



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

An Empirical study of the Role of Demographics in Job Satisfaction of Sunyani Technical University staff

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

Sunyani Technical University

15 June 2017

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/81471/>
MPRA Paper No. 81471, posted 28 Sep 2017 14:23 UTC

An Empirical study of the Role of Demographics in Job Satisfaction of Sunyani Technical University staff

Safura Mohammed¹, Ayisha Ahmed Azumah², Rebecca Tetteh³

1 Senior Assistant Registrar, Department of Computer Science, Sunyani Technical University, Sunyani Ghana: (Corresponding author): Phone: +233244465576. Email: safantwi@gmail.com

2 Assistant Registrar, Department of Accountancy, Sunyani Technical University, Sunyani Ghana: Phone: +233244529929. Email ayisha.ahmed59@yahoo.com.

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

Abstract

The paper analyses the effects of demographic variables on overall job satisfaction and satisfaction elements for Sunyani Technical University using standard Ordinary Least Square method (OLS). The estimates of the regression analysis indicate that demographic variables have insignificant positive and negative effect on overall job satisfaction. However, the estimates show significant positive and negative effect of demographic variables on some elements of job satisfaction. Managements of academic institutions should take into account the findings of the study to ensure that workers are well satisfied with their job so that productivity will not be affected. Future study should replicate the current study in a comparative study of private and public academic institutions.

Keywords: Gender, Age, Rank, overall job satisfaction, elements of job satisfaction

Jel Codes: J10, J24, J28, M51, M52, M54

1 Introduction

The issue about Job satisfaction has received a lot of attention from Psychologist, human resources professionals and managements of organisations for quite some time (Lim, 2008; Alniacik, Akcin, & Erat, 2012; Amarasena, Ajward, Haque, 2015) since job satisfaction construct plays very important role in the growth of an organisation. Various authors (Heslop et al., 2002; Küskü, 2003; Kaliski, 2007; Lim, 2008; Eyupoglu & Saner, 2009; Saner & Eyupoglu, 2012; Syed et al., 2012) have provided various definition of job satisfaction and the have explained the role of job satisfaction in an organisation.

For example, Heslop et al. (2002) consider worker job satisfaction as the difference between what the job actually provides the worker and what the worker's expectations, values and needs of the job are. Alniacik et al. (2012) explained that job satisfaction is a function of the worker's perception of the organisation's ability to provide various satisfaction elements they consider as very important to them.

On the role of job satisfaction in an organisation, Kaliski (2007) explained that workers sense of work fulfilment resulting from promotion, income, and recognition is a function of job satisfaction. Lim (2008) indicates that the personal well-being and organizational effectiveness and performance is a function of job satisfaction. Other researchers (McFarlin & Rice, 1992; Küskü, 2003; Saner & Eyupoglu, 2012) have explained that the attraction and retention of highly qualified workers into an organisation is a function of job satisfaction.

Various studies have examined the job satisfaction level of workers in organisations and the factors that influence job satisfaction. The findings are found in the works of authors such as Chen et al. (2006); Ho and Au (2006); Zembylas and Papanastasiou, 2006); Karim

(2008); Vandenberghe and Trembley (2008); Vandenberghe and Trembley (2008); Awang and Ahmed (2010); Danish and Usman (2010); Malik et al. (2010); Nadeem (2010); Ping (2010); Shahzad et al. (2010); Zainudin, Junaidah, and Nazmi (2010); Amal and Mohammad (2011); Saygi, Tolon, and Tekogul (2011); Strydom (2011); Bilal (2012); Mustapha (2013).

The factors that influence job satisfaction reported by these authors are job security, attractive compensation plan, salaries, promotion, supervision, interpersonal relations, work place, organization vision, respect, result feedback and motivation, management system, affective commitment, role clarity, job autonomy, organizational tenure, role conflict, work content, development, communication, co-workers, and workload and work demands.

Aside these elements reported by researchers to influence job satisfaction, demographic factors (gender, age, education, religion, rank, working experience, marital status, family size, income level) have been reported to influence job satisfaction.

