

An Empirical Study on the Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among Academic and Non-academic Staffs

Ahmed Hassan Mohamud ¹, Galad Mohamed Barre¹, Husein Osman Abdullah ²

¹Faculty of Management Science, SIMAD University

²Faculty of Computing, SIMAD University

axgurey@simad.edu.so (Corresponding author)

Abstract. This study investigated factors influencing job satisfaction among 208 academic and nonacademic staff at SIMAD University, Somalia using a quantitative questionnaire. Descriptive analysis showed staff reported higher satisfaction levels across areas like salaries, job security, governance, and management relations, but lower satisfaction with promotion policies and physical working conditions. The results provide insights into strengths and improvement areas related to staff satisfaction at SIMAD University. Further analysis is warranted to examine differences across demographics. Enhancing satisfaction levels can help SIMAD University optimize human resources and performance.

Keywords: staff, job satisfaction, academic and nonacademic staff, university

1. Introduction

Job satisfaction refers to employees' happiness with their work and their organizations (Jameel & Ahmad, 2019). It also measures how fulfilled you are with your job (Khan, Bhatti, Hussain, Ahmad, & Iqbal, 2021). Education is one of the most essential institutions in a country. It deals with issues that affect the national interest. It needs to align with the public expectations to function well. Effective education relies on teachers' and other academic staff's efforts, dedication, and professionalism. They are more satisfied with their work when they have a positive and supportive environment in their institutions (Noordin & Jusoff, 2009). A positive university climate can enhance academic quality and productivity, as well as the work satisfaction of the academic staff. Job satisfaction needs a supportive environment that fosters shared values and goals and generates positive energy for achievement. Deans and university department heads should engage with lecturers respectfully, transparently, and constructively, informing them about organizational decisions and processes (Horoub & Zargar, 2022). This will improve participation and work satisfaction by increasing inclusivity. Various studies define job satisfaction as employees' evaluations of their jobs' intrinsic and extrinsic aspects (Jameel & Ahmad, 2019). It reflects the extent of an employee's job satisfaction and covers specific satisfaction domains related to compensation, promotion, work conditions, supervision, and coworker relations. The academic staff is the most asset of the University. Universities should pay more attention to staff satisfaction to achieve success. According to the expectation discrepancy theory, work satisfaction is an effective employee response to the gap between expected and actual outcomes. This study conceptualizes job satisfaction as an effective employee reaction to their work, organizational culture, or individual engagement. Job motivation has a significant impact on the level of job satisfaction (Omar et al., 2021).

Herzberg's Two-Factor theory is a widely used framework for understanding work motivation (Mehrad, 2020). According to this theory, some aspects of work lead to satisfaction, while others prevent dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1968). These work-related factors are classified into motivators and hygiene factors (Herzberg, 2008). Motivators include achievement, recognition, work, responsibility, growth, and personal development. Hygiene factors include company policy, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions (Herzberg, 1968). There have been many studies on job satisfaction of academic and nonacademic staff around the world (Kendirikiran & Batur, 2022; Mehrad, 2020; Mwesigwa et al., 2020; Ong et al., 2020; Szromek & Wolniak, 2020).

The study found that academic staff satisfaction is positively and significantly associated with pay, job security, and working conditions. It was found that job security was among the strongest predictors of teacher job satisfaction. Research suggests that improving advancement opportunities, stable jobs, and suitable working environments can motivate instructors to perform better during learning. The results of this study can assist policymakers in making informed decisions regarding teacher job satisfaction and retention, improving the well-being of students, and elevating the prestige of instructors (Afaq et al., 2022). Researchers found that core self-evaluations (CSEs) significantly influenced job satisfaction and turnover intentions among academic staff in Nigerian higher education institutions. According to the research, CSEs primarily influence job satisfaction and turnover intention through intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. The mediating role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation provided new insights into the connections between core self-evaluations, job satisfaction, and turnover expectations (Akosile & Ekemen, 2022).

Moreover, employee satisfaction contributes to employee retention, productivity, and overall health and well-being of an organization. Despite this, limited research explores the determinants of job satisfaction among academic and nonacademic staff at SIMAD University in Somalia. This lack of understanding hinders the development of effective strategies to enhance employee satisfaction and organizational performance. Hence, this study aims to investigate factors influencing job satisfaction among academic and nonacademic staff at SIMAD University, informing evidence-based interventions to boost employee morale and enhance the work environment. This study will add to the existing

knowledge in this area and help academic and nonacademic staff achieve higher levels of job satisfaction. It can also guide the University's senior management in improving staff satisfaction.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is widely used in management science, especially human resource management (Smagina, 2020). It refers to the feeling of satisfaction or enjoyment that people experience from their work (O'Leary, Wharton, & Quinlan, 2009). Job satisfaction has been extensively studied in psychology, mainly about individual and organizational behaviour (Chen et al., 2012). It is defined as the psychological, physical, and environmental well-being employees obtain from the workplace (Williams & Hazer, 1986). Previous research showed a consistent link between job satisfaction and positive work outcomes such as productivity, organizational commitment, reduced absenteeism and turnover, customer satisfaction, and organizational performance (Opatha, 2019). Job satisfaction is often used to assess employees' job attitudes as affected by organizational events such as organizational change (Tong et al., 2013). A study that focused on 418 bank staff in the Peshawar region suggested that job satisfaction is influenced by two groups of factors: intrinsic and extrinsic (Mehrad, 2020). It is also positively associated with employee growth and well-being (Khan et al., 2021). Job satisfaction occurs when an employee is adequately rewarded and assigned challenging and exciting tasks (Bateman & Organ, 1983). This implies that top management should regularly update and redesign job duties to increase employee interest and satisfaction (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). This study uses the following important variables:

