A Study of Determinants of Job Satisfaction in Wolaita Sodo University Academic Staff

Andinet Bibiso[1]   P.K. Agarwal[2]
1. Ethiopia Commodity Exchange (ECX), Head of branch operations Dilla, P.O.Box 17341, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
2. College of Business and Economics, Department of Management, Wolaita Sodo University, P.O.Box 138, Wolaita Sodo, Ethiopia

Abstract
The purpose of this study was to investigate the determinants of job Satisfaction and impact of identified factors in Wolaita Sodo University academic staff due to the university is facing critical shortage of senior staff members, low morale and job dissatisfaction. The researcher were applied conclusive (Causal and descriptive) research design. The reliability coefficient of 0.829 was computed using Cronbach Alpha formula to measure the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. This research study tried to find out the main factors of job satisfaction and whether they have any impact on the job satisfaction of the academic staff of Wolaita Sodo University or not. The study result showed among twelve factors, nine explanatory variables were found to be significant. It includes communication climate followed by recognition, Autonomy, policy and procedure, Promotion, supervision, working condition, Relationship with coworkers and pay were found to be positively significant effect on job satisfaction. Thus, from the findings, it can be recommended that University authorities and academic staff should work together in order to pave way for an atmosphere that is conducive to the education process.
Keywords: Job satisfaction, Communication climate, Academic staff, Recognition and Pay

1. Introduction
Education is essential to national growth and development. It helps individual to become self-reliant, adroit and good citizens. The future of any nation depends largely on the excellence of its educational system. It further depends on the quality of its teachers. *(Imaobong, 2004),* sees a teacher as an individual who plays the moral basis on which good social responsibility is built. Thus a teacher's job goes beyond teaching.

The significance of academic staff members' job satisfaction can be observed from different outlooks. Machado-Taylor et al, 2010, explained the significance of satisfaction and motivation of faculty members in terms of their support to the Higher Education Institution (HEI) and society.

A very puzzling issue in the education system is a weakening in educator morale and mounting educator's turnover of which both are needles of lowly enthusiasm and job dissatisfaction. Results of a inclusive survey conducted by the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC, 2005), directed that educators seem to be leaving the profession in huge numbers. It was noted that some of the main causes that were doubted for this attrition included low morale and job dissatisfaction. Additionally, this becomes a huge problem for education administrators because it mirrors negatively on the education system's progress and efficiency.

Job related dissatisfactions and in extreme case job related hindrances might lead to the faculty member to be less industrious in their job and less devoted towards the organization (Ahsanetal, 2009). In order to overcome such negative consequences, the reasons and determinants of academic staff job satisfaction have to be considered at the first place. Thus, this study aimed to investigate the determinants of job Satisfaction and impact of identified factors in Wolaita Sodo University academic staff.

2. Methodology
2.1 Description of the Study Area
Wolaita Sodo University is recognized in 2007 as a public higher education institution situated in the large town of Sodo (population range of 50,000-249,999 inhabitants), SNNPR. Officially accredited by the Ministry of Education, Ethiopia, It is also a coeducational higher education institution. It offers courses and programs leading to officially recognized higher education degrees such as bachelor degrees, Masters, PhD in several areas of study. WSU also provides several academic and non-academic amenities and services to students including a library, as well as administrative services (WSU, 2016).

2.2 Sampling Techniques
Multi-level stratified random sampling procedure was employed to select sample academic staff of Wolaita Sodo University. In the first level, Wolaita Sodo University main campus or Gandaba campus was selected purposively due to the financial and time constraint to reach the second (Tercha) branch of the university as it was very far from the study area. In the second level, eight colleges and or schools were selected using simple

random sampling techniques. In the third level the probability proportional to sample size methods was employed and 400 respondents will be drawn by using stratified random sampling technique.

2.3. Methods of Data Collection

The research employed a survey method of data collection since it is economical, free from interviewer's bias, gives adequate time to respondents for answering and the likes. It is a method that obtains data from a subset of a population, in order to estimate population attributes. Thus, Primary data on determinants of job satisfaction in Wolaita Sodo University Was collected from the sample respondent through closed-ended structured questionnaire using a seven point Likert scale (where1 = Completely disagree and 7 = Completely agree) and some open ended questionnaire as well.