The findings are found in the works of these researchers (Gurbuz, 2007; Schroder, 2008; Noordin & Jusoff; 2009; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009; Wong and Heng, 2009; Malik, 2011; Phua and Phua, 2011; Ravichandran, 2011; Ghafoor, 2012; Mehboob, Sarwar, & Bhutto, 2012; Syed et al., 2012; Amarasena et al., 2015). The review of the literature on both job satisfaction and the effect of demographics on job satisfaction has shown that the findings are mixed. Some studies have indicated that job satisfaction is not influenced by the various elements of satisfaction and in some other studies; the effect on job satisfaction is negative and positive in other studies. Similarly, demographic factors have neutral effect in some studies, positive effect in other studies and negative effects in other studies. These inconsistencies call for further empirical studies such as the current study to add to the literature.

The review have in addition, shown that many of the empirical works on job satisfaction in higher institutions in relation to elements of job satisfaction and the effect of demographics on job satisfaction have focused on developed economies with few works in developing economies such as Ghana (Hean & Garrett, 2001; Sseganga & Garrett, 2005; Eyupoglu & Saner, 2009). The findings of the current study fill in the gaps in literature.

The purpose of the current study is to add to the empirical literature in the area of job satisfaction by examining the effect of demographic factors on elements of job satisfaction and the overall job satisfaction.

The study is based on research question such as what is the effect of demographic factors on elements of job satisfaction and what is the effect of demographic factors on overall job satisfaction? The paper is based on the research hypothesis that demographic variables significantly influence elements of job satisfaction and not overall job satisfaction.

The study is based on the primary data and the findings are limited by the demerits of such data response consistency effect. The focus of the paper is on the effect of demographic variables on job satisfaction. The findings are also challenged by the use of standard regression estimation methodologies used for not producing more robust results like other estimation methods.

The rest of the study is organised into three sections. Section 2 deals with the method, section 3 considers the empirical results, whereas section 4 concludes the paper.

METHOD

2.1 Design and Estimation

Quantitative research design is employed in the study since the focus is to quantify the effect of demographic factors on job satisfaction. The study is also based on cross-sectional study and as such, data was taken from the respondents once in the survey. The survey data obtained was analysed using the standard regression method (OLS).

2.2 Population, Sampling method, and Data

The target population is the workers of Sunyani Technical University (lecturers, and administrators). Convenient sampling method was used to sample 100 respondents since it was not possible to contact all the workers at the time of the survey at their work places because some of the workers do not have permanent offices for probability sample. Self-designed questionnaire with 20 items was used to collect data at the work place of the respondents. Data on the satisfaction level and elements of satisfaction was collected using the Likert scale.

2.3 Model

Equation (1) specifies the empirical model. The model assumes positive relationship between demographic factors and overall job satisfaction. The independent variables are the demographic variables whereas overall job satisfaction (OJ) is the dependent variable.

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

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

Where in the case of the independent variables (DF), $i=1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,$ and 8 for G, E, RG, A, R, YE, MA, and NC respectively.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 reports the results of the demographics of the respondents in the survey. The results indicate that majority (69.0%) of the respondents are males; majority (42%) have Master's Degree; significant majority of the respondents (83.0%) are Christians; most of the respondents (25%) fall in the age groups of 28-32 and 33-37; most of the respondents (32.0%) are in senior administrative assistant rank (22.0%); majority of the respondents (65.0%) are married; majority (52%) of the respondents have worked between 5-10years in the organisation; and majority (37.0%) not having children.