2.2 Salaries and Benefits

Many studies often link Employee satisfaction to salary and other material benefits (Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1992; Witt & Nye, 1992). Pay is a primary factor of satisfaction for different types of employees and organizations (Khalid, Irshad, & Mahmood, 2012). However, the effect of pay on job satisfaction is not apparent. Some studies find a significant relationship between pay, rank, and satisfaction (Oshagbemi, 2000; Grace & Khalsa, 2003), while others do not (Bassett, 1994; Young, Worchel, & Woehr, 1998; Brainard, 2005). The financial needs of employees may also influence their satisfaction and attitude (Brett et al., 1995). Therefore, this study examines the level of satisfaction among academic and nonacademic staff of SIMAD University in order evaluate the employee's satisfaction of the university.

2.3 Institutional Integrity

Integrity is a critical factor for enhancing the quality of service and the moral values of society and nations in the globalized world (Chong & Mui, 2021). It also affects the affective commitment of employees, which reflects their emotional attachment, identification, and involvement with the organization (ALIFUDDIN & WIDODO, 2021). This study shows that social intelligence, integrity, self-efficacy, and affective commitment significantly impact job satisfaction. Researchers and practitioners can use this model to improve job satisfaction among teachers. The study also confirms the positive relationship between integrity, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Karim & Nadeem, 2019).

2.4 Appointment and Promotion

Some researchers say promotional opportunities are crucial to job satisfaction (Peterson, Puia, & Suess, 2003). They found a positive and significant correlation between satisfaction with promotion and overall job satisfaction (Ellickson & Logsdon, 2002). However, public sector organizations often lack such opportunities, which may discourage qualified employees from staying (Khalid et al., 2012).

Rewarding employees financially and non-financially can improve business outcomes such as profit, customer service, and employee retention (Ahmad & Jameel, 2018). As long as appointment and promotion is important factor that can contribute to the satisfaction of staff, this study examine the level of satisfaction of employees in terms of appointment and promotion in the university.

2.5 Job Security

Job security is the likelihood of keeping one's job, according to Wilczyńska et al. (2016). Previous studies have explored how job security affects job satisfaction, which is the emotional attachment to one's organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). However, the healthcare sector has received less attention in this regard (Bassam Mahmoud & D. Reisel, 2014). Job security can be seen as a positive or negative evaluation of one's current and future work situation (Ahmad & Jameel, 2018). Job security increases job satisfaction, while job insecurity decreases it (De Cuyper et al., 2009; Reisel et al., 2010). Job insecurity can also weaken the bonds between employees and their organizations (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005). As long as job security is essential for the employees because they are sure they will not be fired from the job. Therefore, given job security to the staff is very important for their satisfaction.

2.6 University Management (Administration) Satisfaction

The role of superiors in employee satisfaction is well-established in many studies, which focus on how they influence employee performance and career outcomes (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Jenkins, 1993; Judge, 1993; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1992; Wall & Payne, 1973). These studies explore various aspects of satisfaction with higher management, such as their understanding, consideration, concern, and accessibility for employees. However, these studies mainly examine the direct relationship between employees and their immediate superiors. The impact of the higher management group on employees is harder to measure and often overlooked. Yet, satisfaction with higher management is a critical factor in job satisfaction and work environment satisfaction (Küskü, 2001). Therefore, employee satisfaction studies, especially at the university level, should consider both higher management and department management, which directly affect the employee. The satisfaction of the staff for the management plays crucial role with their performance of the and their motivation with job. Thus, the university management should emphasise the satisfaction of their employees in order to enhance the job performance.

2.7 Faculty/Department Management (Administration) Satisfaction

Colleague satisfaction is vital for employee satisfaction and work environment quality (Küskü, 2001). It depends on how well the employees get along with each other, how competent and skilled they are, and how much they support and cooperate (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Jenkins, 1993; Judge, 1993; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1992; Tang & Talpade, 1999; Wall & Payne, 1973). Colleague satisfaction can influence work's competitive and collaborative aspects (Küskü, 2001). Many researchers have found that having friendly and supportive colleagues can increase job satisfaction (Hitt, Miller, Colella, & Triana, 2017; Ting, 1997). On the other hand, a lack of colleague support can lead to job dissatisfaction. Therefore, colleague satisfaction is a crucial element for job satisfaction.

2.8 Physical Environment (Organizational Conditions) Satisfaction

The physical environment in which people work significantly impacts their performance and productivity, regardless of their motivation and efficiency (Küskü, 2001). Hence, the quality of the physical environment (e.g. library conditions, laboratory and computer facilities, work area, and canteen conditions) is often a critical factor in employee satisfaction studies (Chacko, 1983; Pearson & Seiler, 1983; Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1992; Wall & Payne, 1973). The satisfaction of the staff with the environment is also crucial for their job performance. Thus, developing a physical and non-physical environment is crucial for the performance of the staff.

