DMU

Advanced Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies 9(2025) 1855-1874

Journal homepage: www.ajids.dmu.edu.et

AJIDS

Volume 9(1), June 2025

Job Satisfaction among University Academics: Evidence from Debre Markos University

Molalegn Tamiru Semegn

Department of Educational planning and management, Institute of Education & Behavioral Science, Debre Markos University, Ethiopia

Corresponding Author's Email: molalegne_tamiru@dmu.edu.et

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the level of job satisfaction among Debre Markos University academics. Furthermore, the study sought to determine whether there is a mean difference in job satisfaction among academics in accordance with demographics (streams, length of service in years, and gender). The study employed cross sectional survey design. Modified and adapted Spector's (1985) job satisfaction survey was used to collect data. Mean, standard deviation and an independent sample t-test were used to analyze data. The total mean value (mean=2.52) of all dimensions of job satisfaction revealed that academics at Debre Markos University were dissatisfied with their jobs, while moderately satisfied in one of the categories 'nature of work' (mean=3.37). Significant mean difference of job satisfaction was observed between academics of social (mean= 2.38) and natural science (mean=2.57) streams; and academics with length of service below (mean=2.61 and above ten years (mean=2.37). But, there was no significant difference of job satisfaction between male (mean=2.48) and female (mean=2.65) academics. The study concluded that Debre Markos University academics were not satisfied with their job and they have serious concern for what they are paid. Therefore, practical and policy implications were derived from the findings. The Ethiopian Ministry of Education and respective government institutions in general and Debre Markos University in particular need to take actions for the improvement of academics' working conditions.

Key words: Academics, Job satisfaction, Stream, Length of service in years, gender

1. Introduction

Job satisfaction (JS) is an emotional, affective response to a job or certain components of it (Locke, 1976; Smith et al., 1969). JS is the result of a cognitive process that compares the existing job component to an individual's frame of reference, which includes the individual's needs, expectations, and values (desires or wants) (Smith et al.,1969). Accordingly, Locke (1969) notes JS is a joyful or pleasant emotional state that results from analyzing one's work experience. In addition, Robbins and Judge (2008) define JS as a positive feeling about one's job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics. Likewise, Weiss (2002) asserts that JS is an individual's favorable evaluation of his or her job. Similarly, Vroom (1964) defines JS as individual's favorable emotional state or attitude towards their employment. Moreover, Blum and

Naylor (1968) define JS as an attitude that results from calculating and balancing a number of specific likes and dislikes associated with the employment. On the basis of the above definitions one can conclude that JS is a complex set of variables governed to a large extent by perception and expectations of the employees. This implies if a variety of psychological, physiological, and environmental needs are fulfilled, employee may honestly declare that they are satisfied with their employment (Hoppock, 1935).

JS encompasses a broader range of internal and external variables. Internal variables include employee's perception of the job's characteristics. External variables are concerned with the feelings associated with elements of a work (Hirschfeld , 2000). Similarly, Spector (1997) contends that factors such as personal traits, workplace culture, and job peculiarities drive an employee's JS. Personality qualities and prior work experience are examples of personal attributes. The nature of work activities, relationships with coworkers, the reward system, and how employees are treated are all examples of the work environment and job characteristics.

Since JS affects productivity, employee turnover, absenteeism, safety, stress, unionization, and other issues, it is an important issue to address in order to achieve better results in any organization (Thangaswamy & Thiyagaraj 2017). Similarly, Mgaiwa (2021) notes that JS is critical for better work performance, reduced turnover intention, enhanced organizational commitment and decreased job burnout.

Academics are an educational system's greatest human capital asset and its greatest expense. A strong educational system is built on a foundation of outstanding academic personnel. Understanding the elements linked to teaching quality and retention is the first step in creating an outstanding faculty. JS is one of the crucial elements to create and retain outstanding academics and it is connected to student achievement, organizational performance, and organizational commitment (Sharma & Jyoti, 2006).

Thus, satisfied academics have significant impact on higher education, and they are essential to providing high-quality instruction (Abebe & Assemie, 2023). In other words, higher education institutions are able to fulfill their vision and mission and develop into centers of excellence with the help of the dedication and work-life balance of its faculty. However, academics in a number of Ethiopian higher education institutions are grappling with worse living and working conditions, given the critical relevance of enhancing the quality of work-life and work-life balance (Abebe & Assemie, 2023). In their qualitative study at Haramaya University, Sintayehu and Hussien (2021) found that the academic staff is facing challenges related to substandard living conditions, increased living expenses, inadequate monthly salary and housing allowance, and a dearth of opportunities for career advancement and research funding.

According to Mushemeza (2016), academics' salaries in Ethiopian institutions are among the lowest in Sub-Saharan Africa. Furthermore, Woldegiorgis and Doevenspeck (2013) demonstrated the

deplorable working conditions and meager remuneration offered by Ethiopia's higher education public colleges. In addition, Chattopadhyay (2020) pointed out that low motivation and dedication, bad working conditions, poor leadership, a lack of suitable resources, a lack of adequate compensation, and academic staff turnover are the key issues facing Ethiopian higher education institutions. Because, employee satisfaction levels determine whether people stay with a company or depart (Spector, 1997).

Regarding academics job satisfaction by service year, discipline (stream), and gender, several researches clarified conflicting results. For example, Bilmora et al. (2006) observed that male academics are generally more satisfied than female academics, although Oshagbemi (2000) discovered that gender has no effect on academics' satisfaction with their jobs. At the same time, researchers like Okpara et al. (2005) claimed that male academics were satisfied with payment, promotion, and supervision when women were more satisfied with aspects like the nature of their work.

