

Full Length Research Paper

Job satisfaction: Does rank make a difference?

Serife Zihni Eyupoglu* and Tulen Saner

Department of Business Administration, Near East University, Lefkosa 98010, North Cyprus.

Accepted 21 August, 2009

If low job satisfaction or dissatisfaction exists amongst academics then the goals of higher education cannot be accomplished. The purpose of this study was to provide empirical evidence as to the job satisfaction levels of academics in North Cyprus and to ascertain as to whether academic rank is a reliable predictor of their job satisfaction. The study instrument used was the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) which measures job satisfaction using 20 facets of the job. The population for this study consisted of academics in North Cyprus. A total of 412 academics (69% response rate) agreed to take part in the study. Data analysis consisted of the computation of descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings showed that academics indicate only a moderate level of overall job satisfaction. The job facets advancement, compensation, co-workers and variety were found to be statistically significant with academic rank indicating that academic rank affects the satisfaction associated with 4 out of the 20 facets of the academics' job examined. In general, it can be said that the results of this study indicate the extent of the low to moderate satisfaction levels that exists among academics in North Cyprus.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, academics, academic rank, North Cyprus

INTRODUCTION

Satisfaction has been widely studied in the management literature (Spector, 1997) due to its relevance to the physical and mental well-being of the employee, as well as its implications for such job-related behaviours as productivity, absenteeism, turnover and employee relations. Job satisfaction also plays an important role in improving the financial standing of organizations (Aronson et al., 2005). In this respect, job satisfaction today still is a topic of major interest for many researchers and is an organizational variable that should be understood and constantly monitored for the welfare of any organization. In fact, understanding the job satisfaction of employees is an important organizational goal of any organization (Aronson et al., 2005) and indeed, has been a matter of growing interest for those concerned with the quality of working life and organizational efficiency (Maghrabi, 1999).

As Johnes and Taylor (1990) state, the goals of higher education are to provide in-depth knowledge, seek academic development, educate students, as well as to coordinate national development demands (cited in Chen et al., 2006). None of these goals can be accomplished efficiently if low satisfaction or dissatisfaction exists amongst the academics in higher education organizations. Thus the study of job satisfaction of academics seems inevitable for several reasons. Firstly, an understanding of the factors involved in job satisfaction is crucial to improving the happiness of workers (Okpara et al., 2005). This influences the mental and physical well-being of the academics in their work, as well as the quality of their teaching, which is important in the attraction of quality students and the quality of the academics' research and academic development. Secondly, understanding whether academics are satisfied or dissatisfied towards their work can lead to improvements and innovations in their teaching. This will help in retaining academics resulting in lower absenteeism and turnover, as well as helping in attracting new competent staff to the organization as well as meeting national demands. Fur-

*Corresponding author. E-mail: serifeeyupoglu@neu.edu.tr. Tel: +9-0392-223-6464. Fax: +9-0392-223-6461.

Furthermore, job satisfaction has serious implications for relations between the academics and the management of the higher educational organizations they belong to.

Most of the research that has been conducted in the field of job satisfaction has been done so in the business sector with less interest in higher education. However, in recent years, a clear increase has been observed in the number of studies related to the job satisfaction of academics. One probable reason for this increasing interest is the reality that higher education institutes are labour intensive and their budgets are predominantly devoted to personnel and their effectiveness is largely dependent on their employees (Kusku, 2003). Additionally, the vast majority of research conducted in the field of job satisfaction has been conducted in North America, the UK and other parts of Western Europe. Evidence from developing or less developed nations is unfortunately seriously lacking and is a gap which needs to be filled.

In a service system, customers are not the only ones who may experience problems, with the job satisfaction of employees being just as important as customer satisfaction in the dimension of organizational performance (Comm and Mathaisel, 2000). Employees are the internal customers of organizations and they satisfy the current and working environment and are willing to cooperate with the organization to accomplish its goals (Chen et al., 2006). However, low job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are barriers to ability utilization and goal achievement. With teachers being the employees of educational organizations, the satisfaction they gain from their work and working environment promotes teaching and research quality (Chen et al., 2006). Therefore, in order for teachers to achieve high standards of teaching, for them to produce quality research and publications and to meet the goals of the higher education, the requirements to improve their work and working environment must be met.

