



A research on job dissatisfaction of the university staff¹

Şeyma Gün Eroğlu ^{a*}, Hatice Çoban ^b, Ayşe İrmış ^c

^a*Pamukkale University, Institute of Social Sciences, 20070, Denizli, Turkey*

^b*Pamukkale University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 20070, Denizli, Turkey*

^c*Pamukkale University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 20070, Denizli, Turkey*

Abstract

One of the today's strategic issues of organizations is knowledge. Producing and using it properly is related with the quality of human resources. Paying importance to employees' job satisfaction to put informed employees in hand is essential for organizations. High level of job satisfaction helps to reach success for employees and productivity for organizations. However, if employees' job satisfaction is low, there will be some unfavourable results such as absenteeism, high employee turnover, conflicts, alienation and stress. Purpose of this research, which was done in a state university in Turkey, is to reveal whether there is or not job dissatisfaction of academic and administrative staff, if any, at which level and what the reasons of job dissatisfaction are. Sample population of this research is academic and administrative staff working in the university. 400 questionnaires handed out including 250 questionnaires to academic and 150 to administrative staff. Porter Scale had been used formed with values from 1 to 7. Results show that both academicians and administrative staff experience job dissatisfaction. The most important point of dissatisfaction for both groups is that there is no transportation service. Second factor of dissatisfaction for academicians is unfavorable promotions to higher positions but for administrative staff, it is about the lack of supplementary payments. Third cause for both groups is that they are not satisfied with assignments. Another indication of this research is that academic or administrative staff, who is dissatisfied with his job, experiences conflict and has intention to quit.
© 2013 European Journal of Research on Education by IASSR.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Job Dissatisfaction, Results of Job Dissatisfaction

1. Introduction

Job satisfaction is one of the issues that is often discussed in the field of organizational behavior contemporarily started to be investigated in 1920s (Özgen and Yalçın, 2010:353). Locke (1976:1300) defines job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. In this context, job satisfaction is an internal soothing emotion strived by individuals from their work environments including the

¹ This study is a part of the first author's master's dissertation named as "A Study About Organizational Justice And Job Satisfaction".

* E-mail address: gun_eroglu@hotmail.com

work itself, managers, workgroups and organizations. Job satisfaction as a relative concept that emerges when individuals' desires from work match with what they actually have (Eroğlu, 2013:444-445).

A job which meets just the individual needs is not sufficient in the sense of employees. It is expected to affect the emotions and value judgements positively in order to ensure job satisfaction (Erdoğan, 1997:376). The results of studies show that while employees who have high job satisfaction have positive emotions to their jobs, others that have low job satisfaction have relatively negative emotions to their jobs (Robbins and Judge, 2011:76). Therefore, job satisfaction is generally conceived as an attitudinal variable that reflects the degree to which people like their jobs, and is positively related to employee health and job performance (Spector, 1997 as cited in O'Leary, Wharton and Quinlan, 2009: 222-223). The Hawthorne studies, conducted in the 1930s, are often credited with making researchers aware of the effects of employee attitudes on performance. Shortly after the Hawthorne studies, researchers began taking a critical look at the notion that a "happy worker is a productive worker" (Saari and Judge, 2004:398).

Job dissatisfaction is employees' dissatisfaction from the work they do and their negative feelings against the job such as weariness, reluctance and the sense of escape. Conducted researches show that dissatisfied employees have high intention to quit. The reflections of job dissatisfaction to the employees are absenteeism, burnout, frequent errors while working and finally to quit (Karcıoğlu ve Akbaş, 2010:146). Employees who dissatisfied with their jobs are more introverted, unfriendly, emotionally unstable and distressed. Job dissatisfaction leads the employees to feel themselves powerless and untalented. In the case of a dissatisfaction that can not be dealt with personally, personality disorders and diseases arise (Ergün, 2003:44-47).