2.9 Good Governance

Governance is a complex and multidimensional concept that can be understood and applied in various

ways. Some researchers define governance as exercising economic, political, and administrative authority to manage a country at all levels (Ara & Khan, 2006). Others describe governance as the organization and management of resources, human capital, and work groups within different institutions using economic, administrative, political, and social methods (Tahir, 1998). Governance can also be studied regarding quality and effectiveness, which are influenced by several relevant public and private dimensions (Hijazi, 2020). For example, good corporate governance can enhance organizational performance and employee behaviour and increase employee job satisfaction (Nmai & Delle, 2014; Sandika et al., 2016). Therefore, a sound governance system is essential for achieving positive outcomes and impacts in various domains and contexts. Several studies suggest that good governance influences job satisfaction among university employees. For example, Alamrew et al. (2016) surveyed academics and administrators at the University of Gondar in Ethiopia. They found poor governance was associated with low job satisfaction and high turnover intention. They recommended that the university should enhance its governance practices. Similarly, Shahin (2016) examined the effect of good governance indicators on job satisfaction among faculty and staff of Lorestan University in Iran and found that good governance improved job satisfaction. Finally, Lakshika and Priyanath (2018) reported a positive relationship between governance and job satisfaction of Supportive Staff at Sabaragamuwa University in Sri Lanka. In any industry, general governance is critical to the productivity of workers, but in academia it is more so because the majority of employees are highly educated. Fairness and equality should therefore be used by upper management when dealing with their staff. All staff members, academic and nonacademic alike, ought to be treated equally under the university's policies and procedures.

3. Research Methodology

In this study, the researcher employed a quantitative methodology to examine the factors contributing to job satisfaction for academics and nonacademic staff at SIMAD University. This approach aimed to collect numerical data through surveys or structured questionnaires that quantified the degree of job satisfaction and identified the key influencing factors. Analyzing the quantitative data led to a statistical interpretation of the relationship between various factors and university staff job satisfaction.

3.1. Population and Sample:

This study focused on SIMAD University, examining academic and nonacademic staff across its various departments. A comprehensive analysis of job satisfaction dynamics across different educational and administrative domains was conducted by analyzing individuals representing ten different departments within the university. Purposive sampling was used to ensure a representative sample, capturing data from 208 academic and nonacademic staff members. In addition, this method enabled the inclusion of participants from different departments and roles within the university, providing insights into the nuanced aspects of job satisfaction experienced by varying levels of staff members.

3.2. Measures:

To ensure the quality and privacy of the survey, specific criteria were established for the respondents. Firstly, respondents needed to be proficient in reading, writing, and understanding either Somali or English, as the questionnaire was presented in both languages. Secondly, they were required to be University employees, either in academic or nonacademic roles. Lastly, respondents were asked to indicate their department. The survey utilized filtered questions based on these criteria. Additionally, the survey employed a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree) to measure responses to the items.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure:

The researchers distributed the questionnaires in person, courteously requesting University employees

to complete them. Additionally, various online platforms such as Facebook, WhatsApp, responder emails, and other social media channels were utilized to share the Google document form survey. The questionnaires were designed with cover pages and content pages in both Somali and English. Data collection took place in Mogadishu, the capital of Somalia, where the University's campuses are situated. In this research, data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). A descriptive analysis was used to examine and summarize the data collected. In a nutshell,

4. Results

4.1. Respondents' Demographic Profile Results

The demographic details of respondents are given in Table I. There was a huge gender difference among the respondents: 91.8 per cent of the respondents were male, and 8.2 per cent were female. Concerning the age of the respondents, 27.4 per cent were less than 30 years, 53.4 per cent were between 31 and 40 years, 11.1 per cent were between 41 and 50 years, and 8.2 per cent were above 50 years. Concerning marital status of the respondents, 76 per cent were married, 22.1 per cent were single, and 1.9 per cent were divorced. Concerning level of education of the respondents. 3.8 percent were secondary certificate, 24 percent were Bachelor, 55.3 percent were masters' degree, 7.2 percent were PhD, while remaining are others. According to the position of the respondents, 12.5 percent were management, 33.2 percent were administrative, and 9.6 percent were supportive, 48.1 percent were lecturer. In terms of mode of contract respondents 69.7 were full time contract, 15.9 were part time contract, 14.4 were special contract. According to the divisions 7.7 percent were, 7.7 % of the respondents FA were 7.7% FECCO

Table 1: Demographic profile of the respondents

Demographics attributes	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	191	91.8
Female	17	8.2
Total	208	100.0
Marital Status		
Single	46	22.1
Married	158	76.0
Divorced	4	1.9
Total	208	100.0
Age		
less than 30 years	57	27.4
31 - 40 years	111	53.4
41 - 50 years	23	11.1
50 Above	17	8.2
Total	208	100.0

Level of Education		
Secondary	8	3.8
Bachelor	50	24.0
Master	115	55.3
PHD	15	7.2
Other	20	9.6
Total	208	100.0
Position		

Management	26	12.5
Administrative	69	33.2
Supportive	13	6.3
Lecturer	100	48.1
Total	208	100.0
Contract		
Full Time	145	69.7
Part Time	33	15.9
Special Contract	30	14.4
Total	208	100.0
Division		
FA	16	7.7
FECO	16	7.7
FENG	5	2.4
FASS	6	2.9
FMS	61	29.3
FLAW	6	2.9
FMED	14	6.7
FOC	29	13.9
FoE	15	7.2
IML	40	19.2
Total	208	100.0

Table 2. Level of general satisfaction at SIMAD University

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	The university shows fairness and transparency in the appreciation of subordinates	41.3	34.6	12.5	7.7	3.8	.737	1.98	1.094
2	The university provides availability and ease of access to information when needed.	37	44.2	13.5	3.4	1.9		1.89	.897
3	I am satisfied with the current recruitment and promotion rules at the university.	31.7	34.6	19.7	10.6	3.4		2.19	1.100
4	I am totally satisfied with my job	52.4	35.6	8.2	2.9	1.0		1.64	.827

