



# Employee Satisfaction and its Impact on Faculty Members' Performance at Al Ain University of Science and Technology in the UAE

Dr. Amer Hani Al-Kassem<sup>1\*</sup>, Sunita Marwaha<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

This study aims to determine the level of job satisfaction and examine factors affecting job satisfaction among Faculty members at Al Ain University of Science and Technology in the United Arab Emirates. A sample of 110 faculty members, responded to the study. Job satisfaction was measured by The Brayfield Rothe Job Satisfaction Index as modified by Warner and self-efficacy by the General Self-efficacy Scale. T-test analysis, Pearson correlation, one-way analysis of variance with Tukey post hoc and multiple regression analyses were employed. Results indicated that faculty members had a high level of job satisfaction. Moreover, results showed differences in the level of job satisfaction for men with higher academic ranks and more teaching experience. No significant difference in job satisfaction could be seen among married and bachelor faculty members. Therefore, this variable was excluded from the further analysis. The result of stepwise multiple linear regression showed that the independent variables (self-efficacy, gender, age, teaching experience, and academic rank) accounted for 46.7% of the variance in the job satisfaction of faculty members. Findings showed that higher self-efficacy aligned with high levels of job satisfaction hence self-efficacy emerged as the most significant predictor of job satisfaction. Recommendations include that higher education policymakers in the United Arab Emirates must focus attention on self-efficacy and its inclusion in recruitment review and training & development of faculty, as an effort to improve faculty members' job satisfaction.

272

**Key Words:** Job Satisfaction, Self-efficacy, Demographics, Faculty Member, UAE.

**DOI Number:** 10.14704/nq.2022.20.2.NQ22306

**NeuroQuantology 2022; 20(2):272-287**

## Introduction

Employee satisfaction is the most widely discussed issue in organizational behaviour, personnel and human-resource management, and organizational management. In simple terms, job satisfaction is crucial, and it directly impacts the performance of employees at different levels of the profession. In addition, it is an integral component of the environment of organizations and an important element in the relationship between managers and employees.

Moreover, researchers showed that employees with high job satisfaction exhibit higher energy, pleasurable engagement, and enthusiasm;

dissatisfied employees show distress, unpleasant engagement, lack of organizational commitment, decreased morale, low productivity, and nervousness. In any company or enterprise, job satisfaction of the total workforce plays a vital role. With a group of satisfied workers, institutions can successfully implement their plans (Akomolafe & Olatomide, 2014). Therefore, companies must strive to keep employees satisfied by making appropriate plans to increase levels of positive behaviour among workers with an understanding of the contributing factors to employees' satisfaction (Probst, Baek, & Laditka, 2010).

**Corresponding author:** Dr. Amer Hani Al-Kassem

**Address:** <sup>1\*</sup>School of Business, Skyline University College, Sharjah, UAE; <sup>2</sup>Deputy Director, Academic Support Services and Registrar, Skyline University College, Sharjah, UAE.

**Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

**Received:** 15 January 2022 **Accepted:** 04 February 2022



Based on previously available information, the importance of studying job satisfaction comes from two important sets of findings. First, job satisfaction aligns with increased productivity and organizational commitment, lower absenteeism and turnover, and ultimately, increased organizational effectiveness (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001). The benefits employees receive from their organizations influence their skill, effort, creativity, and productivity they willingly contribute in return. The second important finding is that low job satisfaction has negative outcomes, such as withdrawal behaviour, increasing costs, decreasing profits, and, eventually, customer dissatisfaction (Zeffane, Ibrahim, & El Mehairi, 2008).

Job satisfaction has become a serious problem in the management of educational institutions. The health of an educational institution depends on the job satisfaction of its employees (Wood, 1976). Moreover, job satisfaction is a prerequisite for an educator's long-term tenure and performance, and overall institutional effectiveness (Wood, 1976). For these reasons, it seems wise to identify factors that affect the job satisfaction of faculty members in an educational institution, and to use these results to improve the well-being of individuals in an important area of their lives and to increase productivity and hence the profitability of the institution (Malik, 2011).

## Literature Review

### *The Concept of Job Satisfaction*

As researchers widely focus on the complex phenomenon of job satisfaction, they offer numerous definitions of the concept. Wood (2003) described job satisfaction as "the condition of contentment with one's work and it's in my mind, denoting a positive attitude" Locke (1976) stated that job satisfaction could be viewed as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." Three practical points of view illustrate the meaning of job satisfaction: First, job satisfaction is a valuable product of the society; second, is an early warning indicator at an early stage of an organization; and third, can serve as a predictor of organizational behaviour (Moorman, 1993). Job satisfaction has been linked to situational and personal factors. Situational factors include job-related conditions such as pay, opportunities for promotion, and working conditions, and characteristics such as task identity, task

significance, skill variety, autonomy, and feedback (Heller, Judge & Watson, 2002). However, a more comprehensive approach requires the inclusion of many additional factors before researchers can fully understand job satisfaction such as employees' ages, genders, temperaments, desires, and levels of aspiration. Further, family relationships, social status, recreational outlets, activity in organizational labour or politics, or purely social aspects, ultimately contribute to job satisfaction (Mishra, 2013).

Numerous theorists attempted to explain job satisfaction, but two conceptual frameworks seem to be more prominent in the literature. First, the Herzberg two-factor theory of satisfaction supposes that two sets of factors are essential for job satisfaction: hygiene factors and motivators. Hygiene factors are associated with the work environment and include policies, supervision, pay, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. Motivators link to the job and include achievement, responsibility, advancement, recognition, and the work itself (Redmond, 2012).

A second theory is Locke's range of affect theory (1976), which determines job satisfaction through the difference between what an employee wants from a job and what the employee is getting from the job. A minute difference makes job satisfaction high; conversely, a huge difference means an employee is less satisfied with their job. Furthermore, this theory also affirms that employees give priority to one facet of the job. This prioritization is different for each employee. Hence, to guarantee job satisfaction, employers must identify the most important facet of the job for an employee and ensure this facet is met suitably (Ray & Ranjan, 2011).

### *Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction*

Self-efficacy represents one aspect of social-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977). General self-efficacy is the belief in one's competence to tackle novel tasks and to cope with adversity in a wide range of stressful or challenging encounters; in contrast, specific self-efficacy is constrained to a particular task at hand. High self-efficacy allows individuals to choose challenging settings and explore their environment or create new ones, and enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. A strong sense of self-efficacy effectively buoys personal goals, how a person uses all effort to achieve those goals, and to



what extent they cope with problems and respond to failures (Martin et al., 2004).

Bandura (1993) described teachers with a low level of efficacy were less committed to the teaching profession than those with higher efficacy. Because of their lack of commitment, teachers with a lower sense of efficacy spent more time on nonacademic activities than did highly efficacious teachers. Highly efficacious teachers were more likely to assist students who have difficulty learning and praise students for success. Lower efficacious teachers, in contrast, were more apt to give up on students who did not learn quickly and criticize their failures. Highly efficacious teachers had more motivation to remain in the teaching profession. Less efficacious teachers were more likely to experience burnout and leave the profession.