Table 1 Demographic features of respondents

Demographic variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	69	69.0
Female	30	30.0
Missing data	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0
Education		
Ordinary diploma	2	2.0
HND	28	28.0
Degree	26	26.0
Masters	42	42.0
PhD	1	1.0
Missing data	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0
Religion		
Traditionalist	3	3.0
Christian	83	83.0

Muslim	12	12.0
Missing data	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0
Age		
18-22	3	3.0
23-27	19	19.0
28-32	25	25.0
33-37	25	25.0
38-42	16	16.0
43-47	5	5.0
48-52	1	1.0
above 52	4	4.0
Missing data	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0
Ranks		
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
Missing data	7	7.0
Total	100	100.0
Experience		
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
Missing data	3	3.0
Total	100	100.0
Marital status		
Married	65	65.0
Unmarried	34	34.0
Divorced	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0
No. of Children (NC)		
None	37	37.0
One	29	29.0
Two	12	12.0
Three	15	15.0
Four	5	5.0
Above 5	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Author's computation, June, 2017

3.2 Results on the influence of demographic variables on overall job satisfaction

The effect of demographic variables on overall job satisfaction was investigated using simple regression method. The results are reported in Table 2. The results as reported in Table 2 show that some demographic variables (gender, religion, and marital status) have positive insignificant effect on overall job satisfaction, whereas other demographic variables (education, age, rank, and years of experience) show negative insignificant effect on overall job satisfaction.

Table 2 The effect of demographic variables on overall job satisfaction

Dependent variable= Overall job satisfaction				
Independent variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
Gender (G)	0.202	0.158	1.280	0.204
Education (E)	-0.054	0.081	-0.666	0.507
Religion (RG)	0.131	0.191	0.685	0.495
Age (A)	-0.018	0.048	-0.377	0.707
Rank (R)	-0.007	0.023	-0.315	0.754
Years of experience (YE)	-0.035	0.080	-0.434	0.665
Marital status (MA)	0.011	0.144	0.076	0.940
Number of children (NC)	-0.014	0.052	-0.258	0.797

Source: Author's computation, June 2017

3.3 Results on the effect of demographic variables on elements of satisfaction

Table 3 to Table 10 reports the results on the effect of demographic variables on elements of job satisfaction using simple regression method. Some of the demographic variables have significant positive and negative effect on some of the elements, whereas other demographic variables have insignificant positive and negative effect on some elements.

In Table 3, the results show that gender have significant positive effect on satisfaction with salary (at 5%) and satisfaction with supervision (at 5%). There is significant negative link between gender and satisfaction with work autonomy (at 10%). Gender has insignificant positive (WC, ODM, and LC), and insignificant negative (WE, IR, SW, WL, and SR) relationship with the rest of the elements in the survey.

Table 3 The effect of gender on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable=Gender (G)				
Dependent variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	0.529	0.253	2.089	0.039**
WE	-0.051	0.229	-0.225	0.823
WC	0.094	0.210	0.448	0.655
ODM	0.055	0.246	0.224	0.823
LC	0.327	0.223	1.467	0.146
IR	-0.168	0.165	-1.022	0.309
SW	-0.261	0.174	-1.498	0.137
WL	-0.172	0.167	-1.026	0.308
WA	-0.287	0.169	-1.696	0.093*
SR	-0.064	0.195	-0.328	0.744
SU	0.981	0.451	2.178	0.037**

Source: Author's computation, June 2017

Note **, and * denote significance at 5%, and 10% levels

In Table 4, the results indicate that education have insignificant positive effect on satisfaction with work autonomy. There is significant negative link between education and satisfaction with satisfaction with work environment (at 1%), satisfaction with organisational decision making (at 1%), satisfaction with leadership care (at 1%), interpersonal relationship (at 5%), self-worth (at 10%), social recognition (at 1%), and supervision (at 10%). Education has insignificant negative effect on work characteristics, and workload.

Table 4 The effect of education on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable= Education (E)				
Dependent variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	-0.158	0.130	-1.216	0.227
WE	-0.406	0.110	-3.704	0.000***
WC	-0.190	0.101	-1.893	0.062
ODM	-0.440	0.115	-3.830	0.000***
LC	-0.310	0.110	-2.808	0.006***
IR	-0.166	0.082	-2.029	0.045**
SW	-0.153	0.089	-1.719	0.089*
WL	-0.140	0.085	-1.637	0.105
WA	0.046	0.086	0.537	0.592
SR	-0.260	0.094	-2.770	0.007***
SU	-0.423	0.210	-2.016	0.053*

Source: Author's computation, June 2017

Note ***, **, and * denote significance at 1%, 5%, and 10% levels

The results in Table 5, revealed that religion have significant positive effect on only satisfaction with salary. The rest of the results in the Table indicate insignificant negative and positive link between religion and satisfaction with the other elements.