In the case of streams (disciplines), Ward and Sloane (2000) found that academics' disciplinary (stream) affiliations significantly affect their job satisfaction levels. They discovered that social scientists were the least satisfied among female academics, whereas engineers and other academics in the natural science stream were the most satisfied. They came to the conclusion that, among male faculty members, social scientists were the most satisfied, while natural and physical scientists were the least. Sabharwal & Corley (2009) in their study explained that male faculty members in all disciplines report generally higher levels of job satisfaction than female faculty members. The mediating role of academics length of service year on job satisfaction was investigated by Latiff et al. (2017). The study's findings showed that length of service year raised job satisfaction, while Topchyan and Woehler (2021) discovered that the length of teaching experience had no noticeable effect on job satisfaction.

The operational environment of Ethiopian public higher education institutions that provide better training is criticized for a number of reasons, including inadequate facilities, promotion/increase opportunities, financial benefits, and poor control, which all contribute to the negative emotions of staff members (Anteneh, 2016). Similarly, Tesfaye (2011) notes that faculty staffs at Ethiopia's higher education institutions were vulnerable to mind drain due to a variety of factors, including unhappiness with the administration and challenges in advancing in their careers.

Hence, the aforementioned studies trigger the researcher to examine the job satisfaction and associated factors of academics at Debre Markos University as one of the Ethiopian higher education institutions.

1.2.Statement of the problem

In Ethiopia numerous studies have been conducted on the subject of JS and associated topics in higher educations. Abebe and Markos (2016) investigated the job satisfaction of academicians at Arbaminch University in relation to organizational commitment and discovered that, on average, staff members are satisfied with their relationships with coworkers, the

nature of their work, and communication. They are less satisfied with their pay and prospects for advancement.

According to Gessesse and Premanandam's (2023) research, the majority of higher education teachers in Addis Ababa both private and public were not satisfied with their jobs. But there were distinctions between higher education in the public and private sectors. Academic staff members at public institutions were satisfied with job security, but those at private universities were happy with compensation and oversight. In their research, Kebede and Demeke (2017) discovered an average degree of JS among academic staff members at public institutions in connection to leadership style.

Researchers Wedajo and Chekole (2020) have also examined the relationship between job satisfaction and instructors' attitudes toward reform initiatives in higher education. They disclosed the low degree of JS among teachers. Gebrekirstos and Hagos (2015) studied the factors that influence the job satisfaction of instructors at Mekelle University. The researchers found that academic employees were satisfied with their jobs. However, female instructors were less satisfied than male instructors. A study conducted at Gondar University by Mohammed *et al.* (2019) disclosed 35% academic staff members are dissatisfied and strongly dissatisfied.

Furthermore, Daniel *et al*. (2017) surfaced out that academic staff's low JS in Dire Dawa University. The general level of JS among academic staff was found to be low in Mulubran's (2014) study on academic staff turnover intentions and the moderating role of gender at Haramaya University. A study conducted by Mohammed et al. (2019) on public universities in Amhara region revealed that 35% of the academics strongly dissatisfied and dissatisfied with their job, while the 38.5% of them have an interest to leave the employing universities searching for other jobs.Accordingly, 53.6% of Debre Markos University academics had higher intention to leave the university and more than half of them were dissatisfied with their overall jobs (Simieneh et al., 2022).

The findings of aforementioned local studies vary from one another. While some reported full or partial job satisfaction, others reported academics dissatisfaction. Besides, except gender almost all studies did not address associated demographic factors like length of service in years and streams.

Thus, this research aims to determine the status of Academics Job Satisfaction (AJS) and the associated demographic factors such as stream, length of service in years and gender. Where stream refers to academics' field of specialization, length of service in years is the number of years that academics serve the university, and gender is being male and female academics.

Hence, the researcher decided to address the following fundamental questions:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction among academics at Debre Markos University?
2. Is there a significant variation in job satisfaction among academics (by stream, length of service in years, and gender)?

2. Methodology

2.1. Research approach and design

This study used a cross-sectional descriptive survey research design employing a quantitative research approach. According to Choy (2014), the information gathered using this research methodology is regarded as quantitative and suitable for generalization to a broad population. The quantitative data gathered using this research technique enables quick searches for the degree of agreement or disagreement among respondents on assessing the extent of AJS (Yauch & Steudel, 2003).

2.2.Population, sampling and Sample size

The study's population is found in Debre Markos University, Ethiopia. Full-time academics of the university are the population of this study. These academics are full time teaching staff members. There are two streams: natural and social science streams offered in the university. Each stream contains colleges, institutes and schools.

Social science stream contain two colleges social science and humanities; and business and economics colleges), one institute (education and behavioral sciences institute) and one school (law school). Natural science stream includes four colleges (natural and computational science, Agriculture, Technology, and health sciences colleges), one institute (urban and land administration institute) and one school which is medical school. The university is one of Ethiopia's second-generation public universities, located in Debre Markos, Amhara Region, around 300 km from Addis Ababa. It was established in 2005 and started teaching its first students in 2007.

The target population consists of 1221(923 natural science and 298 social science) 2023/24 active teaching staff members. Those staff members in sabbatical and study leave were not included. Besides, those expatriates were also not part of the target population. Since the study population is known, Yamane's formula (1967) was used to determine the sample size (Muyembe & Anselemo, 2023). Thus, 301 sample sizes were determined at 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error.

$$n=N/1+Ne^2$$

Where; n indicates sample size
N indicates population under study
e indicates the margin error

from the above formula sample size(n)= $\frac{1221}{1+1221(0.05)^2}$ =301

Thus the required sample size of this study was n=301.

