

AN ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND THE LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION OF SENIOR UNIVERSITY STAFF

ABSTRACT

The study was focused on the need to determine what demographic factors were related to the level of job satisfaction of Senior University Staff. The study adopted a descriptive correlational design to elicit relevant information which were analysed using the SPSS version 13 window. A modified version of the Job Diagnostic Survey developed by Hackman and Oldham (1980) distributed to 1535 Senior University staff. The information gathered from 1243 respondents showed that significant relationships existed between the job satisfaction constructs and the demographic factors of gender and age. When considering Senior University Staff current position, a significant difference was found between Academic and professional & Technical Staff regarding how each group rated satisfaction with co-worker relations. Significant relationships were determined at the $p < .05$ level.

INTRODUCTION

Some of the most widely used definitions of job satisfaction include Porter LW, Lawler EE, Hackman JR (1975) who define job satisfaction as one's reaction against his/her occupation or organization, Locke (1976) who defines job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience and Dawis and Lofquist (1984) who define it as the result of the worker's appraisal of the degree to which the work environment fulfils the individual's needs. As well as the above definitions indicate, a review of published works reveal that there does appear to be general agreement that job satisfaction is an affective reaction to a job that results from the comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (Oshagbemi, 2003). Most research into job satisfaction has been undertaken in the business sector with attempts often having been made to adapt these findings to higher education (Okpara JO, Squillace M, Erondue EA (2005). Though there has been numerous publications on job satisfaction, there has been relatively little empirical data gathered on the job satisfaction of Academics in general (Okpara et al., 2005). Perhaps this area has not received so much attention because a high level of job satisfaction generally has been presumed to exist in a university setting (Pearson and Seiler, 1983).

When considering job satisfaction, demographic variables should be considered to thoroughly understand the possible factors that lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The history of job satisfaction can be traced back to the early 1900's when different studies were carried out by researchers on different situations perspective on job

satisfaction. This perspective states that satisfaction is determined by certain characteristics of the job and characteristics of the job environment itself. Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have towards their work. Kaliski (2007) posited that Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that lead to a feeling of fulfillment. As noted by Adekola (2012), Job satisfaction may serve as a good indicator of employee effectiveness. High levels of job satisfaction may be sign of a good emotional and mental state of employees. The behavior of workers depending on their level of job satisfaction will affect the functioning and activities of the organization's business. In his study, Bilimoria, (2006) found that women are mainly satisfied with internal relationships and fairness in the relational support received from colleagues, and that these factors positively influence their satisfaction with the job as a whole. As noted by Okpara, et al (2005), the relationship between gender and job satisfaction still continue to draw attention since some studies reviewed by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell in 1957 indicated that males are more satisfied with their job, while others indicated that females are more satisfied. The status of educational level and its relationship with job satisfaction is not clear either. Some studies showed that workers with more education have a higher job satisfaction level, while other studies indicate that workers with more education have a lower job satisfaction level. Other studies showed no relationship between the two. Since then, many studies have suggested that a clear conclusion cannot to drawn concerning job satisfaction and its relationship to marital status, number of dependents, number of previous occupations, or ethnicity. (Mcneely, 1984; Polin, 1990; Nestor & Leary, 2000; Okpara, et.al, 2005).

Cano & Miller (1992b) in their study of agricultural education teachers in Ohio, indicated in their findings that age, length of years spent in current position, number of years spent in the teaching job, and educational status of teachers were not significantly related to overall job satisfaction. This is an indication of some level of equality in the job satisfaction level of teachers of both genders. Castillo, Conklin & Cano (1999) reported the same findings in their study on the same set of subjects many years later. The indication of the findings was that over a period of about ten years, the subjects experienced a significant relationship between the demographic characteristics and their level of job satisfaction did not relate in any significant manner. The implication of the findings of the two studies (Cano & Miller, 1992b; & Castillo et al., 1999) are (i) that age of teachers was not necessarily a factor in their job satisfaction. (ii) The length of teachers' experience in the profession did not affect their overall job satisfaction level. Even when the two variables were examined by Cano & Miller, (1992a) in another study with six different classifications of agriculture teachers, no significant relations was found to any of the demographic variable.