4.2. Overall Satisfaction

Table 2 above reveals the level of general satisfaction at SIMAD University by asking four questions. For the first question, 75.9% of the respondents strongly believed and agreed that the university shows fairness and transparency in the appreciation of subordinates, while a small amount of the respondents (11.50%) showed an abjection and strongly disagreed. For the second question, 81.2% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the university provides availability and ease of access to information when needed, whereas 5.3% of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Respondents were also asked if they're satisfied with the current recruitment and promotion rules at the university; 66.3% of them agreed and strongly believed that they're satisfied with the university's current recruitment and promotion policies, while 14% of the respondents showed no satisfaction and either disagreed or strongly disagreed. These reveals the entire satisfaction of employees, and 88% exhibited better satisfaction and either agreed or strongly agreed, whilst 3.9% disagreed or strongly

disagreed. In overall, the findings indicate that SIMAD university staff are very satisfied.

Table 3. Level of Relationship with managers and supervisors at SIMAD University

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No.	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	My supervisors at the university are committed to honesty and integrity.	38.9	39.9	15.4	3.8	1.9	.806	1.90	.930
2	My direct supervisor at the university deals with me with respect, fairness, transparency, and integrity.	50.5	33.2	10.1	3.4	2.9		1.75	.971
3	The information we receive from the managers at the university about the job is sufficient and clear.	35.1	44.2	14.4	3.4	2.9		1.95	.944
4	Managers support cross-departmental collaboration to achieve business goals.	30.8	42.3	16.8	7.7	2.4		2.09	.999

4.3. Managerial Relations

Table 3 discloses the level of relationship of employees with managers and supervisors at SIMAD university. Four questions were presented to the participants. 78.8% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the supervisors at the university are committed to honesty and integrity where 5.7 either disagreed or strongly disagreed. 83.7% of the respondents for the second question agreed or strongly agreed that the direct supervisor at the university deals them with respect, fairness, transparency, and integrity where 6.3% strongly disagreed or disagreed. For the third question, 79.3% accepted and strongly agreed that the information they receive from managers at the university about the work is sufficient and clear, while 6.3% of the participants showed disagreement and strongly disagreed. For the fourth question “Managers support cross-departmental collaboration to achieve business goals” were supported and strongly agreed by 73.1% of the participants, yet 10.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This shows that there is good relationship between employees, supervisors and managers at the university.

Table 4. Salaries and Benefits

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No.	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	My current salary compared to my colleagues at the university is satisfactory to me.	21.6	41.3	18.8	13.5	4.8	.791	2.38	1.110
2	My current salary compared to the local market is satisfactory to me.	14.9	36.1	22.6	17.8	8.7		2.69	1.180
3	My salary at the university, compared to the size of my duties and responsibilities, is satisfactory.	14.9	36.5	16.8	26	5.8		2.71	1.173
4	I receive my monthly salary at the university on time immediately.	84.6	12.5	1.0	1.9	0		1.20	0.545
5	The annual incentive I receive at the university is fair and satisfactory to me.	22.6	24.5	29.8	17.8	5.3		2.59	1.172
6	I feel generally satisfied with the financial services (salary, bonuses, allowances, incentives) provided to me by the university.	26.9	35.1	23.1	12.0	2.9		2.29	1.078

4.4. Salaries and Benefits

In the above table 4 shows respondents' perceptions of employees' salaries and benefits at SIMAD university. Six question were presented; first question was if their current salary compared to their colleagues at the university is satisfactory to them, 62.9% of the respondents showed that they agreed or strongly agreed while 18.3% of them didn't show satisfaction and either disagreed or strongly disagreed at all. They're also asked if their current salary compared to the market is satisfactory, 51% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed and those disagreed or strongly disagreed are 26.5%, which is more than one fourth of the respondents. Thirdly, they're asked if their salary compared to the size of duty and responsibilities is satisfactory, 51.4% agreed or strongly agreed that the university's compensation is parallel to the size of duties and responsibilities of employees, while 31.8% showed abjection and strongly disagreed. Four question was about if employees receive their salary immediately at month end or on time, 97.10% of the employees greatly accepted or strongly agreed while 1.9% disagreed, yet, there were no strong abjection from employees. For the fifth question which is if the annual incentive that employees receive from university is fair and satisfactory, 47.10% of the responders believed and either agreed or strongly agreed while 23.10% rejected and either disagreed or strongly disagreed. For the six question, 62% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they generally feel satisfied with the financial services (salary, bonuses, allowances and incentives) provided to them by the university, while 14.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. This means that SIMAD University compensates its employees based on their duties and rewards them on time.