Self-efficacy contributes significantly to teachers' job satisfaction. Teachers were more likely to be satisfied with their work when they feel confident in performing their major work-related tasks or attaining their work-related goals (Vaezi & Fallah, 2011). Self-efficacy influences job satisfaction through its link to practical achievement on the job. Thus, individuals with high confidence in their competencies and capabilities to carry out a job will exhibit a higher level of satisfaction on the job, regardless of their length of service with the organization. Piquart, Juang, and Silbereisen (2003) found that individuals who believe more in their self-efficacy are likely to have high job satisfaction. Telef (2011) investigated the relationships among teachers' self-efficacy, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and burnout. Results indicated that self-efficacy had a statistically significant positive relationship with teachers' jobs and life satisfaction. Another study by Borgogni, Consiglio, Alessandri, and Schaufeli (2012) found that training in self-efficacy can help employees achieve higher job satisfaction. However, Tojjari, Esmaeili, and Bavandpour (2013) identified that perceived self-efficacy showed no significant effect on job satisfaction.

### *Demographics and Job Satisfaction*

Researchers identified that gender, age, marital status, years of experience, academic rank etc. are a few areas to be explored for their effect on faculty members' job satisfaction. Hence it was decided to explore these factors affecting job satisfaction. Researchers also provided evidence that employees express diverse attitudes about the factors of

satisfaction due to their demographic diversities. Various surveys yielded a variety of results such that some demographics significantly influence job satisfaction whereas other attributes have no or little impact (Rosser, 2005).

Research conducted in Jordan aimed to assess the level of job satisfaction among educational faculty members in Jordanian universities (Batainch, 2014). Results indicated that faculty members had a moderate level of job satisfaction. Results showed improvement differences in the level of job satisfaction for men with higher teaching experience, higher rank, and university type. However, Jaime and Jamie (2004) findings displayed that the impact of demographics on job satisfaction was negligible. In general, empirical data on the impact of demographic, institutional, and personal factors on job satisfaction is conflicting. Findings vary as to which factors affect the level of job satisfaction of academics (Oshagbemi, 2003).

### *Gender and Job Satisfaction*

Although researchers conducted ample research on gender and job satisfaction in higher education organizations, no clear consensus emerged (Seifert & Umbach, 2008). Three situations may align gender and job satisfaction. First, women are more satisfied than men. In a study conducted by Malik (2011), the researcher tried to explain the relationship between demographic factors "Age, Gender, Family size, Income, Occupation, Education, Ethnicity, Nationality, Religion, Social standards and job satisfaction." Results showed that women were more satisfied with the job than men. Okpara, Squillace, and Erondy (2005) found that female college and university teachers are more satisfied with their work than their male colleagues. Interestingly, female faculty members holding higher academic ranks expressed more satisfaction with their jobs than their male peers (Okpara et al., 2005). Conversely, other researchers found that men are more satisfied than women (e.g., Callister, 2006; Rosser, 2005; Seifert & Umbach, 2008). Similarly, Hijha, Jassbi and Ghaffari (2009), in their study on four university staff members, concluded that male academic staff tend to be more satisfied than their female counterparts. Researchers found no significant difference between the level of satisfaction of men and women (e.g., Smith and Plant, 1982; Warren & Johnson, 1995), in studies on gender differences in the job



satisfaction among university professors. They concluded that either no significant gender differences in job satisfaction exist or that, if found, the differences are not statistically significant. In their study with academic members of 10 private universities in Bangladesh, Ali and Akhter (2009) recognized that faculty members overall are satisfied with their present condition. They found no significant differences among male and female faculty members regarding job satisfaction.

### *Age and Job Satisfaction*

The literature supported the relationship between job satisfaction and age. Research findings by Bas and Ardic (2002) on age and job satisfaction indicated a positive correlation. Paul and Phua (2011) indicated age and job position affected the job-satisfaction levels of respondents. In contrast, Castillo, Conklin, and Cano (1999) found no significant difference in job satisfaction between older, more experienced teachers and younger teachers. Cano and Miller (1992) also found that teachers' age, years in teaching, and degree status did not significantly affect their job satisfaction. Ghafoor (2012) found that age and job satisfaction do not positively correlate with each other.

### *Marital Status and Job Satisfaction*

Another influential demographic variable that might bear on job satisfaction is the marital status of employees, but the results of the limited research conducted in this area are fairly inconsistent. Marriage increased satisfaction levels for faculty members in the Saner and Eyüpoğlu (2013) study. The researchers examined the relations between marital status and job satisfaction of higher education personnel. Results showed that the job satisfaction of married academics is, on the whole, higher than that of unmarried academics. A study by Noordin and Jusoff (2009) reported that marital status and age appear to significantly impact respondents' level of job satisfaction. In contrast, Altınok (2011) found that single staff and professors had higher levels of job satisfaction. Results obtained by Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976) indicated that single men are less satisfied with their jobs than married men. Njiru's (2014) findings showed no significant differences at the  $p < .05$  level in teachers' working experience and marital status, showing that they did not influence their job satisfaction. Bhuyan and Choudhary (2003) identified the degree of job

satisfaction of college teachers concerning gender, marital status, and location, as well as experience. Results identified significant differences in the job satisfaction of male and female teachers but no significant differences in job satisfaction between married and unmarried college teachers. Finally, Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) suggested that a clear conclusion cannot be drawn concerning job satisfaction and its relationship to marital status.

### *Academic Rank and Job Satisfaction*

Few researchers investigated whether job satisfaction increases with academic rank. However, few showed that rank is a highly significant predictor of job satisfaction among academicians, with full professors expressing greater job satisfaction than junior faculty members (Oshagbemi, 1997). Similarly, Near, Rice, and Hunt (1978) found rank to be one of the most powerful predictors of job satisfaction. Sharma and Jyoti (2006) undertook a study "on job satisfaction of university teachers at Jammu University India." They revealed that professors were more satisfied than lecturers. Ssesanga and Garrett (2005), in their study of the job satisfaction of university teachers in Uganda, concluded that rank significantly predicted academic job satisfaction. They 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. In another study, Springfield-Scott (2000) showed in his study among faculty in Piedmont, North Carolina that gender and rank affected faculty job satisfaction, whereas age, race, and tenure did not. In contrast, in a study performed in Northern Cyprus, the level of job satisfaction of academicians did not increase with academic rank (Eyupoglu & Saner, 2009). Bas and Ardic (2002) studied the "impact of age on job satisfaction among Turkish academicians." The result showed that the rank of academic staff does not markedly affect job satisfaction. In Singapore, Paul and Phua (2011) indicated age affected the job satisfaction levels of respondents. However, variables such as gender, academic qualification, length of employment, and marital status showed no significant differences.

### *Teaching Experience and Employee Satisfaction*

The literature supporting job satisfaction and years of experience indicated that no relationship exists





between job satisfaction and years of experience (e.g., Andrews, 1990; Griffin 1984). Cherabin, Praveena, Azimi, Qadimi, & Shalmani (2012) conducted an ANOVA, revealing a nonsignificant difference among teachers with different lengths of teaching experience in their mean job-satisfaction scores. However, research performed by Bowen et al. (1994) and by Bertz and Judge (1994) found that overall job satisfaction increased as years of experience increased.

