

Job Satisfaction Among Academic and Administrative Staff in Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

Kian-Sam Hong^{a*}, Jia-Mien Lim^a, Kock-Wah Tan^a, Abang Ekhsan Abang Othman^a

^aUniversiti Malaysia Sarawak, 94300 Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: hksam@fcs.unimas.my

Article history

Received :7 Disember 2011
Received in revised form :8 May 2012
Accepted :15 August 2012

Abstract

This study investigated the levels of job satisfaction of academic and administrative staff of University Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS) across six dimensions of job satisfaction. It employed a cross-sectional survey research design involving 59 academic and administrative staff from UNIMAS. The six dimensions of promotion, supervision, work itself, colleagues, work environment, and pay benefits were used to measure the level of job satisfaction. On the whole, both academic and administrative staff in UNIMAS enjoyed modest level of satisfaction. There were no significant differences in the level of satisfaction in all dimensions except work itself, where it was found that academic staff tended to enjoy higher level of job satisfaction compared to administrative staff. Gender and disciplines (field of expertise) were not significant factors in influencing job satisfaction. The findings from the study generally supported past findings in the literature. As job satisfaction amongst the academic and administrative staff in UNIMAS were relatively modest, UNIMAS management should consider ways to improve the level of job satisfaction of its staff along the six dimensions investigated, irrespective of gender, disciplines and job categories (academic and non-academic). The study could be extended to other local universities to see if similar patterns exist and thus enable the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) to look into relevant human resource policies to enhance job satisfaction amongst academicians and administrative staff in the public universities.

Keywords: Job satisfaction; academic staff; administrative staff; university

Abstrak

Kajian ini menyelidik paras kepuasan kerja staf akademik dan pentadbiran di Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS) merentasi enam dimensi kepuasan kerja. Kajian ini menggunakan rekabentuk kajian survei keratan rentas melibatkan 59 staf akademik dan pentadbiran di UNIMAS. Enam dimensi kepuasan kerja merangkumi kenaikan pangkat, penyeliaan, pekerjaan, rakan sekerja, persekitaran kerja dan faedah gaji, digunakan untuk mengukur paras kepuasan kerja. Pada keseluruhannya, staf akademik dan pengurusan di UNIMAS menunjukkan paras kepuasan kerja yang sederhana. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan tidak wujud perbezaan yang signifikan dalam paras kepuasan kerja untuk semua dimensi kecuali pekerjaan, dan staf akademik mempamerkan paras kepuasan kerja yang lebih tinggi berbanding staf pentadbiran untuk dimensi ini. Manakala, jantina dan disiplin (bidang kepakaran) bukan merupakan faktor signifikan yang mempengaruhi kepuasan kerja. Dapatan kajian ini amnya menyokong dapatan kajian lepas dalam literatur. Oleh kerana paras kepuasan kerja di kalangan staf akademik dan pentadbiran UNIMAS hanya pada paras sederhana, pengurusan UNIMAS perlu mempertimbangkan langkah-langkah untuk meningkatkan paras kepuasan kerja staf berdasarkan kepada enam dimensi dalam kajian ini, tanpa mengira jantina, disiplin dan kategori kerja (akademik dan bukan akademik). Kajian ini perlu dilanjutkan kepada universiti tempatan yang lain untuk melihat samada pola yang sama wujud dan seterusnya membolehkan Kementerian Pengajian Tinggi (KPT) untuk meneliti polisi sumber manusia yang relevan bagi meningkatkannya kepuasan kerja di kalangan staf akademik dan pentadbiran di universiti awam.