Table 5 Institutional Integrity

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	The university administration deals with complaints with integrity and institutionalism.	24.0	40.4	22.1	10.6	2.9	.791	2.28	1.035
2	I feel generally satisfied with the institutional integrity applied at the university	35.6	41.8	13.9	7.7	1.0		1.97	0.945
3	There is a clear job description provided by my line manager at the university.	33.2	39.9	17.8	6.7	2.4		2.05	.999
4	The university administration deals with all employees at the university with the same standards.	26.4	34.6	19.7	14.9	4.3		2.36	1.150

4.5. Institutional Integrity

Table 5: Four questions were utilized to reveal the institutional integrity. 64.40% agreed or strongly agreed that the university administration handles concerns with integrity and institutionalism, whereas 13.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. 77.4% agreed or strongly agreed that university personnel are typically satisfied with the institutional integrity implemented at the university, whereas 8.70% opposed or strongly disagreed. In response to the third question, 73.10% agreed or strongly agreed that any line manager at the institution provides a clear job description, whereas 9.10% disagreed or strongly disagreed. When asked if the university administration treats all employees, regardless of status, with the same standards, 61% agreed or strongly agreed, while 19.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed. In general, the results demonstrate that the majority of employees are satisfied with the university's integrity.

Table 6 Appointment and Promotion

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	The university follows clear policies and mechanisms for appointment and promotion, which are announced to all.	18.3	30.8	32.7	12.5	5.8	.818	2.57	1.101
2	Promotions at the university take place following the applicable regulations, with fairness and transparency.	15.9	31.7	34.6	13.5	4.3		2.59	1.046
3	I was hired at the university after completing tests, interviews, and legal paperwork.	52.9	29.8	10.1	7.2	0		1.72	.018
4	I am generally satisfied with the recruitment and promotion policies of the university.	33.2	37.5	16.3	12.0	1.0		2.10	1.028

4.6. Appointment and Promotion

Table 6 unveils university appointment and promotion and four questions were used to study in this segment of HRM activity. 49.10% agreed or strongly agreed that university follows clear policies and mechanisms for appointment and promotion which are announced to all employees, there's still rejection which 18.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Employees were also asked if they believe that promotions at the university take place following the applicable regulations with fairness and transparency, 47.6% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed whereas 14.8% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed. Employees were asked if they're hired at the university after completing tests, interviews, and legal paperwork, 82.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed while 7.2% believed not and either disagreed or strongly disagreed. They're also asked if employees are generally satisfied with the recruitment and promotion policies of the university, 70.70% of them agreed or strongly agreed while 13% showed the opposite, disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. This shows that there are policies and guidelines for hiring and promoting at the university which the majority of employees are satisfied with.

Table 7 Job Security

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	The level of job security at the university is satisfactory.	47.1	37	10.1	4.3	1.4	.892	1.76	.906
2	I feel generally satisfied with job security at the university.	48	37	8.7	4.3	1.0		1.71	.870

4.7. Job Security

Table 7 discloses job security at the university and two questions were presented to the participants. For the first question 84.10% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the level of job security at the university is satisfactory while 5.7% opposed and disagreed or strongly disagreed. They were also asked if they feel generally satisfied with job security at the university 85% of the employees believed so and either agreed or strongly agreed while 5.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This shows that the job security at the university is quite high and satisfied with the most employees.

Table 8 University Management (Administration) Satisfaction

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	I am very happy with those who have administrative positions at our university.	34.6	43.8	16.8	4.8	0	.852	1.92	.839
2	The administrators at our university understand our problems and needs.	21.2	35.1	27.9	13	2.9		2.41	1.051
3	Our university administrators generally consider our suggestions when taking decisions.	18.8	36.1	31.7	11.5	1.9		2.42	.984
4	Our university administrators have the experience, knowledge and ability to help the university reach its goals and objectives.	36.1	45.2	13.9	3.8	1.0		1.88	.855
5	We can easily reach the top administrators of the university when necessary.	37	37	19.7	2.9	3.4		1.99	.995

4.8. University Management (Administration) Satisfaction

Table 8 discloses the degree in which employees are satisfied with university management (administration), five questions were presented to the employees. For the first question 78.40% of the respondents accepted, agreeing or strongly agreeing that they're very happy with those who have administrative positions at the university, while 4.8% disagreed. For the second question, 56.3% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the administrators at the university understand employees' problems and needs, while 15.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Thirdly, employees were asked if the university administrators generally consider employees' suggestions when taking decisions, 59.4% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed while 13.4% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. They were also asked if the university administrators have the experience, knowledge and ability to help university reach its goals and objectives, 81.3% accepted and either agreed or strongly agreed while 4.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Employees were also asked if they easily reach top administrators of the university when necessary, 74% either agreed strongly agreed while 6.3% rejected and either disagreed or strongly disagreed. This highlights that employees are quite confident and satisfied with university's top administrators.

Table 9 Faculty/Department Management (Administration) Satisfaction

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	I am generally satisfied with the administrators working in our faculty.	41.8	46.6	7.2	3.8	0.5	.854	1.92	0.839
2	Our faculty administrators understand our problems and needs.	30.3	47.1	16.3	5.8	0.5		2.41	1.051
3	Our faculty administrators generally consider our suggestions when taking decisions.	31.3	37.5	21.2	8.7	1.4		2.42	0.984
4	Our faculty administrators have the experience, knowledge and ability to help the faculty reach its goals and objectives.	38.9	45.7	11.5	3.4	0.5		1.88	0.855
5	We can easily reach the top administrators of the faculty when necessary.	52.9	35.1	10.1	1.4	0.5		1.99	0.995
6	My direct manager at the university contributes to my performance development.	28.8	42.8	18.3	8.2	1.9		1.92	0.839