The studies of Grady (1985) and Berns (1989) on age, total years of teaching experience and their educational status however did not tally with those of Ohio Researchers. For instance, Grady (1985) found that years of teaching of experience had positive effects on overall job satisfaction. The findings of the study conducted by Berns (1989) revealed that the overall job satisfaction of teachers increased as their age. Berns (1989) also discovered that the educational level of teachers is an affective factor of their overall job satisfaction level. The study revealed that teachers with Master's Degree were

93 more satisfied than those with Bachelor's Degree. The report of the study by Jamie &
94 Jamie (2004) indicated that demographic factors generally have negligible relationship
95 with job satisfaction.

96 The need for the present study therefore arose from this dichotomy of findings in the
97 literature, on what the relationship is between the demographic variables and the overall
98 job satisfaction among the workers generally.

99
100 Many Researchers had conducted studies on the relationship between job
101 satisfaction and demographic factors like age, years of experience, educational level, and
102 marital status. Some of these studies include Griffin, 1984, Andrews, 1990; Bowen,
103 Radhakrishna, & Keyser, 1994; Fetsch & Kennington, 1997; and Nestor & Leary, 2000.
104 Nestor & Leary, (2000) found that intrinsic job satisfaction was higher for those in their
105 age groups of 23 to 33 and 46 to 50 which give potency to age as a factor. This is
106 consistent with the findings of the study conducted by Griffin (1984) in a study of
107 Extension home economists where he revealed that age was related to job satisfaction.
108 Also, the research conducted by Bowen, et.al. (1994) confirmed age as a related factor to
109 job satisfaction. The study revealed that Professional Staff of older ages had a higher As
110 for relationship between job experience and job satisfaction, Griffin (1984) and Andrews
111 (1990) both found no relationship between job satisfaction and years of experience. In
112 contrast however, Nestor and Leary (2000) did find that as one's years of experience
113 increased as an Extension faculty member, his or her intrinsic and overall job satisfaction
114 increased as well. This conclusion was confirmed by Bowen et al. (1994) for Professional
115 Staff. The findings of Fetsch and Kennington (1997) also corroborated this fact for all
116 Senior University Staff in their study.

117 The relationship between the educational level and job satisfaction has also been
118 studied with varied findings. Andrews (1990; 1996) discovered a relationship between
119 educational level and job satisfaction of Extension workers. This finding is not the same
120 with those of Griffin (1984) and Bowen et al. (1994). Gurbuz (2007) also fund a good
121 relationship between the educational lelvel and the job satisfaction of Hotel workers.

122
123 Bowen, et.al (1994) reported a relationship between marital status and the job
124 satisfaction levels of Professional Staff in a study by indicating that married Professional
125 Staff were more satisfied with their jobs than those who were single. In the same manner,
126 Fetsch and Kennington (1997) also revealed a relationship between marital status and job
127 satisfaction levels in their study where they indicated that divorced and married agents
128 are more satisfied with their jobs than agents who were never married, remarried, or
129 widowed. Adekola (2012) did not find the same result in his study of University Non-
130 Teaching staff in relation factors predicting their burnout level.

131
132 level of job satisfaction when compared with the younger ones. However, Andrews
133 (1990) did not find any relationship between age and the job satisfaction level of
134 Extension agricultural agents.

135
136
137 Many studies have also been conducted regarding the relationship between gender
138 and job satisfaction by researchers over the years with divergent conclusions (Bowen et

al., 1994; Nestor & Leary, 2000; Riggs & Beus, 1993, Adekola, 2012.). While some studies that females have higher levels of job satisfaction, other studies indicate that males do (Bowen et al., 1994; Riggs & Beus, 1993). There are even some studies that indicate that there is no relationship between gender and job satisfaction levels (Nestor & Leary, 2000). In the study conducted by Riggs & Beus (1993), job satisfaction of female agents was found to be higher than male when compared with other variable like number family size. Bowen et al. (1994) as well found a relationship between job satisfaction and gender. They discovered that female Professional Staff were more satisfied with their jobs than male agents. Olorunsola (2010) found that male administrative officers were more satisfied than female administrative officers in Nigeria universities.