Today academics have to work harder to fulfil the gradually increasing expectations, not only of themselves, but also of the institute (Bilge, 2006) however; this is not possible when satisfaction levels are low or when dissatisfaction may exist. Furthermore, Ostroff (1992) found that most measures of school performance were significantly linked to employee satisfaction with schools with more satisfied teachers being more effective than those with less satisfied ones. In this respect the main aim of this study is to provide empirical evidence as to the satisfaction levels of academics in North Cyprus, a developing nation and to ascertain whether academic rank is a reliable predictor of job satisfaction. In doing so the study will give insight into which facets of the job result in satisfaction and which facets result in dissatisfaction for academics. The findings will enable university management and higher education authorities to modify their human resource management policies and practices. Furthermore, the study will indicate as to whether

results attained hold true for studies conducted in developed countries thus contributing to filling the gap in the area of job satisfaction in developing/less developed countries.

In this study "academic rank" indicates whether an academic is a lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, or a full professor.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Some of the most widely used definitions of job satisfaction include Porter et al. (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 et al., 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). The research that does exist focusing on job satisfaction in higher educational organizations does indicate that, on the whole, academics are generally satisfied with their work.

Findings indicate that academics want work tasks that correspond to their personal interests and allow them considerable autonomy in task selection and decision-making; they want a sense of achievement, facilitated by feedback from supervisors; they want clarity as to what is expected of them and harmony among the various people they work with; they want salaries awarded equitably and at a level that meets their expenses and they want promotions to be awarded fairly (Kelly, 1989). The job aspects that are most frequently perceived as responsible for low satisfaction are pay (Kusku, 2003; Oshagbemi, 1997; Kelly, 1989), university administration policy, availability of resources, working conditions (Kelly, 1989) and promotion systems (Lacy and Sheehan, 1997; Oshagbemi, 1996).

The literature also indicates different determinants of job satisfaction. For instance, Oshagbemi (1997) in his study in the UK employed eight scales designed to mea-

sure satisfaction with respect to different components of university teachers' overall job satisfaction, namely teaching; research; administration and management; present pay; promotions; supervision/supervisor behaviour; behaviour of co-workers and physical conditions/working conditions. Kusku (2003) measured the job satisfaction of academics in a university in Turkey using the seven determinants general satisfaction; management satisfaction; colleagues; other working group satisfaction; job satisfaction; work environment and salary satisfaction. Chen et al., (2006) measured the job satisfaction of teachers in a private university in China using six satisfaction factors, namely organization vision; respect; result feedback and motivation; management system; pay and benefits and work environment. Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) measured the job satisfaction of academicians in Uganda using nine general elements of their work comprising teaching, research, governance, remuneration, opportunities for promotion, supervision, co-worker's behaviour, working environment and the job in general.

A look at the literature show that research designed to investigate whether or not job satisfaction increases with rank are few (Oshagbemi, 1997), however most of the evidence that does exist suggests that job rank/level/position is a reliable predictor of job satisfaction with workers at higher-ranks/levels/positions generally being more satisfied with their jobs compared to those at lower-ranks/levels/positions (Oshagbemi, 2003). Higher-ranked employees indicate higher levels of job satisfaction because higher-level jobs tend to be more complex and have better working conditions, pay and promotion prospects, supervision and responsibility (Cranny et al., 1992; Robie et al., 1998; Aronson et al., 2005). Dissatisfaction amongst higher-level employees will most likely reflect on lower-level employees thus resulting in economic, financial and morale problems indicating that a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job level conveys certain economic advantages to business organizations (Aronson et al., 2005).

In their study that examined the relationship between age, occupational level and overall job satisfaction Near et al. (1978) found that the strongest predictors of job satisfaction were rank and age. Holden and Black (1996) indicated clear differences in productivity and satisfaction by academic rank amongst psychologists employed as faculty members in medical school, with full professors having displayed higher levels of productivity and satisfaction when compared to associate professors and assistant professors. Oshagbemi (1997), in his study that examined the effects of academic rank on the job satisfaction of UK academics, found that overall job satisfaction increased progressively with rank. De Noble and McCormick (2008), in their study that examined the job satisfaction of primary school staff, found job position to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction and Ssesanga and Garrett (2005), in their study of the job satisfaction of university teachers in Uganda, concluded

that rank significantly predicted academic job satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY

