



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

## **An empirical study of Job satisfaction of university staff**

Ahmed Azumah, Ayisha and Mohammed, Safura and Tetteh, Rebecca

Sunyani Technical University

20 May 2017

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/79674/>

MPRA Paper No. 79674, posted 14 Jun 2017 08:28 UTC

## **An empirical study of Job satisfaction of university staff**

Ayisha Ahmed Azumah<sup>1</sup>, Safura Mohammed<sup>2</sup>, Rebecca Tetteh<sup>3</sup>

1 Assistant Registrar, Department of Accountancy, Sunyani Technical University, Sunyani Ghana: Phone: +233244529929. (Corresponding author): Email: ayisha.ahmed59@yahoo.com.

2 Senior Assistant Registrar, Department of Computer Science, Sunyani Technical University, Sunyani Ghana: Phone: +233244465576. Email: safantwi@gmail.com

3 Senior Assistant Registrar, Department of Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Sunyani Technical University, Sunyani Ghana: Phone: +233244247493. Email: reccateth@yahoo.com

### **ABSTRACT**

The paper examined university staff overall job satisfaction in Sunyani Technical University in a survey of 100 respondents in a cross-sectional study and a quantitative design. Using standard ordinary least square (OLS) method the findings of the study show that employees are satisfied with overall job satisfaction, and satisfied with the elements of satisfaction identified in the survey, with salary and workload been the most satisfied elements. The findings of the research in addition, indicate that elements of job satisfaction influence overall job satisfaction. Management of higher institutions should take into account the findings of the current study in motivating employees for enhance performance resulting from better service and quality service, since university workers are the first members of the community in dealing with students who are junior members of the community.

**Keywords:** Elements of satisfaction, overall job satisfaction, employee performance

**Jel Codes:** J24, J28, M52, M54

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The effect of job satisfaction on employee performance or job effort has received lots of attention in management and human resources literature both theoretically and empirically with inconsistent empirical findings on whether workers are satisfied with the overall job satisfaction in all economies since the seminal works of Hoppock (1935) and Brayfield and Crockett (1955).

Workers job satisfaction influences their productivity and the production levels of organisations (Katzell et al., 1992; Oshagbemi, 1999; Weiss, 2002; Lund, 2003; Zeinabadi, 2010; Rashid & Rashid, 2011; Lin, 2012). According to researchers such as Froeschle and Sinkford (2009), Wong and Heng (2009), job satisfaction of employees leads to employee's retention as well as increase in productivity. Other research (Mardanov, Heischmidt, & Henson, 2008; DeConinck (2009) findings have indicated that some employees are dissatisfied with their jobs and that leads to increase in voluntary turnover.

Hence, management needs to provide appropriate measures to ensure that workers are satisfied. There are many aspects of jobs workers tend to be dissatisfied or satisfied. Among the areas are salary, work environment, work characteristics, organisational decision-making, leadership care, interpersonal relationship, self-worth, workload, work autonomy, and social recognition (Lund, 2003; Chen, 2008; Daneshfard & Ekvaniyan, 2012; Khalid, 2012).

Studies have examined workers satisfaction of these aspects of workers job using survey. The findings are found in the works of researchers such as Ilies et al. (2002); Podolske (2003); Judge et al. (2004); Curall et al. (2005); Snipes et al. 2005; Sweeney et. al., (2005); Tai and Chuang (2014).

Podolske (2003) explained that various factors influence employee job satisfaction differently. In his study of ranking the most important job components to employees, the findings indicate that employee's apparent desire for flexibility in balancing work and life issues is the most factor. Podolske (2003) indicated that employers believe that increasing employee's satisfaction influence overall performance positively and as such they are actively making sure that employees are satisfied.

The findings of the survey by Curall et al. (2005) revealed that higher pay leads to higher satisfaction which results in better performance. According to Snipes et al. (2005), customer perceptions of service quality and satisfaction with benefits significantly influence job satisfaction at the work place. Sweeney et al. (2005) indicate that employees' satisfaction with pay is based on fairness with what they receive as compared to their co-workers.

Other variable that influence job satisfaction of employee is leadership style of faculty members in administrative position and inadequate knowledge of the type of leadership and its effect on job satisfaction leads to job dissatisfaction of employees with it resultant negative consequences (Zeinabadi, 2010; Austin, 2012; Lawrence & Bell, 2012).