The sample respondents were selected from natural and social stream colleges using a proportional stratified random sampling method. According to this method, the sample size was proportionally allocated to each stream. (See Table-1) Therefore, 74 social science (61 male and 13 female; 42 with length of service below 10 years and 32 with over 10 years) and 227 natural science teachers (179 male and 48 female; 148 with length of service below 10 years and 79 with over 10 years) were randomly selected. (Because ten years is half the university age, it was chosen as the border of academics' length of service year in this situation).

Table 1. Demographic data of sample members

		Gender			Service year		
		Male	Female	Total	<10 years	>10 years	Total
Streams	Social Science	61	13	74	42	32	74
	Natural Science	179	48	227	148	79	227
Total		240	61	301	190	111	301

"Source: Author's own work"

2.3.Instrument

The questionnaire was adapted from the Spector's Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1985). JSS was chosen because its items are applicable to human services; the scale covers major aspects of job satisfaction with distinct sub scales and manageable number of items (Spector, 1985). The original Spector's (1985) JSS uses 36 items (positively and negatively worded items) with a 6-point scale (disagree very much to agree very much) to assess nine factors (Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Operating Procedures, Coworkers, Nature of Work, and Communication). The English version of the JSS questionnaire is freely available on the author's official website, where the author states that the free questionnaire may be used for non-commercial educational research.

Nevertheless, words were modified and reconstructed to be appropriate for the local context of Debre Markos University after thorough judgment of language and psychology experts. Accordingly, the scale was modified from six point to five point likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Moderately Agree, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree). The scale has been reduced for a variety of reasons. First, to avoid the risk of respondents struggling to distinguish between closely related points on a six-point scale (Preston and Colman, 2000); second, to avoid respondents feeling of overwhelmed (Krosnick and Berent, 1993); and third, to simplify the response process without sacrificing the reliability and validity of the data that could be obtained from longer scales (Dawes, 2008).

Regarding internal consistency reliabilities of the original JSS, Spector (1985) reported for the facets Chronbach's alpha coefficient ranges from .60 (Coworkers) to .82 (Supervision), with a value of .91 for the total score. In addition, 18-month test-retest coefficients ranges of .37 to .71 for small 43 sample members. In addition, a multi trait-multi method matrix analysis supported construct validity of the JSS.

The modified scale with 36 items, all worded positively, (See Appendix-1) was first piloted with small size samples of 60 respondents to check the reliability of the questionnaire in a new context. Cronbach alpha for total job satisfaction was 0.93, satisfaction with pay (0.70), Promotion (0.62), supervision (0.84), fringe benefits (0.75), contingent rewards (0.65), operating procedures 0.50), coworkers (0.54), nature of work (0.77) and Communication (0.67). It ranges 0.50 to 0.84, which is more acceptable range compared to the original

JSS. However, the two factors such as '*operating procedure'* and '*coworkers*' were deleted to maintain the acceptable range chronbach's alpha value between 0.6 and 0.8 (Wim *et al*., 2008) which enabled the researcher to have more reliable data.

Hence, the re-modified scale with 28 items (see Appendix-2) and seven sub scales was appropriate to conduct the study and collect data from academic employees at higher education institutions. The seven sub scales were pay, Promotion, supervision, fringe benefit, contingent reward, nature of work and communication. Each sub scale contains 4 items. The 28 items survey questionnaire were distributed to 301 sample respondents and 74 from social science and 182 from natural science in sum 256 (85%) questionnaire were fully responded and returned back for data analysis, the non-response rate was 15%. (See table-2).

Table 2. Sample members who fully responded the questionnaire

		Gender		Total	Service year		Total
		Male	Female		<10 years	>10 years	
Streams	Social	61	13	74	42	32	74
	Natural	144	38	182	116	66	182
Total		205	51	256	158	98	256

"Source: Author's own work"

2.4.Data analysis

In this study, the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 29 was utilized to analyze the quantitative data. Data was entered, coded, and edited. Different statistical techniques were used to analyze the collected data. The mean and standard deviation were used to assess the status of job satisfaction among academicians. Moreover, an independent samples t-test was used to see the relative difference between natural and social science streams; length of service below 10 and above 10 years and males and females academics. Before the analysis was done, normality test was conducted. Since the sample size was 256 which is in the interval 50<=x<=300 then Kolmogorov-Smirnov p value was 0.20 which is >0.05 (Mishra et al., 2019). The value indicates that the data distribution was normal.

2.5.Ethical consideration

The ethical approval was given by the author's institution. A formal letter of cooperation was forwarded to every college within the university. Before the study was carried out, the subjects were verbally told consented to by being informed of its purpose. Participants were also informed that their participation was entirely voluntary and that the information they provided would be kept confidential. The participants were also informed that they could halt answering the questionnaire at any time if it caused them any discomfort. The questionnaires were created without any personal identifiers in order to preserve participant confidentiality.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Level of AJS

In this study to measure the level of AJS, Best's criteria (1977) were used. Best classified the level of job satisfaction into five categories:

$$\frac{\text{High score} - \text{Lower score}}{\text{Number of levels}}$$

$$\frac{5-1}{5} = 0.80$$

Table 3. The scale for understanding the mean values of AJS levels

Mean Score	Level of Satisfaction
1.00- 1.80	Very unsatisfied
1.81- 2.60	Unsatisfied
2.61- 3.40	Moderate
3.41- 4.20	Satisfied
4.21- 5.00	Very satisfied

Source: Best (1997)

According to Best's criteria, the AJS of Debre Markos University was 2.52 which is between 1.81and 2.60 as shown in table-4. This indicates academics in the university were unsatisfied in their job.