There are many studies examined relations between job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction and other job-related factors. For instance, the study of Atan on bankers (1994) shows as job satisfaction decreases, the ratio of intention to quit and desire to change the occupation increases for the lower level managers but it is not significant for upper level managers (Aksu, Acuner and Tabak, 2002:277). According to the results of Clark and Oswald's study (1995), more educated employees have lower level of job satisfaction compared to less educated ones. The negative effect of high education on job satisfaction is supported by latter studies (Groot, 1999:344). Oshagbemi (1997:358) conducted his study on academicians and revealed that teaching and research tasks significantly effect the job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of them. A study on 850 academicians working in several universities in Turkey detected that not only the qualifications of the job but also the prestige of the institutions are at work related to effects of job satisfaction. In this context, it is stated that academicians working in highly prestigious universities have more job satisfaction than others have (Baş, 2002:29). Another study conducted on academicians' job satisfaction demonstrates that academicians whose responsibilities are expressed clearly, execute their jobs fondly (Bakan and Büyükbeşe, 2004:14).

2. Methodology

This research was conducted on job dissatisfaction of academic and administrative staff working in rectorate building and various faculties. Questionnaire was chosen as a quantitative research method. There were 1467 academic and 1043 administrative staff at the time of the survey conducted. Accordingly, "Random Sampling" method was used for academic and administrative staff working in Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Science and Arts, Medical Faculty, Faculty of Education, Engineering Faculty and various departments and institutes affiliated to rectorate. 400 questionnaires handed out including 250 questionnaires to academic and 150 to administrative staff but just 260 of them could be picked up. 20 questionnaires could not be evaluated because of missing answers. That's why, 240 questionnaire were accepted as valid and evaluated.

2.1. Scale

Porter Scale, which is usually preferred by conducted researches in management and organization field in order to interpret the perception and satisfaction of employees has been used in this research. This scale was formed with values from 1 to 7 and which has three stages. This is a kind of research technique which measures satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) and subjective individual sensibility about a particular subject. Here is an example of a declaration appropriate for Porter Scale:

Your satisfaction level when you compare your assignments at work and your wage or salary.

	Not at all						Very high
(a) How is it now?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(b) How should be?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

According to this scale, the number chosen in the option (a), subtracted from the number chosen in the option (b). By this way, if the derived value is equal to zero, there is a satisfaction on the subject. If derived value is positive, it means there is a dissatisfaction (obtained value is lower than expected). However, if derived value is negative, it means this subject is satisfactory for participants (obtained value is more than expected). With reference to this example, suppose that the participant choosing 1 in the option (a) and 7 in the option (b). After the calculation (7-1), we derived +6 and that means there is a high level of dissatisfaction. Arithmetic average analysis is made by using this scale.

Research questions of this study:

1. What are the subjects related with job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of academic staff?
2. What are the subjects related with job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of administrative staff?
3. What are the results of comparison between job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of academic and administrative staff?
4. Which negations and inconveniences are there behind the job dissatisfaction of the university staff?

3. Findings

3.1. Interpretation of sociodemographic questions

Human resources of universities consists of different staff groups and professions. In this context, academic and administrative staff are two main human resources who handle the operations of the university. 70% of academic staff participating in this research is male and 30% is female. And 51% male, 49% female participants get involved in this research as administrative staff.

The education level of academic staff, as it should be, higher than that of administrative staff. 70% of academic staff have completed a PhD and 22% of them have a masters degree. Almost 8% of academic staff continue their career after undergraduate education. The education level of administrative staff vary on their positions. 56,5% of administrative staff have completed their undergraduate education and 37% of them graduated from high school. A small group of administrative staff (3,3%) have a masters degree.

The age of academic staff participating in this research is as follows; 45% of them are between 31–40, 27% of them are between 20–30 and 24% of them are between 41–50. But just 4% of academic staff is more than 50 years old. When the age of administrative staff is taken into consideration, it is seen that majority of them are in their middle-ages like academic staff. Almost 46% of them are between 31-40, 28,7% of them are between 41–50 and 23,7% of them are between 20–30 ages.