2.4. Data Analysis Techniques

In order to determine influences that affect job satisfaction of academic staff, fitting analytical tools and statistical software was employed and data were analyzed using a Variety of statistical tests, which are as follows:
1. Using inferential statistics to investigate the determinants of' job satisfaction in Wolaita Sodo University academic staff by employing a multiple regression analysis.
2. Test of Normal Distribution, scatter plot and histogram to warrant normal distribution of the variables of the study.
3 Test of Multi Co linearity to make sure there is no existence of collinearity between the linear variables of the study was tested by using the variance inflation factor (VIF)
4. Test in the method of least squares regression analysis (OLS), to test the hypotheses of the study.
5. Testing autocorrelation by using Durbin-Watson test
6. These analyses were computed using the software SPSS version 20.0.
        The study included the following variables:
        There were twelve explanatory variables that have been acknowledged based on theoretical and empirical reviews. These are Pay (P) ,Supervision (S),Working Condition (WC), Policy and procedure (PP), job security (JC), Autonomy (AU), Promotion(PR), Recognition (R), Leadership style (LS), relationship with supervisor (RS), Communication climate (CC), and Relationship with co-workers (RC). To sum up, the functional form of the model will be as follows

$$JS = \beta + \beta_1 P + \beta_2 S + \beta_3 WC + \beta_4 PP + \beta_5 JC + \beta_6 AU + \beta_7 PR + \beta_8 R + \beta_9 LS + \beta_{10} RS + \beta_{11} CC + + \beta_{12} RC + {}_\mu$$

        where JS is the dependent variable and P,S,WC,PP,AU,PR,R,LS,RS,CC, and RC are the explanatory variables or (regressors)
        β is the intercept term. As usual, it gives the mean or average effect on JS of all the variables excluded from the model, although its Mechanical interpretation is the average value of JS when all explanatory variables are set equal to zero.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Characteristic of Respondents

The respondents dominated by men as many as 301 teachers (81.8%), with the most of respondents' age range over 31 years is 305 teachers (83.7%). Education is dominated by graduate level of which Consisting of 346 teachers (94%), most of whom were lecturer academic rank and 9 % (n=32) respondents were from Business and economics faculty, 9 % (n=35) respondents were from school of social science and humanity, 28 % (n=103) respondents were from faculty Natural and Computational science, 26 % (n=96) respondents were from College of Engineering, 17 % (n=63) respondents were from College of Agriculture.

3.2 Model Summary of the regression analysis

As shown in the Table 1, R^2 is a measure of how much of the variability in the outcome is accounted for by the predictors (Field, 2005). The value of R^2 was 0.777 which showed that these twelve determinants of job satisfaction variables can account for 77.7% of the variation in the overall job satisfaction. This means that 22.3 % of the variation in overall job satisfaction cannot be explained by these twelve determinants of job satisfaction variables. So, there must be other variables too that have an influence.

        The adjusted R^2 gives an idea of how well the model generalizes and ideally its value is likely to be the same or very close to, the value of R^2 (Field, 2005). Here, the difference between r2 and adjusted r2 is 0.8 % (0.777 – 0.769= 0.008). This means that if the model were derived from the population rather than a sample it would account for approximately 0.8 % less variance in outcome

Table :1 Model Summary of regression analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.881[a]	.777	.769	.46920	1.968

3.3. Pay

First hypothesis was H1; pay has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: pay= -2.510 + 0.069P, where, P is pay. Statistical result showed that pay value is significant $p < 0.05$, $p = 0.027$ and $t = 2.223$ which showed that pay had positive impact on the job satisfaction as just mentioned by According to (Luthans, 1992), pay not only assist people to attain their basic needs, but are also instrumental in satisfying the higher level needs of people.