Nestor and Leary (2000) discovered that as years of experience increased for extension faculty members, their intrinsic and overall job satisfaction increased as well. In Pakistan, Ghafoor (2012) carried out a study to examine the relationship between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction among academic staff. The researcher identified that experienced faculty members were more satisfied than less experienced. In Jordan, Bataineh's (2014) findings showed that highly experienced professors have a higher level of job satisfaction than others. Bataineh proposed the results can be attributed to the higher rank and greater financial and social status of professors with 10 or more years of experience.

### Study Significance

Researchers of similar studies reported variation in the determinants and consequences of job satisfaction across cultures. Therefore, given the importance of understanding the determinants of job satisfaction, this study is of great importance to practitioners in the UAE. This study aimed to identify factors affecting job satisfaction among faculty members in the universities in UAE. Specifically, the study examined the relative effects of demographic factors on job satisfaction among UAE expatriates. It is seen that there were few studies on job satisfaction in UAE higher education sector. Findings from this study contribute to a greater understanding of the area of job satisfaction among teaching professionals in universities in the UAE as well as other developing countries. Significantly, this study provides knowledge about the relationships between self-efficacy and selected demographics and faculty members' job satisfaction.

### Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to understand the level of job satisfaction among the faculty members at present. The study was conducted at Al

Ain University of Science and Technology (AU); a leading private university in UAE. The objective of the study was to determine where significant differences exist between faculty job satisfaction and selected demographics. Moreover, this study sought to examine if a relationship existed between general self-efficacy and job satisfaction among faculty members of AU.

### Research Questions

Using a quantitative approach, explored the following research questions were explored:

1. What was the overall level of job satisfaction among faculty members working in Universities?
2. Does a significant difference exist in the job satisfaction among faculty members based on selected demographics namely gender, age, marital status, academic rank, and years of experience.
3. Does a significant relationship exist between job satisfaction and self-efficacy?
4. Extend to which variability in faculty members' level of job satisfaction be explained by their self-efficacy, gender, age, marital status, academic rank, and teaching experience? 276

### Procedure

Data collection was done during October and November 2014 after obtaining prior permission from the university administration. Respondents for the study agreed to participate in the survey upon understanding the objectives and procedures of the study and after signing the consent form. Voluntary participation in the survey and discussions were encouraged among respondents. Total confidentiality for the responses was assured to the respondents. The questionnaires were distributed directly through personal contacts to faculty members on both campuses of AU: Al Ain and Abu Dhabi. In total 110 questionnaires were received from the respondents.

A pilot survey was carried out among 10% of the respondents using modified versions of the two scales. The purpose was to ascertain the feasibility of the study and the clarity and applicability of the tools. The pilot study helped to estimate the time needed to complete the questionnaire. It was found that approximately 15 minutes were required to complete the questionnaire. Based on the results of the pilot study, few modifications were made to prepare the final questionnaire.



## Participants

The present study used a descriptive-survey methodology. The population for the study were faculty members who were formally employed on the two campuses of AU (Al Ain and Abu Dhabi) during 2014.

## Instrumentation

The questionnaire employed for this study consisted of three parts. Part I measured job satisfaction. The Brayfield-Rothe (1951) used the Job Satisfaction Index (JSI) to measure the overall job satisfaction of clergy in the Global Evangelical Church (Ghana). The questionnaire was modified slightly for cultural relevance. Although developed several decades ago, researchers still use the JSI today, and unlike others, it focuses on a participant's intrinsic level of job satisfaction. Though the cognitive appraisals of the job namely salary, fringe benefits, working conditions etc. impact job satisfaction, they were not the focal point of this study. The study concentration is participants' feelings and emotions resulting from their current teaching position (Moorman, 1993).

The JSI scale consisted of 18 questionnaire items with five possible responses per item. Potential responses to the items ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The questionnaire included items such as "My job is like a hobby to me," "I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job," and "I feel that my job is not more interesting than others I could get." The questionnaire is a mixture of positive and negative statements. Scores for negative statements were reverse coded. The sum of a respondent's score for each item provides an overall index of job satisfaction. The possible range of scores was from 18 to 90.

Other researchers supported the psychometric properties of the Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) JSI (Price & Mueller, 1986). Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the reliability of the modified instrument, based on responses received from study participants. The second part of the questionnaire was designed to solicit participants' demographic characteristics. To interpret the results, the level of job satisfaction was operationally divided them into three levels: high (more than 3.5), medium (2.5–3.49), and low (less than 2.49), knowing that the scale of alternative answers for the tool items was distributed into 5 levels.

Part II of the study questionnaire measured general self-efficacy. General Self-efficacy Scale (GSS; Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1979) was used to collect data about participants' general self-efficacy. Jerusalem and Schwarzer developed the original scale in Germany in 1979, originally consisting of 20 items. In 1981, it was reduced to 10 items and subsequently adapted to 28 languages including Arabic (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1995). Participants rate the 10 items on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 = not at all true to 4 = exactly true. The item's example is "I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort". The sum of responses to all 10 items yields the final score with a range of 10 to 40. Higher scores indicate greater degrees of self-efficacy.

Researchers reported the instrument's reliability (Akpochofo, 2011; Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1995); the Cronbach's alpha of the GSS ranged from .75 to .90 respectively. The content validity of the instrument yielded 76.50% and the construct validity ranged between .51 and .92 (Akpochofo, 2011). The formula of Cronbach's alpha guaranteed the stability of the JSS and GSS tools', and the stability coefficients were .80 and .86, respectively, which are significant and acceptable for this study.

By using the "forward-backwards" procedure, a bilingual expert translated the English version of the two instruments into Arabic; then another bilingual expert translated the Arabic version into English without accessing the original version. A third bilingual faculty member compared the translated Arabic and the translated English versions and corrected any incongruence in the translation, detecting no significant variation between the two. These instruments have been translated into many languages, and for many of these translations, validation studies confirmed the internationally applicable nature of these tools. These instruments are in the public domain; therefore, they may be used without copyright permission.

Part III of the questionnaire was comprised of the demographics of AU faculty members. Data on demographic variables were collected through a self-reported questionnaire that included gender, age, marital status, job rank, and teaching experience in the current job.

## Data Analysis

This quantitative study used a descriptive correlational model. The data were analyzed



utilizing SPSS and presented the data analysis in tables. The alpha level for all statistical tests was set *a priori* at .05. *t*-test and ANOVA were performed with post hoc analysis to compare demographic-factor scores on the main variable of the study. Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine relationships between job satisfaction and general self-efficacy and hierarchical multiple regression analysis to explain and demonstrate the effect of self-efficacy and demographics as independent variables on faculty job satisfaction, the dependent variable.