Almost 62% of academic staff has no administrative position but 38% of them have various administrative and managerial duties. 70% of administrative staff are public officers and workers, almost 30% of them are in managerial and superior positions.

3.2. Interpreting the level of job satisfaction for academic and administrative staff

The job satisfaction level of both academic and administrative staff emerged as 2,24 in this research. According to this value, it could be said that the university staff have perceived job dissatisfaction although it is not so low. While the job satisfaction level of academic staff is 2,33, it is 2,16 for administrative staff (Table 1). The most prominent factor that leads to dissatisfaction is the lack of transportation services. Overall arithmetic mean of this factor is 3,45. Second factor leading to dissatisfaction is supplementary payments which is thought not enough for participants. The use of vacations except public holidays and annual vacations (such as sick leave, day offs for wedding, funeral, etc.) factor is found insignificant for dissatisfaction. Overall arithmetic mean of this factor is 1,04. The other minimum effects on dissatisfaction level are health and insurance services because it has 1,55 dissatisfaction mean (Table 1).

Table 1. Job Dissatisfaction Statistics of All Staff

Satisfaction Levels for Conditions	The level of dissatisfaction	
	Mean	Standart Deviation
Transportation services	3,45	2,18
Supplementary payments	3,16	1,89
Assignments	3,08	2,10
Promotions to higher status	3,05	1,99
The possibility of overtime	2,70	2,04
Participation to administrative issues	2,62	2,03
Complaints system	2,50	2,04
Reward and punishment system	2,42	1,99
Informed by managers	2,35	1,90
Explanations of managers	2,26	2,04
Discretion from managers	2,15	1,99
Sensitiveness of rules	2,09	1,76
Sincerity of managers	2,00	2,03
Wages and salaries	1,92	1,65
Adherence to rules	1,92	1,76
Physical conditions	1,91	1,82
Status symbols	1,88	1,96
Tools and equipments	1,76	1,78
Comparative wages and salaries	1,76	1,71
Courtesy of managers	1,74	1,77
Health facilities	1,55	1,62
Vacations	1,04	1,57
General	2,24	1,89

The most important factor leading to dissatisfaction of academic staff is transportation services that is not provided by the university (mean:3,23). Moreover, as different from administrative staff's priorities, the second important factor leading to dissatisfaction of academic staff is unfavorable promotions to higher positions (mean: 3,14). The insignificant factor, use of vacations, leading to dissatisfaction level of academic staff is similar with general thoughts of all participants (Table 2).

Table 2. Job Dissatisfaction Level of Academic Staff

Satisfaction Levels for Conditions	The level of dissatisfaction	
	Mean	Standart Deviation
Transportation services	3,23	2,25
Promotion opportunities	3,14	1,85
Assignments	3,11	2,00
Supplementary payments	3,11	1,74
The possibility of overtime	2,72	2,02
Participation to administrative issues	2,66	1,96
Informed by managers	2,44	1,79
Explanations of managers	2,40	2,02
Reward and punishment system	2,35	1,84
Wages and salaries	2,34	1,40
Complaints system	2,34	1,92
Physical conditions	2,30	1,81
Discretion from managers	2,26	1,87
Sensitiveness of rules	2,26	1,75
Sincerity of managers	2,18	2,07
Tools and equipments	2,16	1,67
Adherence to rules	2,05	1,69
Status symbols	2,00	1,95
Courtesy of managers	1,79	1,71
Comparative wages and salaries	1,66	1,56
Health facilities	1,64	1,61
Vacations	1,05	1,58
General	2,33	

The most essential factors lead to disstisfaction of administrative staff are the lack of transportation services (mean:3,66) and supplementary payments level (mean:3,21). The least effective factor is as smilar to academic staffs, the use of unusual vacations (mean:1,04) and the use of tools and equipments in the workplace (mean:1,37).