The value of beta showed 1 unit changes in pay will bring 0.069 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, **H_1** was accepted as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Regression coefficients of pay

Model	Un standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H_1
Pay	.069	.031	.072	2.223	.027	Accepted

3.4. Promotion

Second hypothesis was H₂: promotion has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: promotion= -2.510 + 0.146Pr, where, Pr is promotion. Statistical result showed that promotion value was significant $p < 0.05$, $p = 0.027$ and $t = 4.428$ which shows that promotion had positive impact on the job satisfaction as stated earlier by (Locke, 1976), advocates that the aspiration to be promoted emanates from the desire for social status psychological growth, the desire for justice .Thus management should remember that promotion furnishes a positive motivating tool in certifying that the employee conquers goals at a higher level. The value of beta shows 1unit changes in promotion will bring 0.146 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, **H_2** accepted as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Regression coefficients of promotion

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H_2
Promotion	.146	.033	.128	4.428	.000	accepted

3.5. Supervision

Third hypothesis was H₃: Supervision has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: Supervision = -2.510 + 0.146S, where, S is Supervisor. Statistical result showed Supervisor value was significant $p < 0.05$, $p = 0.000$ and $t = 3.915$ which showed that Supervisor had positive impact on the job satisfaction as indicated by (Luthans, 1992), the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship will have a significant, positive influence on the employee's overall level of job satisfaction. . The value of beta showed 1 unit changes in supervision will bring 0.146 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, **H3** was accepted as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Regression coefficients of Supervision

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H3
Supervisor	.146	.037	.139	3.915	.000	accepted

3.6. Working condition

Working condition plays a vital role since it influences job satisfaction, as employees are concerned with a comfortable physical work condition that will ultimately renders more positive level of job satisfaction (Robbins, 2001).

Fourth hypothesis was H₄: Working condition has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: Working condition = -2.510 + 0.111WC, where, WC is Working Condition. Statistical result showed Working condition value was significant $p < 0.05$, $p = 0.001$ and $t = 3.216$ which showed that Working condition had positive impact on the job satisfaction. The value of beta showed 1unit changes in working condition will bring 0.111 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, **H_4** was accepted as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Regression coefficients of working condition

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H4
Working Condition	.111	.034	.113	3.216	.001	accepted

3.7. Policy and Procedure

Fifth hypothesis was H5: policy and Procedure has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: Policy and Procedure = -2.510 + 0.164PP, where, PP is Policy and Procedure. Statistical result shows Policy and Procedure value was significant $p < 0.05$, $p = 0.000$ and $t = 5.970$ which showed that Policy and Procedure had positive impact on the job satisfaction. According to (Paoline et al, 2006), policies are critical for any organization. Without clear policies that are fairly and equally applied across all shifts and areas, a correctional facility faces probable negative events. Policies provide support and guidance for correctional staff. The value of beta showed 1unit changes in pay will bring 0.164 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, H_5 was accepted as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Regression coefficients of Policy and procedure

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H5
Policy and Procedure	.164	.027	.189	5.970	.000	accepted

3.8. Job security

The unpredictable economic situation and the tougher competitive standards have resulted in downsizing, mergers, acquisitions, and other types of structural change, all of which tend to produce increased feelings of insecurity among the workers, not only pertaining to their jobs but also about the future in general (Sverke, et al, 2002).

Sixth hypothesis was H6: Job Security has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: job security = -2.510 + 0.017JS, where, JS is job security. Statistical result showed job security value was insignificant $p > 0.05$, $p = 0.571$ and $t = 0.567$ which showed that job security had no significant impact on the job satisfaction. Hence, $H6$ was rejected as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Regression coefficients of job security

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H6
Job Security	.017	.030	.018	.567	.571	Rejected

3.9. Autonomy

Reported by (Rylance and Bongers, 2001), autonomy had connection with employee's job satisfaction; and autonomy at work enlarge the satisfaction level. Similarly, (Spector, 1997) indicated that autonomy in the work place had a positive relationship with job satisfaction.

Seventh hypothesis was H_7: Autonomy has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: autonomy= -2.510 + 0.189A, where, A is autonomy. Statistical result showed autonomy value is significant $p < 0.05$, $p = 0.000$ and $t = 6.095$ which showed that autonomy had positive impact on the job satisfaction. The value of beta showed 1unit changes in pay will bring 0.189 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, $H7$ was accepted as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Regression coefficients of Autonomy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H7
Autonomy	.189	.031	.176	6.095	.000	Accepted

3.10. Recognition

According to (Spector, 1997), recognition is a process of giving an employee a certain status within an organization; and this is a very crucial factor towards an employee motivation.