Some author (Kusku, 2003; Fuller et al., 2006) have reported that faculty members are differently motivated by intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors. Staff members are influence by extrinsic factors (salary satisfaction and relationships with university management), whereas faculty members are more motivated by intrinsic factors (satisfaction with the academic components of their positions).

Noltemeyer (2014) used the Herzberg model to examined employees job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in a survey study. The findings of the study revealed that four main variables accounted for job satisfaction. The variables are responsibility, work itself, effective supervisor, and recognition. They influence job satisfaction positively. Core values as a variable for job satisfaction negatively influence job satisfaction.

The review indicate enough studies have investigated the job satisfaction of university faculty in developed countries; however, a little is known about the faculties' job satisfaction in the developing economies, especially the technical universities in Ghana. The purpose of the study is to examine faculty member's job satisfaction in higher institution and the factors that influence overall job satisfaction in other to contribute to the body of knowledge in literature on employee job satisfaction using regression method.

The paper is based on research question such as what is the nature of employee overall job satisfaction and what are the variables that influence employees job satisfaction. The hypothesis underlying the paper are (i) that there is significant positive effect of motivational factors on overall job satisfaction, and (ii) employees are satisfied with the motivational factors that influence job satisfaction.

The paper uses primary data in the empirical studies and as such, challenges of using primary data may influence the results of the study. The focus of the paper is not on the effect of demographic variables on job satisfaction. The findings are also limited by the criticisms of the estimation methodologies used (Regression analysis).

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. The methodology is provided in section 2 of the paper. The empirical results are discussed in section 3, whereas section 4 concludes the study.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 Estimation methodology and design**

The current paper is based on quantitative research design using survey data. The employee's job satisfaction level and the effect of both extrinsic and intrinsic factors on overall job satisfaction are quantitatively explained in the study. The study is a cross-sectional study

since data were taken from the respondents once for the analysis. The analysis is based on the use of regression method.

**2.2 Population, Sampling method, and Data**

The population for the study is the faculty members of Sunyani Technical University both teaching and non-teaching staff. The respondents include both males and females. The sample is based on convenient sampling method since it is difficult to locate all the faculty members for non-availability of offices for all the faculty members for the administration of the questionnaire. The sample size is 100 respondents.

The data for the empirical study is based on cross-sectional primary data for Sunyani Technical University, Ghana, in April 2017. The researchers developed the questionnaire used to collect data. The number of items on the questionnaire are 21. The Likert scale was used to examine respondents level of satisfaction. The questionnaire was administered by the researchers at the work place of the respondents.

**2.3 Empirical Model**

The empirical model is as specified in equation (1). The model shows a priori positive effect of the motivational variables on overall job satisfaction. The dependent variable in the model is overall job satisfaction (OJ), whereas the independent variables are the elements of satisfaction. The elements are salary (S), work environment (WE), work characteristics (WC), organisational decision-making (ODM), leadership care (LC), interpersonal relationship (IR), self-worth (SW), work load (WL), work autonomy (WA), social recognition (SR), supervision (SU). In the model ES represent all the elements.

$$OJ_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_i ES_{it} + e_{it} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

where;  $\alpha_0; \alpha_i$ ; are the coefficients; and  $\epsilon$ = error term

Where in the case of the independent variables (ES), i=1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 for S; WE; WC, ODM, LC, IR, SW, WL, WA, SR, and SU respectively.

**3 EMPIRICAL RESULTS**

**3.1 Descriptive Statistics**

The results on the demographic features of respondents are reported in Table 1 to Table 8. The results in Table 1 show that majority 69(69.0%) of the respondents are males. Table 2 report the level of education of respondents with significant majority 42(42%) having graduate level education (Masters). Table 3 reports the religious affiliations of the respondents. The results show significant majority of the respondents 83(83.0%) are Christians. Table 4 shows the age distribution of the respondents with most of the respondents 25(25%) falling in the age groups of 28-32 and 33-37. The results in Table 5 exhibit the ranks of the respondents. The results indicate that most of the respondents 32(32.0%) belong to senior administrative assistant followed by lecturers 22(22.0%). The results on the years of experience are shown in Table 7. The results indicate that majority of the respondents 65(65.0%) are married. Table 8 report the results on the number of children of the respondents with majority 37(37.0%) not having children.