### Study Results

#### Demographic Data of Faculty Members

The present study used a descriptive-survey methodology. The population for the study were faculty members who were formally employed on the two campuses of AU (Al Ain and Abu Dhabi) during 2014. The sample was chosen to cover the whole population. Among the respondents, 81.8%

were men. According to the sample age, almost half (47.27%) were between 41 and 50. The overwhelming majority (90%) were married. A quarter (24.5%) were lecturers, half (51.8%) were assistant professors, and a quarter (23.6%) were associate or full professors. A quarter of the sample had been teaching for 3 or fewer years and a third 7 to 9 years. The mean of their working years as faculty members was measured to be 5.08 (see Table 1).

To answer the first question, "What is the level of job satisfaction among the faculty members of AU?" I calculated the means and standard deviations for all variables presented in Table 1. The result indicated that the mean for the overall level of job satisfaction was 4.018 with a standard deviation of 6.65. Hence, the overall level of job satisfaction in the sample was high. The standard deviation was not high, indicating that most faculty members experience high levels of job satisfaction.

**Table 1.** General Characteristics of the Sample, Means, and Standard Deviations of Job Satisfaction (N = 110)

Characteristics	Job satisfaction				
		N	%	Mean	SD
Gender	Male	90	81.80	4.07	9.313
	Female	20	18.20	3.45	7.755
	Total	110	100.0	3.67	10.019
Age	32-40	36	32.73	3.65	8.674
	41-50	52	47.27	4.05	9.048
	51 or over	22	20.00	4.25	10.139
	Total	110	100.00	3.97	10.019
Marital Status	Married	99	90.00	3.98	10.252
	Unmarried	11	10.00	3.79	7.284
	Total	110	100.00	3.97	10.019
Teaching experience	3 or less	30	27.27	3.68	10.324
	4-6	42	38.18	3.78	7.113
	7-9	38	34.55	4.24	9.797
	Total	110	100.00	3.96	10.019
Rank	Lecturer	27	24.50	3.63	10.589
	Assistant	58	51.80	3.94	7.897
	Associate and Full Professor	25	23.60	4.4	8.894
	Total	110	100.00	3.97	10.019

Results showed that less than a fifth of participants had low job satisfaction, almost half had a medium level of job satisfaction, and the remaining 40% had a high level of job satisfaction. The distribution of job satisfaction among the sample of 110 faculty members is depicted in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Distribution of the Whole Sample According to the Levels of Job Satisfaction (n = 110)

Category	n	%
Low (up to 2.49)	18	18.2
Medium (2.5-3.49)	48	41.8
High (above 3.5)	44	40.0
Total	110	100.0



The second question was, “Does job satisfaction level among the faculty members of AU vary/differ according to the variables of gender, age, marital status, academic rank and teaching experience?” To answer this question, I calculated means, standard deviations, and *t*-tests to determine the differences between the dual-level variables. I used the *F*-test and Tukey honestly significant difference (HSD) comparisons test for post comparisons to identify the significance of differences between the variables.

To find the difference between faculty members' job satisfaction according to their gender, I applied independent *t*-tests on the mean differences between male and female faculty members' responses to the JSS scale. As noted in Table 3, *t*-

test analysis revealed a significant difference between male and female faculty members ( $t = 4.73, p = .000$ ). The mean score for male faculty members ( $M = 4.07$ ) was higher than that for female faculty ( $M = 3.45$ ). This result indicated that men were more satisfied than their female counterparts.

I conducted the Independent *t*-test on the mean differences between married and unmarried faculty members. As seen in Table 3, I found no significant statistical difference between married and unmarried faculty member for job satisfaction ( $t = .018, p = .986 > .05$ ). The mean for married faculty members was 4.25, whereas female faculty members had a mean of 4.01.

**Table 3.** Independent Samples t-Test of Job Satisfaction by Gender and Marital Status

Dependent variable	Independent variable		M	SD	t	Sig.
Job Satisfaction						
	Gender				4.73	.000
		Male	4.07	9.94		
		Female	3.45	7.41		
	Marital Status				.018	986
		Married	4.25	10.56		
		Unmarried	1.01	9.78		

\* Significance level ( $\alpha \leq .05$ ).

To unravel the significance of differences according to the variable of age, I calculated an ANOVA. As shown in Table 4, statistically significant differences emerged in the level of job satisfaction among faculty members by their age ( $F = 8.631, p = .000$ ), and in favour of those who are 51 years old or older. The mean among faculty members whose age is less than 40 years old was 3.65, aged 41–50 years old was 4.05 and 51 or older was 4.25. This result means that the faculty members whose age is more than 51 years old have a higher level of job satisfaction than other age groups of faculty members.

**Table 4.** Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction by Age (N = 110)

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1651.439	825.719	8.631	.000
Within groups	10236.779	95.671		
Total	11888.218			

To identify the sources of these statistically significant differences, I conducted a further

analysis using the Tukey HSD multiple comparison test. The result showed a significant means score difference between age groups 25–40 and 41–50 and between age groups 40–50 and 51 or more. However, the mean score difference between the age group 41–50 and the age group (51 or more) was not significant, indicating that the two groups had the same level of job satisfaction (see Table 5).

**Table 5.** Tukey HSD Comparison Test for Locating the Source of Differences According to Age (N = 110)

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std.Error	Sig.
25-40	41-50	-7.45726*	2.12069	.002
	51 and more	-9.56566*	2.64692	.001
41-50	25-40	7.45726*	2.12069	.002
	50 and more	-2.10839	2.48767	.674
51 and more	25-40	9.56566*	2.64692	.001
	41-50	2.10839	2.48767	.674

\* Significance level ( $\alpha \leq .05$ ).

An ANOVA and the Tukey HSD comparison test measured the significance of three groups of faculty members with different academic ranks regarding their job satisfaction ( $F = 15.478, p = .000$ ). As seen





in Table 6, statistically significant differences arose in the level of job satisfaction among the faculty members under their academic rank, favouring those who hold the rank of associate or full professor. That result indicates that faculty members who hold the rank of associate and full professor have a higher level of job satisfaction than members who hold other ranks.

**Table 6.** One-Way ANOVA in Accordance with Academic Rank (N = 110)

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2667.591	2	1333.796	15.478	.000
Within groups	9220.627	107	86.174		
Total	11888.218	109			

I used the Tukey HSD comparison test to identify the sources of these statistically significant differences between the means of job-satisfaction level for faculty members as per their academic rank. As seen in Table 7, all differences among the three groups of academic rank were significant.

**Table 7.** Tukey HSD Comparison Test for Locating the Source of Differences According to Academic Rank (N = 110)

(I) Rank	(J) Rank	Mean difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Lecture	Assistant	-8.04470*	2.16273	.001
	Associate and Full Prof.	-14.22815*	2.57655	.000
Assistant	Lecture	8.04470*	2.16273	.001
	Associate and Full Prof.	-6.18345*	2.22097	.000
Associate and Full Professor	Lecturer	14.22815*	2.57655	.000
	Assistant	6.18345*	2.22097	.017

\* Significance level ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ).

To unravel the significance of differences according to the variable of teaching experience, I calculated an ANOVA. The result revealed statistically significant differences in the level of job satisfaction ( $F = 11.870, p = .000$ ) among faculty members in accordance with their teaching experience (see Table 8).