Table 5 The effect of religion on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable= Religion (RG)				
Dependent variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	0.540	0.307	1.757	0.082*
WE	0.017	0.278	0.063	0.950
WC	0.283	0.254	1.114	0.268
ODM	-0.132	0.297	-0.443	0.658
LC	0.022	0.271	0.081	0.935
IR	-0.231	0.205	-1.127	0.263
SW	-0.163	0.215	-0.760	0.449
WL	-0.074	0.205	-0.363	0.718
WA	-0.106	0.205	-0.517	0.606
SR	0.099	0.239	0.416	0.678
SU	-1.000	0.755	-1.324	0.196

Source: Author's computation, June 2017. Note * denotes significance at 10% levels

In Table 6, the results depict that age have insignificant positive effect on satisfaction with work autonomy. However, the rest of the results show that, age of the respondents have significant negative effect on satisfaction with work environment (at 5%), satisfaction with

organisational decision making (at 1%), satisfaction with leadership care (at 5%), self-worth (at 5%), and work load (at 10%), whereas age has insignificant negative effect on the rest of the elements (WC, IR, SR, and SU).

Table 6 The effect of age on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable= Age (A)				
Dependent variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	-0.074	0.078	-0.954	0.343
WE	-0.171	0.066	-2.579	0.011**
WC	-0.027	0.062	-0.443	0.659
ODM	-0.218	0.071	-3.058	0.003***
LC	-0.140	0.067	-2.095	0.039**
IR	-0.050	0.049	-1.017	0.312
SW	-0.108	0.052	-2.087	0.040**
WL	-0.099	0.050	-1.971	0.052*
WA	0.048	0.050	0.942	0.349
SR	-0.034	0.057	-0.602	0.549
SU	-0.004	0.114	-0.036	0.972

Source: Author's computation, June 2017

Note ***, **, and * denote significance at 1%, 5%, and 10% levels

The results depicted in Table 7, shows that the ranks of respondents have significant positive effect on satisfaction with work autonomy (at 5% level) and insignificant positive effect on social recognition and supervision. The rest of the results indicate that ranks of the respondents have significant negative effect on satisfaction with work environment (at 5%), satisfaction with salary (at 1%), satisfaction with organisational decision making (at 5%), satisfaction with leadership care (at 5%), and satisfaction with interpersonal relationship (at 10%). However, ranks have insignificant negative effect on the rest of the elements (WC, SW, and WL).

Table 7 The effect of rank on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable= Rank (R)				
Dependent variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	-0.099	0.035	-2.793	0.006***
WE	-0.065	0.033	-1.960	0.053*
WC	-0.034	0.029	-1.149	0.254
ODM	-0.069	0.035	-1.982	0.050**
LC	-0.073	0.032	-2.260	0.026**
IR	-0.040	0.023	-1.692	0.094*
SW	-0.027	0.025	-1.083	0.281
WL	-0.028	0.024	-1.168	0.246
WA	0.058	0.024	2.445	0.016**
SR	0.005	0.029	0.188	0.851
SU	0.021	0.064	0.326	0.747

Source: Author's computation, June 2017

Note ***, **, and * denote significance at 1%, 5%, and 10% levels

The results presented in Table 8, indicate that the years of experience of respondents have insignificant positive effect on satisfaction with salary and supervision. The rest of the results in the Table show that the years of experience of the respondents have significant

negative effect on satisfaction with interpersonal relationship (at 1%), satisfaction with self-worth (at 5%), and satisfaction with workload (at 1%). However, years of experience have insignificant negative effect on the other elements of satisfaction (WC, WE, ODM, LC, WA, and SR).