**Table 1 Gender of respondents**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Valid male	69	69.0
Valid female	30	30.0
Total	99	99.0
Missing data	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Source: Author's computation, April 2017

**Table 2 Education of respondents**

<b>Educational Level</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Valid Ordinary diploma	2	2.0
Valid HND	28	28.0
Valid Degree	26	26.0
Valid Masters	42	42.0
Valid PhD	1	1.0
Total	99	99.0
Missing data	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

**Table 3 Religion of respondents**

<b>Religion</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Valid Traditionalist	3	3.0
Valid Christian	83	83.0
Valid Muslim	12	12.0
Total	98	98.0
Missing data	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

**Table 4 Age of respondents**

<b>Age</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Valid 18-22	3	3.0
Valid 23-27	19	19.0
Valid 28-32	25	25.0
Valid 33-37	25	25.0
Valid 38-42	16	16.0
Valid 43-47	5	5.0
Valid 48-52	1	1.0
Valid above 52	4	4.0
Total	98	98.0
Missing data	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

**Table 5 Ranks of respondents**

Ranks		Frequency	Percent (%)
Valid	senior administrative assistant	32	32.0
	principal administrative assistant	4	4.0
	chief administrative assistant	2	2.0
	assistant registrar	6	6.0
	senior assistant registrar	4	4.0
	deputy registrar	3	3.0
	Instructor	13	13.0
	Lecturer	22	22.0
	senior lecturer	7	7.0
	Total	93	93.0
Missing	Data	7	7.0
Total		100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

**Table 6 Years of working(experience)**

Years of working (YW)		Frequency	Percent (%)
Valid	less than 5 years	25	25.0
	5-10years	52	52.0
	11-15years	12	12.0
	16-20years	5	5.0
	over 20years	3	3.0
	Total	97	97.0
Missing	data	3	3.0
Total		100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

**Table 7 Marital status of respondents**

Marital		Frequency	Percent (%)
Valid	married	65	65.0
	unmarried	34	34.0
	divorced	1	1.0
	Total	100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

**Table 8 Number of children of respondents**

Number of Children	Frequency	Percent (%)
none	37	37.0
one	29	29.0
two	12	12.0
Valid three	15	15.0
four	5	5.0
above 5	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

### 3.2 Results on the ranks of elements of job satisfaction

The results on the satisfaction level of respondents are reported in Table 9. Table 9 reports of the variables that respondents are satisfied with and that influences overall job satisfaction. The results indicate that respondents are satisfied more with salary, followed by work load, and then interpersonal relationship. The least satisfied variable is work autonomy followed by leadership care, and then organisation decision-making.

**Table 9 Descriptive Statistics of the variables that influence Job satisfaction**

Variables	Mean	Std Deviation	Sample (N)	Ranks of Variable
Satisfaction with salary	3.8795	1.13048	83	1
Satisfaction with work environment	3.7470	0.97334	83	4
Satisfaction with work characteristics	3.6747	0.93845	83	6
Satisfaction with organisation decision-making	3.6506	1.04103	83	7
Satisfaction with leadership care	3.6024	0.93626	83	8
Satisfaction with interpersonal relationship	3.7831	0.71650	83	3
Satisfaction with self-worth	3.7229	0.80112	83	5
Satisfaction with work load	3.7952	0.74505	83	2
Satisfaction with work autonomy	3.5060	0.78668	83	9
Satisfaction with social recognition	3.7470	0.85316	83	4

Source: Author's computation, April 2017

### 3.2 Results on factors that influence job satisfaction

The effect of satisfaction with elements of job satisfaction on overall job satisfaction was examined using simple regression method of analysis. The results are reported in Table 10 to Table 19. The results in Table 10 report the effect of satisfaction with salary on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate positive insignificant effect of satisfaction with salary on overall job satisfaction. The value of the Adjusted R Square (-0.002) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 10 The effect of satisfaction with salary on overall job satisfaction**

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Constant (C)	3.366	0.244	13.785	0.000***
Satisfaction with salary (S)	0.055	0.061	0.900	0.370
R Square=0.008: Adjusted R Square= -0.002: DW= 1.927				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* denote significance at 1%.

The results in Table 11 show the effect of satisfaction with work environment on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate positive significant effect of satisfaction with work environment on overall job satisfaction. The results show that 1% increase in satisfaction with work environment leads to about 16.3% increase in overall job satisfaction at 5% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.045) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 11 The effect of satisfaction with work environment on overall job satisfaction**

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)				
Variable	coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Constant (C)	2.979	0.260	11.465	0.000***
Satisfaction with work environment (WE)	0.163	0.069	2.371	0.020**
R square= 0.055: Adjusted R square= 0.045: DW= 1.994				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\* and \*\*\* denote significance at 5% and 1% respectively.