**Table 8.** One-Way Analysis of Variance in Accordance to Teaching Experience (N = 110)

Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2158.647	2	1079.323	11.870	.000
Within groups	9729.571	107	90.931		
Total	11888.218	109			

These statistically significant differences in accordance with the variable of teaching experience favoured associate and full professors who have experience of more than 7 years in their current position. The mean for faculty members with fewer than 3 years of experience was 3.68, whereas for faculty members with 4 to 6 years of experience, the mean was 3.78, and for those with 7 or more years, the mean was 4.24 (see Table 1).

To identify the sources of these statistically significant differences between the means of the job-satisfaction level for faculty members in accordance with the variable of teaching experience, I performed a Tukey HSD comparison test for post comparisons. As seen in Table 9, the results showed that the differences between the mean scores of all the three teaching-experience groups were significant.

**Table 9.** Tukey HSD Comparison Test for Locating the Source of Differences According to Teaching Experience (N)

(I) Exper.	(J) Exper.	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1-3	4-6	-4.46667	2.80550	.286
	7 or above	-4.80000	3.13664	.314
4-6	1-3	4.46667	2.80550	.286
	7 or above	-.33333	2.80550	.993
7 or above	1-3	4.80000	3.13664	.314
	4-6	.33333	2.80550	.993

I used bivariate correlation analysis to answer Question 4 of this study: "Does a significant relationship exist between job satisfaction and self-efficacy?" The results of this analysis indicated a moderate positive relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction ( $r = .495, p < .05$ ). This intercorrelation suggested that greater self-efficacy relates to higher job satisfaction. To answer the last research question, "To what extent can variability in the faculty member's overall level of job satisfaction be explained by



their self-efficacy, gender, age, marital status, academic rank and teaching experience?" I performed a hierarchical regression analysis. The regression model included self-efficacy and selected demographics (gender, age, marital status, academic rank, and teaching experience). The variance inflation factor (VIF), a multicollinearity measure statistic, detected the collinearity among predicting variables. The result showed that the VIF between the variables was less than 2 (VIF = 1.00 for self-efficacy, 1.3 for academic rank, 1.31 for age, and 1.18 for teaching experience) which was an acceptable level. So, high multicollinearity among variables did not appear to be a problem when I entered factors into a regression-equation model. Table 10 shows the results of regression analysis on the full sample with the independent variable, self-efficacy, and selected demographics (gender, age, marital status, academic rank, and teaching

experience) used to predict the dependent variable of job satisfaction.

Based on the strength of bivariate correlations among all variables, self-efficacy was the first variable entered into each of the three regression equations, because it was known to be highly correlated with job satisfaction. I expected self-efficacy to account for the greatest amount of variance in predicting faculty members' job satisfaction. Because the *t*-test analysis used in this study revealed no significant effects of marital status on job satisfaction, I excluded this variable from the regression analysis. The ANOVA analysis of selected demographics showed that gender and age are the most influential variables on job satisfaction; thus, I entered these variables second, and entered academic rank and teaching experience third. Table 10 shows results of the analysis of Models 1, 2, and 3. *R* differs from zero at the end of each model.

**Table 10.** Regression Results of Self-Efficacy and Selected Demographics on Job Satisfaction (N = 110)

Model	Variables	Stand. β	R	Total R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	F total	ΔF	Sig.
1	(Constant)							.000
	Efficacy	.566	.566	.320	.320	50.795	50.795	.000
2	(Constant)							.000
	Self-efficacy	.409	.651	.424	.104	26.030	9.602	.000
	Gender	-.232						.005
	Age	.208						.012
3	(Constant)							.000
	Self-efficacy	.307	.683	.467	.042	18.193	4.131	.001
	Gender	-.193						.016
	Age	.119						.167
	Academic Rank	.191						.030
	Teaching Experience	.164						.044

In Model 1, after entering self-efficacy in the equation,  $R^2 = .320$ ,  $F(1, 108) = 50.795$ ,  $p < .001$ . Self-efficacy made a highly significant ( $\beta = .566$ ,  $p < .001$ ) contribution to predicting job satisfaction among participants. Self-efficacy explained about one third (32.0%) of the variability in job satisfaction.

Model 2, with gender and age added to the prediction of job satisfaction,  $R^2 = .424$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 107) = 26.03$ ,  $p < .001$ . Thus, gender and age together predicted additional variance in job satisfaction beyond that shared with self-efficacy.  $\Delta R^2$  increased .104 from .32 to .424. The three variables in Model 2 jointly accounted for 42.4% of the variation in faculty members' job satisfaction. In Model 2, results showed that gender and age were

significant unique predictors (Gender,  $\beta = .232$ ,  $p = .005$ ; and age  $\beta = .208$ ,  $p = .012$ ) of job satisfaction.

In Model 3, I introduced academic rank and teaching experience in Step 3. The addition of academic rank and teaching experience increased the percentage of explained variance by 4.2%, total  $R^2 = .467$ ,  $F$  change  $(1, 105) = 4.131$ ,  $p = .001$ .  $\Delta R^2$  increased .042. These results indicated that academic rank and teaching experience predicted additional variation in job satisfaction, and were significant unique predictors (academic rank,  $\beta = .191$ ,  $p = .03$ ; and teaching experience  $\beta = .164$ ,  $p = .044$ ).

Self-efficacy, academic rank, age, and teaching experience together predicted 46.7% of the



variation in faculty members' job satisfaction. Self-efficacy contributed most to faculty members' job-satisfaction scores, followed by gender. Of the variables that did contribute significantly to a linear model of job satisfaction, all had positive coefficients, indicating that as the values of these variables increased, overall job satisfaction also increased.

## Discussion

The present study aimed to investigate how self-efficacy and demographic variables (gender, marital status, age, academic rank, and teaching experience) affect job satisfaction. The study revealed that AU's faculty members have a high degree of job satisfaction. In another study, the chance to do things for other people (social service) provided faculty members with the highest level of satisfaction (Zarafshani & Alibaygi, 2009). This result is congruent with the results of previous studies conducted in college environments (Al Rubaish, Abdul Rahim, Abumadini, & Wosornu, 2009).

In answering the second question, results indicated significant differences in job satisfaction between male and female faculty members. Though men and women were satisfied with their jobs; male faculty members expressed a better level of satisfaction when compared with female faculty members. Investigators attributed that female faculty members have other commitments towards family and children leads to much lesser job satisfaction in comparison to male faculty members. (Ayers, Thomson, Rich, & Newton, 2008). The number of female faculty members at AU is lower than that of men. Hence it is understood that the chances for women to have social relationships and friendships with other women are limited in comparison to male faculty who have greater available opportunities for social communication. Researchers have reported similar findings from studies in diverse sociocultural settings, including New Zealand (Ayers et al., 2008), Russia (O'Leary, Wharton, & Quinlan, 2009), and Pakistan (Khuwaja, Qureshi, Andades, Fatmi, & Khawaja, 2004). In addition, similar findings accrued for those in the same culture. For example, in Saudi Arabia, Al-Rubaish et al. (2009) and in Jordan, Bataineh (2014). Other researchers, such as Castillo & Cano (2004), Callister (2006), and Seifert and Umbach (2008) found the same result.