Research instrument

To measure the job satisfaction of the academics the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al. 1967) was utilized. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is one of the most widely used instruments in the measurement of job satisfaction (Scarpello and Campbell, 1983) and its validity and reliability has been proven over the 40 years that it has been in use. It has been used to measure job satisfaction in a variety of sectors, including education. The long-form MSQ consists of 100 items which make up 20 scales/facets of the job (each facet represented by five items). The MSQ facets are ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and procedures, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision-technical, variety and working conditions. The short-form MSQ is composed of the twenty facets listed above with each facet represented with just one satisfaction item. The response format for both the short-form and the long-form MSQ are the same. The short-form MSQ measures three satisfaction scales, namely intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and overall job satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction refers to occupational conditions (how people feel about the nature of the job's tasks) and extrinsic satisfaction refers to environmental conditions (how people feel about features of the job that are external to the work).

Respondent academics were asked to express the extent of their satisfaction with each of the 20 facets of their job on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The original short-form MSQ was translated into Turkish by the authors and tested on ten academics to test its validity and reliability. The internal consistency of the translated questionnaire was 0.85, obtained using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The questionnaire was accompanied with a personal information form in order to determine the demographic variables of the academics that participated in the study.

Sample

The population for this study comprises academics in the five North Cyprus universities. A total of 600 academics were randomly approached with 412 agreeing to take part in the study, resulting in a response rate of 69%. The questionnaires were administered in an interview format. Though extremely time consuming this method was utilized so as to ensure as high a response rate as possible, hence the use of the short-form MSQ over the long-form. Of the 412 respondents, 67.7% were lecturers with a master degree, 7.8% were lecturers with a PhD, 13.3 per cent were assistant professors, 4.6% were associate professors and 6.6% were full professors. The low number of respondents from the academic ranks associate professor and full professor is an indication of their relatively small numbers in the academic population in North Cyprus compared to the other ranks, though this is not surprising for a developing country. However, it is not felt that these percentages have had an affect on the final results as comparable studies conducted have also yielded both similar sampling percentages and similar results. Such studies include Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) and Oshagbemi (1997). Just slightly over half the respondents (53.4%) were male and 46.6% were female and 63.8% were married and 36.2% were not married. The greatest percentage of respondents (37.6%) were in the age range 21 - 30, 34.5% were in the age range 31 - 40,

17.2% were 41 - 50, 6.1% were aged 51 - 60 and the remaining 4.6% were in the age range 61 and above.

Statistical methods

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 13.0 was used to analyze the data collected. Analysis consisted of the computation of descriptive statistics in order to examine the job satisfaction levels of the academics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) in order to understand the effects of academic rank of the job satisfaction of academics.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) for the job satisfaction of academics in North Cyprus can be seen in Table 1. With a mean score of 3.79 academics indicate a higher level of satisfaction for the intrinsic aspect of their job when compared to the extrinsic aspect of their job (M = 3.50). Mean scores below 3.50 are considered to be more on the "dissatisfied" side of the "satisfaction-dissatisfaction" scale with mean scores above 3.50 being more on the "satisfied" side of the scale (Pearson and Seiler, 1983). In this respect, academics can be said to be satisfied with the intrinsic aspect of their job, however indicating lower satisfaction for the extrinsic aspect of their job. The overall job satisfaction level experienced by academics (M = 3.69) can be considered as satisfactory, however, only moderately. Of the 20 facets measured in relation to overall job satisfaction all academic ranks indicate obvious dissatisfaction with 2 of the facets, namely university policies and practices and compensation. Table 2 presents the overall mean scores and standard deviations for the two facets. Mean scores for university policies and practices range from 3.03 (SD = 1.06) to 2.58 (SD = 1.24). Compensation reflects some degree of dissatisfaction for all ranks (except for professors) mean scores ranging from 3.49 (SD = 1.10) to 2.81 (SD = 1.29). Professors indicate a mean score of 3.70 (SD = 1.43), which can only be considered as moderate satisfaction.

It would therefore be true to say that academics are dissatisfied with university policies and practices, this finding being consistent with Kelly (1989), Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) and compensation, consistent with Kusku (2001), Koustelis (2001) and Oshagbemi (1997). Table 3 presents the four facets found to be responsible for obvious satisfaction, along with their overall mean scores and standard deviations. These being moral values (being able to do things that don't go against one's conscience), mean scores ranging from 4.44 (SD = 1.05) to 3.95 (SD = 1.39), social service (the chance to do things for others), mean scores ranging from 4.11 (SD = 0.97) to 3.95 (SD = 0.85), creativity (the chance to try out own methods of doing the job), mean scores ranging from 4.22 (SD = 0.94) to 3.84 (SD = 0.83) and achievement (the feeling of accomplishment one gets from the job),

Table 1. Job satisfaction mean scores and standard deviations.