Kata kunci: Kepuasan kerja; staf akademik; staf pentadbiran; universiti

© 2012 Penerbit UTM Press. All rights reserved.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is a “pleasurable emotional state as a result of the appraisal on an employee’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (Toker, 2011, p. 156). Job satisfaction significantly influences among others, absenteeism, turnover, performance and psychological distress (Chen, Yang, Shiau, & Wang, 2006). Though job satisfaction is an area that is relatively well researched, research works on job satisfaction amongst staff in higher education are somewhat limited. Most research in job satisfaction has been done in profit-making industry and service organization (Kusku, 2003). There is an increasing interest in research on job satisfaction in universities as these institutions are labor intensive and with a big portion of budget devoted to staff. Therefore, the effectiveness of universities is largely dependent on their staff and thus, job satisfaction is an important issue (Toker, 2011). However, most studies related to job satisfaction among academics in higher education has been conducted overseas such as the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, Hong Kong and Sweden (Lacy & Sheehan, 1997), India (Sharma & Jyoti, 2009), and Turkey (Kusku, 2003). In Malaysia, one of the studies looking at job satisfaction among academicians was reported by Santhapparaj and Syed Shah Alam (2005). Studies related to job satisfaction of administrative staff in university are generally lacking. Among others, Glick (1992), Volkwein, Malik and Napierski-Prancl (1998) and Baldwin (2009) investigated this issue in universities in the United States. On the other hand, Olorunsola (2010) looked at administrators’ job satisfaction in Nigerian universities. Thus, Ward and Sloane (2000, cited in Sabharwal & Corley, 2009) asserted that although there were studies on job satisfaction but limited studies were done in the university setting.

In addition, most studies carried out overseas used the five factors identified in Job Description Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Huilin, 1969) comprising of promotion, supervision, work, salaries, and co-workers as the basis for investigating job satisfaction. Furthermore, several demographic variables such as gender (Okpara, Squillace, & Erundu, 2004) and discipline of study (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009) were considered as possibly having an impact on job satisfaction in the academic setting.

Nebeker, Busso, Werenfels, Diallo, Czekajewski, and Ferdman (2001) also stated that employee job satisfaction could impact on performance and employee commitments. More than any other institutions, human capital is most crucial in a university setting and hence, job satisfaction of academic staff is important as they can result in high quality teaching and research. The job satisfaction of university’s administrative staff is no less important as they facilitate and support teaching and research activities. Poor job satisfaction usually results in frequent complaints and high level of turnover which may contribute to low staff morale and dampened productivity (Jennings & McLaughlin, 1997).

1.1 Research Purposes

Therefore, this study aimed to explore academicians and administrative staff job satisfaction in a Malaysian public university setting using the factors incorporated in the JDI and taking into consideration the possible effects of gender and discipline of study. The main objectives of this study were to investigate the levels of job satisfaction among academic and administrative staff in UNIMAS and to determine the differences in job satisfaction levels based on selected demographic characteristics.

The findings of this study could thus contribute to the existing literature on job satisfaction in public universities in Malaysia in addition to providing input to management of public universities in enhancing job satisfaction among its staff which ultimately could improve students’ learning. However, generalizability of the findings of this study could be limited as the study was conducted at only one public university and with a relatively small sample size.

1.2 Background of UNIMAS

UNIMAS is the eighth public university in Malaysia located in Kota Samarahan, Sarawak. UNIMAS was established on the 1st October 1992 and currently has eight faculties, comprising of the Faculty of Applied and Creative Art (FACA), Faculty of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development (FCSHD), Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology (FCSIT), Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB), Faculty of Engineering (FENG), Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (FMHS), Faculty of Resource Science and Technology (FRST) and Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS). Staff in UNIMAS is divided into two categories comprising of the academic and administrative staff. Academic staffs are required to teach and conduct research. In addition, some academicians take on administrative posts, such as the dean, deputy dean, head of program and program coordinator. For the administrative staff, they hold non-academic positions including technician, laboratory administrator, clerk and professional staff that work to support the vision and missions of the faculties.

2.0 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In job satisfaction related research, many factors were used to measure job satisfaction. Some of the most frequently used factors is based on the Job Description Index (JDI) developed by Smith *et al.* (1969). The index uses five dimensions to determine job satisfaction, i.e., promotion, supervision, works, salaries and co-workers. JDI measures the perceptions on these five dimensions of job satisfaction. The JDI is one of the most popular measure of job satisfaction been found to produce reliable results (Oshagbemi, 2000).