4.9. Faculty/Department Management (Administration) Satisfaction

Table 9 shows the degree in which employees are satisfied with faculty/departmental management (administration) and six questions were presented to them. For the first question which is whether employees are generally satisfied with administrators working in their faculty or department, 88.4% agreed or strongly agreed while 4.30% disagreed or strongly disagreed. They're asked if faculty/departmental administrators understand employees' problems and needs, 77.4% either agreed or strongly agreed whereas 6.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. For the third question, 68.8% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that each faculty/department's administration considers employees' suggestions when decision making, however, 10.1% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Employees were also asked if faculty/departmental administrators had experiences, knowledge and ability to help the faculty/department reach its goals and objectives, 84.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed while 3.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. 88% of the respondents believed and either agreed or strongly agreed that employees can easily reach the top faculty/departmental administrators when necessary, while 1.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Employees were also asked whether employees' direct managers at the university contribute to the employees' performance developments, 71.6% agreed or strongly agreed while 10.1% either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Table 10 Physical Environment (Organizational Conditions) Satisfaction

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	The computer facilities in our faculty are adequate for our needs.	15.4	30.8	26.9	20.2	6.7	.747	2.72	1.150
2	The laboratory facilities in our faculty are adequate for our needs.	9.6	19.7	48.6	15.9	6.3		2.89	0.992
3	The librarians have the knowledge and skills required to do their work.	13.9	44.7	34.6	5.3	1.4		2.36	0.839
4	Our work area in the faculties is adequate in size, comfort and provides the necessary work environment.	22.6	38.9	21.2	15.4	1.9		2.35	1.053
5	Our faculty is always clean.	35.1	47.6	10.6	4.3	2.4		1.91	0.918

4.10. Physical Environment (Organizational Conditions) Satisfaction

Table 10 shows employees' satisfaction towards organization's environmental conditions. Five questions were presented to the employees, 36.2% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the equipment facilities in their faculty/department are adequate for employees' needs, while 26.9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. For the second question, 29.3% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the laboratory facilities in their faculty/department are adequate for their needs, while 22.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed. 58.6% of employees also believed or strongly agreed that the librarians have the knowledge and skills required to do their work while 6.7% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. For the fourth question, 61.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that employees' work area in the faculties/departments is adequate in size, comfort and provides the necessary work environment, while 17.3% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. 82.7% of employees accepted or strongly agreed that the faculties/departments are always clean.

Table 11 Good Governance

1 = Strongly agree (%), 5 = Strongly disagree (%)									
No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Cronbach's alpha (a)	Mean	Std. dev
1	The university encourages participation from all employees.	31.7	46.2	13.0	6.7	2.4	.911	2.02	0.968
2	The university administration practices transparency in	27.4	37.0	22.6	11.5	1.4		2.23	1.022

	its decision-making processes.								
3	The university administration is effective and efficient in carrying out its operations.	34.6	47.1	10.6	6.3	1.4		1.93	0.911
4	The university administration has a clear strategic vision for the future.	40.9	43.8	10.6	3.8	1.0		1.80	0.848
5	The university administration treats all employees equitably.	28.8	36.5	20.7	10.6	3.4		2.23	1.083
6	The university administration adheres to the role of law in its decision-making processes.	30.8	37.5	22.1	9.1	0.5		2.11	0.964

4.11. Good Governance

Table 11 reveals university's good governance, asking employees six questions to measure. Regarding the first question asked, 77.9% of the staff members agreed or strongly agreed that the institution encourages employee participation, whilst 9.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed. While 12.9% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the university administration uses transparency in its decision-making, 64.4% of respondents agreed. For the third question, 81.7% of the employees agreed or strongly agreed that the university administration is effective and efficient in carrying out its operations, while 7.7 either disagreed or strongly disagreed. For the fourth question, 84.7% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that the university administration has a clear strategic vision for the future, while 4.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Employees were asked if the university administration treats all employees equitably, 65.3% agreed or strongly agreed while 14% showed disagreement or strongly disagreed. 68.3% of the respondents also believed or strongly agreed that the university administration adheres to the role of law in its decision-making processes, 9.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

When it comes to job satisfaction, the study found out that the majority of the sample as a whole fall into the higher category, which is followed by high and moderate.

The findings of the current study revealed that there are higher levels of general satisfaction at SIMAD University staff because the majority of respondents indicate a higher level of satisfaction. Second, the study discovers the level of relationship of employees with managers and supervisors at SIMAD University and the results indicate that the employees are highly satisfied with their managers and supervisors. Thus, this shows that there are strong and positive relationship between the employees and their supervisors as four questions indicated their higher level of satisfaction. Third, the results indicated a higher level of satisfaction in terms of employees' perception of salaries and benefits at SIMAD university and the six questions showed that the staff of academic and nonacademic are very satisfied with the salary and other benefits they gain from the university. Fourth, in terms of institutional integrity, although the majority of the respondents are satisfied, a handful number of the respondents indicated that the university administration does not deal with all employees at the university with the same standards. Therefore, the administration needs to adopt and deals with the complaint from the staff same standards in order to increase institutional integrity. Fifth, regarding appointment and promotion the majority of the staff feel that the university does not follow clear policies and mechanisms with fairness and transparency for the appointment and promotion of their staff. Therefore, it is recommended that the management should follow clear policies and procedures in terms of staff promotion and appointment in order to enhance their satisfaction. Sixth, regards university management (administration) satisfaction the results show that the employee is satisfied with the management of the university and they feel the administration of the university understand the problems and needs of the staff. Seventh, in terms faculty management the employees indicated that they are satisfied with the administrators working of the faculty and the administrators understand the problems and needs of the

employees. Eight, towards university's environmental conditions the staff shown that they are not satisfied with the computer facilities in the faculties and laboratory facilities, and even librarians' knowledge and skills, although, the results indicated that faculties are adequate in size, comfort and provides the necessary work environment and the employees are satisfied with faculty cleanness. On the other hand, several limitations of the study should be noted, including the fact that it relied on self-reported data, which may have created bias in the results. Despite focusing on SIMAD University, it is likely that the findings of this study cannot be applied to other universities. Additionally, quantitative approaches might overlook qualitative nuances, and cross-sectional designs limit analysis of changes over time.