Table 4. Level of AJS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation
AJS	256	1.04	4.39	2.52	.57955

"Source: Authors own work"

Moreover, AJS for each sub scale was also analyzed.Table-5 explains that Debre Markos University academic staff members were moderately satisfied in nature of work (M=3.37) and communication (M=3.03). But, they were unsatisfied in the majority factors such as pay (M=1.88), Promotion (M=2.36), supervision (M=2.56), fringe benefit (M=2.06) and contingent reward (M=2.35). From all the factors 'pay' is with the least mean value and 'nature of work' is with greatest mean value. This implies compared to others nature of work is the biggest contributor of Debre Markos University academics job satisfaction and pay is the least one. Similarly, a research conducted in Ethiopian context by Mohammed *et al*. (2019) confirmed that pay is a factor for academicians low job satisfaction. Though, it is in another context, similar result was found by Smerek and Peterson (2006) for non-academics employees and by Guoba *et al.* (2022) for secondary school teachers.

Table 5. AJS for each sub scale

Factors	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
pay	256	1.00	4.00	1.88	.65001
Promotion	256	1.00	4.50	2.36	.70092
Supervision	256	1.00	4.75	2.56	.84931
Fringe benefit	256	1.00	5.00	2.06	.72665
Contingent reward	256	1.00	4.75	2.35	.72258

Nature of work	256	1.00	5.00	3.37	.87752
Communication	256	1.00	4.75	3.03	.74926

"Source: Author's own work"

Key: N=number of sample members

3.2.Mean comparison between demographics

As indicated in table-6, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the academics job satisfaction for social science stream and natural science stream; length of service in years below and above ten years; and males and females.

Thus, there was significant difference t (111.654) =-2.141, p=0.034 in the score with mean score for social science stream (M=2.3822, SD=0.67229) and natural science stream (M=2.5695, SD=0.52983). The mean of social science was less than that of natural science. The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean difference =-0.19, 95% CI= -0.36 to -0.01) was significant. Implies, social science academics were less satisfied than natural science academics. This result is aligned with the study conducted by Ward and Sloane (2000) on female academics job satisfaction that social science female academics are less satisfied than that of natural science steam academics.

Table 6. AJS mean difference between streams, service years and gender

Independent Samples Test											
				LTEV		t-test for Equality of Means					
		Mean	SD	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. 2sided (p)	MD	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
AJS	Social	2.3822	0.67229	7.939	.005	-2.141	111.65	.034	-.19	-.36	-.01
	Natural	2.5695	0.52983								
	<=10	2.6056	0.56555	.003	.953	3.220	254	.001	.24	.09	.38
	>10	2.3699	0.57554								
	Male	2.4831	0.58373	1.344	.247	-1.792	254	.074	-.16	-.34	.02
	Female	2.6453	0.54895								

"Source: Author's own work"

Key: LTEV=Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, MD=Mean Difference, df=degree of freedom, SD=standard deviation

Similarly, there was significant difference t (254) =3.220, p=0.001 in the scores with mean score for academics whose length of service below ten years (M=2.6056, SD= 0.56555) and above ten years (M=2.3699, SD=0.57554). The mean of those academics with length of service below ten years was greater than the mean of those whose service above ten years. This shows academics with less service are more satisfied than those with high service. But it is contradicting with Oshagbemi's (2000)b and Latiff et al. (2017) findings that length of service has positive relation with job satisfaction. Furthermore, the magnitude of the difference in the means (mean difference

=0.24, 95% CI= 0.09 to 0.38) was significant. Similar result was confirmed by Toker (2011) that significant difference in job satisfaction between high service year and less service year academics, though, Topchyan and Woehler (2021) found that length of service year has no noticeable effect on job satisfaction.

However, regarding gender, there was no significant difference t (254) = -1.792, p=0.247 in scores for male (Mean=2.4831, SD= 0.58373) and female (Mean= 2.6453, SD=0.54895). Though the job satisfaction mean of females is greater than male academics, the magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference=-0.16, 95% CI: -0.34 to 0.02) was very small. Similarly results in Turky by Toker (2011), in Nigeria by Abosede (2014), a study conducted in Malaysia by Dhanapal *et al. (*2013) and in UK by Oshagbemi (2000)$_a$ surfaced out no significant difference between male and female academics. To the contrary of this finding, Mohammed *et al.(*2019) in Ethiopia found that male academics' job satisfaction is higher than female's job satisfaction, and they also asserted the significant difference of job satisfaction between male and female academicians.

3.3.Mean comparison between demographics; based on sub scales

Once more, an independent sample t-test analysis was conducted to determine whether job satisfaction varies by demographics such as gender, length of service in years, and streams (see table-7).

Pay

Academics in the social science stream (M=1.7804, SD=0.67356) and those with more than ten years of experience (M=1.7117, SD=0.56912) expressed extreme dissatisfaction with their pay. Both males (M=1.8171, SD=0.64887) and females (M=2.1373, SD=0.59438), natural science stream academics (M=1.9217, SD=0.63755) and those who had less than ten years of service (M=1.9858, SD=0.6717) were dissatisfied. Males and females (p=.002), as well as those with service years under and over ten (p<.001), showed significantly different means. However, no significant difference (p=.115) was seen between the two streams. To this end, academics of natural science stream, and those with length of service years below ten were more satisfied with what they are paid than their counterparts. Accordingly, females were more satisfied in their pay than that of male academics. To the contrary, the result of a study conducted in USA by Okpara *et al.* (2005) notified that males are more satisfied than female academics in their pay.