Theoretical Framework

Job satisfaction is one of the most complex area facing today's managers when managing their employees (Aziri, 2011). According to the Lise and Timothy 2004; employee surveys, can be used effectively for improving employee attitudes and making organizational changes. Warsi et al (2009) found that job satisfaction, work motivation and organizational commitment were positively correlated each other. Job dissatisfaction also appears to be related to other withdrawal behaviours, including lateness; unionization, grievances, and drug abuse, and decision to retire. (Lise & Timothy, 2004). Moser (1997) has stated that absence of job satisfaction leads to lethargy and reduced organizational commitment.

Locke (1976) described job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Job satisfaction is associated with job enrichment, good supervision, and clear roles and met expectation. According to the Luthans (1998) there are three important dimensions to job satisfaction as emotional response to a job situation, how well meet or exceed expectations, and related attitudes about important characteristics of the job (work itself, promotion, opportunities, supervision and co-workers)

There are several theories of job satisfaction. Among all the theories however, the Herzberg two factor theory of satisfaction which proposed a theory about job factors that satisfy & dissatisfy employees seem to be the most famous. The theory focused on some factors like company policy, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions and salary as mostly those factors creating job dissatisfaction. It however posited that five factors; achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and advancement are strong determiners of job satisfaction. According to the Affect theory, what determines satisfaction is the discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. Vooms (1964) also identify job satisfaction as an interface between personal and workplace variables. According to him, employees put more effort and perform better when they are compensated accordingly.

The study conducted by Jain, Fauzia, Vinita, & Naveen (2007) among oil workers in India concluded that better organizational climate was positively affected on job satisfaction. The Research findings of Harmon, Scotti, Bebson, Farias, Petzel, Neuman, & Keashly, (2007) among Healthcare staff proved that the positive correlation between job satisfaction and better supervision. Jude and Church (2000) found that the nature of the work itself emerged as the most important job facet that affect employee satisfaction among different facets of

186 their job such as supervision, pay, promotion opportunities, co-workers etc. The findings
187 of Hamidia and Phadett (2011) also identified supervision, job training, and pay
188 practices as playing a crucial role in enhancing job satisfaction of employees. On the
189 other hand, Yunki (1999) identified autonomy as the strongest projector of satisfaction.
190 Whereas Victor (2008) identified employee empowerment (employee believes of
191 involvement in organizational processes and decision making) a stronger factor over
192 employee satisfaction than the other variables including salaries, working conditions, job
193 security and co-workers. Yesemmin, (2011) in his own study identified Working in a
194 supportive and friendly and corporate environment as a factor that is very important for
195 employee satisfaction.

196 The study carried out by Boran Toker (2011) indicated that the job satisfaction levels of
197 the academicians were found to be moderately high. He identified social status as being
198 ranked as the highest and compensation was ranked as the lowest of the examined items.
199 The results of the study indicated that professors reported a higher level of job
200 satisfaction as compared to instructor and research assistants. Nonetheless, among the
201 demographic variables age, length of service in present university and in higher education
202 as a whole were significantly related to job satisfaction. Marital status and gender were
203 not significantly related to job satisfaction. A related study by Yapa, Rathnayake,
204 Senanayake & Premakumara (2014) also identified age and marital status as most potent
205 factors affecting job satisfaction of Non academic staff of Universities.

206
207
208 The questions to be asked which needed to be answered through proper study
209 however remain:

- 210 i. What is the level of satisfaction level of individuals with certain aspects
211 of their work context which may affect their willingness to respond
212 positively to work enrichment?
- 213 ii. Can the workers be relatively satisfied with job security, pay, co-worker
214 relations, and supervision tend to respond more positively to jobs rating
215 high on the job characteristics, thus having a higher level of context
216 satisfaction.
- 217 iii. Can these four aspects of work context combine to form the context
218 satisfaction constructs.