Eighth Hypothesis H8: Recognition has a significant effect on the job satisfaction Equation for this relationship was: recognition = -2.510 + 0.264R, where, R is recognition. Statistical result showed recognition value was significant $p < 0.05$, $p = 0.000$ and $t = 8.933$ which showed that recognition had positive impact on the job satisfaction. The value of beta showed 1unit changes in recognition will bring 0.264 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, H_8 was accepted as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Regression coefficients of recognition

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H8
Recognition	.264	.030	.253	8.933	.000	Accepted

3.11. Leadership style

Nineth hypothesis was H_9: leadership Style has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: Leadership style = -2.510 + 0.012LS, where, LS is Leadership style. Statistical result showed Leadership style value was insignificant p > 0.05, p = 0.654 and t = 0.48 which showed that Leadership style had no significant impact on the job satisfaction. Hence, H_9 was rejected as shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Regression coefficients of leadership style

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H_9
Leadership style	.012	.027	.013	.448	.654	rejected

3.12. Relationship with Supervisor

Tenth hypothesis was H10: Relationship with supervisor has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship is: Relationship with Supervisor = -2.510 + 0.069RS, where, RS is Relationship with Supervisor. Statistical result showed Relationship with Supervisor value was insignificant p > 0.05, p = 0.398 and t = 0.846 which showed that Relationship with Supervisor had no significant impact on the job satisfaction. Hence, H_{10} was rejected as shown in Table 11

Table 11. Regression coefficients of relationship with supervisor

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H_{10}
Relationship with Supervisor	.024	.028	.028	.846	.398	Rejected

3.13. Communication climate

Effective communication is a key to organizational accomplishment. Therefore communication should have been located by organizations in their strategic planning process (Azhar, 2006).

Eleventh hypothesis was H_{11}: Communication climate has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: Communication climate = -2.510 + 0.337CC, where, CC is Communication climate. Statistical result shows Communication climate value was significant p < 0.05, p = 0.027 and t = 6.877 which showed that Communication climate had positive impact on the job satisfaction. The value of beta showed 1unit changes in Communication climate will bring 0.337 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, H_{11} **was** accepted as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Regression coefficients of Communication climate

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H_{11}
Communication Climate	.337	.049	.320	6.877	.000	Accepted

3.14. Relationship with coworkers

The finding reflects the importance that social relations in the workplace can have on employee job satisfaction (Saeed et al., 2013).

Twelveth hypothesis was H12: Relationship with coworkers has a significant effect on the job satisfaction. Equation for this relationship was: Relationship with coworkers = -2.510 + 0.090RC, where, RC is Relationship with coworkers. Statistical result showed Relationship with coworkers value was significant p < 0.05, p = 0.027 and t = 3.146 which showed that Relationship with coworkers had positive impact on the job satisfaction. The value of beta showed 1unit changes in Relationship with coworkers will bring 0.090 unit changes in job satisfactions. Hence, H_{12} was accepted as shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Regression coefficients of relationship with coworkers

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
	B	Std. Error	Beta			H_{12}
Relationship with coworkers	.090	.029	.099	3.146	.002	Accepted

3.15. Summarized mathematical model

The following mathematical model was identified through the regression analysis result as follows.

JS = -2.510+ 0.069P+ 0.146Pr+ 0.146S+ 0.111WC+ 0.164PP+ 0.189A+ 0.264R+ +0.337CC+ 0.090RC+ 0.223

Where JS is the dependent variable and P, Pr, S, WC, PP, A, R, CC and RC are the explanatory variables or (regressors).

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The result of multiple regression model revealed that out of twelve variables included in the analysis, nine explanatory variables were found to be significant at different probability level. Those significant variables include; communication climate have the highest beta (0.337) followed by recognition (0.264), Autonomy (0.189), policy and procedure (0.164), Promotion (0.146), supervision (0.146), Working condition (0.111), Relationship with coworkers (0.09) and pay (0.069) were found to be positively significant effect on job satisfaction. Whereas, relationship with supervisor (0.024), job security (0.017), and leadership style (0.012) were found to be positively associated with job satisfaction but no significant effect on job satisfaction.