Promotion

All academics, both social (M=2.2703, SD=0.78487) and natural (M=2.3901, SD=0.66296), male (M=2.3476, SD=0.70162) and female (M=2.3873, 0.70412) and those with under (M=2.4082, SD=0.66913) and over ten years (M=2.2704, SD=74498) of service, were dissatisfied with the university's promotion program. In this regard, natural science stream, females and those with under ten years of service academics were relatively more satisfied than their counter parts with the university's promotion endeavor. To the contrary, in the case of gender, Okpara *et al.*

(2005) asserted male academics are more satisfied in their promotion than females.

In addition, the means of satisfaction in promotion for demographics such as gender (p=.718), service (p=.126), and streams (p=.216) were not significantly differ from one another. To the opposite again in the case of gender, Mayya *et al*. (2020) noted that the job satisfaction in the aspects of promotion differed significantly between the male and female academicians.

Supervision

Academicians of natural science stream (M=2.6360, SD=0.81491) expressed a modest level of satisfaction with the university's supervision. Males (M=2.5598, SD=0.83858) and Females (M=2.5833, SD=0.89954), those with service under (M=2.6060, SD=0.81648) and over ten years (M=2.4974, SD=0.89995), and academics in the social science stream (M=2.3885) were not satisfied with the supervision provided by the university. However, females, natural science stream and academics with less than ten years of experience were more satisfied than their counterparts.

Moreover, there was a notable disparity in satisfaction in promotion (p=.034) in the means of academics from the social and natural science programs. But, there was no significant difference between other demographics: gender (p=.860) and service year (p=.321). To the contrary, Mayya *et al.* (2020) noted that the job satisfaction in the aspects of supervision differed significantly between the males and female**s** academics. To this end, Okpara et al. (2005) discovered male academics are more satisfied than females with the supervision made by their institution.

Fringe Benefit

Academics from the social (M=1.9595, SD=0.78843) and natural science (M=2.0948, SD=0.69847) streams, as well as all males (M=2.5598, SD=0.72961) and females (M=2.2304, SD=0.69434), both with length of service below (M= 2.1598, SD=0.78039) and above ten years (M=1.8878, SD=0.63725) were dissatisfied with the university's fringe benefits. Accordingly, a notable disparity (p=.002) in the means of academics with length of service under ten years of employment and those with over ten years was noted. However, academics in the social and natural science streams (p=.089); and males and females (p=.055) were not significantly different in their means job satisfaction in the aspects of fringe benefit.

Contingent Reward

All academics in the sample, regardless of their gender, service year, or stream, expressed dissatisfaction with the contingent reward offered by the university. Although there was no discernible variation (p=.053) in the means of males (M=2.3110, SD=0.73260) and females (M= 2.5294, SD=0.65888) academics, there was a notable difference (p=.010) in the means of social (M=2.1723, SD=0.78178) and natural science (M=2.4286, SD=0.68557) streams, as well as between service years under (M=2.1598, SD=0.72020) and over ten (M=2.1760, SD=0.69350) with p value 0.002.

Nature of Work

Academics in the social science stream (M=3.2061, SD=1.0545), those with service years over ten (M=3.1913, SD=0.92419), and males (M=3.3463, SD=0.90182) expressed a moderate level of satisfaction with the nature of university's work. Academics in the natural science stream (M= 3.4327, SD=0.78834), women (M=3.4510, SD=0.77463) and those with service years under ten (M=3.4763, SD=0.83169) were satisfied with the nature of their work in the university. In the case of gender, Okpara *et al.* (2005) identified similar result. Besides, there was no discernible difference between the means of males and females (p=.447), and the social and natural science (p=.098) academics, but there was a substantial difference (p=.011) between the means of those with below and above ten years of experience.

Communication

All academics in the sample, regardless of their demographics such as social science (M=2.8986, SD=0.84695), natural science (M=3.0824, SD=0.70128), under (M=3.1377, SD=0.74949) and over (M=2.8546, SD=0.71879) ten years of experience, males (M=2.9878, SD=0.74580) and females (M=3.1961, SD=0.74718) expressed a moderate level of satisfaction with the communication they get at the university. While there was a notable difference (p=.003) between academics with less than and more than ten years of experience, academics from the social and natural science streams (p= .075); and males and females (p=.076) were not significantly different from one another.

Table 7. Comparison of means based on sub scales

Independent Samples Test											
				LTEV				Sig. (p)	MD	95% CI	
		Mean	SD	F	Sig.	t	df			Lower	Upper
Pay	Social	1.7804	.67356	.317	.574	-1.581	254	.115	-.14	-.32	.03
	Natural	1.9217	.63755								
	<10	1.9858	.67617	3.81	.052	3.343	254	<.001	.27	.11	.43
	>10	1.7117	.56913								
	Male	1.8171	.64887	3.21	.074	-3.205	254	.002	-.32	-.52	-.12
	Female	2.1373	.59438								
Promotion	Social	2.2703	.78487	3.64	.057	-1.241	254	.216	-.12	-.31	.07
	Natural	2.3901	.66296								
	<10	2.4082	.66913	.87	.352	1.533	254	.126	.12	-.04	.31
	>10	2.2704	.74498								
	Male	2.3476	.70162	.004	.947	-.361	254	.718	-.02	-.26	.18
	Female	2.3873	.70412								
	Social	2.3885	.91050	2.57	.110	-2.128	254	.034	-.25	-.48	-.02
	Natural	2.6360	.81491								
	<10	2.6060	.81648	.46	.497	.994	254	.321	.11	-.11	.32