219 220 221 **Objectives**

222 The main objective of the study is to determine the demographic factors that were related to
223 the level of job satisfaction of Senior University Staff. The study is therefore to examine
224 the effect of gender, indigineship, age, marital status, education level, current position
225 and previous position on the job satisfaction level of University Senior University Staff.

226 227 **Methods and Procedures**

228 229 *Population*

230 The population for this descriptive correlation study was all Senior University
231 staff employed by the Olabisi Onabanjo University in Ago-Iwoye on April 2014 ($N =$

1535). This included Academic, technical Staff, and Professional Staff. All 1535 were included in the study. The University is State owned whereas some of the employed staff are not indigenes of the State. The non-indigenes are by convention not considering for positions that are consider vital especially the Principal Officers position.

Study Instrument

The instrument used for the study is the modified version of the popular Job Diagnostic Survey scale developed by Hackman and Oldham in 1980. Only three out of the seven sections of the scale however was used on the basis of relevance of each of the sections to elicit the required information from the subjects as explained below. A section containing ten questions was added to the scale by the researcher to elicit demographic information.

In two of the sections, the statements were rated on a 7-point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree to measure two (internal work motivation and general satisfaction) of the seven aspects in the job satisfaction construct. In the third section, the items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied to elicit response for the remaining five job satisfaction constructs (growth satisfaction, satisfaction with job security, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with co-worker relations, and satisfaction with supervision). The last section consisted of questions that asked the participants pertinent demographic information because this was not part of the original instrument.

Each of the scores was computed in line with the key provided by the author of the Scale. The scores elicited for internal work motivation, growth satisfaction, and general satisfaction, were put together to create the personal satisfaction category for the study. The last section which comprised satisfaction with job security, pay, co-worker relations, and supervision, were added together to form the context satisfaction category as provided in the key to the scale by Hackman & Oldham, (1980). This modified version had been used successfully by Meagan Scott, Kirk A. Swortzel & Walter N. Taylor (2005) in two studies on Extension Agents in Ohio. The modified version of the instrument was validated through a test and re-test means among 25 Senior Staff of the Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta and confirmed to be adequate for the study before use.

Reliability and Validity

As noted by many other studies, Hackman and Oldham (1974) the internal consistency reliabilities of each of the scales measured by the Job Diagnostic Survey was established Hackman and Oldham since 1974. The reliability coefficients for the job satisfaction constructs ranged from .56 (satisfaction with co-worker relations) to .84 (growth satisfaction) as reviously established too. (Hackman & Oldham, 1974; 1975).

The median off diagonal correlations for the job satisfaction constructs ranged from .23 in satisfaction with co-worker relations and 0 to .28 in growth satisfaction as provided by Hackman & Oldham, (1974).

Data Collection

Data collection was accomplished through distribution of questionnaire. Prior to data collection, the Researcher addressed the Senior Staff through their Unions notifying them that they would be asked to participate in the study and encouraged them to participate. They gave their unanimous consent to approve of the study and their willingness to participate through their Union Leaderships.

A total of 1535 staff were selected to participate in the study. Out of the number, 1324 (86.2%) who got the questionnaire responded to the survey. Only 1243 (80.9%) of the returned questionnaire however were usable due to the fact that some respondents did not fill all the aspects of the questionnaire leading to incomplete data.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed with the aid of Statistical package for the Social Sciences (SPSS® Version 13 for Windows). The data were summarized using Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations. The demographic data were reported through frequencies and percentages.

Means and standard deviations for the job satisfaction construct were computed as revealed by the statistics. Point-biserial correlation coefficients (r_{pb}) was used to determine the relationships between the job satisfaction constructs and gender, Indigene/Non Indigene, marital status, and whether or not the participant had held a previous position to other Universities prior to his or her current position. To determine the relationships between the job satisfaction constructs and age, the rank-biserial correlation coefficient (r_b) was calculated. As for the relationship between the job satisfaction constructs and age, Spearman's rho correlation coefficient (r_s) was calculated. Job satisfaction constructs and education level relationships were also determined using the Spearman's rho correlation coefficient (r_s). All relationships were determined with an a priori alpha level of .05 significant level.

