

Level of Job Satisfaction among the Staff of Gezira University in Sudan

by

Amel Farage Rmadan

Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education, Al-Gezira University, Sudan
Email: amareabebe97@gmail.com

Tilaye Kassahun (PhD)

Associate Professor, St. Mary's University, Ethiopia
Email: tilayek@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of job satisfaction among the staff at Gezira University and to find if there is a significant difference between the teaching staff and the managerial staff perceptions about job satisfaction at the Gezira University. Also, to analyze gender differences in the level of job satisfaction among the staff of the Gezira University. Among the staff members of the university under consideration, 332 participants were taken through stratified random sampling techniques. The study employed a descriptive research approach by using a questionnaire developed from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and Lester's (1987) Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). The results indicate that the staffs of the Gezira University are satisfied with the promotion and supervision and the coworkers' system. The staffs of the Gezira University demonstrate a low level in work itself, pay, and work condition dimensions of job satisfaction. The result also revealed that there is a difference between the teaching staff and managerial staff in the level of job satisfaction in the Gezira University in favor of managerial staff. The study found no statistically significant difference between the male and female groups in the level of job satisfaction at the Gezira University. The study recommended that the Gezira University needs to provide opportunities for the staff to develop themselves; the Gezira University should also look for sources to increase the income for its staff members.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Gezira University, Teaching Staff, Managerial Staff.

Introduction:

Job satisfaction is a phenomenon that is the point of consideration for decades. Job satisfaction is an important research topic that captured the attention of many scholars in organization and management disciplines (Luthans, 2005). Job satisfaction is one factor that contributes to the success of an organization, particularly in managing human resources. Munir, Rahman, Malik, and Ma'amor (2012) found that some workers are content with some elements of their work while unsatisfied with others. In this regard, Nadi (1997) defined job satisfaction as composed of the reaction, attitude, or perception of an individual to work. So, the teacher's job satisfaction is related to the affective attitude of teachers towards their role, while the function of

teacher's satisfaction is perceived as the relationship between what he/she wants from teaching and what is offered to him/her (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2004). According to Amburgey (2005), job satisfaction is a critical component of organizational success.

Employees that are satisfied with their jobs put forth greater effort to complete their tasks and advance the organization's goals. An organization with employees who have high job satisfaction can retain and attract employees with the skills that it needs. Bavendum (2000) argues that increasing job satisfaction is important for its humanitarian values and its financial benefits due to its effect on employee behavior. He notes that employees with higher job satisfaction believe that the organization will be satisfying in the long run, care about the quality of their work, are more committed to the organization, and have higher retention rates, and are more productive. According to Woods and Weasmer (2002), when teachers are satisfied, attrition decreases, collegiality improves, and work performance improves.

Moreover, positive and favorable attitudes towards the job are strong predictors of job satisfaction; while negative and unfavorable attitudes towards the job are strong predictors of job dissatisfaction (Akhtar et al., 2010). In this regard, Sisungu (2002) found that teachers with high job satisfaction exhibited characteristics such as the following:

- i. low turnover,
- ii. always present in school,
- iii. highly efficient and effective, and
- iv. friendly to the administration.

On the other hand, teachers with low job satisfaction:

- i. had apathy,
- ii. worked towards promotions to other positions with better prospects or quit their jobs resulting in high teacher education costs,
- iii. were hostile to the administration,
- iv. had reduced academic performance,
- v. valued material rewards,
- vi. made frequent transfer requests, and
- vii. were regular absentees.

Many scholars agree that satisfied university employees contribute to organizational effectiveness and that employee motivation can lead to improved student achievement and the creation of a strong organizational culture, a better image of the institution, and even higher numbers of talented students and faculty members (Siddique et al., 2011; Webb, 2009). In Haridwar, Uttarakhand, India, Kumar (2013) found the elements that influence teacher satisfaction. According to research, female university instructors are more content with their jobs than male university instructors, and annual pay is a significant determinant in work happiness. Nirmala and Mpho (2015) investigated job and career satisfaction amongst university employees. The findings indicate that employees are not satisfied with the training they received.