Supervision	**>10**	2.4974	.89995								
	Male	2.5598	.83858	.003	.954	-.177	254	.860	-.02	-.29	.24
	Female	2.5833	.89954								
	Social	1.9595	.78843	1.63	.203	-1.353	254	.089	.177	-.14	-.33
	Natural	2.0948	.69847								
	<10	2.1598	.76039	4.60	.033	3.080	232.1	.002	.27	.10	.45
Fringe	**>10**	1.8878	.63725								
benefit	**Male**	2.0122	.72961	1.93	.166	-1.929	254	.055	-.22	-.44	.004
	Female	2.2304	.69434								
	Social	2.1723	.78178	1.77	.184	-2.601	254	.010	-.26	-.45	-.06
	Natural	2.4286	.68557								
	<10	2.4652	.72020	.02	.885	3.167	254	.002	.29	.11	.47
Contingent	**>10**	2.1760	.69350								
reward	**Male**	2.3110	.73260	2.92	.089	-1.942	254	.053	-.22	-.44	.003
	Female	2.5294	.65888								
	Social	3.2061	1.0545	11.7	<.001	-1.669	107.7	.098	-.23	-.50	.04
	Natural	3.4327	.78834								
	<10	3.4763	.83169	1.63	.202	2.552	254	.011	.28	.07	.50
Nature of	**>10**	3.1913	.92419								
work	**Male**	3.3463	.90182	1.60	.208	-.761	254	.447	-.10	-.38	.17
	Female	3.4510	.77463								
	Social	2.8986	.84695	3.76	.053	-1.787	254	.075	-.18	-.39	.02
	Natural	3.0824	.70128								
	<10	3.1377	.74949	.22	.638	2.983	254	.003	.28	.10	.47
Communica	**>10**	2.8546	.71879								
tion	**Male**	2.9878	.74580	.01	.917	-1.784	254	.076	-.21	-.44	.02
	Female	3.1961	.74718								

" Source: Author's own work"

Key: LTEV=Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, MD=Mean Difference, df=degree of freedom, SD=standard deviation

4. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1. Summary

Overall, Debre Markos University academics were not satisfied in their job. However, academics were moderately satisfied in nature of work and communication, although they were not satisfied in their pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefit and contingent reward.

Academics were less satisfied in their pay, while they were relatively more satisfied in the nature of work in the university. Regarding the t-test result the mean of AJS of social science stream was less than that of natural science; and the difference was significant. Similarly, there was significant

difference between academics with length of service below and above ten years. However, there was no significant difference between males and females.

In view of sub scales academics' job satisfaction level varies between demographics. Academics of social science stream and those with length of service over ten years were extremely dissatisfied in their pay, while those with length of service year under ten were dissatisfied. Besides, female academics were more satisfied than males. Furthermore, academic staffs with length of service year over ten and males were at moderate level of satisfaction with the nature of university's work. Natural science stream woman and those with length of service year under ten were satisfied with nature of work.

4.2. Conclusion

The study concluded that academics were not happy in their job and they have serious concern on what they are paid. In addition, regardless of demographics, all academics were not satisfied with contingent rewards done by the university. Therefore, the Debre Markos University in particular; and the Ethiopian Ministry of Education and respective government institutions in general need to take the issue in to consideration for the improvement of academics' job satisfaction. Because, the dream of quality education at university level cannot be materialized without satisfied and highly motivated academics (Mohammed *et al.,* 2019).

4.3. Recommendation

Further researches which incorporate qualitative data need to be conducted to explore more on academics job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the present study suggests both practical and policy implications for the university management and Ethiopian ministry of education.

First, the findings have practical consequences for university management. Academics who have been exposed to diverse types of work environments report varying levels of job satisfaction. Academics, for example, who believe fringe benefits are desired and significant in the workplace, are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs, as do those who believe contingent rewards are important to them. This study's recommendations, however, go much beyond the concept of a pleasant work environment for academics. Rather, it proposes distinctive, accommodating, and desirable work settings in which everyone enjoys and feels fulfilled in their jobs.

Second, there are policy implications from the present study. Specifically, the current findings suggest that the Ethiopian Ministry of Education should develop institutional policies that promote acceptable work conditions and job satisfaction. These policies should encourage work cultures that prioritize salary raises while also developing a culture of improved promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent compensation, nature of work and communication. When such policies are implemented, they create work conditions that promote academics job satisfaction. Overall, the current findings point to producing satisfied academics who are more productive and devoted to the university.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this research. First and foremost, I extend my sincere thanks to the Debre Markos University Institute of Education and Behavioral Sciences for providing the necessary resources and facilities that made this research possible. I am also grateful to the participants of this study, whose willingness to share their time and experiences were essential to the success of this research.

Limitation of the study

As the study was completely quantitative and did not incorporate qualitative data, triangulation was not possible.

5. References

Abebe, A., & Assemie, A. (2023). Quality of work life and organizational commitment of the academic staff in Ethiopian universities. *Heliyon*, 9(4). https://www.cell.com/heliyon

Abebe, T., & Markos, S. (2016). The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in public higher education institution: The case of Arba-Minch University, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 4(8), 2347-4572. http://www.impactjournals.us/

Abosede, S. C. (2014).Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction of Academic and Non-Academic Staff of OlabisiOnabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *5*(22), 34-41. http://www.iiste.org/

Anteneh, Melu. (2016). Brief Assessment of Higher Education Governance in Ethiopia. Reflection on the Leap of the Decade. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa,*14*(*3), 304-314. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/90015349

Bilimoria, D., Perry, S., Liang, X., Stoller, E., Higgins, P. and Taylor, C. (2006). How do female and male faculty members construct job satisfaction? The roles of perceived institutional leadership and mentoring and their mediating processes. *The Journal of Technology Transfer* 31(3): 355–365.

Blum,M.L. and Naylor,J.C.(1968). *Industrial Psychology-Its Thoretical and Social Foundations,* New York, Harper and Row.