Results

Population Description

The largest percentage (41.2%) of the participants identified themselves as Administrative Staff, while 32.2% were classified as Academic. Technical and Professional staff accounted for 26.6% of the participants.

Gender

The data as shown in Table 1 revealed that low significant relationships exist between gender and three of the job satisfaction constructs. This was demonstrated in growth satisfaction ($r_{pb} = .32$), satisfaction with job security ($r_{pb} = .29$), and satisfaction with pay ($r_{pb} = .33$). The scatter plots for the relationships between gender and these three constructs revealed that females rated higher than males in growth satisfaction, satisfaction with job security, and satisfaction with pay higher than males. Except for the negligible relationship between gender and satisfaction with co-worker relations ($r_{pb} = .09$), all other relationships were found to be low

Indigene/Non-Indigene

There were no significant relationships between Indigene/Non Indigene and two of the job satisfaction constructs, general satisfaction ($r_{pb} = .32$) and satisfaction with supervision ($r_{pb} = .34$) as shown in Table 1. When examined on the scatter plots, the relationships between Indigene/Non Indigene and these two constructs, a lower rate of general satisfaction and satisfaction with supervision was found among Non indigene than the Indigene. The relationships found between Indigene/Non Indigene and internal work motivation ($r_{pb} = .05$) and between Indigene/Non Indigene and satisfaction with pay ($r_{pb} = .09$) were however negligible.

Age

The outcome of the research indicated no significant relationship between age and the job satisfaction constructs. However, when age was compared with satisfaction with job security ($r_b = .13$) and satisfaction with pay ($r_b = .11$) on the two job satisfaction constructs, it revealed low relationships.

Marital Status

When correlated statistically, marital status and the job satisfaction constructs did not show any significant relationship. But some low relationships were found in two areas of the construct. These were the relationships found between marital status and internal work motivation ($r_{pb} = .11$) and between marital status and satisfaction with pay ($r_{pb} = .12$).

Education

When analysed, the educational level of the subjects and the job satisfaction construct did not reveal any significant relationship. Even though a low relationship found was between education and satisfaction with pay ($r_s = .24$), all the other relationships analysed were found to be negligible.

Held a previous Position with other Universities

No relationship ($r_{pb} = .21$) was found between this factor and satisfaction with supervision but it was not significant in the real sense for the report.

Table 1. The Relationships Between the Job Satisfaction Constructs and gender and Indigene/Non Indigene for All staff (N = 1243).

r_{pb}

370	Job satisfaction construct	Gender ^a	Indigine/Non Indigine
371			
372			
373	Personal Satisfaction Construct		
374			
375	Internal Work Motivation	.15	.05
376			
377	Growth Satisfaction	.32*	.16
378			
379	General Satisfaction	.10	.32
380			
381	Context Satisfaction Construct		
382			
383	Job Security	.29*	.11
384			
385	Pay	.33*	.09
386			
387	Co-Worker Relations	.09	.10
388			
389	Supervision	.17	.34*
390			

391 ^a1 = Female; 2 = Male

392 ^b1 = Indigine; 2 = Non Indigine

393 *p < .05

394

395 *Current Position*

396 Job satisfaction means for all staff ranged from 4.30 to 6.80 (table 2). Professional
 397 and Technical staff rated the job satisfaction construct of satisfaction with co-worker
 398 relations the highest ($M = 6.80$), while Administrative Staff rated the job satisfaction
 399 construct of satisfaction with pay the lowest ($M = 4.30$). The means among the staff
 400 groups were alike for six of the seven job satisfaction constructs. When rated on how
 401 each group rated their satisfaction with co-workers, a significant difference was found
 402 between Academic and Professional and technical Staff (Scheffe Mean Difference =
 403 .3427, $p = .032$). This score was an indication that Academic staff rated this construct
 404 significantly lower than Professional Staff.