Similarly, Fessehatsion and Bahta (2016) carried out a study to examine the factors affecting faculty job satisfaction in institutions of higher education in Eritrea. According to the findings, research, coworker relations, and training and development all have a strong positive and significant impact on faculty job satisfaction in Eritrea's higher education institutions. In his research, Duong (2016) looked at the impacts of demographic, internal, and external factors on

teacher job satisfaction in Vietnamese higher education. The findings revealed that the majority of respondents were content with their careers, and that satisfaction among academics varied by age and discipline. The study also found that job satisfaction was significantly influenced by demographic and internal and external university environment factors.

In their study, Shafi and Fatima (2016) sought to analyze the employment satisfaction of 150 randomly selected teachers¹ from Government Colleges. The study showed that teachers are not satisfied with their job because of a factor of promotion. On payment issues, teachers are very dissatisfied. Understanding the elements that affect academic success, according to Mateko and Nirmala (2017), is critical for higher education institutions to achieve satisfactory levels of performance. The findings of the study highlighted salaries as a factor influencing job satisfaction.

Jawabri (2017) aimed to examine the job satisfaction of academic staff in higher education as well as private universities in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). According to the findings, academic employees at private universities in the United Arab Emirates are extremely satisfied with their professions. It was also discovered that only a few elements, like supervisor support, advancement, and coworker support, have a favorable impact on job satisfaction. Araújo, Miranda, and Pereira (2017) conducted a study to identify the prevalence of satisfaction among accounting professors in Brazil throughout their careers. The study found that levels of satisfaction are higher among individuals with more experience, in that in their first years in the job,² professors have lower levels of satisfaction; the last stage has the highest levels of satisfaction.³

Hence, this study sought to examine the level of job satisfaction among the staff at Gezira University and to see whether the satisfaction differs in terms of gender and academic rank of the staff of the Gezira University.

The rationale of the Study:

To investigate the problem of the research it was important to identify and shed light on job satisfaction in the context of the study. The researchers reviewed some studies, in a study conducted by Yousif (2004) to examine the impact of job satisfaction on staff's performance in higher education. He found that job satisfaction statically influences the performance of the staff at Sudan University of Science and Technology. Another study by Syed, Bhatti, Michael, Shaikh, and Shah (2012) identified that college satisfaction is the most significant aspect in higher education and is important for the improvement, efficacy, and effectiveness of the higher education system.

Moreover, Ali (2012) conducted a study on identifying the level of job satisfaction for the members of staff of public universities in Sudan. The study concluded that the administrative practices in the public universities that have a direct relation with job satisfaction need to review and reveal reasons for the dissatisfaction of staff in these academic institutions. To reflect financial factors related to wages and incentives do not provide job satisfaction compared with the wage and salary. The psychological factors that stimulate the staff members to work at these institutions are not adequate. The training of the staff members has not been considered enough in the public universities and so led to job instability. Accordingly, based on the observation, the

¹ Male and female

² one to three years

³ over 35 years

researchers noted that the staff of the Gezira University have been expressed their dissatisfaction with various issues related to job satisfaction like low payment, bad work environment, absence of incentives, etc. Therefore, the researchers have got provoked to conduct the current study by seeking to answer the following research questions:

- i. What is the level of job satisfaction among the staff at Gezira University?
- ii. Is there a significant difference between the teaching staff and the managerial staff perceptions about job satisfaction at the Gezira University?
- iii. Is there a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction among the staff of the Gezira University due to gender and academic rank?

Theoretical Framework:

This study in its theoretical framework is based on Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction.⁴ Herzberg's two-factor theory attempts to explain satisfaction and motivation in the workplace. This theory states that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are driven by different factors—motivation and hygiene factors, respectively (Herzberg et al., 1959). Motivating elements are features of a profession that motivate employees to perform and give them satisfaction, such as work accomplishments, acknowledgment, and advancement chances. These motivating factors are considered to be intrinsic to the job, or the work carried out while the Hygiene factors include aspects of a working environment such as pay, company policies, supervisory practices, and other working conditions (Kumar, 2016). According to Dion (2006), Herzberg's theory is one of the most significant content theories in job satisfaction. Locke (1976) deeply analyzed Herzberg's theory, stated that Herzberg made a major contribution to job satisfaction theory, and given the understanding of the nature of job satisfaction. Locke (1976) mentioned that most dimensions of job satisfaction are: the work itself, the pay, promotion, the work condition, supervision, and coworkers.