The results in Table 12 depict the influence of satisfaction with work characteristic on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate positive significant influence of satisfaction with work characteristics on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate that 1% increase in satisfaction with work characteristics leads to about 25.3% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.101) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 12 The effect of satisfaction with work characteristics (WC) on overall job satisfaction**

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Constant (C)	2.633	0.287	9.159	0.000***
satisfaction with work characteristics (WC)	0.253	0.076	3.326	0.001***
R square= 0.111: Adjusted R square= 0.101: DW= 1.846				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* denote significance at 1% level

The results in Table 13 indicate the influence of satisfaction with organisational decision-making on overall job satisfaction. The results show significant positive influence of satisfaction with organisational decision-making on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate that 1% increase in satisfaction with organisational decision-making leads to about 19.6% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.085) indicate that the model is not well fitted.



**Table 13 The effect of satisfaction with organisation decision-making (ODM) on overall job satisfaction**

<b>Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction</b>				
<b>Variable</b>	<b>coefficient</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>T-Ratio</b>	<b>P-value</b>
Constant (C)	2.884	0.228	12.624	0.000***
satisfaction with organisation decision-making (ODM)	0.196	0.062	3.173	0.002***
R square= 0.94: Adjusted R square= 0.085: DW= 2.025				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* denote significance at 1% level

The results in Table 14 show the effect of satisfaction with leadership care on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate significant positive influence of satisfaction with leadership care on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate that 1% increase in satisfaction with leadership care leads to about 20.0% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.073) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 14 The effect of satisfaction with leadership care (LC) on overall job satisfaction**

<b>Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)</b>				
<b>Variable</b>	<b>coefficient</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>T-Ratio</b>	<b>P-value</b>
Constant (C)	2.881	0.252	11.430	0.000***
satisfaction with leadership care (LC)	0.202	0.069	2.918	0.004***
R square= 0.082: Adjusted R square= 0.073: DW= 2.003				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* denote significance at 1% level

The results in Table 15 show the effect of satisfaction with interpersonal relationship (IR) on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate significant positive influence of satisfaction with interpersonal relationship (IR) on overall job satisfaction. The results show that 1% increase in satisfaction with interpersonal relationship (IR) leads to about 22.9% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.047) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 15 The effect of satisfaction with interpersonal relationship (IR) on overall job satisfaction**

<b>Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)</b>				
<b>Variable</b>	<b>coefficient</b>	<b>Std. Error</b>	<b>T-Ratio</b>	<b>P-value</b>
Constant (C)	2.714	0.368	7.374	0.000**
satisfaction with interpersonal relationship (IR)	0.229	0.096	2.389	0.019**
R square= 0.057: Adjusted R square= 0.047: DW= 1.958				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\* denote significance at 5% levels.

Table 16 shows the results on the effect of satisfaction with self-worth (SW) on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate significant positive influence of satisfaction with self-worth (SW) on overall job satisfaction. The results show that 1% increase in satisfaction with self-worth (SW) leads to about 39.8% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.190) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 16 The effect of satisfaction with self-worth on overall job satisfaction**

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)				
Variable	coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Constant (C)	2.106	0.309	6.808	0.000***
satisfaction with self-worth (SW)	0.398	0.082	4.880	0.000***
R square= 0.199: Adjusted R square= 0.190: DW=1.899				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* denote significance at 1% level.

Table 17 report the results on the effect of satisfaction with workload (WL) on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate significant positive influence of satisfaction with workload (WL) on overall job satisfaction. The results show that 1% increase in satisfaction with workload (WL) leads to about 21.6% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.043) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 17 The effect of satisfaction with workload (WL) on overall job satisfaction**

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)				
Variable	coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Constant (C)	2.763	0.360	7.671	0.000***
satisfaction with work load (WL)	0.216	0.093	2.317	0.023**
R square= 0.053: Adjusted R square= 0.043: DW= 2.017				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* and \*\* denote significance at 1% and 5% levels respectively.