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

Table 2: Means of the Job satisfaction Constructs for All senior University Staff (N = 1243)

Job Satisfaction Construct	M		
	Academic	Administrative Staff	Professional Staff
Personal Satisfaction Construct			
Internal Work Motivation	5.59	5.86	5.98
Growth Satisfaction	5.88	6.15	6.29
General Satisfaction	6.20	5.44	5.27
Context Satisfaction Construct			
Job Security	5.80	6.49	6.72
Pay	4.76	4.30	4.85
Co-Worker Relations*	6.25	6.53	6.80
Supervision	4.80	5.21	5.22

Note: Each of the scores was computed in line with the key provided by the author of the Scale. The scores elicited for internal work motivation, growth satisfaction, and general satisfaction, were put together to create the personal satisfaction category for the study. The last section which comprised satisfaction with job security, pay, co-worker relations, and supervision, were added together to form the context satisfaction category as provided in the key to the scale by Hackman & Oldham, (1980).

* $p < .05$.

Findings and Discussion

The main objective of the study is to determine the demographic factors that were related to the level of job satisfaction of Senior University Staff. The study is therefore to

462 examine the effect of gender, indigineship, age, marital status, education level, current
463 position and previous position on the job satisfaction level of University Senior
464 University Staff. As shown above, the analysis of the statistics of the data indicate a low
465 relationship between gender and the job satisfaction constructs of growth satisfaction,
466 satisfaction with job security, and satisfaction with pay. Also, Females rated higher than
467 males in three of these constructs. This indicated that the females show a higher level of
468 satisfaction with personal learning and growth opportunities at work, job security, and
469 compensation when compared to their male counterparts. The earlier researches of
470 Bowen et al., (1994) and Riggs & Beus, (1993) also had the same conclusions. Despite
471 the above findings however, some other studies such as those conducted Cano & Miller,
472 (1992a); Cano & Miller, (1992b); Castillo & Cano, (1999); Castillo et al., (1999); Nestor
473 & Leary, (2000) have shown that gender is not related to job satisfaction.

474
475 Regarding age, the findings of this study indicate that there was no significant
476 relationship between age and any of the job satisfaction constructs of the Senior
477 University Staff in Ago Iwoye. While this finding contrast with the conclusions of some
478 earlier researchers like Nestor & Leary (2000) and Olorunsola (2010), it is consistent
479 with other studies carried out by Castillo, et al. (1999) and Castillo & Cano, 1999.

480
481 Indigineship had low relationships with the job satisfaction constructs of general
482 satisfaction and satisfaction with supervision among the population for the research
483 because all of them rated both of these constructs low indicating a lower level of
484 satisfaction with their jobs in general and with the supervision that they receive.

485
486 This study indicated that marital status was not related to any of the job satisfaction
487 constructs for this set of University staff. This conclusion is consistent with earlier study
488 by Adekola, (2012). Several studies like Bowen, et al. (1994) and Fettsch & Kennington,
489 (1997) however indicated that married or divorced staff are more satisfied with their jobs
490 than remarried, never married, or widowed staff as evidence of a relationship between
491 marital status and job satisfaction.

492
493 This study reflected that Education was not related to any of the job satisfaction
494 constructs for Senior University Staff. Earlier researchers like (Bowen et al., 1994; Cano
495 & Miller, 1992a; Cano & Miller; 1992b; Castillo & Cano, 1999; Castillo et al., 1999 have
496 found this same conclusion. However, some studies do indicate that increasing one's
497 educational level increase his or her level of job satisfaction (Andrews, 1990; Berns,
498 1989).

499
500 When the means of the job satisfaction constructs of the three groups are
501 compared, it revealed that for the most part, there was no difference among the three
502 groups regarding how satisfied each group was with the seven job satisfaction constructs.
503 A significant difference was found between Academic and Professional and Technical
504 Staff regarding how satisfied each group was with their co-worker relations. Academic
505 rated this construct lower than Professional and Technical staff. This is an indication that
506 this group of staff experienced lower level of satisfaction in their relationships with their
507 co-workers. The experience of previous position in other Universities as a factor however

508 did not reflect any significance to any of the job satisfaction constructs for Senior
509 University Staff.