Variables	N	M	SD
Intrinsic satisfaction	412	3.79	0.66
Extrinsic satisfaction	412	3.50	0.74
Overall job satisfaction	412	3.69	0.65

Table 2. Sources of dissatisfaction mean scores and standard deviations

Variables	N	M	SD
University policies and practices	412	2.69	1.22
Compensation	412	3.03	1.29

Table 3. Sources of satisfaction mean scores and standard deviations.

Variables	N	M	SD
Moral values	412	4.16	1.16
Social service	412	4.08	0.93
Creativity	412	4.03	1.00
Achievement	412	4.02	0.98

from the job), mean scores ranging from 4.16 (SD = 0.88) to 3.68 (SD = 1.38).

The facets responsible for satisfaction are also found to be consistent with the literature (Kelly, 1989). Of the remaining 14 facets, 3 are responsible for low satisfaction with 11 being responsible for moderate satisfaction levels.

For the three job satisfaction measures (intrinsic, extrinsic and overall job satisfaction) one way ANOVA results indicate that at a 0.05 significance level only extrinsic satisfaction ($F = 3.375$, $p < 0.010$) is statistically significant with academic rank implying that the extrinsic satisfaction of academics is significantly dependent on academic rank.

When the 20 facets of the job are analyzed individually in relation to academic rank, 4 of the facets are statistically significant with academic rank at a 0.05 significance level. These are advancement, compensation, co-workers and variety, as seen in Table 4. Similar results were obtained by Oshagbemi (1997) who also found advancement and compensation to be significant with the rank of UK university teachers as well as the interactive effect of their rank and gender. Additionally, Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) suggested that promotion satisfaction among Ugandan academics was dependent on rank; however no evidence was adduced to suggest that differences in academic rank consistently predicted differences in co-worker satisfaction.

As illustrated in Table 5, for advancement, professors

Table 4. One way ANOVA between academic rank and significant job facets.

Variables	Sources of variance	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Advancement	Between groups	26.573	4	6.643	4.808	0.001
	Within groups	562.417	407	1.382		
	Total	588.990	411			
Compensation	Between groups	44.921	4	11.230	7.047	0.000
	Within groups	648.603	407	1.594		
	Total	693.524	411			
Co-workers	Between groups	11.914	4	2.978	3.349	0.010
	Within groups	361.931	407	0.889		
	Total	373.845	411			
Variety	Between groups	24.620	4	6.155	4.539	0.001
	Within groups	551.894	407	1.356		
	Total	576.515	411			

Table 5. Mean scores and standard deviations for significant job facets according to academic rank.

Variables	Advancement		Compensation		Co-workers		Variety	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Professor	4.15	0.95	3.70	1.44	4.04	0.98	4.33	0.73
Associate Professor	3.53	1.22	3.37	1.21	3.87	0.88	3.47	1.22
Assistant Professor	3.69	0.98	3.49	1.10	4.25	0.72	3.80	1.13
Lecturer (PhD)	3.94	1.05	3.44	1.11	3.59	0.93	3.78	1.18
Lecturer (Master Degree)	3.34	1.24	2.81	1.29	3.53	0.84	3.44	1.20

with a mean score of 4.15 are the most satisfied having reached the peak of their academic career and having experienced all the associated benefits. Lecturers with a PhD ($M = 3.94$) are next to professors on satisfaction with advancement, assistant professors ($M = 3.69$) are third, associate professors ($M = 3.53$) fourth and lecturers with a master degree ($M = 3.34$) being the least satisfied. Naturally, lecturers with a master degree are the least satisfied because they are at the beginning of their academic career with a long journey still ahead of them. Associate professors ranking fourth seems surprising however a probable reason for can be that associate professors may be experiencing some stress with their rank in that they are struggling in their efforts to advance, maybe due to their lack of academic research and publications which are required for academic advancement (Eyupoglu and Saner, 2009). Additionally, many academics may find themselves in environments with increasing demands for creative intellectual activity brought about by stringent applications of up-or-out and publish-or-perish policies (Pearson and Seiler, 1983).