Table 3. Job Dissatisfaction Level of Administrative Staff

Satisfaction Levels for Conditions	The level of dissatisfaction	
	Mean	Standart

		Deviation
Transportation services	3,66	2,10
Supplementary payments	3,21	2,03
Assignments	3,04	2,21
Promotion opportunities	2,95	2,13
The possibility of overtime	2,68	2,08
Complaints system	2,66	2,14
Participation to administrative issues	2,58	2,11
Reward and punishment system	2,50	2,13
Informed by managers	2,27	2,01
Explanations of managers	2,12	2,07
Discretion from managers	2,04	2,11
Sensitiveness of rules	1,93	1,77
Comparative wages and salaries	1,85	1,85
Sincerity of managers	1,83	1,99
Adherence to rules	1,79	1,84
Status symbols	1,77	1,99
Courtesy of managers	1,68	1,84
Physical conditions	1,53	1,75
Wages and salaries	1,52	1,78
Health facilities	1,47	1,65
Tools and equipments	1,37	1,81
Vacations	1,04	1,57
General	2,16	

3.3. Organizational and individual outcomes of job dissatisfaction

There are several outcomes of job dissatisfaction for both individuals and organizations. Unfavorable outcomes, experienced in recent years for individuals and organizations can be seen in Table 4. The level of psychological problems felt by employees in the workplace (Table 5) and the level of biological and physical diseases (Table 6) are shown in the following tables.

As seen in Table 4, work conflicts are experienced frequently by all university staff. The second negative outcome is intention to quit with almost 14%. Third outcome is frequent errors and low productivity which is not desired by organizations.

Table 4. Unfavorable Outcomes for the Organization

Result	Percentage
Absenteeism	3,33%
Frequent errors and low productivity	12,92%
Workplace accidents	0,42%
Industrial accidents	1,67%
Occupational diseases	10,42%
Intention to quit	13,75%
Work conflicts	37,50%

Participants were asked to specify their feeling of psychological problems in the workplace, if any. According to given answers, all university staff often feel intention to change their job. 23% of them feel reluctance to go to work and 20% of them avoid contact with others and feel loneliness.

Table 5: Feeling of Psychological Problems in the Workplace

Result	Percentage
Reluctance to go to work	22,5%
Feeling of loneliness	20%
Childish behaviors	5,42%
Communication avoidance	20%
Aggressive behaviors	10,83%
Intention to change the job	30%

Participants were also asked to specify their biological and physical diseases in the workplace, if any. According to the responses, the most common disease felt by university staff is dizziness. The second common disease is headache with 38% and third one is burnout with 28%.

Table 6: Biological and Physical Diseases in the Workplace

Result	Percentage
Heart throb	14,27%
Stomachache	10,83%
Pain in back and shoulders	22,92%
Headache	37,92%
Dizziness	44,17%
Chronic tiredness	26,25%
Insomnia	22,08%
Feeling of burnout	28,33%

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Human resource is one of the most strategic components of organizations. In order to ensure retention and development of these resources which have strategic importance; organizations should care on providing their employees with job satisfaction. Job satisfaction, which is important for not only the organizations but also the employees themselves, has become a frequently studied subject (Tella, Ayeni and Popoola, 2007:4).

In this research, which is targeting university academic and administrative staff; it is seen that both academic and administrative staff are experiencing general job dissatisfaction. However, in overall average; job dissatisfaction of academicians is found to be slightly higher than administrative staff (Overall arithmetic average for academicians is 2,33; for administrative staff 2,16). The most important subjects which cause dissatisfaction are the lack of transportation services and inequity in the distribution of supplementary payments.

The most important cause of dissatisfaction for both academic and administrative staff is the lack of transportation services of the university; and the dissatisfaction level of administrative staff is higher than academicians'. The second cause of dissatisfaction for academicians is the problem in promotion opportunities; and

for administrative staff it is the supplementary payments. The dissatisfaction about promotion opportunities is on the second order for academicians; while it is on the fourth order for administrative staff.

The dissatisfaction level for complaint system is higher both in order and point (6th order, mean:2,66); whereas it is lower for academicians (11th order, mean:2,34). In addition, dissatisfaction for tools and equipments has more priority and is higher for academic staff (16th order, mean:2,16) than administrative staff (21st order, mean:1,37).