Thus, this study is recommended that the university management should look back at the university faculties including computer facilities, laboratory, and librarians' skills and knowledge. As a result of the study's findings, SIMAD University should emphasize maintaining high employee satisfaction through regular monitoring, strengthening employee-supervisor relationships, addressing concerns about institutional integrity, improving appointment and promotion transparency, improving university facilities, and fostering good governance practices. These efforts will contribute to a positive work environment and academic excellence. Finally, the result of the study shows that they are very satisfied with the university's governance as majority of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the positive statements that related the good governance of the university.

Reference

- Ahmad, M. A.-A., & Jameel, A. S. (2018). Factors affecting on job satisfaction among academic staff. *Polytechnic Journal*, 8(2).
- Afaq, A., Khan, Q., Arshad, A., Sibte-Ali, M., & Malik, A. A. (2022). The Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff in Higher Educational Institutes. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 10(1), 95-101.
- Akosile, A. L., & Ekemen, M. A. (2022). The impact of core self-evaluations on job satisfaction and turnover intention among higher education academic staff: Mediating roles of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(7), 236.
- Alamrew, Y., Belay, H., & Shishigu, A. D. (2016). The Effect of Governance on Employees' Job Satisfaction, Intention to Leave and Task Performance (A Case of University of Gondar). *Res. J. Commer. Behav. Sci*, 6, 1-6.
- ALIFUDDIN, M., & WIDODO, W. (2021). How Social Intelligence, Integrity, and Self-efficacy Affect Job Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(7), 625-633.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Ara, F., & Khan, M. M. R. (2006). Good governance: Bangladesh perspective. *The Social Sciences*, 1(2), 91-97.
- Arifin, M. A. M., & Ahmad, A. H. (2016). Konsep integriti dalam organisasi Polis Diraja Malaysia (PDRM): Satu tinjauan awal. *Geografia*, 12(8).
- Bassam Mahmoud, A., & D. Reisel, W. (2014). Relating patient satisfaction to nurses' job satisfaction, job security, and obedience OCBs. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Healthcare Marketing*, 8(1), 47-61.
- Bassett, G. (1994). The case against job satisfaction. *Business Horizons*, 37(3), 61-69.

- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.
- Brainard, J. (2005). Postdoctoral researchers value structured training over pay, survey says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(32).
- Brett, J. F., Cron, W. L., & Slocum Jr, J. W. (1995). Economic dependency on work: A moderator of the relationship between organizational commitment and performance. *Academy of management Journal*, 38(1), 261-271.
- Buitendach, J. H., & De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and affective organisational commitment of maintenance workers in a parastatal. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 36(2), 27-37.
- Chacko, T. I. (1983). Job and life satisfactions: A causal analysis of their relationships. *Academy of management Journal*, 26(1), 163-169.
- Chong, K. Y., & Mui, H. K. (2021). The importance of integrity practices on task performance Royal Malaysia Police: the mediating role of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 3(2), 79-93.
- De Cuyper, N., Notelaers, G., & De Witte, H. (2009). Job insecurity and employability in fixed-term contractors, agency workers, and permanent workers: associations with job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 14(2), 193.
- Ellickson, M. C., & Logsdon, K. (2002). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *Public personnel management*, 31(3), 343-358.
- Grace, D., & Khalsa, S. (2003). Re-recruiting faculty and staff: The antidote to today's high attrition. *Independent school*, 62(3), 20-27.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of applied psychology*, 60(2), 159.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(2), 268.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). *One more time: How do you motivate employees* (Vol. 65): Harvard Business Review Boston, MA.
- Herzberg, F. (2008). *One more time: How do you motivate employees?* : Harvard Business Review Press.
- Hijazi, H. A. (2020). The impact of applying good governance principles on job satisfaction among public sector employees in Jordan. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 9(01), 1.
- Hitt, M. A., Miller, C. C., Colella, A., & Triana, M. (2017). *Organizational behavior*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Horoub, I., & Zargar, P. (2022). Empowering leadership and job satisfaction of academic staff in Palestinian universities: Implications of leader-member exchange and trust in leader. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 8060.
- Jameel, A. S., & Ahmad, A. R. (2019). The effect of transformational leadership on job satisfaction among academic staff. Paper presented at the The 34th International Business Information Management Association (IBIMA) Conference.