Professors with a mean score of 3.70, as expected, are the most satisfied with compensation, followed by assistant professors ($M = 3.49$), lecturers with a PhD ($M = 3.44$), associate professors ($M = 3.37$) and lastly lecturers with a master degree ($M = 2.81$). Compensation in univer-

sities is usually a reflection of academic rank with higher-ranked academics receiving higher levels of compensation when compared to lower-ranked employees. However, the mean scores for compensation indicate that satisfaction with pay, even though statistically significant with rank, does not appear to be a function of an academic's rank and maybe be more related to family size and lifestyle (Oshagbemi, 1997).

Assistant professors with a mean score of 4.25 are more satisfied with their co-workers, professors ($M = 4.04$) and associate professors following ($M = 3.87$), lecturers, with a both PhD ($M = 3.59$) and master degree ($M = 3.53$), being the least satisfied. A probably explanation may be that lower-ranked academics are at the beginning of their academic career and in order to advance need to be successful in research work and publications. To realize this, lower-ranked academics may need to work with higher-ranked academics to benefit from their research abilities and publication experience. Lower-ranked academics tend to have to take on a greater work load in joint projects and researches this maybe putting some strain on relationships and creating some frustration for overloaded lower-ranked academics, therefore, work on joint projects and researches between higher-ranked and lower-ranked academics may lead to lower satisfaction for lower-ranked academics and greater satisfaction with

co-workers for higher-ranked academics (Eyupoglu and Saner, 2009). Findings are consistent with Oshagbemi (2000) who reported that the rank of university teachers, to a certain extent, affects the level of job satisfaction derived from co-workers' behaviour – the higher, the better and Kelly (1989) who concluded that academics wanted harmony amongst the various people they worked with.

Variety refers to the opportunities that academics have to try out different things in their job. On variety professors (M = 4.33) are the most satisfied, followed by assistant professors (M = 3.80), lecturers with a PhD (M = 3.78), associate professors (M = 3.47) and lastly lecturers with a master degree (M = 3.44). This may be due to academics at higher ranks tending to be more concerned with the freedom to work as they please and to use their own methods and techniques, thus emphasizing their status in the university (Eyupoglu and Saner, 2009). This finding seems partially consistent with Kelly (1989) who suggested that academics want work tasks that correspond to their personal interests and allow them considerable autonomy in task selection and decision-making and Lacy and Sheehan (1997) who reported that one of the four facets academics were satisfied with was the opportunity to pursue their own ideas.

Conclusion and recommendations

Understanding the factors that contribute to academics' job satisfaction is vital in order for them to achieve high standard of teaching and for them to produce quality research and publications. With academics today having to work harder to fulfil the gradually increasing expectations not only of themselves but also of their institute (Bilge, 2006), this is not possible when satisfaction levels are low or when dissatisfaction may exist. This study examines the satisfaction levels of academics in a developing nation, North Cyprus, towards their job. Results indicate that academics enjoy only a moderate level of overall job satisfaction. Academics are also found to be more satisfied with the intrinsic aspect of their job compared to the extrinsic aspect. Of the 20 facets of the job examined 2 of them, namely university policies and practices and compensation, are clearly responsible for dissatisfaction, with 4 of the facets, namely moral values, social service, creativity and achievement clearly being responsible for satisfaction. Additionally, the facets advancement, compensation, co-workers and variety, are found to be statistically significantly related to academic rank. This implies that academic rank affects the satisfaction levels associated with advancement, compensation, co-workers and variety for academics. On the whole job satisfaction research in North America and Western Europe has produced similar results.

In general, it can be said that the results of this study indicate the extent of the low to moderate satisfaction le-

vels that exists among academics in North Cyprus. This should be a topic of immediate concern for university management and higher education authorities and calls for a closer look at this aspect of academic life. It is suggested that university management provide academics with the opportunity to contribute in the decision-making process, especially aspects that have a direct influence on their performance and satisfaction levels. University policies and practices will then, to a certain degree, reflect some of the interests and concerns of the academics. This may then pave the way to a more trust-based relationship between university management and academics. After all, the satisfaction of academics with university management is surely to the advantage of all involved. Additionally, the introduction of reward/incentive systems for academics is also suggested in order to fuel motivation and to maintain satisfaction levels at suitable levels resulting in committed academics.