- i. **The work itself:** Employee job happiness is influenced by the kind of work they do (Landy, 1989). Landy (1998) advocates the work that is personally interesting to employees is likely to contribute to job satisfaction. Similarly, research suggests that task variety may facilitate job satisfaction (Any, Freeman, Rush & Lance, 1999). For example, a job that demands a variety of skills to be applied might lead to job satisfaction (Ting, 1997).

Bowen and Radhakrishna (1991) found that the academics were most satisfied by the work itself and least satisfied with their opportunities for advancement. Academics were most content with interpersonal relationships inherent in being a faculty member and least satisfied with the level and procedure utilized to calculate their salary when it came to hygienic factors. Faculty members were generally content with their jobs, according to Mehboob and Bhutto (2012), but female faculty members were more content with their work than male faculty members. According to their research, the most satisfying component of the job is “work itself,” while the least satisfying aspects are “policy” and “working conditions.”

⁴ Motivation

- ii. **Pay:** Pay refers to the amount of financial compensation a person receives as well as to the extent to which such compensation is perceived to be equitable (Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969). Pay (salary) Organizations, they say, ‘paying organizations get what they pay for’. The agreement between the employer and the employee on salary is called a salary contract. It is not a motivator for them but do want to be paid fairly and when due. If an employee believes he is not being appropriately compensated, he will be dissatisfied and slow down his performance. To avoid dissatisfaction, comparable pay, and perks, as well as clear policies relating to salaries, increments, bonuses, and benefits, must be explicitly stated (Dugguh, & Dennis, 2014).

According to Lutans (1998), salaries not only assist people to attain their basic needs but are also instrumental in satisfying the higher-level needs of people. Similarly, Lambert, Hagan, Barton, and Lubbock (2001) found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Herzberf (1966) classified pay as a ‘hygiene factor’ in the work environment and maintained that pay can only lead to feelings of dissatisfaction, but not to satisfaction.

In a study conducted by Oshagbemi (2000a) that determined the correlates of pay satisfaction ill higher education, the following findings were made: Within the university work environment, out of eight aspects of job satisfaction, employees were most dissatisfied with their pay and promotions. These two factors are related, as promotions lead to increased pay. He also found that less than 30 percent of university teachers in UK universities are satisfied with their pay and over 50 percent indicated that they are dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, or extremely dissatisfied.

In the same study, Klein and Maher (1966) found that higher education is generally associated with a relative dissatisfaction with pay. Similar findings were made by Comm and Mathaisel (2003) in the United States, who found that 51 percent of the faculty does not believe they are fairly compensated. In their study of job satisfaction among university faculty, Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) discovered that professors are more content with their careers when they believe they are paid what they are worth and that their colleagues value their research work.

- iii. **Promotion:** An employee’s opportunities for promotion are also likely to exert an influence on job satisfaction (Landy, 1989; Logwood, 1984). Robbins (1998) matins that promotion provides opportunities for personal growth, increased responsibility, and increased social status. Similarly, Srafk & Kossn (2002) postulate that many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their prospects are good. This may translate into opportunities for advancement and growth in their current workplace or enhance the chance of finding alternative employment.

The fairness of promotional opportunities has a positive effect on job satisfaction. The aspiration of an employee to show better performance in his job increases if the organization provides better scope for promotions. The public sector employees are satisfied in this aspect as they hope to get promotions every two to three years in their entire service, the promotion of a private sector employee depends upon his performance in the jobs (Mann, and Pelz, 2001).

In their study of the impact of compensation and promotion on job satisfaction in Pakistan's Higher Education Institutes, Muhammad Ehsan et al. (2012) discovered that money has a considerable impact on job satisfaction, but the promotion has a lesser impact and is only partially significant.

- iv. **Work condition:** Working condition is another factor that has a moderate impact in the employee job satisfaction (Luthans, 1992). People will find it simpler to work if they work in a clean, friendly workplace, according to Luthans (1998). Luthans (1992) added working condition is another factor that has a moderate impact on the employees' job satisfaction.

The environment under which employees work has a tremendous effect on their level of pride in themselves and for the work they do. Modern equipment and facilities, high-quality furniture, well-ventilated offices, well-spaced offices, secure, well-spaced staff quarters, and so on are some of the requirements that must be met to avoid job discontent at the workplace (Dugguh, & Dennis, 2014).