From the findings, it can be recommended that University authorities and academic staff should work together in order to pave way for an atmosphere that is conducive to the education process by valuing academic staff idea since academic staffs are a basin of information, forming high levels of faith, by answering the fight invited positively, welcoming creative opposition, initiating an employee suggestion program and avoid restraining open communication to only staff meetings. Create a questionnaire or grievance form in which employees can express issues in a guaranteed confidential manner and then discuss it openly during a meeting and well informing the academic staff through formal channel (Email, meeting and the likes). Communication is valued highly by academic staff in every age group, so the management must know the worth of being able to communicate successfully with teachers as this directly impact the job satisfaction of the academic staff.

Reference

Ahsan, N. Abdullah, Z. Fie, D.Y.G. and Alam, S.S. (2009). A Study of Job Satisfaction among University Staff in Malaysia: Empirical Study. European Journal of Social Sciences. Vol.8, No.1 pp. 121-131.

Alemayehu Hailu, Damen Haile Mariam, Daniel Fekade, Miliard Derbew and AmhaMekasha(2013), Turn-over rate of academic faculty at the College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University: a 20-year analysis (1991 to 2011)Journal of human resource for health.

Azhar, A. (2006). "Auditing Communication Satisfaction Among Academic Staff: An Approach to Managing Academic Excellence", The Business Review, Cambridge, 5, 330-333.

Chen S-H, Yang C-C, Shiau J-Y, Wang H-H (2006) the development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. TQM Journal 18: 484–500.

Churchill, O. A., Jr., & Surprenant, C. (1982). An investigation into the determinants of customer satisfaction. JMR, Journal of Marketing Research, 19(4), 491-504.

Education Labour Relations Council, (E LRC), 2005. Factors affecting educator supply and demand in South African Public Schools. HSRC Press.

Gebrekiros Hagos, Kebede Abrha(2015) Study on factors affecting Job Satisfaction in Mekelle University Academic staff at Adi-Haqi campus International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Volume 5, Issue 1 ISSN 2250-3153

Imaobong, U. N. (2004). Teacher preparation for Nigerian basic education. Journal of Research in Education1 (1), 1-6 in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Klassen RM, Usher EL, Bong M (2010) Teachers' collective efficacy, job satisfaction, and jobstress in cross-cultural context. J ExpEduc 78: 464–486.

Luthans, F. (1992). Organisational behavior.(6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

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). Chicago, IL:

Machado-Taylor, M.L. Soares, V.M. Ferreira, J.B. and Gouveia, O.M.R. (2010). What factors of satisfaction and motivation are affecting the development of the academic career in Portuguese higher education institutes? Revista De Administracao Publica (RAP). Vo.45, No.1, pp.33-44.

Maertz CP, Griffeth RW (2004) eight motivational forces and voluntary turnover: a theoretical synthesis with implications for research. J Manage 30: 667–683.

Mansor M, Tayib M (2010) an empirical examination of organizational culture, job stress and job satisfaction within the indirect tax administration in Malaysia. Int J Bus SocSci 1: 81–95.

Paoline, A.E, A.E.,Lambert, E.G, Lambert, E.G.,&Hogan, N.L. (2006).A Calm and Happy Keeper of the Keys: The Impact of ACA Views, Relations With Coworkers, and Policy Views on the Job Stress and Job Satisfaction of Correctional Staff. The Prison Journal 86:182

Robbins, S.P. (2001).Organisational Behaviour. New Jersey. Prentice Hall.(453-455)

Rylance, B., Russ, S., Chiang, B., &Bongers, J. (2001). Caseload in Special Education: An integration of research findings. Exceptional Children, 67, 161-172.

Saeed, et al., 2013.Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Employees in Telecom Sector of Pakistan. Middle-

East Journal of Scientific Research, 16(11) 1476-1482.

Spector, P.E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ssesanga K, Garrett RM (2005) Job satisfaction of university academics: perspectives from Uganda. High Educ 50: 33–56.

Sverke, M., Hellgren. J. andNaswall, K.(2002).No Security: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Job Insecurity and Its Consequences. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, Vol.7 (3), 242-264.

Wolaita Sodo University Book of abstract (2016), the 5th annual national research work shoop, ``supporting national development through research``