Most studies in the literature on job satisfaction investigated the contributing factors and impacts of job satisfaction on performance. Pearson and Seilor (1983) investigated the level of satisfaction of academics in the United States and found that academics were generally satisfied with their working environment but were very dissatisfied with fringe benefits and pay. Toker (2011) on the other hand reported that academics in Turkish universities had moderate level of job satisfaction. Meanwhile, Manger and Eikeland (1990) showed that employee satisfaction and relationship with colleagues were strong predictors of employees’ satisfaction and intention to leave. On the other hand, Hagedorn (1994) reported that factors that included salary, total number of working hours, and perceived support from colleagues influenced the perception of stress level which in turn influenced job satisfaction of academic staff. Lacy and Sheehan (1997) work on job satisfaction which spanned across eight nations (Australia, Germany, Hong Kong, Israel, Mexico, Sweden, United Kingdom, and United States) discovered that university’s atmosphere, sense of community and relationship with colleagues were the best predictors of job satisfaction.

Kusku (2003) set out to determine the differences in the satisfaction levels of the academic and administrative staff

amongst the public universities in Turkey. Amongst others, it was found that there were significant differences in the levels of satisfaction in most factors influencing job satisfaction investigated and it was also reported that public universities in Turkey had difficulties to attract and retain staff due to relatively low salary compared with private universities. Meanwhile, in the Malaysian context, Santhapparaj and Syed Shah Alam (2005) reported that factors that included pay, promotion, fringe benefits, working conditions, support for research and teaching had significant association with job satisfaction amongst private universities in Malaysia. And more recently, Sharma and Jyoti (2009) found that job characteristics, e.g., autonomy, job enrichment, idealness and appropriateness of job were vital for enhancing job satisfaction of academicians in India.

Literatures on job satisfaction amongst administrative staff in universities are relatively sparse as most research tends to focus on academic staff. Volkwein *et al.* (1998) found several important intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions that influenced job satisfaction of administrative staff. The intrinsic satisfactions were the feelings of accomplishment, autonomy, creativity, initiative, and challenges in job while extrinsic satisfactions were one's attitude toward salary and benefits, opportunities for advancement, and future income potential. Baldwin (2009), on the other hand, investigated job satisfaction of men and women administrators in four public universities in Alabama and found no statistically significant difference in the overall job satisfaction, work climate and job structure between male and female administrative staff. Recently, Olorunsola (2010) explored job satisfaction amongst administrative staff in Southwest Nigeria universities and the result indicated that the levels of job satisfaction among administrative staff in both federal and state universities were high.

However, on the influence of gender on job satisfaction, Gruneberg (1979) showed that female faculty members placed greater emphasis on intrinsic factors, e.g., contribution to societies, opportunities for advancement and intellectual challenge compared to male faculty members. Meanwhile, Okpara *et al.* (2004) in an extensive study that covered eighty universities in the United States reported that there were obvious gender differences in job satisfaction levels as well as factors influencing it. Similarly, but on a lesser scale, Sharma and Jyoti (2009) conducted a study on job satisfaction amongst academicians in University of Jammu and found that female academicians were generally more satisfied compared to their male counterparts. Oshagbemi (2000) in a study in the United Kingdom stated that generally there were no gender differences in job satisfaction among universities' administrators but there was an interaction effect between gender and service ranks. And more recently, Olorunsola (2010) carried out a study that compared job satisfaction of administrative staff based on gender in South West Nigeria universities and showed that there was significant difference in the job satisfaction of male and female administrative staff in the universities. The male administrative staff tended to have higher level of job satisfaction compared to female administrative staff.