Best, J.W. (1977). *Research in Education, Eaglewood cliffs*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Chattopadhyay, S. (2020). Academic freedom, institutional autonomy and institutionalizing accountability: a reflection on the National Education Policy 2020. *Sci. J. Crit. Pract Theory*, 4, 1-23. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346476283

Choy, L. T. (2014).The strengths and weaknesses of research methodology: Comparison and complimentary between qualitative and quantitative approaches. *IOSR journal of humanities and social science*, 19(4), 99-104. http://www.iosrjournals.org/

Daniel Dando, Getachew Liben, &Ashenafi Adugna. (2017). Factor Analysis of Academic Staff Satisfaction in DireDawa University. *Science Journal*

of Education. 5(2), Doi: 10.11648/j.sjedu.20170502.16

Dawes, J., (2008). Do data characteristics change according to the number of scale points used? An experiment using 5-point, 7-point and 10-point scales. *International journal of market research*, 50(1), 61-104.

Dhanapal, S., Subramaniam, T., & Vashu, D. (2013). Factors affecting job satisfaction among academicians: A comparative study between gender and generations. *International Journal of Management Excellence*, *2*(1), 128-139.

Federal Ministry of Education (2021). *Education Sector Development Program VI (ESDP VI) 2020/21 – 2024/25 G.C*." Addis Ababa

Gebrekiros Hagos, K. A. (2015). Study on factors affecting job satisfaction in Mekelle University Academic staff at Adi-Haqi campus. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 5(1), 1-6.

Gessesse, K. T., & Premanandam, P. (2023). Job satisfaction among academic employees in private and public sector universities at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: comparative analysis. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(1) https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2196105

Guoba, A., Žygaitienė, B., & Kepalienė, I. (2022). Factors influencing teachers' job Satisfaction. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 4(4), 234-241. https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2022.4.4.30

Hirschfeld, R. R. (2000). Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire short form make a difference? *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(2),255–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640021970493

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction,* New York: Harper and Brothers.

Kebede, A. M., & Demeke, G. W. (2017). The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in Ethiopian public universities. *Contemporary Management Research*, 13(3). Doi:10.7903/cmr.17668

Krosnick, J.A., Boninger, D.S., Chuang, Y.C., Berent, M.K. & Carnot, C.G., (1993). Attitude strength: One construct or many related constructs? *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 65(6),1132.

Latiff, H., Majoka, M. I., & Kahn, M. I. (2017). Emotional intelligence and job performance of high school female teachers. Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 32(2), 333–351.Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 4(4), 309-336.

Mayya, S. S., Martis, M., & Mayya, S. P. (2020). Does gender difference matter in job satisfaction? A case of academicians in Karnataka. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 28(4), 2749-2764. https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.28.4.14

Mgaiwa, S. J. (2021). Academics' job satisfaction in Tanzania's higher education: The role of perceived work environment. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *4*(1), 100143.

Mohammed, K., Melese, D., & Esa, E. (2019). Status of Job Satisfaction among Academic Staffs of Federal Higher Education Institutions in Amhara Region, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Renaissance Journal of Social Sciences and the Humanities*, 6(2), 39-52. https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.28.4.14

Muluberhan Birhanu. (2014). Factors affecting academic staff turnover intentions and the moderating effect of gender. *Haramaya University*, Haramaya.

Mushemeza, E.D. (2016). Opportunities and challenges of academic staff in higher education in Africa", *International journal of Higher education.* 5(3). http:// www.sciedu.ca/journal/index.php/ijhe/article/view/10080.

Muyembe Asenahabi, B., & Anselemo Ikoha, P. (2023). Scientific research sample size determination. *The international Journal of Science & Technology.*

Okpara, J. O., Squillace, M., & Erondu, E. A. (2005). Gender differences and job satisfaction: a study of university teachers in the United States. *Women in management Review*, 20(3), 177-190. https://doi.org/10.1108/09649420510591852

Oshagbemi, T. (2000)$_a$. Gender differences in the job satisfaction of university teachers. *Women in Management review*, 15(7), 331-343. https://doi.org/10.1108/09649420010378133

Oshagbemi, T. (2000)$_b$. Is length of service related to the level of job satisfaction? *International Journal of Social Economics*,*27*(3), 213-226. https://doi.org/10.1108/03068290010286546

Preston, C.C.& Colman, A.M., (2000). Optimal number of response categories in rating scales: reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences. *Acta psychologica*, 104(1), 1-15.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). *Perilaku Organisasi Buku* 1, Jakarta: Salemba Empat. *Hal*, *256*, 266.

Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, *46*(3), 539-556.)

Sharma, R. D., & Jyoti, J. (2006). Job satisfaction among school teachers. *IIMB Management Review*, 18(4), 349-363.

Simieneh, M. M., Berhanu, K. Z., Molla, F., Endalew, B., Getaneh, W., Alle, A., & Tesfa, M. (2022).Turn over intention and associated factors among academic staffs in Debre Markos and Bahir Dar universities, Ethiopia: A mixed research. *Dmujids,* 6(1) DOI:10.20372/dmujids.1000

Sintayehu, B., & Hussien, A. A. (2021). Living standard of academic staff at haramaya university. *Education Research International*, *2021*(1), 7956736. https://www.hindawi.com/journals/edri/2021/7956736/.

Smerek, R. E., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university.

Research in higher education, *48*, 229-250. DOI: 10.1007/sl 1162-006-9042-3

Smith,P.,Kendall,L. and Hullin,C.(1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chcago:Rand MC Nally.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American journal of community psychology*, *13*(6), 693.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.*3. Sage.