- Jenkins, J. M. (1993). Self - monitoring and turnover: The impact of personality on intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(1), 83-91.
- Judge, T. A. (1993). Does affective disposition moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and voluntary turnover? *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(3), 395.
- Karim, S., & Nadeem, S. (2019). Understanding the unique impact of dimensions of ethical leadership on employee attitudes. *Ethics & Behavior*, 29(7), 572-594.
- Kendirikiran, G., & Batur, B. (2022). The Relationship Between Eating Behavior and Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 15(2), 825-836.
- Khalid, S., Irshad, M. Z., & Mahmood, B. (2012). Job satisfaction among academic staff: A comparative analysis between public and private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 126.
- Khan, A. J., Bhatti, M. A., Hussain, A., Ahmad, R., & Iqbal, J. (2021). Employee job satisfaction in higher educational institutes: A review of theories. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 9(3), 257-266.
- Küskü, F. (2001). Dimensions of employee satisfaction: A state university example.
- Lakshika, L., & Priyanath, H. (2018). Effect of relational governance on job satisfaction: empirical evidence of supportive staff of the Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 2(1), 163-169.
- Mehrad, A. (2020). Evaluation of academic staff job satisfaction at Malaysian universities in the context of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. *Journal of Social Science Research*, 15(1), 157-166.
- Mwesigwa, R., Tusiime, I., & Ssekiziyivu, B. (2020). Leadership styles, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among academic staff in public universities. *Journal of Management development*, 39(2), 253-268.
- Nmai, B. N., & Delle, E. (2014). Good corporate governance and employee job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from the Ghanaian Telecommunication sector. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(13), 209-217.
- Noordin, F., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff. *Asian social science*, 5(5), 122-128.
- O'Leary, P., Wharton, N., & Quinlan, T. (2009). Job satisfaction of physicians in Russia. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 22(3), 221-231.
- Omar, M. S., Idrus, I. M., & Jamal, N. A. (2021). The influence of job motivation on job satisfaction: A case study of polytechnic academic staff. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(1), 206-213.
- Ong, C. H., Shi, C. H., Kowang, T. O., Fei, G. C., & Ping, L. L. (2020). Factors influencing job satisfaction among academic staff. *Int. J. Eval. Res. Educ*, 9(285), 10.11591.
- Opatha, H. (2019). *Sustainable human resource management*. Sri Lanka: Author.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Correlates of pay satisfaction in higher education. *International Journal of educational management*, 14(1), 31-39.
- Pearson, D. A., & Seiler, R. E. (1983). Environmental satisfiers in academe. *Higher Education*, 12(1), 35-47.

- Peterson, D. K., Puia, G. M., & Suess, F. R. (2003). "Yo Tengo La Camiseta (I Have the Shirt On)": an exploration of job satisfaction and commitment among workers in Mexico. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(2), 73-88.
- Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S.-L., Maloles, C. M., & König, C. J. (2010). The effects of job insecurity on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and negative emotions of employees. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 40(1), 74-91.
- Sandika, A., Rupasena, L., & Abeywickrama, L. (2016). EFFECT OF GOOD GOVERNANCE PERCEPTION TOWARDS JOB SATISFACTION: A CASE STUDY OF THE AGRICULTURE PROFESSIONALS ATTACHED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURESRI LANKA.
- Scarpello, V., & Vandenberg, R. J. (1992). Generalizing the importance of occupational and career views to job satisfaction attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 125-140.
- Shahin, M. (2016). The Effect of Good Governance Mixture in Governmental Organizations on Promotion of Employees 'Job Satisfaction (Case Study: Employees and Faculty Members of Lorestan University). *Asian social science*, 12(5), 108-117.
- Smagina, O. (2020). Gender and job satisfaction in higher education institution: Case study from Uzbekistan. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, 7(2), 219-229.
- Szromek, A. R., & Wolniak, R. (2020). Job satisfaction and problems among academic staff in higher education. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 4865.
- Tahir, N. A. (1998). Problems of Good Governance In South Asian Countries: Learning From European Political Models: Hanns Seidel Foundation.
- Tang, T. L.-P., & Talpade, M. (1999). Sex differences in satisfaction with pay and co-workers: Faculty and staff at a public institution of higher education. *Public personnel management*, 28(3), 345-349.
- Ting, Y. (1997). Determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees. *Public personnel management*, 26(3), 313-334.
- Wall, T. D., & Payne, R. (1973). Are deficiency scores deficient? *Journal of applied psychology*, 58(3), 322.
- Wilczyńska, A., Batorski, D., & Sellens, J. T. (2016). Employment flexibility and job security as determinants of job satisfaction: the case of Polish knowledge workers. *Social Indicators Research*, 126, 633-656.
- Witt, L. A., & Nye, L. G. (1992). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness of pay or promotion and job satisfaction. *Journal of applied psychology*, 77(6), 910.
- Young, B. S., Worchel, S., & Woehr, D. J. (1998). Organizational commitment among public service employees. *Public personnel management*, 27(3), 339-348.
- Chen, X. H., Zhao, K., Liu, X., & Wu, D. D. (2012). Improving employees' job satisfaction and innovation performance using conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 23(2), 151-172. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10444061211218276>
- Khan, A. J., Bashir, F., Nasim, I., & Ahmad, R. (2021). Understanding Affective, Normative & Continuance Commitment through the Lens of Training & Development. *IRASD Journal of Management*, 3(2), 105-113. <https://doi.org/10.52131/jom.2021.0302.0030>
- Mehrad, A. (2020). Evaluation of Academic Staff Job Satisfaction at Malaysian Universities in the Context of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. *Journal of Social Science Research*, 15(April), 157-166. <https://doi.org/10.24297/jssr.v15i.8725>

Tong, C., Tak, W. I. W., & Wong, A. (2013). The Impact of Knowledge Sharing on the Relationship between Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction: the Perception of Information Communication and Technology (ICT) Practitioners in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 3(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v3i1.3112>

Williams, L. J., & Hazer, J. T. (1986). Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction and Commitment in Turnover Models. A Reanalysis Using Latent Variable Structural Equation Methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 219–231. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.2.219>