On job satisfaction in terms of academic disciplinary differences, Hagedorn (2000, cited in Sabharwal & Corley, 2009) found that disciplinary differences tended to be similar to gender and ethnic differences because groups that were alike shared common attributes and a common culture. Meanwhile, Ward and Sloane (2000, cited in Sabharwal & Corley, 2009) discovered that for female faculty members, engineers were the most satisfied and social scientists were the least satisfied. For male faculty members, they reported that social scientists had

the highest level of job satisfaction while natural or physical scientists had the lowest.

On the other hand, Sabharwal and Corley (2009) studied the job satisfaction of academics across gender and discipline. It was discovered that men had significantly higher levels of overall job satisfaction across all disciplines. The study also found that within the science and social science disciplines, men were significantly less satisfied than women while in the engineering and social science fields, there was no significant difference in satisfaction levels for men and women. It was also found that female faculty members earned lower salaries than men across all disciplines, but their satisfaction were generally higher compared to their male counterparts. This finding reinforced the speculation of the researcher that women might place greater emphasis on intrinsic factors (such as feelings of accomplishment, recognition and autonomy) than extrinsic factors (salary and job security).

■ 3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A non-experimental, cross-sectional survey research design was employed. A questionnaire was used to obtain data from the samples. The independent variables of this study included position, gender of the academic and administrative staff and their disciplines of study while the dimensions used to measure job satisfaction levels included satisfaction of staff towards promotion, supervision, work itself, colleagues, work environment and pay and benefits. These items mirror closely those found in JDI and were adopted from instruments used in past studies such as American Academy of Family Physicians (1999); Morris, Yaacob, and Wood (2003); Moyes, Owusu-Ansah, and Ganguli (2006); Nagel-Bennett (2010) and Buckingham (2010).

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part of the questionnaire seeks to explore the demographic profiles of the respondents in terms of their working positions, gender and discipline (fields of expertise). The second part of the questionnaire was concerned with the various dimensions used to determine job satisfaction, i.e., promotion, supervision, work itself, colleagues, working environment as well as pay and benefits. Five-point Likert scale was used as the response format in the survey questionnaire, ranging from "(1) Strongly Agree" to "(5) Strongly Disagree".

Meanwhile, the target population of this research consisted of the academic and administrative staff from eight faculties in UNIMAS which were FACA, FCSHD, FCSIT, FEB, FENG, FMHS, FRST and FSS. Staff population in UNIMAS was 2042 of which academic staff was 745 and administrative staff was 1297 (Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, n.d.). Academic staff in the faculties included lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors and professors involved in teaching and research activities. Meanwhile, administrative staff in the faculties consisted of laboratory administrators, technicians and support staff. Simple random sampling was used to collect the data so that all staff in the university had the equal chance of being selected as respondents. For a population of 2042, 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error, a sample size of 324 is recommended (http://www.raosoft.com/sample_size.html). Thus a total of 400 questionnaires, of which 280 were randomly distributed to the academic staff and 120 were distributed to the administrative staff. The researcher allocated each faculty equally with 50 copies of questionnaires - 35 copies for academic staff and 15 copies for administrative staff in each faculty. However, the

researcher only managed to collect back 59 questionnaires from six faculties as the Faculty of Social Sciences and Faculty of Engineering failed to respond, resulting in an overall response rate of approximately 15%. Thus, the number of respondents obtained was less than that suggested as adequate and results of the study should thus be interpreted subject to this limitation.

4.0 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Reliability of the Research Instrument

Table 1 shows the reliability coefficients of the research instrument. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated in order to determine the reliability of the research instrument. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for Section B1, B2, B3, B4, B5 and B6 of the questionnaire indicated the questionnaire were sufficiently reliable.

Table 1 Reliability coefficients of the dimensions of job satisfaction

Sections	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
Section B1: Promotion	6	0.694
Section B2: Supervision	9	0.895
Section B3: Work itself	8	0.927
Section B4: Colleagues	8	0.908
Section B5: Work environment	7	0.915
Section B6: Pay and benefits	8	0.731
Overall	46	0.817

4.2 Respondents' Demographic Characteristics

The demographic characteristics of respondents included in this study were gender, position and faculty of respondents. Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents based on gender. Fifty-nine respondents participated in this study. Twenty-two of the respondents (27.3%) were male and thirty-seven of the respondents (62.7%) were female.