Teacher workload changes in the education system and lack of discipline amongst some of the learners maybe some of the reasons why teachers want to exit the profession. The working environment of teachers also is the basic determinant of the attitude and behavior of the teachers towards their work (Bisha, 1996).

- v. **Work relation:** In the organization, this entails both technical and general supervision. When it comes to hiring someone to supervise, wise considerations should be made. This is a challenging position that necessitates strong leadership abilities as well as the ability to treat all personnel equitably. Positive feedback should also be provided, as well as a system for reviewing or rating staff (Dugguh, & Dennis, 2014).

Researches indicated that the quality of the supervision and subordinates' relationship will have a significant positive impact on the employees' overall level of job satisfaction (Aumodt, 1999; Robbins, 1998). Some studies have shown that the better the relationships the greater the level of job satisfaction (Wherfo & Boron, 1991). Similarly, another research indicates that individuals are likely to have high levels of job satisfaction if a supervisor provides them with support and cooperation in completing their task (Ting, 1997).

According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), there is a positive relationship between the quality of supervision and job satisfaction. If the superior acts congenially with his subordinates, the subordinates feel motivated to work and a better environment is established. However, if a superior is not supportive, the morale of the employees automatically goes down.

Research design:

The study used descriptive research. Descriptive research studies are those studies that identify a particular individual or group's characteristics (Kothari 2004). Because the researchers want to identify characteristics, frequencies, and categories of the variable of interest in the Gezira University, they applied the descriptive research method. In line with this, the quantitative data was collected through a standardized questionnaire and analyzed based on what the quantitative data required.

Sampling design:

In this study, the teachers of Gezira University were selected to conduct the research. The estimated size of the sample from the target population of 1226 teachers, at 95% confidence level with 5% level of precision is found to be 332 teachers. The researcher applied Yamane's (1967) formula to determine the sample size " $n = N/(1+N(e^2))$ ", where: n = sample size, N = Population size (i.e., 1226), and e = level of precision (i.e., 0.05). Accordingly, $n = 1226/(1+1226(0.0025)) = 302$. After adding 10% from the sample to offset the possible non-response rate, the total estimated sample size became 332 respondents (Israel, 1992). The teachers were selected through the stratified random sampling technique because it allows the researcher to select the participants from each category that leads to creating a sample representative of a given population and comparing the responses of participants from different categories of the population.

Data gathering tool and standardization procedure:

The questionnaire for this study was developed from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and Lester (1987) Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ); for measuring the satisfaction of individuals having twenty items divided into five dimensions (the work itself, the pay, promotion, the work condition, supervision and coworkers) with five points scale (5= Very Satisfied, 4= Satisfied, 3= Natural, 2= Dissatisfied, 1= Very dissatisfied).

The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, and the result of the reliability for the overall job satisfaction was found to be (0.879). This is greater than 0.8, which was acceptable to use the questionnaire for data gathering tools, according to Katou (2008), the questionnaire will consider reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is greater than 0.70.

Methods of data analysis:

The data was coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Scientists SPSS software program. The analysis was begun with descriptive statistics⁵ to describe the basic data features of a survey and to analyze respondent demographics. To check research questions, the researchers applied some inferential statistics such as; one-sample t-test, Independent sample t-test, Mann-Whitney U test, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Results and Discussion:

Demographic characteristics of respondents:

The demographic information of the respondents has been presented and analyzed using descriptive statistical. This has been displayed in Table 1 below:

⁵ frequencies, percentages

Table 1 Background Information of the Respondents

Variables		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	206	62
	Female	126	38
	Total	332	100.0
Age group	21 – 30	58	17.5
	31 – 40	147	44.3
	41 – 50	76	22.9
	More than 50	51	15.4
	Total	332	100.0
Academic rank	Professor	12	3.6
	Associate professor	98	29.5
	Assistant professor	69	20.8
	Lecturer	116	34.9
	Teaching Assistants	37	11.1
	Total	332	100.0
Occupational status	Teaching staff	209	63.0
	Managerial	123	37.0
	Total	332	100
Experience	1 – 5	101	30.4
	6 – 10	80	24.1
	Over 10	151	45.5
	Total	332	100.0

As depicted in Table 1, the distribution of participants according to sex shows that the majority of the respondents (62%) were males, while females represented 38%. According to age, the majority of the study sample (147) represented (44.3%) ranged between “31-40”, while 76 (22.9%) teachers have ages ranging from 41 to 50, and (58) teachers, represented (17.5%) between 21-30, then (51) teachers, represented (15.4%) their age above 50. According to academic rank, the majority of the staff was lecturers (34.9%), associate professors (29.5%), and then assistant professors (20.8%). The fewer respondents were teaching assistants (11.1%), and full professors (3.6%). Most of the teachers (45.5%) their years of experience were above 10 years, (30.4%) their experience range (1-5) years, and (24.1%) of teachers their experience between 6-10 years. Hence, the study sample is characterized by a good level of demographic information.