Table 18 shows the results on the effect of satisfaction with work autonomy (WA) on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate significant positive influence of satisfaction with work autonomy (WA) on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate that 1% increase in satisfaction with work autonomy (WA) leads to about 25.3% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.043) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 18 The effect of satisfaction with work autonomy (WA) on overall job satisfaction**

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)				
Variable	coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Constant (C)	2.702	0.325	8.310	0.000***
satisfaction with work autonomy (WA)	0.253	0.091	2.786	0.006***
R square= 0.076: Adjusted R square= 0.066: DW= 1.898				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* denote significance at 1% level.

Table 19 shows the results on the effect of satisfaction with social recognition (SR) on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate significant positive influence of satisfaction with social recognition (SR) on overall job satisfaction. The results indicate that 1% increase in satisfaction with social recognition (SR) leads to about 22.4% increase in overall job satisfaction at 1% level of significance. The value of the Adjusted R Square (0.061) indicate that the model is not well fitted.

**Table 19 The effect of satisfaction with social recognition (SR) on overall job satisfaction**

Dependent variable: Overall job satisfaction (OJ)				
Variable	coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Constant (C)	2.743	0.322	8.516	0.000***
satisfaction with social recognition (SR)	0.224	0.085	2.650	0.009***
R square= 0.071: Adjusted R square= 0.061: DW= 2.082				

Source: Author's computation, April 2017: Note \*\*\* denote significance at 1% level.

#### 4 DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study is to contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of job satisfaction by examining the elements of satisfaction and their effect on overall job satisfaction. The study specifically examined and ranked the elements to determine which element is most satisfied, and how the level of satisfaction of the element influenced overall job satisfaction. The research questions are recalled as follows: What is the nature of employee overall job satisfaction? Which satisfaction element is most rank? What is the effect of the satisfaction element on overall job satisfaction?

The findings of the study showed that respondents are satisfied with the elements of job satisfaction in the study area. The findings are in support with previous works by researchers such as Chen (2008) who explained that overall job satisfaction is a function with satisfaction with salary welfare, work environment, work characteristics, organizational decision-making, leadership care, interpersonal relationship, and self-worth.

The findings on the ranks of the element of satisfaction support that of Podolske (2003) study that various elements influence overall job satisfaction differently. In his study of ranking of the element, the most important job components to employees, the findings indicate that employee's apparent desire for flexibility in balancing work and life issues is the most factor.

The findings on satisfaction with the job satisfaction elements are in support with that of Tai and Chuang (2014) study on satisfaction with job element in a study of the satisfaction of private university staff and public university staff. However, the ranking of the elements in the current study is not in line with that of Tai and Chuang (2014) in which Interpersonal Relationships (M = 3.78) and Self-Worth (M = 3.76) were the most satisfied whereas salary welfare (M = 2.91) and organizational decision-making (M = 2.96) of job satisfaction were least satisfied.

In Tai and Chuang (2014) study for public university staff the most satisfied element are Self-Worth (M= 3.84), and Interpersonal Relationship (M=3.69), whereas Organizational Decision-Making (M= 3.17), and Salary Welfare (M= 3.26) were least satisfied. However, in the current study, satisfaction with salary (M=3.8795), and Satisfaction with workload (M=3.7952) are the most satisfied, whereas work autonomy (M=3.5060), and leadership care (M=3.6024) are the least satisfied.

The finding of the study support the work of Noltemeyer (2014) in using the Herzberg model to examined employee's job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in a survey study and reported that responsibility, work itself, effective supervisor, and recognition are the four main variables that significantly influenced overall job satisfaction.

The findings of the study on the effect of satisfaction elements on overall job satisfaction is in line with that of Tai and Chuang (2014) study on public university staff on the similar elements in the model except salary welfare which did not have significant effect on overall job satisfaction in Tai and Chuang (2014). The findings are also in agreement with that of Tai and Chuang (2014) study on the private university staff job satisfaction except Interpersonal Relationship, which did not have significant effect on overall job satisfaction in their study.

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The paper examined the extent of employees overall job satisfaction and the effect of the elements of job satisfaction on overall job satisfaction in a survey study using the OLS regression method. The estimates indicate that the employees in the survey are satisfied with overall job satisfaction. In addition, employees are more satisfied with salary and work load, whereas they are more dissatisfied with work autonomy and leadership care. Furthermore, overall job satisfaction is influenced by the elements of satisfaction identified in the survey except salary, which did not significantly influenced overall job satisfaction, though the most ranked element in the survey.