Table 2 Distribution of respondents based on gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	22	37.3
Female	37	62.7
Total	59	100.0

Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents based on position. Twenty-three of the respondents worked as academic staff (39.0%) while 36 (61.0%) of the respondents were administrative staff.

Table 3 Distribution of respondents based on position

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Academic staff	23	39.0
Administrative staff	36	61.0
Total	59	100.0

Table 4 shows the distributions of respondents based on faculty. Most of the respondents in this study were from FCSHD, comprising 20 (33.9%) respondents, followed by FEB with 13 (22.0%) respondents. There were nine (15.3%) respondents from FRST, seven (11.9%) respondents from FCSIT and six (10.2%) respondents from the FMHS. FACA had the least respondents which were only four (6.8%) respondents.

Table 4 Distribution of respondents based on faculty

Faculty	Frequency	Percentage
Faculty of Applied and Creative Arts (FACA)	4	6.8
Faculty of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development (FCSHD)	20	33.9
Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology (FCSIT)	7	11.9
Faculty of Resource Science and Technology (FRST)	9	15.3
Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB)	13	22.0
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (FMHS)	6	10.2
Total	59	100.0

4.3 Job Satisfaction of Academic and Administrative Staff in UNIMAS

Table 5 shows that on the whole, both the academic and administrative staff in UNIMAS enjoyed almost similar level of job satisfaction, with the overall mean of 2.55 (s.d.=0.803) for academic staff and 2.69 (s.d.=0.590) for administrative staff respectively. This shows that both staff categories showed modest level of job satisfaction. It was also noted that academic staff demonstrated highest level of job satisfaction for the "work itself" and "colleagues" dimensions while for administrative staff, "colleagues" and "work environment" yielded the highest level of satisfaction. Meanwhile, both the academic and administrative staff showed least satisfaction for "promotion" and "pay and benefits" dimensions. These findings were similar to those in the literature. For example, Toker (2011) reported that academics in Turkish universities had moderate level of job satisfaction while Pearson and Seilor (1983) found that academics in United States universities were generally satisfied with their job. On the other hand, Baldwin (2009) found that administrators were satisfied with "pay," "promotion opportunities" and "supervision" but dissatisfied with the "people whom they work".

Table 5 Levels of job satisfaction for academic and administrative staff in unimas

	Academic staff		Administrative staff	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
B1: Promotion	3.08	0.655	2.94	0.400
B2: Supervision	2.49	0.730	2.72	0.526
B3: Work itself	2.09	0.813	2.62	0.522
B4: Colleagues	2.22	0.844	2.45	0.488
B5: Work Environment	2.61	0.976	2.57	0.526
B6: Pay and Benefits	2.81	0.809	2.86	1.078
Overall	2.55	0.803	2.69	0.590

Note: Lower scores indicate higher level of satisfaction with range of 1 to 5

As both the academic and administrative staff enjoyed modest level of job satisfaction, it would be interesting to investigate if there were indeed significant differences in the various dimensions used to measure job satisfaction levels for both categories of staff. Independent t-tests were used to determine the differences for the various factors in influencing the level of job satisfaction between academic and administrative staff in UNIMAS. As shown in Table 6, out of the six dimensions of job satisfaction which were “promotion,” “supervision,” “work

itself,” “colleagues,” “work environment,” and “pay and benefits,” only one of the dimensions of job satisfaction, i.e., “work itself” showed significant differences between academic and administrative staff with $t(57) = -3.031$ and $p\text{-value} = 0.004$. The mean for academic staff was 2.09 (s.d.=0.813) while it was 2.62 for administrative staff (s.d.=0.522). The academic staff showed higher “work itself” job satisfaction compared to administrative staff.

