

# JOB SATISFACTION OF TEACHING AND NON-TEACHING STAFF OF NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY (NAU), AWKA.

By

**Asiegbu, Chidubem Emmanuel (Ph.D)**

Senior Lecturer, Department of Educational Management and Policy  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Anambra State, Nigeria.

E-mail: [ec.asiegbu@unizik.edu.ng](mailto:ec.asiegbu@unizik.edu.ng) or [blessedasiegbu@yahoo.com](mailto:blessedasiegbu@yahoo.com)

Phone: 08038683562;

**Rev. Fr. Hilary Obinna Nwajagu**

Department of Educational Management and Policy  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Anambra State, Nigeria

**Ani, Anthonia Nwabugo Amarachukwu (Ph.D)**

Department of Educational Management and Policy  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Anambra State, Nigeria

and

**Emmasiegbu, Chimauche Mary**

Département of Library and Information Science  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Anambra State, Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

This study compared the Job Satisfaction of Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The Population of the study is 5004 staff (Teaching and Non-Teaching) of NAU, while the sample consist of five hundred (500) teaching and non-teaching staff selected through simple random sampling technique. Two research questions and two null hypotheses tested at 0.05 level of significance, guided the study. A twenty-four items researchers-developed questionnaire was the instrument for data collection. It was validated by three experts. The reliability of the instrument was established using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient which yielded 0.82 indexes. Arithmetic mean was used to provide answer to the two research question while t-test statistic was adopted to test the two null hypotheses. The study found among others that government interference in university autonomy and unpaid allowances by the government and the institutions are the major factors that affect the job satisfaction of both teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU. It was also found that there are no significant differences between teaching and non-teaching staff on the strategies that improves their

job satisfaction. Based on this, conclusion, implication and recommendations were made for the study.

**Keywords:** Job Satisfaction, Teaching and Non-Teaching Staff, University.

## INTRODUCTION

Luttans (2000) gave a comprehensive definition of Job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or experience. He went further to say that job satisfaction is how employees perceive how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important.

According to Lawal (2000), it is generally recognized in the organizational behavior field that job satisfaction is the most important and frequently studied attitude at work. While Luttans (1998) posited that there are three important dimensions of job situation. As such it cannot be seen, it can only be inferred. Job satisfaction is often determined by how well outcome meet or exceeds expectations.

Job satisfaction represents several related attitudes, which are most important characteristics of job about which people have effective response. These to Luthana are the work itself, pay, promotion, opportunities, supervision and co-workers attitude. Job satisfaction of both teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU naturally depends on the economic, social and cultural condition in the state and nation at large.

Ebru (2000) opined that, a worker who did not get sufficient wages will be faced with the problem of maintaining his or her family. This problem puts the worker far from being satisfied especially the non social facilities such as transportation and lack of cooperation with the workers welfare club. Job satisfaction cannot be talked about where there is absence of motivation. Poor job satisfaction of workers in the university will certainly affect the quality of the services rendered, especially where the material and moral element in the school which affect job satisfaction of workers are gaining ground (Ebru 2000).

Job satisfaction is so important in that its absence often leads to failure and reduce organizational commitment (Lermson 1987, Mosex 1997). Lack of job satisfaction is a predictor at quitting a job (Alexander, Lichtenstein and Hellmen 2002, Janet 2002). Sometimes worker may quit from public to the private sector vice-versa. This is common in countries grappling with dwindling economy and its concomitants such as poor condition of service and late payment of salaries (Nwagwu, 1997). For staff especially the teaching staff, most of them who are able to access TETFund training abroad, refuses to return back after enjoying good facilities and welfare packages that are lacking in Nigeria. Some of the best brains also leave the University for a Higher-Paid-Job within the country causing brain-drain within the institution. According to Fafunwa (2000), people migrate to better and consistent paying jobs.

From this view point, satisfaction might be motivational by nature of the job, its pervasive social climate and extent to which workers' peculiar needs are met. Others are the availability of power status, pay satisfaction, promotion opportunities and task clarity (Bilarim 2000). However,

(Osagbemi 2002) argues in favor of the control of job satisfaction by factor intrinsic to the workers. His arguments are based on the idea that workers deliberately decide to find satisfaction in their jobs and perceive them as worthwhile.