However, this result is inconsistent with the findings of Oshagbemi (2000), Paul and Phua (2011), Ssesanga and Garrett (2005), and Wong and Heng (2009), who states from their study that gender has no direct effect on the job satisfaction of university teachers. Similarly, results from another study by Ali and Akhter (2009) identified no significant differences between male and female faculty members in job satisfaction. This result was supported by the studies of Paul and Phua (2011) and Wong and Heng (2009).

While exploring the level of job satisfaction based on the marital-status variable, mean satisfaction was 3.98 and 3.79 for those who were married or unmarried, respectively. This indicates that faculty members are satisfied, as marriage never brings changes in the commitment to the job, whereas the *p*-value of the *t*-test showed no significant differences in satisfaction at a 0.05 significance level. Studies supporting this result included those conducted by Mahdi, Almarshad, Elsiddig, & Elbanna (2014), Viet (2013), Paul and Phua (2011), and Wong and Heng (2009). According to Scott, Swortzel, and Taylor (2005), marital status was unrelated to job-satisfaction constructs. This has contradictions with the findings from Federico, Federico, and Lundquist. (1976) and Watson (1981), show that married employees are more satisfied than unmarried employees. Similarly, Fetsch and Kennington (1997) recognized that married faculty were more satisfied than single or widowed faculty. These findings may arise from the significance of a job in one's career, irrespective of marital status.

In contrast, previous researchers arrived that marital status significantly affects job satisfaction and explored that, when the length of marriage increases, job and life satisfaction decreases as well as married employees were less satisfied compared to unmarried faculty members. (Azalea, Omar, & Mastor, 2009). Similarly, Malik (2011) found unmarried faculty members were more satisfied, compared to those who were married. This inconsistent finding may be due to the cultural influences. The culture of the UAE upholds the concept of extended family, where everybody as a member of the family, married or unmarried, sustains a sense of obligation to satisfy their family commitments and demands.

One way ANOVA testing revealed statistically significant differences in the level of job satisfaction among faculty members in accordance with the variable of age, favouring those who are 51 years



old or older. Findings for age-based job satisfaction align with previous studies such as Scott et al. (2005) and Brunet and Sabiston (2011). They concluded that job satisfaction increased with age, due to the capability in adapting needs and wants to an outcome for work completed. Moreover, findings from Malik (2011) showed that younger faculty members are less satisfied than teachers reaching age 45 years and older. This result was consistent with results found in the literature. For instance, Ghafoor (2012); Castillo et al. (1999). This result could illustrate those faculty members who are 51 years old or older have a high level of satisfaction regarding their social status and job security.

Concerning academic rank, the current results showed statistically significant differences in job satisfaction among the faculty members in accordance with their academic rank. Specifically, associate and full professors reported a higher level of job satisfaction compared to those holding other academic ranks. This result means that faculty members become increasingly satisfied as their academic rank improved. The reason may be that those with higher rank feel stable, secure in their jobs, become more familiar with promotion regulations and, accordingly, attune themselves to such rules. This result aligns with those discussed in studies by Ghafoor (2012), Malik (2011), Oshagbemi (2003), and Wong and Heng (2009), who indicated that faculty members at higher academic ranks generally are more satisfied with their jobs, compared to those at lower ranks.

In contrast, several other studies in this area expressed that there is no statistically significant differences emerged in satisfaction levels associated with academic rank. For example, Eyupoglu and Saner (2009) reported that academic titles or types of faculty do not produce significant differences among subgroups of teachers in the measured variables.

Concerning teaching experience in AU, results indicated statistically significant differences emerged in job satisfaction levels favouring faculty members who have experience of more than 7 years. As the number of years of teaching experience increased, job satisfaction also increased. This finding supports research conducted by Ghafoor (2012) and Mahdi et al. (2014), who concluded that this result gives a clear picture of the aspirations of more experienced academic faculty members to different treatments in all facets of a job's conditions and environment.

In contrast, some findings showed no statistically significant effects of teaching experience on job satisfaction (e.g., Castillo & Cano, 2004; Paul & Phua, 2011; Wong & Heng, 2009).

### *Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction*

Consistent with previous empirical studies, which found that individuals' self-efficacy plays an important role in shaping job satisfaction, a moderate relationship ( $r = .495, p < .05$ ) emerged between self-efficacy and job satisfaction in the current study. This finding supported that noted by Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010) in their research, in that teacher job Satisfaction and self-efficacy have a strong positive relationship. Further, another study by Akomolafe and Ogunmakin (2014) also revealed a significant relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

Nonetheless, the findings from this study highlight the predictive value of self-efficacy in the job satisfaction of faculty members. The results of the hierarchical regression model, which included self-efficacy as a predictor, had a significant effect on job satisfaction among faculty members. The outcome of the study suggests that teachers who are most satisfied with their jobs consider their work environment as supportive, experience positive goal progress, and report high levels of trait positive affect.

A possible explanation for this finding is that teachers reporting higher teaching self-efficacy have greater expectations of themselves to perform effectively and successfully in their job roles. As a result, the faculty members feel satisfied in their job. Such an interpretation is consistent with Badri, Mohaidat, Ferrandino, and El Mourad (2013), who suggested that teachers who have important goals and gauge progress in attaining them will be more likely to experience increased job satisfaction.

In general, findings from the present study denote that selected demographics (gender, age, academic rank, and teaching experience) and self-efficacy are critical predictors of faculty members' job satisfaction. Self-efficacy emerged as the strongest unique predictor of job satisfaction. Self-efficacy among faculty members aligns with increased job satisfaction. This association agrees with results from many previous researchers. Therefore, greater importance should be given to the presence of high levels of self-efficacy to increase levels of job satisfaction of faculty members.



### *Limitations and Recommendations of the Study*

The findings from the current study have practical implications for the management of the university. Academic staff with different levels of job satisfaction may require different management styles and motivational strategies for optimum organizational effectiveness. Accordingly, it is recommended that higher education policymakers in UAE focus attention on self-efficacy in their efforts to improve faculty members' job satisfaction, which may dramatically impact their performance and productivity.

The results from this study have shown a remarkable leading factor in assessing the contribution of the independent variables on job satisfaction. However, several limitations exist in the present study that warrants review. Firstly, the generalizability of the results may be limited because the study was mainly concentrated on the sample segment of faculty members from one university. The results are not representative of other faculty members in other UAE universities. Second, this study relied on self-report measures for the predictor variables as well as the independent variables, potentially creating a mono-method bias. Third, data gathered for the current study pertains to discussions at one point in time. Consequently, covariate factors may have influenced respondents' attitudes. Thus, the cross-sectional nature of the data may constrain the interpretation of results. Finally, some of the non-conditional difficulties encountered during the study included misunderstanding in the Likert-type scale as well as the limited exposure to handling the analysis instruments. These difficulties might have some reflection in the data analysis and interpretation which might have affected the scores obtained and thus weakened the validity of the study at some points.