Table 8 The effect of years of experience on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable= (YE)				
Dependent variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	0.051	0.126	0.403	0.688
WE	-0.103	0.113	-0.914	0.363
WC	-0.067	0.103	-0.652	0.516
ODM	-0.107	0.124	-0.868	0.388
LC	-0.116	0.111	-1.041	0.301
IR	-0.214	0.080	-2.688	0.009***
SW	-0.192	0.086	-2.224	0.029**
WL	-0.233	0.080	-2.921	0.004***
WA	-0.115	0.083	-1.392	0.167
SR	-0.077	0.093	-0.832	0.407
SU	0.042	0.199	0.210	0.835

Source: Author's computation, June 2017

Note *** and ** denote significance at 1% and 5% levels

Table 9 presents the results on the link between marital status and elements of satisfaction. The results indicate marital status of respondents have insignificant negative effect on satisfaction with salary and leadership care. The rest of the results in Table 9 show marital status of the respondents have significant positive effect on satisfaction with supervision (at 10%), with insignificant positive effect on the rest of the elements (WC, WE, ODM, IR, SW, WL, WA, and SR).

Table 9 The effect of marital status on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable= Marital status (MA)				
Dependent variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	-0.177	0.235	-0.754	0.453
WE	0.164	0.208	0.791	0.431
WC	0.064	0.192	0.333	0.740
ODM	0.145	0.225	0.645	0.520
LC	-0.056	0.208	-0.268	0.790
IR	0.050	0.151	0.328	0.743
SW	0.213	0.160	1.331	0.186
WL	0.113	0.154	0.732	0.466
WA	0.033	0.155	0.213	0.832
SR	0.122	0.175	0.697	0.487
SU	0.770	0.382	2.015	0.053*

Source: Author's computation, June 2017. Note * denote significance at 10% level

Table 10 shows the results on the relationship between number of children and elements of satisfaction. The results indicate number of children of respondents have significant negative effect on only satisfaction with organisational decision making (at 1% level). The rest of the results in Table 10 indicate number of children of the respondents have insignificant negative

effect on satisfaction with the other elements (WE, WC, LC, IR, SW, WL, and SU). However, number of children have insignificant positive effect on satisfaction with salary, satisfaction with work autonomy, and satisfaction with social recognition.

Table 10 The effect of number of children on elements of satisfaction

Independent variable= number of children (NC)				
Dependent variables	Coefficient	Std. Error	T-Ratio	P-value
S	0.017	0.085	0.200	0.842
WE	-0.118	0.074	-1.612	0.110
WC	-0.070	0.068	-1.030	0.306
ODM	-0.222	0.078	-2.858	0.005***
LC	-0.108	0.073	-1.480	0.142
IR	-0.024	0.055	-0.435	0.665
SW	-0.093	0.057	-1.627	0.107
WL	-0.073	0.055	-1.335	0.185
WA	0.058	0.056	1.041	0.301
SR	0.038	0.062	0.606	0.546
SU	-0.088	0.113	-0.776	0.443

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

4 DISCUSSIONS

The relationship between demographic variables and overall job satisfaction of employees as well as the link between demographic variables and satisfaction with elements of job satisfaction have been investigated in the survey. The findings of the study seems to suggest that demographic variables (G, E, RG, A, R, YE, MA, and NC) in the survey do not significantly influence overall job satisfaction of respondents in the survey. Whiles the findings confirm some existing literature, they do not also confirm other findings.

For example, the findings of the research do not support that of Hagedorn (2000) who indicated that marital status positively influence job satisfaction levels of respondents, as well as that of DeVaney and Chen (2003) who reported that age, gender, and education have significant effect on job satisfaction. In Oshagbemi (2003) study he reported that the rank of the employees positively influence overall job satisfaction.

Marital status, according to Cetin (2006) positively influence job satisfaction of employees that does not support the findings of the current research. The findings are not in support of that of Noordin and Jusoff (2009) study that found that current job status, marital status, age, and salary have significant influence on the level of job satisfaction of employees.

The findings of Sabharwal and Corley (2009) that, rank positively influence job satisfaction are not supported by that of the present study. The findings also are inconsistent with that of Malik (2011) who reported that age, job rank, job qualification, and years of experience influence overall job satisfaction of employees, as well as the findings of Paul and Phua (2011) that job position, and age affect the levels of job satisfaction of employees.