The rationale for this study is that it has been perceived by students that most workers in the university are not satisfied and if nothing is done urgently, most workers will relocate and change their job or otherwise engage in other mediating jobs, in order to get satisfaction. This is the problem of most workers in universities including NAU. This may be the reason why some staff collects money or other forms of reward from students for normal services they render (part of their duties/responsibilities) which they are being pay for. The problem may be caused by poor salary, delay/denial of payment of allowances, lack of infrastructures/facilities, poor updating of qualification of workers through in-service training, and so on. This has been a big problem to the staff in Nigerian Universities and NAU inclusive.

The harsh socio-economic environment in Nigeria makes one wonder if university workers are really satisfied with their job and actually have the incentive to continue to work ( Lawal 2000 ). In the words of Fredrick Herzberg, the hygienic factors or dissatisfies include; salary, fringe benefits, government interests, poor management and poor infrastructure/facilities as they are in any other work situation.

Although, it seems that teaching staff are more satisfied when compared to the non-teaching staff. Many non-teaching staff will always wish to be converted to teaching. This is evident as they progress with their post graduate programme up to Ph.D level so that they can have the advantage to be converted when the need arises. This is also seen in the recent conversion exercise in NAU, where almost all non-teaching staff, qualified, came forth for the interview and later were all converted. This therefore necessitates the study on comparison between job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff in Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

### **Purpose of the study**

The main purpose of the study is to compare the job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Specifically, the study is aimed at:

1. Examining the factors that affect job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU.
2. Investigating the strategies that can improve job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU.

### **Significance of the study**

The study will be significant when the emotional, physical and psychological conditions of the staff are satisfied. The study will also help the government to identify the areas of job dissatisfaction among the workers to help settle them so that the workers will be happy. Knowing that when the workers are motivated intrinsically, they will be happy and their jobs output will increase. The study therefore, will help to eliminate strikes and improve relationship between management and labor.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the factors that affect job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU?
2. What are the strategies that can improve job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff in NAU?

### Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference between the mean score of teaching and non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction.
2. There is no significant difference between the mean score of teaching and non-teaching staff on the strategies that can improve their job satisfaction.

### METHOD

This study employed a descriptive survey research design in which the researchers used structured questionnaire to gather information from respondents. The study was carried out in Nnamdi Azikiwe University (NAU), Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. The population is (5,004) made up of all teaching and non-teaching staff of the institution. There are about 2,000 teaching staff and 3,004 non-teaching staff in the University as at April, 2020. A simple random sampling technique was used to select 200 teaching and 300 non-teaching staff in the campus. The instrument used for data collection was a researcher-developed questionnaire titled: Job Satisfaction of Teaching and Non-Teaching staff Questionnaire (JSTNTSQ). The questionnaire was divided into two sections A and B. Section A centers on Biographical data of respondents while section B is on the questionnaire proper which is further divided into two parts. The first part contains items that measures factors that affect job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff while the second part contains items that measure the strategies that can improve job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff. Both are structured on a four point Likert type scale of Strongly Agree = SA; Agree = A; Disagree = D; and Strongly Disagree = SD. This instrument was subjected to validation by three experts. The reliability of the instrument was obtained through test re-test method. The results were correlated using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient which yielded  $r = 0.82$ . This was assumed to be high enough for the instrument to be reliable for the study. The instrument was administered to the respondents by the researchers with the help of two research assistants using Direct Delivery Approach (DDA). For the analysis of data, the researchers used the arithmetic mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) to answer the research questions and t-test for testing the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

### RESULTS

**Research Question 1:** What are the factors that affect job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU?

**Table 1: Mean response of teaching and non-teaching staff on factors that affect their job satisfaction in NAU**

Respondents		Teaching Staff			Non-Teaching Staff		
S/N	ITEMS	INT	$\bar{X}$	Remark	INT	$\bar{X}$	Remark