Table 6 Independent t-test results for academic and administrative staff differences in the levels of job satisfaction

	Academic staff		Administrative staff		t	df	p
	Mean	Std dev	Mean	Std dev			
B1: Promotion	3.08	0.655	2.94	0.400	1.027	55	0.309
B2: Supervision	2.49	0.730	2.72	0.526	-1.410	55	0.164
B3: Work itself	2.09	0.813	2.62	0.522	-3.031	57	0.004**
B4: Colleagues	2.22	0.844	2.45	0.488	-1.309	55	0.196
B5: Work Environment	2.61	0.976	2.57	0.526	0.241	56	0.811
B6: Pay and Benefits	2.81	0.809	2.86	1.078	-0.193	56	0.847

Note: ** $p < 0.005$

Kusku (2003) found that in Turkey’s universities, academic staff had higher levels of “professional satisfaction” compared to administrative staff. Kusku (2003) also found that academic staff had higher satisfaction with “work itself” and reasoned that it was because academic staff tended to place greater importance in career development and advancement compared to administrative staff. This aspect of Kusku (2003) study appeared to be consistent with the findings of the present study in which academic staff in UNIMAS were found to be generally more satisfied compared to administrative staff for “work itself.” Thus, in general, previous studies showed that there were differences between academic and administrative staff in job satisfaction, as opposed to the findings of present study in which job satisfaction as measured by “promotion,” “supervision,” “colleagues,” “work environment” and “pay and benefits” did not significantly differ between academic and administrative staff.

4.4 Gender Differences in the Levels of Job Satisfaction

The study showed that gender was not a significant influence on job satisfaction. As shown in Table 7, there were no differences between male and female staff on all six dimensions of job satisfaction. This finding was similar to the results reported by Oshagbemi (2000) indicating no gender differences in job satisfaction among universities’ administrators in the United Kingdom. However, Okpara *et al.*’s (2004) study demonstrated

that gender was an important variable influencing job satisfaction. Females were generally more satisfied with “work” and “colleagues” while males were more satisfied with “promotion,” “supervision” and “overall job satisfaction.” Likewise, Sharma and Jyoti (2009) conducted a study on job satisfaction amongst university teachers in University of Jammu in India and found that female teachers were generally more satisfied with their jobs than their male counterparts. It was suggested that female teachers were more satisfied because they had lower expectations on job status compared to male teachers. Besides, the nature and social cultural values of teaching may be the reasons for the likings of female teachers on their professions (Sharma & Jyoti, 2009). However, Lacy and Sheehan (1997) in their study involving several nations noted that male academics tended to be more satisfied than females with most aspects of their job and stated that these findings were consistent with the research literature. In addition to that, a recent study by Olorunsola (2010) on job satisfaction and gender amongst administrative staff in Southwest Nigerian Universities also found significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female administrative staff in the universities. Male administrative staff had higher level of job satisfaction compared to female administrative staff. Hence, they suggested that the management of the university should develop programs to motivate the female staff to enhance their job satisfaction level and in turn helped achieve organizational goals.

Table 7 Independent t-test results for gender differences in the levels of job satisfaction

	Male		Female		t	df	p
	Mean	Std dev	Mean	Std dev			
B1: Promotion	3.03	0.691	2.97	0.380	0.415	55	0.680
B2: Supervision	2.56	0.733	2.67	0.552	-0.617	55	0.540
B3: Work itself	2.19	0.733	2.55	0.643	-1.973	57	0.053
B4: Colleagues	2.30	0.760	2.39	0.600	-0.450	55	0.655
B5: Work Environment	2.59	0.729	2.58	0.741	0.044	56	0.965
B6: Pay and Benefits	2.98	1.386	2.76	0.642	0.833	56	0.408

4.5 Discipline Differences in the Levels of Job Satisfaction

Table 8 showed that there was no significant difference between staff involved in the hard discipline (FRST, FMHS, FCSIT) and soft discipline (FEB, FACA, FSKPM) of study in all six dimensions of job satisfaction. This indicated that discipline is

not a significant influence on job satisfaction. However, according to Sabharwal and Corley (2009) findings on differences between disciplines are often difficult to interpret and could also be influenced by other factors such as culture and gender.