The level of job satisfaction experienced by the staff at Gezira University:

Mean score and one sample t-test analysis were conducted to determine the level of job satisfaction at Gezira University.

Table 2 One sample t-test of the level of job satisfaction among the staff in the Gezira University⁶

Factors	N	Test value	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Work itself	332	12	11.9418	2.67830	-.396-	.692
Pay	332	12	8.6225	3.53653	-17.401-	.000
Promotion	332	12	14.4580	2.99075	14.975	.000
Work Condition	332	12	11.9075	3.02930	-.557-	.578
Supervision and Coworkers	332	12	15.7682	3.00761	22.828	.000
Overall staff job satisfaction	332	60	62.6980	10.45617	4.702	.000

As depicted in Table 2, the mean scores of the respondents in promotion, and supervision, and coworkers were (14.4580, 15.7682). This indicates that these values are significantly higher than the expected mean of 12. The meaning is that the staff of the Gezira University was demonstrating a high level of job satisfaction in these two dimensions. This indicates to the staff of the Gezira University are satisfied with promotion, supervision, and coworkers' support. This result is congruent with Mateko and Nirmala (2017) revealed a high level of job satisfaction in factors; promotion, and supervision, and coworkers. Fessehatsion and Bahta (2016) revealed that co-workers' relations and training and development have strong positive and significant contributions to job satisfaction of the faculty in institutions of higher education in Eritrea. The result of current study differ from result of Shafi, Memon, and Fatima (2016) who found that teachers are not satisfied with their job because of factor considered for promotion and the working place had fully dissatisfied teachers.

Table 2 also shows that the mean scores of the respondents in work itself, pay, and working condition dimensions of job satisfaction were 11.9418, 8.6225, and 11.9075, respectively. This indicates that the values are significantly lower than the expected mean of 12. This indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in the respondents' responses regarding mentioned dimensions of staff job satisfaction, which can be described as low level. This result agreed with Mei Tai (2014) who explored the levels of job satisfaction among staff of public and private universities in Taiwan and how they differ in their satisfaction levels regarding salary, work environment, and others. Hanaysha (2016) found that work environment and organizational learning have significant positive effects on job satisfaction. Mateko and Nirmala (2017) highlighted salaries as a factor influencing job satisfaction. Further, insufficient financial resources to support teaching, learning, and research at the NUL impacted job satisfaction.

Furthermore, the mean score of the overall staff job satisfaction was (62.6980), this value is higher than the expected mean (60), and the meaning is that the staff of the Gezira University is satisfied as general. Supporting this result, Boyer et al. (1994) explored that in 14 countries among other factors; the professors had a high sense of satisfaction with their intellectual lives and the courses they taught as well as their relationships with colleagues. Duong (2016) showed that most respondents were satisfied with their jobs, and that faculty job satisfaction varied with age and discipline. The results of the current study differ from the result of Shafi, Memon, and Fatima (2016) who found that teachers are not satisfied with their job because of factor considered for promotion is full dissatisfaction of teachers and working place.

⁶ df= 331

Comparison of the level of job satisfaction between the teaching staff and the managerial staff

Independent sample t-test analysis was conducted to see the difference between the teaching staff and the managerial staffs' perceptions about job satisfaction at the Gezira University. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 Difference between Managerial and Teaching staff in Job Satisfaction

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	P .value
Teaching staff	209	61.2273	9.72394	-3.393-	330	.001
Managerial	123	65.197	11.19902			

As it is indicated in Table 3, there is a statistically significant between the teaching staff and managerial staff in the level of job satisfaction ($p < 0.05$). The meaning is that there is a difference between the teaching staff and managerial staff in the level of job satisfaction in the Gezira University in favor of managerial staff with a mean score of 65.197 higher than the mean score for teaching staff. This indicates that the managerial staffs are more satisfied than the teaching staff. This may be due to the additional incentives and bounces the managerial staff is receiving on their jobs.