511 **Recommendations**

512
513 Understanding the factors that contribute to the job satisfaction level of members of the
514 University Community is very fundamental if we are expecting to get the best from them
515 in terms of productivity. It is therefore our suggestion that that the results of this kind of
516 study must be made available to University administrators to make them aware of which
517 demographic factors that was related to the level of job satisfaction of Senior University
518 Staff. It is suggested that management should design in-service and trainings to help
519 male Senior University Staff increase their level of satisfaction with personal learning
520 and growth opportunities at work, job security, and compensation. There is a need to
521 encourage University Staff who are non- indigene to increase their level of satisfaction
522 with their jobs in general and with their supervisors. Since Academic indicated a lower
523 level of satisfaction in their relationships with their co-workers as compared to other
524 Staff, University Management should find a means of enlarging Academic' job duties in
525 to include some aspects that can make them build better relationships with their co-
526 workers.

527 **References**

- 528
529 Andrews, G.L. (1990). An assessment of the interaction of selected personal
530 characteristics and perceptions of selected aspects of job satisfaction by
531 Wisconsin Cooperative Extension agricultural agents (Master's thesis,
532 University of Wisconsin-River Falls, 1990). *Summary of Research in Extension*,
533 5..151.
534
535 Aziri, B., (2011). Job satisfaction: A Literature Review, *Management Research and*
536 *practice*, 3(4) 77-86
537
538
539 Berns, R. G. (1989). *Job satisfaction of vocational education teachers in northwest Ohio*.
540 Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University, Northwest Ohio
541 Vocational Education Personnel Development Regional Center.
542
543 Bola Adekola (2012). Work burnout experience among University Non-Teaching Staff:
544 a gender approach, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and*
545 *Social Sciences*, January 2012, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp 128-135, ISSN: 2222- 6990.
546 www.hrmars.com/journals.
547 :
548 Boran Toker, (2011) "Job satisfaction of academic staff: an empirical study on Turkey",
549 *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 19 Iss: 2, pp.156 - 169
550
551 Bowen, C. F., Radharkrishna, R. B., & Keyser, R. (1994). Job satisfaction and
552 commitment of Professional Staff. *Journal of Extension*, 32(1). Retrieved
553 October 6, 2003, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1994june/rb2.html>

- 554
555 Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992a). An analysis of job satisfaction and job satisfier factors
556 among six taxonomies of agricultural education teachers [Electronic version].
557 *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33(4), 9-16.
558
- 559 Cano, J., & Miller G. (1992b). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors,
560 and job dissatisfier factor of agricultural education teachers [Electronic
561 version]. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33(3), 40-46.
562
- 563 Castillo, J. X., & Cano, J. (1999). A comparative analysis of Ohio agriculture teachers'
564 level of job satisfaction [Electronic version]. *Journal of Agricultural Education*,
565 40(4), 67-76.
566
- 567 Castillo, J. X., Conklin, E. A., & Cano, J. (1999). Job satisfaction of Ohio agricultural
568 education teachers [Electronic version]. *Journal of Agricultural Education*,
569 40(2), 19-27.
570
- 571 Davis, J. A. (1971). *Elementary survey analysis*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
572
- 573 Dawis R, Lofquist L (1984). *A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment*, University of
574 Minnesota Press, MI.
575
- 576 Fetsh, R. J., & Kennington, M. S. (1997). Balancing work and family in cooperative
577 Extension: History, effective programs, and future directions. *Journal of*
578 *Extension*. 35(1). Retrieved August 9, 2007, from
579 <http://www.joe.org/joe/1997february/a2.html>
580
- 581 Grady, T. L. (1985). Job satisfaction of vocational agriculture teachers in Louisiana. *The*
582 *Journal of the American Association of teacher Educators in Agriculture*. 26(3),
583 70-78, 85.
584
- 585 Griffin, S. F. (1984). Methods of coping with work force role conflict in relation to job
586 satisfaction of Cooperative Extension home economists (Doctoral dissertation.
587 Rutgers University, 1984). *Summary of Research in Extension*, 2, 195.
588
- 589 Gurbuz, A., (2007), "An Assessment on the effect of education level on the job satisfaction
590 from the tourism sector point of view", *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 8, 1: 36-46.
591
- 592 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1974). *The Job diagnostic Survey: An instrument for*
593 *the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects* (tech. Rep. No.
594 4). New Haven, CT: Yale University, Department of Administrative Sciences.
595
- 596 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job diagnostic Survey.
597 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170.
598
- 599 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of
600 a theory. *Organizational behaviour and Human Performance*. 16(2), 250-279.

- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hamidia, M. & Phadett, T.,(2011). Conceptual framework on the relationship between human resource management practices, job satisfaction and turnover. *Journal of Economics and Behavioural Studies*, 2 (2), 41-49.
- Harmon, J., Scotti, D.J., Bebson, S., Farias, G., Petzel, R., Neuman, J. H., & Keashly, L.(2007). Effects of high involvement work systems on employee satisfaction and services costs in veterans Healthcare. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 48(6), 1-14.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Jaime, X. C. & Jamie, C. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45, 65-74.
- Lise, M.S., & Timothy, A.J., (2004). Employee Attitudes and Job satisfaction, 43 (4), 395-407.
- Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling non-response in social science research [Electronic version]. *Journal of Agricultural Education*. 42(4), 43-53.
- Locke, A.A (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction , *Handbook of Industrial organizational psychology*, M.D. Dunnette (ed), .1927-1349.
- Luthans, F., (1998). *Organizational behavior 8th ed* ,Boston : Irwin Mcgraw – Hill.
- Meagan Scott, Kirk A. Swortzel &Walter N. Taylor (2005). The relationships between selected demographic factors and the level of job satisfaction of extension agents, (Electronic version) *Journal of Agricultural Education* , Volume 46, Number 3, 1-11.<https://pubs.aged.tamu.edu/jae/pdf/vol 46/46-03-002.pdf>
- Meagan Scott, Kirk A. Swortzel &Walter N. Taylor (2005). The relationships between selected demographic factors and the level of job satisfaction of extension agents, (Electronic version) *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education research* , Volume 55, <https://www.jsaer.org/pdf/vol 55/55-01-102.pdf>
- Mcneely, R. L.,(1984). Occupation, gender and work satisfaction in a comprehensive human service department. *Administration in Social Work*, 8(2), 35-47.
- Nestor, P. I., & Leary, P. (2000). The relationship between tenure and non-tenure track status of Extension faculty and job satisfaction. *Journal of Extension*, <http://www.joe.org/joe/2000august/rbl.html>
- Oldham, G. R., Hackman, J. R., & Pearce, J. L. (1976). Conditions under which employees respond positively to enriched work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 61(4), 395-403.

Olorunsola, O. E., (2010), "Job satisfaction and gender factor of Administrative staff in south west Nigeria Universities", EABR & ETLC Conference Proceedings Dublin, Ireland: 91-95.

Okpara JO, Squillace M, Erundu EA (2005). Gender differences and job satisfaction: a study of university teachers in the United States. *Women Manage. Rev.* 20(3): 177-190.

Oshagbemi, T (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. *Int. J. Soc. Econ.* 30(12): 1210-1231.

Pearson DA, Seiler RE (1983). Environmental satisfiers in academy. *Higher Educ.* 12 (1): 35-47.

Poling, R. L. (1990). Factors associated with job satisfaction of faculty members at a land-grant university (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1990). *Summary of Research in Extension*, 5, 143.

Porter LW, Lawler EE, Hackman JR (1975). *Behaviours in Organisations*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Riggs, K., & Beus. M. (1993). Job satisfaction in extension. *Journal of Extension*, 31(2). Retrieved August 9, 2007, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1993summer/a5.html>

Turner, A. N. & Lawrence, P.R. (1965). *Industrial jobs and the worker*. Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Victor, V. (2008). Employee improvement and employee satisfaction in the workplace. *California sociology journal*, 01, 1-17.

Warsi, S. Fatima, N., & Sahibzada, A.S., (2009). Study on relationship between organizational commitment and its determinants among private sector employees of Pakistan. *International Review of Business Research Paper*, 5(3), 399-410.

Yunki, K. (1999). *The Determinants of Public Officials Job satisfaction - The case of Korean Public Officials in Cadastral Administration* (pp 1-10), Chongju University Press.