1.	Delay in payment of salary	200	2.5	Accepted	300	2.4	Rejected
2	Delay/Denial of promotion	200	3.5	Accepted	300	3.7	Accepted
3	Denial of other welfare packages like; in-service training, study leave, sick leave etc	200	2.1	Rejected	300	2.4	Rejected
4	Poor working condition provided by heads of departments/Units	200	1.9	Rejected	300	2.3	Rejected
5	Poor infrastructure eg. Electricity/Internet	200	3.8	Accepted	300	2.0	Rejected
6	Lack of government interest in development of Higher Education.	200	2.7	Accepted	300	2.4	Rejected
7	Poor Facilities eg. Offices/Classroom	200	3.6	Accepted	300	2.3	Rejected
8	Unpaid Allowances	200	2.1	Rejected	300	1.1	Rejected
9	Government interference in University Autonomy	200	1.9	Rejected	300	1.9	Rejected
10	Poor salary to staff	200	1.7	Rejected	300	2.6	Accepted
11	Difficult Criteria for Accessing Promotion	200	3.3	Accepted	300	2.3	Rejected
12	Inability of the government to pay gratuity and pension of the retirees.	200	2.6	Accepted	300	2.5	Accepted
	<b>Grand Mean</b>		<b>2.6</b>	<b>Accepted</b>		<b>2.3</b>	<b>Rejected</b>

The analysis of research question 1 presented in table 1 above, shows a grand mean of 2.6 for Teaching Staff and 2.3 for Non-teaching Staff. This means that the Teaching Staff accepted majority of the items identified as factors that affects their job satisfaction, while the Non-teaching Staff rejected majority of the items as factors that affects their job satisfaction. This is revealed in their response for each item as the teaching staff accepted 7 items whereas the non-teaching staff accepted only 3 items out of the 12 identified items in this section.

**Research Question 2:** What are the strategies that can improve job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff in NAU?

**Table 2: Mean response of teaching and non-teaching staff on strategies that can improve their job satisfaction.**

S/N	Respondents	Teaching Staff			Non-Teaching Staff		
		INT	$\bar{X}$	Remark	INT	$\bar{X}$	Remark
13.	Giving staff promotion as and when due	200	3.4	Accepted	300	3.3	Accepted
14	Providing staff with good working condition by their head of Department/Unit	200	2.5	Accepted	300	3.5	Accepted
15	Payment of staff salary as and when due	200	2.7	Accepted	300	3.3	Accepted
16	Updating of staff qualification through in-service training	200	2.6	Accepted	300	1.9	Rejected

17	Government adherence to University Autonomy	200	3.9	Accepted	300	2.8	Accepted
18	Providing fair criteria for staff promotion.	200	2.7	Accepted	300	3.0	Accepted
19	Provision of other welfare packages	200	2.6	Accepted	300	2.7	Accepted
20	Payment of other allowances earned by staff	200	3.4	Accepted	300	3.8	Accepted
21	Government interest in Higher Education Development	200	2.2	Rejected	300	2.0	Rejected
22	Paying retirees their pension and gratuity	200	2.5	Accepted	300	3.3	Accepted
23	Provision of Infrastructure like Electricity/Internet	200	2.7	Accepted	300	2.2	Rejected
24	Provision of Facilities Like Offices/Classrooms	200	2.9	Accepted	300	1.9	Rejected
	<b>Grand mean</b>		<b>2.8</b>	<b>Accepted</b>		<b>2.8</b>	<b>Accepted</b>

From the analysis in research question 2 as presented in table 2 above, it is observed that a grand mean of 2.8 for both Teaching and Non-teaching staff were obtained. This shows that both Teaching and Non-Teaching staff of NAU accepted most of the identified items as strategies that can improve their job satisfaction. This is evident since the teaching staff accepted all the identified items except item 21, while the non-teaching staff accepted 8 items out of the 12 identified items in this section.

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant difference between the mean score of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction.

**Table 3: Summary of t-test analysis of mean scores of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction.**

Respondents	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	t-cal.	t-crit	$\alpha$	Decision
Teaching Staff.	200	2.60	0.93					Do Not
Non-Teaching Staff.	300	2.30	0.89	498	2.096	2.000	0.05	Accept Ho

T-test analysis of mean scores of teaching and non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction in table 3 shows that, a calculated value of 2.094, greater than the table value (t-crit) of 2.00 is obtained. This means that the null hypothesis is not accepted; that is, there is a significant difference between the mean score of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant difference between the mean score of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the strategies that can improve their job satisfaction.