The relationship between job satisfaction and gender and academic rank:

Gender difference in the level of job satisfaction:

Mann-Whitney U test was computed to examine whether there is a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction with reference to gender. To see differences between male and female participants in their overall job satisfaction and in five dis-aggregated satisfaction dimensions; the results were summarized and presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Mann-Whitney U Statistic for gender differences in the level of job satisfaction

Variable	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Sig. (2-tailed)
Work itself	Male	206	165.95	34185.00	12864.000	.892
	Female	126	167.40	21093.00		
Pay	Male	206	164.96	33982.50	12661.500	.706
	Female	126	169.01	21295.50		
Promotion	Male	206	159.85	32928.50	11607.500	.104
	Female	126	177.38	22349.50		
Work Condition	Male	206	161.46	33260.50	11939.500	.218
	Female	126	174.74	22017.50		
Supervision and Coworkers	Male	206	161.49	33266.50	11945.500	.220
	Female	126	174.69	22011.50		
Overall Job Satisfaction	Male	206	161.35	33238.00	11917.000	.211
	Female	126	174.92	22040.00		

As shown in Table 4, the results reveal that the values of Mann-Whitney between 11607.500 and 12864.000 are significant, where the sig. > 0.05 for all sub-dimensions, and

overall job satisfaction. This indicates no statistically significant difference between the male and female groups in the level of job satisfaction at the Gezira University. This can be explained by fact that the male and female workers in the same work conditions, and receive the same salaries. The result of the present study refutes that of Kumar (2013), which shows that female university teachers are more satisfied with their job rather than male teachers and income per annum is an important factor impacting the level of job satisfaction. Mehboob and Bhutto (2012) observed that faculty members were generally satisfied with their job; however, female faculty members were more satisfied with their jobs compared to male faculty members.

Differences in job satisfaction with reference to academic rank:

In order to assess whether the degree of job satisfaction is significantly different in terms of their academic rank, –way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed, and the result shown in Table 5.

Table 5: ANOVA analysis for differences among staff in terms of academic rank

Variable	Source	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work itself	Between Groups	92.271	4	23.068	3.305	.011
	Within Groups	2282.090	327	6.979		
	Total	2374.361	331			
Pay	Between Groups	151.005	4	37.751	3.095	.016
	Within Groups	3988.839	327	12.198		
	Total	4139.843	331			
Promotion	Between Groups	47.793	4	11.948	1.341	.254
	Within Groups	2912.874	327	8.908		
	Total	2960.667	331			
Work Condition	Between Groups	49.783	4	12.446	1.362	.247
	Within Groups	2987.688	327	9.137		
	Total	3037.470	331			
Supervision and Coworkers	Between Groups	26.189	4	6.547	.721	.578
	Within Groups	2967.941	327	9.076		
	Total	2994.130	331			
Overall Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	300.678	4	75.170	.685	.603
	Within Groups	35888.064	327	109.749		
	Total	36188.742	331			

Table 5 shows that the results of F between .685 and 3.305, and there is no difference in the level of job satisfaction in promotion, work condition, supervision and coworkers, and overall job satisfaction among staff according to their academic rank as (sig= .254, .247, .578, and .603) respectively which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no difference in the level of job satisfaction in these dimensions related to academic rank in the Gezira University. This might be due to the staff of the Gezira University are working in the same work circumstances and conditions, as they work under one academic leadership, and they had followed the same promotion system. Ehsan et al (2012) in their study of the impact of pay and promotion on Job Satisfaction in the Higher Education Institutes of Pakistan found that pay has a significant influence on job satisfaction but the promotion has less influence and partially significant to the job satisfaction. Luthans (1992) added working condition is another factor that has a moderate impact on the employees’ job satisfaction. According to Kouzes, & Posner

(2003), there is a positive relationship between the quality of supervision and job satisfaction. If the superior acts congenially with his subordinates, the subordinates feel motivated to work and a better environment is established.