Tesfaye Semela. (2011). Vulnerability to Brain-Drain among academics in Institutions of Higher Learning in Ethiopia. *Asian Social Science*, 7(1):3-18. http://www.ccsenet.org/ass

Thangaswamy, A., & Thiyagaraj, D. (2017). Theoretical concept of job satisfaction-a study. *InternationalJournal of Research*, 5(6),464-470. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.822315

Toker, B. (2011). Job satisfaction of academic staff: an empirical study on Turkey. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(2), 156-169. DOI 10.1108/09684881111125050.

Topchyan, R., & Woehler, C. (2021). Do teacher status, gender, and years of teaching experience impact job satisfaction and work engagement?. *Education and Urban Society*, *53*(2), 119-145

Vroom, V. H. (1964),*Work and motivation, John Wiley and sons*, Inc., New York.

Ward, M. E., & Sloane, P. J. (2000). Non-pecuniary advantages versus pecuniary disadvantages: Job satisfaction among male and female academics in Scottish universities. Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 47(3), 273–303)

Wedajo, M., & Chekole, B. (2020). Attitude of employees towards change Initiatives as influenced by commitment and job satisfaction: The case of selected higher education institutions in Ethiopia. *Journal of process management and new technologies*, *8*(3). http://www.japmnt.com/

Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human resource management review*, 12(2),173-194. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00045-1

Wim J., Katrien W., Patrick D. P., & Patrick V. K., (2008). *Marketing Research with SPSS. Prentice Hall; Pearson Education*. ISBN: 978-0-273-70383-9. Pp.274-275.

Woldegiorgis, E.T. & Doevenspeck, M.(2013). The changing role of higher education in africa: a historical reflection. *Higher Education Studies*, 3(6),35–45. http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/hes/article/view/31139

Yauch, C. A., & Steudel, H. J. (2003). Complementary use of qualitative and quantitative cultural assessment methods. *Organizational research methods*, *6*(4), 465-481. DOI: 10.1177/1094428103257362

Yamane, Y. (1967). *Mathematical Formulae for Sample Size Determination*

Appendix-1

Item No.	Items
	Pay
j1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do in my university
j10	Compensation fees are adequate enough in the university
j19	I feel appreciated by the university when I think about what university pays me.
j28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.
	Promotion
j2	There is really too much chance for promotion on my job in the university
j11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.
j20	I get ahead as fast here as I do in other places.
j33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion in this university.
	Supervision
j3	The university leaders are quite competent in doing their job in the university
j12	The university leaders are fair to me.
j21	The university leaders show too much interest in the feelings of teachers.
j30	I like the university leaders in this university.
	Fringe Benefit
j4	I am satisfied with the benefits I receive in the university.
j13	The benefits I receive in this university are as good as most other organizations offer.
j22	The benefit package we have in the university is equitable.
j29	There are benefits which I should have.
	Contingent Rewards
j5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive in the university.
j14	I feel that the work I do in this university is appreciated.
j23	There are enough rewards for those who work in this university.
j32	I feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.
	Operation Procedures
j6	Many of our rules and procedures in this university make me doing a good job
j15	My efforts to do a good job in this university are encouraged.
j24	I have too much to do at work in this university.
j31	I have necessary and appropriate paperwork in this university.
	Coworkers
j7	I like the people I work with in the university.
j16	I find I have to work harder at my job in the university
j25	I enjoy my colleagues in this university.
j34	There is no backbiting and fighting at work in this university.
	Nature of Work
j8	I sometimes feel my job in this university is useful.
j17	I like doing the things I do at work in my university.
j27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my teaching.
j35	My job is enjoyable.
	Communication
j9	Communications seem good within this university.

j18	The goals of this university are clear to me.
j26	I often feel that I know what is going on with this university
j36	Work assignments are fully explained in this university.

Adapted from Spector (1985) Job Satisfaction Survey

Appendix-2

S No.	Item No.	Items
		Pay
1	*j1*	*I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do in my university*
2	*j10*	*Compensation fees are adequate enough in the university*
3	*j19*	*I feel appreciated by the university when I think about what university pays me.*
4	*j28*	*I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.*
		Promotion
5	*j2*	*There is really too much chance for promotion on my job in the university*
6	*j11*	*Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.*
7	*j20*	*I get ahead as fast here as I do in other places.*
8	*j33*	*I am satisfied with my chances for promotion in this university.*
		Supervision
9	*j3*	*The university leaders are quite competent in doing their job in the university*
10	*j12*	*The university leaders are fair to me.*
11	*j21*	*The university leaders show too much interest in the feelings of teachers.*
12	*j30*	*I like the leaders in this university.*
		Fringe Benefit
13	*j4*	*I am satisfied with the benefits I receive in the university.*
14	*j13*	*The benefits I receive in this university are as good as most other organizations offer.*
15	*j22*	*The benefit package we have in the university is equitable.*
16	*j29*	*There are benefits which I should have.*
		Contingent Reward
17	*j5*	*When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive in the university.*
18	*j14*	*I feel that the work I do in this university is appreciated.*
19	*j23*	*There are enough rewards for those who work in this university.*
20	*j32*	*I feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.*
		Nature of Work
21	*j8*	*I sometimes feel my job in this university is useful.*
22	*j17*	*I like doing the things I do at work in my university.*
23	*j27*	*I feel a sense of pride in doing my teaching.*
24	*j35*	*My job is enjoyable.*
		Communication
25	*j9*	*Communications seem good within this university.*
26	*j18*	*The goals of this university are clear to me.*
27	*j26*	*I often feel that I know what is going on with this university*
28	*j36*	*Work assignments are fully explained in this university.*

Adapted from Spector's (1985) JSS