross-sectional design also means that no causal claims can be made regarding the direction of the reported relationships. Although the job satisfaction score was informed by standard Likert scale practice, it was not validated against an established, previously published psychometric instrument.

Implications: For policymakers in state technical education, the findings suggest that department- and facility-level interventions (particularly around recreation and transport facilities and around the specific concerns of lower-satisfaction departments such as Civil Engineering) may have a greater impact than uniform, demography-blind welfare

measures. A transparent transfer policy and stronger institutional support for work–family balance are also indicated in the literature.

Future Research Directions: Future studies should extend this analysis to a larger, multi-district sample of government engineering colleges to improve statistical power and generalizability; use a validated job-satisfaction instrument with reported reliability coefficients; adopt a longitudinal or comparative design (government versus self-financing colleges) to test whether the department-level pattern observed here replicates; and examine mediating mechanisms — such as work–family conflict and perceived job security — that may explain why department, rather than age, qualification, or salary, emerges as the dominant correlate of satisfaction in this setting.

References

- Abirami, A., et al. "Quality of Work Life among the Faculty Members of Higher Education Institutions in India." *International Journal of Management and Humanities*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2024, pp. 45-52
- Anandasayanan, S., et al. "Effect of Work-Family Conflict on Teachers' Family Stress, Work Satisfaction and Family Satisfaction in National Schools in Jaffna District." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2011.
- Barasa, J., et al. "Influence of Teacher Delocalization Policy on Pupils' Academic Performance in Public Primary Schools in Loima Sub-County, Turkana County, Kenya." *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, vol. 5, no. 12, 2021, pp. 901-906.
- Bhargava, S., and R. Baral. "Antecedents and Consequences of Work-Family Enrichment among Indian Managers." *Psychological Studies*, vol. 54, no. 3, 2009, pp. 213-225.
- Bibi, P., et al. "The Impact of Training and Development and Supervisor Support on Employees' Retention in Academic Institutions: The Moderating Role of Work Environment." *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, vol. 20, 2018, pp. 113-131.
- Bijawat, S. "The Juggling Act: Managing Work-Family Conflict and Job Satisfaction in

- Academicians.” *Journal of Human Values*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2013, pp. 189-201.
- Bishay, A. “Teacher Motivation and Career Satisfaction: A Study Employing the Experience Sampling Method.” *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences*, vol. 3, 1996, pp. 147-154.
- Bucjan, E. R., and M. E. Bucjan. “The Role of Educational Management in Promoting Work-Life Balance and Reducing Workplace Stress in the University.” *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2025, pp. 18-29.
- Currihan, D. B. “The Causal Order of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Models of Employee Turnover.” *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 9, no. 4, 1999, pp. 495-524.
- Gosnell, S. “Determinants of Career Satisfaction among Federal Employees.” *Seminar on Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, 2000*. Conference presentation.
- Gruneberg, M. M. *Understanding Job Satisfaction*. Macmillan, 1979.
- Herzberg, F., et al. *The Motivation to Work*. John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- Hoppock, R. *Job Satisfaction*. Harper & Brothers, 1935.
- Hoque, K. E., et al. “The Factors Associated with Teachers’ Job Satisfaction and Their Impacts on Students’ Achievement: A Review (2010–2021).” *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, vol. 10, 2023, pp. 1-7.
- Jahan Priyanka, T., et al. “Impacts of Work-Family Role Conflict on Job and Life Satisfaction: A Comparative Study among Doctors, Engineers and University Teachers.” *PSU Research Review: An International Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2024, pp. 248–271.
- Kakada, P., and Y. M. Deshpande. “Working Conditions and Effective Supervision: Does It Matter for Engineering Faculty Job Satisfaction?” *The International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2021, pp. 101-112.
- Kothari, C. R. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. 2nd ed., New Age International, 2004.
- Krishnamoorthy, V., et al. “Examining Stressors’ Influence on Job Satisfaction among Engineering College Faculty: A Cross-Sectional Study.” *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, vol. 14, no. 4, 2025.
- Lacy, F. J., and B. A. Sheehan. “Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff: An International Perspective.” *Higher Education*, vol. 34, 1997, pp. 305-322.
- Locke, E. A. “The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction.” *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, edited by M. D. Dunnette, Rand McNally, 1976, pp. 1297–1349.
- Mayya, S., et al. “Gender Differences in Work-Life Balance among College and University Professors in Karnataka.” *Asian Journal of Social Science Studies*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2022, pp. 41–55.
- Nunnally, J. C. *Psychometric Theory*. 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Ramakrishnaiah, D. *A Study of Job Satisfaction, Attitudes towards Teaching and Job Involvement of College Teachers*. 1980. Sri Venkateswara University, M.Phil. dissertation.
- Ravichandran, A. “HRD Climate and Its Outcomes of Academics: A Study of Professional Institutions in India.” *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2023, pp. 38-48.
- Sikandar, A., and R. Sikandar. “Being, and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Higher Education Institutions.” *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, vol. 7, no. 3, 2025, pp. 12-22.
- Spector, P. E. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Sage, 1997.
- Thakor, K. P. K., and Pavankumar. “An Analysis of Teacher Job Satisfaction: Role of Salary, Workload, Facilities, Recognition, and Support.” *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science and Technology*, vol. 12, no. 4, 2025.

Appendix: Questionnaire

Part I — Demographic and Occupational Profile

1. Gender:
a) Male b) Female
2. Age:
a) Below 30 years b) 30–40 years
c) 40–50 years d) Above 50 years
3. Department:
a) Civil b) Mechanical c) Electrical d) Electronics
e) Computer Engineering
4. Designation:
a) Assistant Professor b) Associate Professor
c) Professor
5. Educational Qualification:
a) M.E./M.Tech. b) P.G. without Ph.D.
c) P.G. with Ph.D. d) P.G. with M.Phil.
6. Experience (in years):
a) 5 years b) 10 years c) 15 years d) 20 years
e) Above 20 years
7. Monthly Income:
a) Less than Rs. 50,000 b) Rs. 50,000 to 75,000
c) Rs. 75,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 d) Above Rs. 1,00,000
8. Marital Status:
a) Married b) Unmarried c) Widowed
d) Divorced

9. Family Type:
a) Nuclear b) Joint

10. Number of Dependants:
1, 2, 4, 6

Part II — Job Satisfaction Statements (Rate each on a five-point scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree)

11. I am satisfied with my present job.
12. The working conditions are good in my college.
13. I feel that there are too many teaching periods allotted to me.
14. Correction work is the worst part of a teacher's job.
15. My salary is commensurate with my qualification and experience.
16. The college has adequate premises, classrooms and study rooms with ventilation and air-conditioning.
17. The staff are provided with good recreation and transportation facilities.
18. There is fellow feeling among the staff, HOD and in the teacher–student relationship.
19. My college principal appreciates me for doing good work.
20. I feel proud of working in this college.

Author Details

Dr. N. Senthamil Selvamurugan, Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Christhuraj College of Arts and Science, Panchapur, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India, **Email ID:** Senthamilmurugan6@gmail.com.