**Table 4: Summary of t-test analysis of mean scores of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the strategies that can improve their job satisfaction.**

Respondents	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	t-cal.	t-crit	$\alpha$	Decision
Teaching Staff.	200	2.80	0.93					
Non-Teaching Staff.	300	2.81	0.89	498	0.9096	2.000	0.05	Accept Ho

T-test analysis of mean scores of teaching and non-teaching staff on the strategies that can improve their job satisfaction in table 4 shows that, a calculated value of .9094, less than the table value (t-crit) of 2.00 is obtained. This means that the null hypothesis is accepted; that is, there is no significant difference between the mean score of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction.

### Summary of Findings

Based on the analysis, the following findings were made:

1. Teaching Staff accepted with a grand mean of 2.6, majority of the items identified as factors that affects their job satisfaction. Contrarily, the Non-teaching staff rejected with a grand mean of 2.3, majority of the items identified as factors that affects their job satisfaction.
2. Both the Teaching and Non-teaching staff accepted, with a grand mean of 2.8 (for each), most of the identified items are strategies that can improve their job satisfaction.
3. Also, both Teaching and Non-teaching staff rejected item 21 which is on Government interest in the development of higher education. Showing that it is not part of strategies to improve their job satisfaction.
4. The first null hypothesis was not accepted which means that there is a significant difference between the mean score of teaching and Non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction.
5. The second null hypothesis was accepted which means that there is no significant difference between the mean score of teaching and Non-teaching staff on the strategies that can improve their job satisfaction.

### Discussion of Findings

Research question one sought to find out factors that affect job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU, Awka. The findings indicate that poor salary, lack of promotion and Inability of the government to pay gratuity and pension of the retirees are the factors that affect the job satisfaction of staff as agreed by both respondents. This view agrees with Doddme Cue and Wright (2000) that job satisfaction is enhanced by the value placed on ones profession and extrinsic reward such as pay, promotion, etc. When academic staff is paid well, they will be happy and their publication output increases; while for the non-academic staff they tends to attend more workshops and seminars. According to Druker (2004), happy workers are efficient and productive workers.

From the grand mean, teaching staff had 2.6 (Accepted) which show that they agreed with majority of the items as factors that affects their job satisfaction, while the non-teaching staff recorded 2.3 (Rejected) which show that they rejected most of the items as factors that affect their job satisfaction. These items rejected by the non-teaching staff were accepted by the teaching staff and were rated high enough by those experts who validated the instrument as factors that will

certainly affect the job satisfaction of workers. The response from the non-teaching staff seems to suggest that they are less satisfied with their job. This is supported by Prausse and Dooley (2002), who have that most non-teaching staff is dissatisfied with their work when compared to academic staff. This is because they don't see any future in their job.

The result of the hypothesis of teaching and non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction in table 3 shows that, a calculated value of 2.094, greater than the table value (t-crit) of 2.00 is obtained. This means that the null hypothesis, number one, is not accepted; that is, there is a significant difference between the mean score of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction.

Research question two sought to find out the strategies that can improve job satisfaction of teaching and non-teaching staff of NAU, Awka. The findings revealed that promotion and at when due, good working conditions, payment of salary and at when due, government adherence to university autonomy and payment of other allowances are strategies that improves job satisfaction of workers. This finding agrees with Herzberg, in Okoye (2000) that the content theories of motivation are related more to job satisfaction. According to Brown and Shepherd (2000), workers are motivated when they have deep values and beliefs regarding their work. Furthermore, when the working environment is conducive/improved and workers share visions and jobs security; they tend to work very hard.

From the grand mean, both staff, separately, recorded 2.8 (accepted) which show that they agreed with majority of the items as strategies that can improve the job satisfaction of staff in NAU. The result of the hypothesis of teaching and non-teaching staff on the strategies that can improve their job satisfaction in table 4 shows that, a calculated value of .9094, less than the table value (t-crit) of 2.00 is obtained. This means that the null hypothesis, number two, is accepted; that is, there is no significant difference between the mean score of Teaching and Non-teaching staff on the factors that affect their job satisfaction

### **Conclusion:**

On the general findings, the research concludes that even though both teaching and non-teaching staff of the university accepted majority of the identified items as factors regarding their job satisfaction, the teaching staff seem to record better job satisfaction compared to the non-teaching staff in this institution. This is supported by the outcome of hypotheses 1 in table 3 above.