The findings however, are in agreement with that of Ward and Sloane (2000) study that gender of respondents have no significant effect on overall job satisfaction. Oshagbemi (2003) reported that age, gender, and years of experience do not influence job satisfaction significantly, which agrees with the findings of the current study. Sseganga and Garrett (2005) finding that gender have no significant effect on overall job satisfaction is in line with the findings of the current study. Paul and Phua (2011) reported of similar findings in support of the current study that indicated that academic qualification, gender, marital status, and length of employment have no significant effect on overall job satisfaction.

5 CONCLUSION

The current study investigates the effect of demographic variables on overall job satisfaction and satisfaction elements in a survey of employees of Sunyani Technical University, using the standard OLS regression method.

The estimates from the regression analysis indicate that demographic variables do not statistically significantly influence overall job satisfaction in support of the assumption underlying the study. However, there are positive and negative links between demographic variables and overall job satisfaction. The estimates indicate that demographic variables significantly influence some of the satisfaction elements positively and negatively.

The negative link between some of the demographic variables (E, A, R, YE, and NC) and overall job satisfaction must be taken into account by managements of academic institutions so as not to affect the performance of employees as a result of job dissatisfaction.

Future research should expand the scope of the current study by including other private academic institutions and employing other methods of analysis such as cross-tabulation and structural modelling.

REFERENCES

Alniacik, U., Akcin, E. A. K., & Erat, S. (2012). Relationships between career motivation, affective commitment and job satisfaction. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 58, 355-362.

Amal, A., & Mohammad, A. A. (2011). Moderating Affect of Workplace Spirituality on the Relationship of Job Overload and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104, 93-99.

Amarasena, T. S. M., Ajward, A. R., & Haque, A. A. K. M (2015). The effects of demographic factors on job satisfaction of university faculty members in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 3(4), 89-108.

Awang, Z., & Ahmed, J. H. (2010). Modelling Job Satisfaction and Work Commitment among Lecturers: A Case of UiTM Kelantan. *Journal of Statistical Modelling and analysis*, 1(2), 45-59.

Bilal, H. (2012). Job satisfaction of University Teachers: Impact of Working Conditions and Compensation. *Rev. Integr. Bus. Econ. Res.*, 1(1), 101-113.

Cetin, M. O. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction, occupational and organizational commitment of academics. *Journal of American Academy of Business Cambridge*, 8(1), 78-88.

Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiau, J. Y., & Wang, H. H. (2006). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *The TQM Magazine*, 18(5), 484-500.

Danish, R., & Usman, A. (2010). Impact of Reward and Recognition on Job Satisfaction and Motivation: An Empirical Study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(2), 167-195.

DeVaney, S. A., & Chen, Z. S. (2003). Job Satisfaction of recent graduates in Financial services, US Department of Labour. Bureau of Labour Statistics Compensation and Working Conditions Online.

Eyupoglu, S. Z., & Saner, T. (2009a). Job satisfaction: Does rank make a difference? *African Journal of Business Management*, 3(10), 609- 615.

Ghafoor, M. M. (2012). Role of demographic characteristics on job satisfaction. *Far East Research Centre*, 6(1), 30-45.

Gurbuz, A. (2007). An assessment on the effect of education level on the job satisfaction from the tourism sector point of view. *Dogus Universitesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 36-46.

Hagedorn, L. (2000). What contributes to job satisfaction among faculty and staff. *New Directions for Institutional Research*.