Academic and administrative staff have important differentiation in subjects of wages and salaries. While the dissatisfaction of academicians about wages and salaries is on the 10th order (mean:2,34); it constitutes the cause of dissatisfaction on the 19th order for administrative staff (mean:1,52). If wages and salaries are compared to other wages and salaries, then dissatisfaction level of academicians is on the 20th order (mean:1,66) and of administrative staff is on the 13th order (mean:1,85). Especially the levels and points for dissatisfaction level about wages create noteworthy results. Because, academicians have a greater dissatisfaction than the administrative staff about wage earned. However, when the work done by them and the wage earned by them are compared to those of others; the dissatisfaction level of academicians are lower than administrative staff. Administrative staff are less dissatisfied than academic staff about the work done and the wage earned; however the dissatisfaction level is increased if they compare their wages to others' wages (Administrative staff are often observed to compare their wages to academic staff.).

In the point of other factors, while academic and administrative staff have similar order and means of dissatisfaction; it could be stated that academic staff have a higher level of dissatisfaction about many factors. According to Herzberg's dual factor theory, although the presence of factors like wage, physical working conditions, transportation services etc. can not create satisfaction and motivation alone; the absence of these factors cause job dissatisfaction and demotivation (Oshagbemi, 1997:354). For this reason, factors like these act as a base for the creation of job satisfaction. Organizations, especially universities which contribute to the growth of human resources, should ensure satisfaction on these factors which are the base of job satisfaction. Otherwise, as seen on Table 5, employees' intention to change the job and reluctance to go to work will increase. Since 44% of the respondents have dizziness and 38% of them suffer from headaches; it is possible and relevant to the literature that they are caused by job dissatisfaction. However, academic and administrative staff who heavily work on brain power should be safe from these kind of diseases and should not be subject to any problem that may effect their mental health.

References

- Aksu, G., Acuner, A., & Tabak, R. S. (2002). Sağlık Bakanlığı Merkez ve Taşra Teşkilatı Yöneticilerinin İş Doyumuna Yönelik Bir Araştırma (Ankara Örneği). *Ankara Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 55(4), 271-282.
- Bakan, İ., & Büyükebeşe, T. (2004). Örgütsel İletişim ile İş Tatmini Unsurları Arasındaki İlişkiler: Akademik Örgütler İçin Bir Alan Araştırması. *Akdeniz İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*(7), 1-30.
- Baş, T. (2002). Öğretim Üyelerinin İş Tatmin Profilinin Belirlenmesi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(2), 19-37.
- Erdoğan, İ. (1997). *İşletmelerde Davranış*. İstanbul: Dönence Basım ve Yayın.
- Ergün, N. (2003). *İş Tatmini-Motivasyon İlişkisi*. Unpublished Master Dissertation. İstanbul.
- Eroğlu, F. (2013). *Davranış Bilimleri*. İstanbul: Beta Yayınevi.
- Groot, W. (1999). Job Satisfaction of Older Workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(6), 343-360.
- Karcioğlu, F., & Akbaş, S. (2010). İş Yerinde Psikolojik Şiddet ve İş Tatmini İlişkisi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(3), 139-161.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). *A Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*. M. D. (Ed.) içinde, *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (s. 1297-1343). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lund, D. B. (2003). Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18(3), 219-236.
- O'Leary, P., Wharton, N., & Quinlan, T. (2009). Job Satisfaction of Physicians in Russia. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 22(3), 221-231.
- Oshagbemi, T. (1997). Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Higher Education. *Education+Training*, 39(9), 354-359.

- Özgen, H., & Yalçın, A. (2010). *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi: Stratejik Bir Yaklaşım*. İstanbul: Nobel Kitabevi.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*. San Diago: Prentice Hall.
- Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 395-407.
- Tella, A., Ayeni, C. O., & Popoola, S. (2007). Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Organisational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 1-16.