Nevertheless, Table 5 shows a significant difference in work itself and pay dimensions of job satisfaction among staff according to their academic rank as (sig= .011, and .016) respectively which is less than 0.05 level of significance. Bowen and Radhakrishna (1991) found that the academics were most satisfied by the work itself and least satisfied with their opportunities for advancement. Mehboob and Bhutto (2012) observed that the work itself is the most satisfying aspect of job satisfaction. The post-doc test revealed that there is a significant difference in work itself between professors and teaching assistants in favor of professors. This can be explained for professors who have adapted to the work in the university more than teaching assistants because they are still new. Also, there is a significant difference in pay between associate professors and lecturers in favor of associate professors. This might be because associate professors receive salaries and incentives more than lecturers. Lambert Barton & Lubbock (2001) found financial rewards have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) in their study of job satisfaction among university faculty found that faculty are more satisfied with their jobs when they perceive that they are paid what they are worth and when they perceive that their colleagues respect their research work.

Conclusion and possible recommendations:

This was study aimed at assessing the level of job satisfaction among the staff at Gezira University, and to find out whether there is a significant difference between the teaching staff and the managerial staff's perceptions about job satisfaction at the Gezira University. It also intended to analyze gender and academic rank differences in the level of job satisfaction among the staff of the Gezira University. The study employed a descriptive research approach by using a questionnaire developed from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and Lester's (1987) Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ).

The results indicate that the staffs of the Gezira University are satisfied with promotion and supervision and coworkers' support system. The staff of the Gezira University demonstrated a low level in work itself, pay, and work condition dimensions of job satisfaction. Moreover, the results revealed that there is a difference between the teaching staff and managerial staff in the level of job satisfaction in the Gezira University in favor of managerial staff. The study found no statistically significant difference between the male and female groups in the level of job satisfaction at the Gezira University. Besides, there is no difference in the level of job satisfaction in promotion, work conditions, supervision and coworkers, and overall job satisfaction among staff according to their academic rank in the Gezira University. On the other hand, the study shows a significant difference in work itself and pays dimensions of job satisfaction among staff according to their academic rank in the Gezira University.

The study recommended that the Gezira University needs to provide opportunities for the staff to develop themselves, the Gezira University also should look for sources to increase the income for its staff members. The Gezira University must improve the work condition for the staff by providing work facilities and improving the work environment as a whole. To promote teacher satisfaction, university' leaders ought to create an open and collegial climate in their institutions in which teachers can freely express and share their opinions and collaborations on important decisions. Besides, leaders of Gezira University should make faculty members feel good about the university, and help faculty members find meaning in their work.

The main limitation of this study is that the data were gathered from the Gezira University only. Thus, the findings are specific to a particular case, a specific location, and the period; therefore, when the study was conducted in one institution, thus the findings of the study cannot be generalized for other Sudanese universities.

The implications of the study are that investigating the level of job satisfaction in this study might offer a strong base for future researchers to study the challenges that face satisfaction of staff members to provide a broader perspective for an effective way to understand the concept of job satisfaction in the university setting. Furthermore, the results that emerged from this study can help leaders, college officials, and administrators on how they could benefit from the different aspects of job satisfaction in designing effective human resource policies at the University. Besides, the results of this study may have its practical implication for policymakers in the drafting of laws on the work-life of staff members at the Gezira University.

References:

- Ali, T. A. (2012). Job Satisfaction between the Staff members of public Universities. *Journal of Science and technology*, 12 (2), 25-34.
- Araújo, T. S., Miranda, G. J., & Pereira, J. M. (2017). Satisfaction among accounting professors in Brazil. *Revistacontabilidade&finanças*, 28(74), 264-281.
- Bavendum, J. (2000). *Managing Job Satisfaction*, New York. New York Research Inc.
- Bowen, B. E. and Radhakrishna, R. B. (1991). Job satisfaction of Agricultural Education Faculty: a constant phenomenon. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 32 (2): 16 - 22.
- Bozeman, B. and Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *Journal of Higher Education*, 82 (2): 154-186.
- Comm, C. L. & Mathaisel, D. F. X. (2003). A case study of the implications of faculty workload and compensation for improving academic quality. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17 (5), 200-210.
- Dion, M. J. (2006). *The impact of workplace incivility and occupational stress on the job satisfaction and turnover intention of acute care nurses*. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Dorasamy, N., and Letooane, M. K. (2015). Job and career satisfaction in higher education institutions: a case study of university “A” in South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 13(4-1), 259-270.
- Dugguh, S. I., & Dennis, A. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR journal of business and management*, 16(5), 11-18.
- Duong, M. Q. (2016). The effects of demographic, internal and external university environment factors on faculty job satisfaction in Vietnam. *Journal of Educational Issues*, 2(2), 113-130.