It is hoped that this study will provide some insight into improving relationships so as to uphold an innovative, dynamic and effective educational system in North Cyprus. Furthermore, this study can be used as a guide to further research; it may be necessary to understand how other variables apart from academic rank, such as gender, age and tenure, as well as the combined effects of rank, gender, age and tenure may explain the job satisfaction of academics in a developing nation.

REFERENCES

- Aronson KR, Laurenceau JP, Sieveking N, Bellet W (2005). Job satisfaction as a function of job level. *Admin. Policy Mental Health* 32 (3): 285-291
- Bilge F (2006). Examining the burnout of academics in relation to job satisfaction and other factors. *Soc. Behav. Personality* 34 (9): 1151-1160.
- Chen SH, Yang CC, Shiao JY, Wang HH (2006). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *TQM Mag.* 18 (5): 484-500.
- Comm CL, Mathaisel DFX (2000). Assessing employee satisfaction in service firms: an example in high education. *J. Bus. Econ. Stud.* 6 (1): 43-53.
- Cranny CJ, Smith PC, Stone EF (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs and how it Affects Their Performance.* New York: Lexington Books.
- Dawis R, Lofquist L (1984). *A Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment,* University of Minnesota Press, MI.
- De Noble JJ, McCormick J (2008). Job satisfaction of catholic primary school staff: a study of biographical differences. *Int. J. Educ. Manage.* 22(2): 135-150.
- Eyupoglu SZ, Saner T (2009). The relationship between job satisfaction and academic rank: a study of academicians in Northern Cyprus. Paper presented at the World Conference on Educational Sciences, North Cyprus, February 4-7.
- Holden EW, Black MM (1996). Psychologists in medical school-professional issues for the future: how are rank and tenure associated with productivity and satisfaction? *Professional Psychology: Res. Practice* 27 (4): 407-414.
- Johnes J, Taylor J (1990). Performance Indicators in Higher Education: Buckingham, in Chen et al. (2006). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *TQM Mag.* 18 (5): 484-500.
- Kelly JD (1989). Gender, pay, and job satisfaction of faculty in Journalism. *Journalism Q.* 66 (2): 446-452.

- Koustelis AA (2001). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction of Greek teachers. *Int. J. Educ. Manage.* 15 (7): 354-358.
- Kusku F (2003). Employee satisfaction in higher education: the case of academic and administrative staff in Turkey. *Career Dev. Int.* 8(7): 347-356.
- Lacy FJ, Sheehan BA (1997). Job satisfaction among academics staff: an international perspective. *Higher Educ.* 34: 305-322.
- Locke EA (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction in M.D.Dunnette (Ed). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, (Chicago: Rand McNally): pp.1297-1343.
- Maghrabi AS (1999). Assessing the effects of job satisfaction on managers. *Int. J. Value-Based Manage.* 12: 1-12.
- Near JP, Rice RW, Hunt RG (1978). Work and extra work correlates of life and job satisfaction. *Acad. Manage. J.* 21: 95-114.
- Okpara JO, Squillace M, Erondue 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.
- Oshagbemi T (2000). Satisfaction with co-workers' behaviour. *Employee Relations* 22 (1): 88-100.
- Oshagbemi T (1997). The influence of rank on the job satisfaction of organizational members. *J. Managerial Psychol.* 12 (8): 511-519.
- Oshagbemi T (1996) Job satisfaction of UK academics. *Educ. Manage. Admin.* 24 (4): 389-400.
- Orstloff C (1992). The relationship between satisfaction. Attitudes and performance: An organizational level analysis 77: 962-974.
- Pearson DA, Seiler RE (1983). Environmental satisfiers in academe. *Higher Educ.* 12 (1): 35-47.
- Porter LW, Lawler EE, Hackman JR (1975). *Behaviours in Organisations*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Robie C, Ryan AM, Schmieder RA, Parra LF, Smith PC (1998). The relation between job level and job satisfaction. *Group Organ. Manage.* 23: 470-495.
- Scarpello V, Campbell JP (1983). Job satisfaction: are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychol.* 36: 577-600.
- Spector PE (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sseganga K, Garrett RM (2005). Job satisfaction of university academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Educ.* 50: 33-56.
- Weiss DJ, Dawis RV, England GW, Lofquist LH (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* (Minneapolis MN: The University of Minnesota Press).