- Hean, S., & Garrett, R. (2001). Source of job satisfaction in science secondary school teachers in Chile. *Compare*, 31, 363-379.
- Heslop, P., Smith, G. D., Metcalfe, C., Macleod, J., & Hart, C. (2002). Change in job satisfaction and its association with self-reported stress, cardiovascular risk factors, and mortality. *Social Science & Medicine*, 54(10), 1589-1599.
- Ho, C. L., & Au, W. T. (2006). Teaching satisfaction scale: measuring job satisfaction of teachers. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 172-185.
- Kaliski, B. S. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Business and Finance* (Second edition ed.).
- Karim, N. H. A. (2008). Investigating the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction among Malaysian Academic Librarians. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 13(2), 69-88.
- Küskü, F. (2003). Employee satisfaction in higher education: The case of academic and administrative staff in Turkey. *Career Development International*, 8(7), 347-356.
- Lim, S. (2008). Job satisfaction of information technology worker in academic libraries. *Library & Information Science Research*, 30(2), 115-121.
- Malik, N. (2011). Study of job satisfaction factors of faculty members at university of Baluchistan. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(1), 267-272.
- Malik, E., Nawab, S., Naeem, B., & Danish, Q. (2010). Job satisfaction of university teachers in public sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(6), 17-26.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Rice, R. W. (1992). The role of facet importance as a moderator in job satisfaction processes. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 13, 41-54.
- Mehboob, F., Sarwar, M. A., & Bhutto, N. A. (2012). Factors affecting job satisfaction among faculty member. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 1(12), 1-9.
- Mustapha, N. (2013). The Influence of Financial Reward on Job Satisfaction among Academic Staffs at Public Universities in Kelantan. *Malaysia. International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(3), 244-248.
- Nadeem, M. (2010). A Study on Job Satisfaction Factors of Faculty Members at the University of Balochistan. *Journal of Research in Education*, 2.
- Noordin, F., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff. *Asian Social Science*, 5(5), 122-128.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(12), 1210-1232.
- Paul, E. P., & Phua, S. K. (2011). Lecturers' job satisfaction in a public tertiary institution in Singapore: ambivalent and non-ambivalent relationships between job satisfaction and demographic variables. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 33(2), 141-151.
- Ping, D. (2010). Analysis of job satisfaction of University professors from nine Chinese universities. *Front. Educ China*, 5(3), 430-449.
- Ravichandran, A. (2011). Organizational Structure, HR Practices and its Outcomes: A Conceptual Model.
- Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and Discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46, 539-556.
- Saner, T., & Eyupoglu, S. Z. (2012). Have gender differences in job satisfaction disappeared? A study of Turkish universities in North Cyprus. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(1), 250-257.
- Saygi, H., Tolon, T., & Tekogul, H. (2011). Job satisfaction among academic staff in Fisheries faculties at Turkish Universities. *Social Behavior and Personality. An International Journal*, 39(10), 1395-1402.
- Schroder, R. (2008). Job satisfaction of employees at a Christian university. *Journal of*

Research on Christian Education, 17, 225-246.

Shahzad, K., Mumtaz, H., Hayat, K., & Khan, M. A. (2010). Faculty Workload, Compensation Management and Academic Quality in Higher Education of Pakistan: Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *European Journal of Economics, Finance & Administrative Sciences*, 27, 111-119.

Ssesanga, K., & Garrett, R. M. (2005). Job satisfaction of University academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Education*, 50(1), 33-56.

Strydom, A. (2011). The Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff Members on Fixed-Term Employment Contracts at South African Higher Education Institutes. *University of the Free State Faculty of Education*.

Syed, A. A. S. G., Nadeem, B., Sabir, M., Faiz, M., Shaikh, & Hina, S. (2012). Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members of Universities in Pakistan: A Case Study of University of Sindh-Jamshoro. *Modern Applied Science*, 6(7).

Vandenberghe, C., & Trembley, M. (2008). The Role of Pay Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Turnover Intention: A Two-Sample Study. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 22, 275-286.

Ward, M. E., & Sloane, P. J. (2000). Non-pecuniary advantages vs. pecuniary disadvantages: job satisfaction among male and female academics in Scottish universities. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 47, 273-303.

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

Zainudin, A., Junaidah, H. A., & Nazmi, M. Z. (2010). Modelling job satisfaction and work commitment among lecturers: a case of UITM kelantan. *Journal of Statistical Modelling and Analytics*, 1(2), 45-59.

Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2006). Sources of teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in Cyprus. *Compare*, 36(2), 229-247.