Table 8 Independent t-test results for discipline differences in the levels of job satisfaction

	Hard discipline		Soft discipline		t	df	p
	Mean	Std dev	Mean	Std dev			
B1: Promotion	2.93	0.495	3.12	0.549	-1.323	55	0.191
B2: Supervision	2.60	0.630	2.68	0.62	-0.506	55	0.615
B3: Work itself	2.48	0.787	2.30	0.495	1.004	57	0.320
B4: Colleagues	2.33	0.623	2.39	0.728	-0.327	55	0.745
B5: Work Environment	2.62	0.811	2.53	0.587	0.488	56	0.628
B6: Pay and Benefits	2.97	1.118	2.63	0.639	1.328	56	0.190

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study suggested that both the academic and administrative staff enjoyed modest level of job satisfaction. There was no significant difference in the levels of job satisfaction between academic and administrative staff on all dimensions except for the dimension of “work itself,” where it was found that academic staff was more satisfied compared to administrative staff. Meanwhile, it was also found that gender and discipline were not significant factors in influencing job satisfaction.

In terms of contribution to the literature, the findings generally supported the findings in the literature which reported moderate levels of job satisfaction in the university setting. This study reported no gender and discipline differences in job satisfaction while the literature generally reported mixed findings in these aspects of job satisfaction among academic and administrative staff in universities. Some possible reasons contributing to the findings of no gender and discipline differences in job satisfaction could be culture (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009), length of service (Toker, 2011), rank in service (Oshagbemi, 2000) and governance and university culture (Hong et al. 2011) of universities in Malaysia in particular and the eastern world in general. In terms of practical implication, as job satisfaction amongst academic and administrative staff in UNIMAS were relatively modest, UNIMAS management should consider ways to enhance the level of job satisfaction of its staff along the six dimensions understudy, irrespective of gender, discipline and job categories (academic and non-academic). If academic staff are to be encouraged to express higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of dissatisfaction, attention must be paid to their work environment, in particular looking at ways to develop a sense of community-acknowledgment and support, to enhance participation in decision making, to nurture an intellectual environment, to improve clarity of institutional mission and to enrich faculty-administration relations.

However, as the sample size was small and the study was conducted only at one public university in Malaysia, it is hoped that the study could be extended to other local universities to see if similar patterns exist and thus enabling the relevant central agencies to formulate relevant manpower policies to enhance job satisfaction amongst academicians and administrative staff in public universities in the country. Additional independent variables should also be considered such as service length, rank in service and university culture. Research in this area is crucial as the performances of academic and administrative staff, which are largely a direct consequence of job satisfaction, have direct repercussions on students’ performances and research achievements of universities.