Based on the limitations, the findings should be interpreted cautiously and the findings need to be replicated with a more representative sample of faculty members. A need arises to carry out additional research to investigate the variables explored herein with larger samples spanning multiple cultures or different ages. As job satisfaction is a constant dynamic subject in the UAE higher education context, future studies should explore other factors that might contribute to job satisfaction such as leadership style, turnover, productivity, absenteeism, and job stress. The replication of the study on factors measuring

UAE faculty members' job satisfaction with a representative sample from several universities would substantiate or confound the effects of significant and nonsignificant factors in the present study.

### **Conclusion**

The investigation on job satisfaction among faculty members in universities in UAE explored the effects of self-efficacy and selected demographics on job satisfaction. In summary, findings from the present study provided answers to the research questions. The study suggested that faculty members expressed a high level of job satisfaction. Based on beta values, results showed that self-efficacy had the strongest effect on job satisfaction. Furthermore, among the demographic variables of faculty members namely gender, age, academic rank, teaching experience etc. as a whole scored significantly high on job satisfaction.

### **References**

- Akomolafe, M.J., & Ogunmakin, A.O. (2014). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers: Emotional intelligence, occupational stress and self-efficacy as predictors. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4, 487-498. doi:10.5901/jesr.2014.v4n3p487
- Akpochofa, G.O. (2011). Emotional intelligence and self-efficacy as correlates of career commitment in Nigeria. *African Research Review*, 5, 212-225. doi:10.4314/afrr.v5i1.64521
- Ali, T., & Akhter, I. (2009). Job satisfaction of faculty members in private universities—In the context of Bangladesh. *International Business Research*, 2(4), 167-175. doi:10.5539/ibr.v2n4p167
- Al Rubaish, A., Abdul Rahim, S.I., Abumadini, M.S., & Wosornu, L. (2009). Job satisfaction among the academic staff of a Saudi University: An evaluation study. *Journal of Family & Community Medicine*, 16, 97-103. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3377049/>
- Altnok, V. (2011). The relationship between job satisfaction of academicians and lifetime satisfaction. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5, 2563-2571. doi:10.5897/AJBM10.432
- Andrews, G.L. (1990). An assessment of the interaction of selected personal characteristics and perceptions of selected aspects of job satisfaction by Wisconsin Cooperative Extension agricultural agents (Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin)
- Ayers, K.M., Thomson, W.M., Rich, A.M., & Newton, J.T. (2008). Gender differences in dentists' working practices and job satisfaction. *Journal of Dentistry*, 36, 343-350. doi: 10.1016/j.jdent.2008.01.012.
- Azalea, A., Omar F., & Mastor, K.A. (2009). The role of individual differences in job satisfaction among Indonesians and Malaysians. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 10, 496-511.



- Badri, M.A., Mohaidat, J., Ferrandino, V., & El Mourad, T. (2013). The social cognitive model of job satisfaction among teachers: Testing and validation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 57, 12–24. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2012.10.007
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191– 215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117–148. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2802\_3
- Bas, T., & Ardic, K. (2002). Impact of age on job satisfaction of Turkish academicians. *Degisi*, 3, 89–102. <http://iibfdergisi.gazi.edu.tr/index.php/iibfdergisi/article/viewFile/368/358>
- Bataineh, O.T. (2014). The level of job satisfaction among the faculty members of colleges of education at Jordanian universities. *Canadian Social Science*, 10(3), 1–8. <http://www.cscanada.net/>
- Bertz, R.D., Jr., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 32–54. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1994.1003
- Bhuyan, B., & Choudhary, M. (2003). Job satisfaction of college teachers. *Psycho-lingua*, 32, 123–127.
- Borgogni, L., Consiglio, C., Alessandri, G., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2012). Do not throw the baby out with the bathwater! Interpersonal strain at work and burnout. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21, 875–898. doi:10.1080/1359432X.2011.598653
- Bowen, C.F., Radhakrishna, R.B., & Keyser, R. (1994). Job satisfaction and commitment of 4- H agents. *Journal of Extension*, 32(1). <http://www.joe.org/joe/1994june/rb2.html>
- Brayfield, A.H., & Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307–311. doi:10.1037/h0055617
- Brunet, J., & Sabiston, C.M. (2011). Exploring motivation for physical activity across the adult lifespan. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 12, 99–105. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.09.006
- Callister, R.R. (2006). The impact of gender and department climate on job satisfaction and intentions to quit for faculty in sciences and engineering fields. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31, 367–375. doi:10.1007/s10961-006-7208-y
- Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976). *The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). A gender analysis of job satisfaction, job satisfier factors, and job dissatisfier factors of agriculture education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33(3), 40–46. doi:10.5032/jae.1992.03040
- Castillo, J.X., & Cano, J. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), 65–74.
- Castillo, J.X., Conklin, E.A., & Cano, J. (1999). Job satisfaction of Ohio agricultural education teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 40(2), 19–27. doi:10.5032/jae.1999.02019
- Cherabin, M., Praveena, K.B., Azimi, H.M., Qadimi, A., & Shalmani, P.S. (2012). Self esteem, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of faculty members of secondary level teacher training programme in Mysore (India). *Life Science Journal*, 9, 204–214.
- Ellickson, M.C., & Logsdon, K. (2001). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *State and Local Government Review*, 33, 173–184. doi:10.1177/0160323X0103300302
- Eyupoglu, S.Z., & Saner, T. (2009, February). The relationship between job satisfaction and academic rank: A study of academicians in Northern Cyprus. Paper presented at the World Conference on Educational Sciences, Nicosia, North Cyprus.
- Federico, J.M., Federico, P., & Lundquist, G.W. (1976). Predicting women's turnover as a function of extend of met salary expectations and biodemographic data. *Personnel Psychology*, 29, 559–566. doi:10.1111/j.1744- 6570.1976.tb02079.x
- Fetsch, R.J., & Kennington, M.S. (1997). Balancing work and family in cooperative extension: History, effective programs, and future directions. *Journal of Extension*, 35(1). <http://www.joe.org/joe/1997february/a2.php>
- Ghafoor, M.M. (2012). Role of demographic characteristics on job satisfaction. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 6(1), 30–45. <http://www.fareastjournals.com/>
- Griffin, S.F. (1984). *Methods of coping with work force role conflict in relation to job satisfaction of cooperative extension home economists* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Heller, D., Judge, T., & Watson, D. (2002). The confounding role of personality and trait affectivity in the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 815–835. doi:10.1002/job.168
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R.O., & Capwell, D.F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Hijah, A., Jassbi, J., & Ghaffari, F. (2009). The role of gender in job satisfaction of university staff members. Retrieved from <http://www.ufhrd.co.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2009/07/6-15-refereed-paper.pdf>
- Jaime, X.C., & Jamie, C. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), 65–74. doi:10.5032/jae.2004.03065
- Jerusalem, M., & Schwarzer, R. (1979). Self-efficacy as a resource factor in stress appraisal. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action*, 195–216.
- Jerusalem, M., & Schwarzer, R. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio* (pp. 35–37). Windsor, England: NFER-Nelson. Khuwaja, A.K.,
- Qureshi, R., Andades, M., Fatmi Z., & Khawaja, N.K. (2004). Comparison of job satisfaction and stress among male and female doctors in teaching hospitals of Karachi. *Journal of Ayub Medical College, Abbottabad*, 16, 23–27.
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Mahdi, S., Almarshad, S., Elsiddig, B., & Elbanna, L. (2014). Northern Border University academics staff job