### **Educational Implication of the Study:**

The study has made it possible to identify the factors responsible for job satisfaction. The study further highlights the salient issues that workers look forward to make their job worthwhile. Based on the fact that teaching staff are more satisfied to their job compared to non-reaching staff, there is need to harmonize differences that existed between teaching and non-teaching staff and as well enhance their job satisfaction to make them happy. The work environment must be made conducive for both, to improve their job satisfaction.

### **Recommendations:**

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

1. Workers, both teaching and non-teaching, should be adequately motivated by making the work environment conducive.
2. Staff, without discrimination, should be giving promotion as when due so as to increase their morale.
3. There should be good communication link between staff and employers.
4. Both the teaching and non-teaching staff should be rewarded when necessary.
5. There should be a room for upgrading of staff qualification through in-service training.
6. Government should play their own part in the establishment/ management of institutions.
7. Government should not intervene in University matter, and adhere to University Autonomy.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, K ; Lichtenstein, S, and Hellmen, W. (2002). Job Satisfaction and Retention of Social Workers in Public Agencies, Non- profit Agencies and Private Work 18 (3) 93-17
- Bilarim, T.A.(2000). Late Payment of Teachers Salary as it Affects the Quality of Education in Lagos State Primary Schools: A Socio-Psychological Perspective. Journal of National Association of Education Teachers 6(1), 11-15.
- Brown, E and Shepherd, I. (2000),. What Job Attitude tells about Motivation? Harvard Business Review, 46, 118
- Dodd McCue, D.; and Wright, G.B.(2001). Men, Women and Attitudinal Commitment; The effects of workplace experiences and socialization. Human relations, 49, 1065-1089.
- Druker, C.I.(2004). An Examination of Gender Differences for Job Satisfaction, Mental Health, and Occupational Stress among Senior U.K. Civil Servant. International Journal of Stress Management, I, 159-1172.
- Ebru. U. (2000). Job Satisfaction and Publication Output among Librarians in Nigeria Universities, University of Ibadan. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. Pp.9

- Fafunwa, I.R. (2000). The Place of Financial Management in Personnel Psychology. A Paper Presented as Part of Personnel Psychology Guest Lecture Series. Department of Guidance and Counseling, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Herzberg, F. (2012). One More Time: How do you Motivate Employees? Harvard Business Review, Vol. 46, 2002. Pp. 53-62.
- Janet, S.S. (2002). "A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction among Cataloguers and Reference Librarians in university." Journal of academic Librarianship, 4(3), 139.
- Lawal O.(2000). A Survey of task Performance in library and Information work: The Nigeria Perspective. Africa journal of Library Archives and Information Services. Vol. 1, No. 1, Pp 27.
- Lermson, B. (1987). Job Satisfaction of Academic Librarians. An Examination of the Relationship between Satisfactions, Faculty Status participation. College and Research Libraries 56, (4)341-350.
- Luthans, F.(2000). ORGANIZATIONAL Behavior; Sixth Edition, London: McGraw-Hill p. 123.
- Luttans, F. (1998). ORGANIZATIONAL Behavior; 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Bostan Wwin McGraw Hill.
- Mosex, M.(1997). A study of job satisfaction of employees in three research organizations in Turkey \. Ankara; OOTU.
- Nwagwu, M.I. (1997). "Some Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction in Nigeria Library Position Careers, Vol. 4 pp.107.
- Okoye, S.F.(2000), "Job Satisfaction among Reference Librarians and Cataloguers". Australian Academic and Research Libraries, 2(13), 73.
- Osagbemi, D.A. (2002). Job involvement, Career Commitment, Organizational Commitment and job satisfaction of the Nigeria Police. A Multiple Regression Analysis. Journal Advance Studies in Educational Management 5 (6), 35-41.
- Prausse K. and Dooley E. (2002). Job Satisfaction among Support staff in Twelve Ohio Academic Libraries. College and Research Libraries 54.