References

- American Academy of Family Physicians. 1999. *Job Satisfaction: Putting Theory into Practice*. Retrieved September 23, 2010, from <http://www.aafp.org/fpm/991000fm/26.html>.
- Baldwin, H. T. T. 2009. *Administrator Job Satisfaction in Higher Education*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Auburn University, Alabama.
- Buckingham, E. C. D. 2010. *A Case Study Exploring The Impact of Managing Workplace Diversity on Diversity Awareness and Employee Job Satisfaction*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Capella University, United States.
- Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Shiau, J. Y., & Wang, H. H. 2006. The Development of An Employee Satisfaction Model for Higher Education. *The TQM Magazine*. 18(5): 484–500.
- Glick, N. L. 1992. Job Satisfaction Among Academic Administrators. *Research in Higher Education*. 33(5): 625–639.
- Gruneberg, M. M. 1979. *Understanding Job Satisfaction*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Hagedorn, L. S. 1994. Retirement Proximity’s Role in the Prediction of Satisfaction in Academe. *Research in Higher Education*. 35(6): 711–728.
- Hong, K. S., Gan, S. L., Songan, P., Rujhan Mustafa, Tan, G. S., Hasbee Hj Usop, & Ngui K. S. 2011. Leadership Behaviours, University Culture And Leadership Effectiveness for Academic Work: A Study of Malaysian Public Universities. Paper Presented at *ELLTA 2011 – Exploring Leadership and Learning Theories in Asia*, USM, Malaysia, 15-17 February 2011.
- Jennings Jr. K. M., & McLaughlin, F. S. 1997. Measuring and Correcting Inversion in Faculty Salaries at Public Universities. *Public Personnel Management*. 26(3): 345–357.
- Kusku, F. 2003. Employee Satisfaction in Higher Education: The Case of Academic and Administrative Staff in Turkey. *Career Development International*. 8(7): 347–356.
- Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. 1997. Job Satisfaction Among Academic Staff: An International Perspective. *Higher Education*. 34: 305–322.
- Manger, T., & Eikeland, O. 1990. Factors Predicting Staff’s Intentions to Leave the University. *Higher Education*. 19: 281–291.
- Morris, D., Yaacob, A., & Wood, G. 2004. Attitudes Towards Pay and Promotion in the Malaysian Higher Educational Sector. *Employee Relations*. 26(2): 137–150.
- Moyes, G. D., Owusu-Ansah, S., & Ganguli, G. 2006. Factors Influencing the Level of Job Satisfaction of Hispanic Accounting Professionals: A Perceptual Survey. *Journal of Business & Economic Studies*. 12(1): 12–26.
- Nebeker, D., Busso, L., Werenfels, P. D., Diallo, H., Czekajewski, A., & Ferdman, B. 2001. Airline Station Performance as a Function of Employee Satisfaction. *Journal of Quality Management*. 6(1): 29–45.
- Nagel-Bennett, S. 2010. *Job Satisfaction Of University Chief Student Conduct Administrators and Their Intent to Stay Or Leave The Position*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
- Okpara, J. O., Squillace, M., & Erondu, E. A. 2004. Gender Differences and Job Satisfaction: A Study of University Teachers in the United States. *Women in Management Review*. 20(3): 177–190.
- Olorunsola, E. O. 2010. Job Satisfaction and Gender Factor of Administrative Staff in South West Nigeria Universities. Paper Presented at *EABR & ETLC Conference Proceedings*, 91-95, Dublin, Ireland. Retrieved 23 March, 2011, from http://www.cluteinstitute.com/proceedings/2010_Dublin_EABR_Articles/Article%20233.pdf.
- Oshagbemi, T. 2000. Gender Differences in the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers. *Women in Management Review*. 15(7): 331–343.
- Pearson, D. A., & Seiler, R. E. 1983. Environmental Satisfiers in Academe. *Higher Education*. 12(1): 35–47.

- Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. 2009. Faculty Job Satisfaction Across Gender And Discipline. *The Social Science Journal*. 46: 539–556.
- Santhapparaj, S. A., & Syed Shah Alam. 2005. Job Satisfaction Among Academic Staff in Private Universities in Malaysia. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 1(2): 72–76.
- Sharma, R. D., & Jyoti, J. 2010. Job Satisfaction of University Teachers: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Services Research*. 9(2): 51–80.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. 1969. *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Toker, B. 2011. Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff: An Empirical Study on Turkey. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 19(2): 156–169.
- Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (n.d.). *Facts and figures*. Retrieved September 2011, from http://www.unimas.my/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=34.
- Ward, M. E., & Sloane, P. J. 2000. Non-Pecuniary Advantages Vs. Pecuniary Disadvantages: Job Satisfaction Among Male and Female Academics In Scottish Universities. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*. 47: 273–303.
- Volkwein, J. F., Malik, S. M., & Napierski-Prancl, M. 1998. Administrative Satisfaction and The Regulatory Climate at Public Universities. *Research in Higher Education*. 39(1): 43–63.