Management of higher institutions should take into account the findings of the current study in motivating employees for enhance performance resulting from better service and quality service, since university workers are the first members of the community in dealing with students who are junior members of the community.

Future studies should consider the effect of demographic variables on overall job satisfaction. Since, the study is descriptive, future studies should also consider causal studies using structural modelling method of analysis. Comparative studies of public and private higher institutions to determine whether the findings will be replicated.

These results are by no means conclusive for a couple of reasons. First, the sample is not based on probability criterion but convenience and as such, the findings might lack external validity. A second challenge is the use of the standard OLS regression analysis, which is less robust as compared to quintile regressions. However, these challenges in no way invalidate the findings.

## REFERENCES

- Austin, A. E. (2012). Challenges and visions for higher education in a complex world: Commentary on Barnett and Barrie. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(1), 57-64.
- Brayfield, A. H., Crockett, W. H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(5), 396-424.
- Chen, P. Y. (2008). The study of staff's job satisfaction in educational institute-A case study on middle and elementary schools in Kaohsiung. *Electronic Theses of Graduate of Business Management, Asia University*, 1-75.
- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A., & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay Satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Personnel Psychology* 58(3), 613-640.
- Daneshfard, C., & Ekvaniyan, K. E. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Islamic Azad University. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in usiness*, 3(9), 168-181.
- DeConinck, J. B. (2009). The effect of leader-member exchange on turnover among retail buyers. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(11), 1081-1086.
- Froeschle, M. L., & Sinkford, J. C. (2009). Full-time dental faculty perceptions of Satisfaction With the academic work environment. *Journal of Dental Education*, 73(10), 1153-1170.
- Fuller, J., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., & Relyea, C. (2006). Perceived organizational support and perceived external prestige: Predicting organizational attachment for university faculty, staff, and administrators. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(3), 327-347.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: National Occupational Conference, Harper.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. New York: Van No Strand.
- Ilies, R., Judge, T. A. (2002). Understanding the dynamic relationships among

personality, mood, and job satisfaction: A field experience sampling study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(4), 1119-1139.

Judge, T. A., Ilies, R., 2004. Affect and job satisfaction: A study of their relationship at work and at home. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(4), 661-673.

Katzell, R. A., Thompson, D. E., Guzzo, R. A., 1992. "How job satisfaction and job performance are and are not linked." In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, and E. F. Stone (Ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Lexington Books, 195-217.

Khalid, S. Irshad, Z., & Mahmood, B. (2012). Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff: A Comparative Analysis between Public and Private Sector Universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 126-136.

Kusku, F. (2003). Employee satisfaction in higher education: The case of academic and administrative staff in Turkey. *Career Development International*, 8(7), 347-356.

Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(3), 325-352.

Lund, D. B. (2003). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 18(3), 219-236.

Mardanov, I. T., Heischmidt, K., & Henson, A. (2008). Leader member exchange and job satisfaction bond and predicted employee turnover. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 159-175.

Noltmeyer, J. P. (2014). Job satisfaction of professional staff and administrators within the associated colleges of the south: a study of Herzberg's duality theory of motivation in higher education. PhD Thesis, University of Louisville.

Oshagbemi, T. (1999). Academics and their managers: A comparative study in job satisfaction, *Personnel Review*, 28, (1/2), 108 - 123

Podolske, A., ed., 2003. What motivates frontline staff and how the best companies deliver it. *IOMA s Report on Customer Relationship Management*, 2-4.

Tai, F, & Feng, P. (2014). Job Satisfaction of University Staff. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 10(1), 51-64.

Rashid, U., & Rashid, S. (2011). The effect of job enrichment on job satisfaction: A case study of faculty members. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(4), 106-117.

Snipes, R. L., Oswald, S. L., LaTour, M., & Armenakis, A. A. (2005). The effects of specific job satisfaction facets on customer perceptions of service quality: An employee-level analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(10), 1330-1339.

Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (2005). Wage comparisons with similar and dissimilar others. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(1), 113-131.

Weiss, H. M. (2002). "Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences", *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 173-194.

Wong, E., & Heng, T. (2009). Case study of factors influencing job satisfaction in two Malaysian universities. *International Business Research*, 2(2), 86-98.

Zeinabadi, H. (2010). Job organization commitment as antecedents or organizational citizenship Behaviour (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5(2), 998-1003.