- Ehsan, M., Rizwan Q. D. and Yasin, M. (2012). The Impact of Pay and Promotion on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Higher Education Institutes of Pakistan , *American Journal of Economics* pISSN: 2166-4951 e-ISSN: 2166-496X.
- Fessehatsion, M. P. W., & Bahta, M. D. T. (2016). Factors Affecting Academic Job Satisfaction in the Public Institutions of Higher Education, Eritrea.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York, NY: Crowell.
- Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size*. University of Florida.
- Jawabri, A. (2017). Job satisfaction of academic staff in the higher education: Evidence from private universities in UAE. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 7(4), 193-211.
- Katou, A.A. (2008). Measuring the impact of HRM on organizational performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 2, 119-142.
- Kothari. (2007). *Issues in Human Capital Theory and Human Resource*. Retrieved May 6, 2021 from <http://www.ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/view/140>
- Kouzes, J. M & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Encouraging the Heart: A leader's guide to rewarding and recognizing others*, Jossey-Bass Press, San Francisco, U.S.
- Kumar, S. (2013). Job Satisfaction among University Teachers: A Case of Haridwar (Uttarakhand).
- Landy, F. J. (1989). *Psychology of work behaviour*. 4th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Lee-Kelley, L., Blackman, D. A., & Hurst, J. P. (2007). An exploration of the relationship between learning organizations and the retention of knowledge workers. *The Learning Organization*, 14(3), 204-221.
- Lester, P. E. (1987). Development and factor analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47(1), 223-233.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). McNally Chicago, IL: Rand.
- Luthans, F. (1994). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mann, F. C. and Pelz, D. C. (2001). *A Comparison of High and Low Morale Work*. Retrieved May 6, 2021 <https://www.makeadentleadership.com/morale-in-the-workplace/>
- Mehboob, F., Sarwar, M. A., and Bhutto, N. A. (2012). Factors affecting job satisfaction among faculty members. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 1(12), 1-9.

- Moloantoa, M. E. and Dorasamy, N. (2017). Job satisfaction among academic employees in institutions of higher learning. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 15 (3), 193-200. doi:10.21511/ppm.15(3-1).2017.03.
- Munir, R. I. S., Rahman, R. A., Malik, A. M. A., & Ma'amor, H. (2012). Relationship between transformational leadership and employees' job satisfaction among the academic staff. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 65, 885-890. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.215.
- Okpara, J. O. (2006). Gender and the relationship between perceived fairness in pay, promotion, and job satisfaction in a sub-Saharan African economy, *Women in Management Review*, 21(3), 224-240.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Correlates of pay satisfaction in higher education. *The International journal of Educational Management*, 14(1), 31-39.
- Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizational behavior* (10thed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Roodt, G., Rieger, H. S., & Sempene, M. E. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organisational culture. *S A Journal of industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 23-30.
- Shafi, M., Memon, A. S., Fatima, H. (2016). Job Satisfaction in College Teachers: A Survey Based Study of Government Colleges of District Hyderabad, Sindh, Pakistan. *Journal of Hotel Business Management* 5: 124. doi:10.4172/2169-0286.1000124.
- Siddique, A., Aslam, H. D., Khan, M. and Fatima, U. (2011). Impact of academic leadership on faculty's motivation and organizational effectiveness in higher education system. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(2), 730-737.
- Smith, P .C., Kendall, L. M. & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Syed, A. A. S. G., Bhatti, N., Michael, S., Shaikh, F. M., & Shah, H. (2012). Job satisfaction of faculty members of university in Pakistan: A case study of university of Sindh-Jamshoro. *Modern Applied Science*, 6(7), 89-95.
- Wagner, S., Parker, C. P., & Christiansen, N. (2003). Employers that think and act like owners: Effects of ownership, beliefs and behaviors on organizational effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 847-871.
- Woods, A. M., & Weasmer, J. (2002). Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professionals as active participants. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 186-189.
- Yousif, M. A. (2004). *The impact of job satisfaction on staff performance in higher education*. Sudan University of Science and Technology (Master's thesis)
- Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2004). Job satisfaction among school teachers in Cyprus. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 357-374.