- satisfaction. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 25, 121–132.  
<http://www.jitbm.com/jitbm%2025th%20volume/11seif.pdf>.
- Malik, N. (2011). A study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at the University of Balochiston. *Journal of Research in Education*, 21(2), 49–57.  
[http://hied.uark.edu/Article\\_5\\_-\\_Malik.pdf](http://hied.uark.edu/Article_5_-_Malik.pdf)
- Martin, P.D., Dutton, G.R., & Brantley, P.J. (2004) Self-efficacy as a predictor of weight change in African-American women. *Obesity Research*. 2004; 12:646–651
- Mishra, P.K. (2013). Job satisfaction, *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 14(5): 45-54.
- Moorman, R.H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational behavior. *Human Relations*, 46, 759–776.  
 doi:10.1177/001872679304600604
- Near, J.P., Rice, R.W., & Hunt, R.G. (1978). Work and extra-work correlates of life and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management*, 21, 248–264. doi:10.2307/255758
- Nestor, P.I., & Leary, P. (2000). The relationship between tenure and non-tenure track status of extension faculty and job satisfaction. *Journal of Extension*, 38(4).  
<http://www.joe.org/joe/2000august/rb1.php>
- Njiru, L.M. (2014). Job satisfaction and motivation among teachers of Kiharu district in Kenya. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(5), 135–152.  
 doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n5p135
- Noordin F., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff. *Asian Social Science*, 5(5), 122–128. doi:10.5539/ass.v5n5p122
- Okpara, J.O., Squillace, M., & Erondu, E.A. (2005). Gender differences and job satisfaction: A study of university teachers in the United States. *Women in Management Review*, 20, 177–190. doi:10.1108/09649420510591852
- O'Leary, P., Wharton, N., & Quinlan, T. (2009). Job satisfaction of physicians in Russia. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 22, 221–231.  
 doi:10.1108/09526860910953502
- Oshagbemi, T. (1997). The influence of rank on the job satisfaction of organizational members. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12, 511–519.  
 doi:10.1108/02683949710189111
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Is length of service related to the level of job satisfaction? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27, 213–226. doi:10.1108/03068290010286546
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30, 1210–1232.  
 doi:10.1108/03068290310500634
- 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, 141–151.  
 doi:10.1080/1360080X.2011.550087
- Piquart, M., Juang, L.P., & Silbereisen, R.K. (2003). Self-efficacy and successful school-to-work transition: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 329–346.  
 doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00031-3
- Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1986). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Pensacola, FL: Ballinger.
- Probst, J.C., Baek, J.D., & Laditka, S.B. (2010). The relationship between workplace environment and job satisfaction among nursing assistants: Findings from a national survey. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 11, 246–252. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2009.08.008
- Ray, T. and Ranjan, A. (2011). Job satisfaction among Faculty members: A study of Engineering Colleges under BPUT.  
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/56789804/7/Dispositional-Theory>
- Redmond, B.F. (2012) Job Satisfaction. WikiSpaces - PSYCH 484: Work Attitudes and Job Motivation.  
<https://wikispaces.psu.edu/x/yRFzAg>.
- Rosser, V.J. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions overtime: An examination of their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 81–107.  
 doi:10.1007/s11162-004-6290-y
- Saner, T., & Eypöğlü, Ş.Z. (2013). The gender-marital status job satisfaction relationship of academics. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 2817–2821.  
 doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.324
- Scott M., Swartzel, K., & Taylor, W.N. (2005). The relationships between selected demographic factors and the level of job satisfaction of extension agents. *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education Research*, 55, 102–115.  
 doi:10.5032/jae.2005.03002
- Seifert, T.A., & Umbach, P.D. (2008). The effects of faculty demographic characteristics and disciplinary context on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 357–381. doi:10.1007/s11162-007-9084-1
- Sharma, R.D., & Jyoti, J. (2006). Job satisfaction among school teachers. *IIMB Management Review*, 18, 349–363.
- Skaalvik, E.M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1059–1069.  
 doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001
- Smith, D.B., & Plant, W.T. (1982). Sex differences in the job: Satisfaction of university professors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 249–251. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.67.2.249
- Springfield-Scott, M. (2000). Faculty job satisfaction in a university work environment. *Thresholds in Education*, 25–32.
- Ssesanga, K., & Garrett, R.M. (2005). Job satisfaction of university academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Education*, 50, 33–56. doi:10.1007/s10734-004-6346-0.
- Telef, B.B. (2011). The study of teachers' self-efficacy, job satisfaction, life satisfaction and burnout. *Elementary Education Online*, 10, 91–108.
- Tojjari, F., Esmaeili, M.R., & Bavandpour, R. (2013). The effect of self-efficacy on job satisfaction of sport referees. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3, 219–225.  
<http://pelagiaresearchlibrary.com/european-journal-of-experimental-biology/vol3-iss2/EJEB-2013-3-2-219-225.pdf>
- Vaezi, S., & Fallah, N. (2011). The relationship between self-efficacy and stress among Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Resource*, 2, 1168–1174.  
 doi:10.4304/jltr.2.5.1168-1174



- Viet, V.V. (2013). Factors affecting job satisfaction of faculty members. *VNU Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 29(4), 24–29.
- Warner, P.D. (1973). A comparative study of three patterns of staffing within the cooperative extension service organization and their association with organizational structure, organizational effectiveness, job satisfaction and role conflict (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Warren, J.A., & Johnson, P.J. (1995). The impact of workplace support on work-family role strain. *Family Relations*, 44, 163–169. doi:10.2307/584803
- Watson, C.J. (1981). An evaluation and some aspects of the steers and Rhodes model of employee attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66, 385–389. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.66.3.385
- Wong, E.S.K., & Heng, T.N. (2009). Case study of factors influencing jobs satisfaction in two Malaysian universities. *International Business Research*, 2(2), 86–98. doi:10.5539/ibr.v2n2p86
- Wood, O.R. (1976). Measuring job satisfaction of the community college staff. *Community College Review*, 3(3), 56–64. doi:10.1177/009155217600300309
- Zarafshani, K., & Alibaygi, A.H. (2009). Predictors of job satisfaction among academics at an Iranian university. *Psychological Reports*, 104, 633–644. doi:10.2466/pr0.104.2.633-644
- Zeffane, R., Ibrahim, M., & El Mehairi, R. (2008). Exploring the differential impact of job satisfaction on employee attendance and conduct: The case of a utility company in the United Arab Emirates. *Employee Relations*, 30, 237–250. doi:10.1108/01425450810866514