

**JIMMA UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF BUSINESS  
MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT**

**FACTORS AFFECTING JOB SATISFACTION OF  
BUSINESS INSTRUCTORS**

**[The case of Business schools in Addis Ababa city and Jimma town]**

**By H/Mariam Amare**

**Advisor:**

**Mr, Rojers P. Joseph**

*Jimma University  
Library Periodical*

**May 27/2002**

## ABSTRACT

Assessing the extent of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of business instructors has great benefits in getting instructors well motivated for work. This study is therefore an attempt to examine factors affecting the degree of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of business instructors. More specifically, it is designed to 1) examine in detail instructors' extent of job satisfaction inline with F.Herzberg two factors theory, 2) asses factors' upon which instructors are highly impinged, and 3) asses instructors' extent of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in comparing governmental Universities and private colleges so that concerned bodies may get an insight to react on. Participants of the study included all voluntary business instructors from both Addis Ababa and Jimma Universities and randomly selected private colleges. The items in the self-governing questionnaire were rated using a five-point likert scale from verry satisfied to very dissatisfied. The researcher gathered data and analysis was carried out using descriptive and other inferential statistical techniques. The result was expected to suggest that instructors are better satisfied with Herzberg's intrinsic dimension and dissatisfied with extrinsic dimension of job satisfaction. Yet the result portrays that one dimension is not better than the other.

## ACKNOWLEDEMENT

I am very glad to offer my gratitude to the following individuals for they have shown me their diligence:

- Rojers P. Joseph (advisor)
- Alemtsehay Tilahun (Secretary)
- Bethelehem Tsetargachew (Secretary)

*Jimma University  
Library Periodical*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Acknowledgment	ii
Table of contents	iii
List of Tables	iv-v
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Back ground	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	2-5
<b>CHAPTER TWO: OBJECTIVES</b>	
2.1 General Objective	5
2.2 Specific Objective	5
<b>CHAPTER THREE: METHODS</b>	
3.1 Background variables	6
3.2 Independent Variables	7
3.3 Dependent Variables	7
3.4 Sampling Technique	7
3.5 Instrument and procedure for data collection	7
3.6 Method and procedure of data Analysis	8
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	9-30
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS</b>	
5.1 Extrinsic Factors	31-32
5.2 Intrinsic factors	32
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
Bibliography	36
Questionnaire	37-43

## LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table -1	Number of percentage distribution of demographic characteristics of respondents in this study	9
Table -2	Frequency distribution of responses on SALARY, Which is one of extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	11
Table -3	Frequency distribution of responses on WORKING CONDITIONS, which is one of extrinsic factors of job satisfaction	13
Table -4	Frequency distribution of responses on SUPERVISION, which is one of extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	15
Table -5	Frequency distribution of responses on INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	17
Table-6	Frequency distribution of responses on ORGANIZATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	19
Tabel-7	Frequency distribution of responses on WORKITSELF, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	21

10/1/11 had been

Tabel-8	Frequency distribution of responses on ACHIEVEMENT, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	23
Tabel-9	Frequency distribution of responses on ADVANCEMENT, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	25
Tabel-10	Frequency distribution of responses on RECONGNITION, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	27
Tabel-11	Frequency distribution of responses on RESPONSIBILITY, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.	29
Tabel-12	Distribution behavior of respondents for every factor of two dimensions job satisfaction.	33
Tabel-13	Schools where data were collected	43

Jimma University  
Library Periodical

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1: BACKGROUND

Job satisfaction, which is both an important organizational outcome and is interrelated with motivation, can be defined as a person's emotional response to aspects of work (such as pay, supervision, and benefits) or to the work itself. Like motivation, job satisfaction is a complex notion that manifests itself in different ways in different people. Whether job satisfaction is high or low depends on a number of factors including how well a person's needs and wants are met through work, the working conditions themselves, the extent to which an individual defines himself or herself through work, and individual personality traits.<sup>9</sup>

As far as Ethiopian higher education is concerned, because of inefficient management of job satisfaction, they have been losing their staff (usually the best talented) both through internal and external drainage.

To keep the staff well satisfied and motivated on job, the concerned body should primarily go through a thorough assessment of different facets of the job. The assessment gives an insight for a fruitful management of job satisfaction. Hence, the primary objective of this study is to assess rigorously the level of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of Ethiopian business instructors in both governmental Universities and private colleges.

## 1.2: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

For better or worse, employees spend many of their working hours at work. In addition to working on assigned tasks, they typically interact with other persons (supervisors, Fellow employees), and are exposed to organizational policies and practices. This entire intern influence employee feelings about their jobs and organizations that employ them <sup>6</sup>. To bring about quality to the out put of any organization be it small or large, public or private, manufacturing or service oriented, it is highly desirable to keep the morale and motivation of the staff by obtaining relevant information about their extent of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on different facets of the job.

The merit of assessing the extent of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is tremendous. Managers are concerned about job satisfaction for two main reasons. First, they often believe that job satisfaction influence such employee behaviors as attendance and length of service. Second, managers seek favorable satisfaction in its own right. In this context, managements view employees as a group to satisfy, much as they attempt to satisfy other groups such as customers, clients, and investors. Positive job satisfaction provides evidence that management is doing all right by its employees. <sup>6</sup>

Similarly, Bavendom Research has concluded that increasing job satisfaction is important for its humanitarian value and for its financial



benefit (due to its effect on employee behavior). It has emerged with clear patterns that employees with higher job satisfaction believe that the organization will be satisfying in the long run, cares about the quality of their work, are more committed to the organization, have higher retention rates, and are more productive. Bavendom Research identified six factors that influenced job satisfaction. When these factors were low, job satisfaction was low and when they were high, job satisfaction was high. These factors are opportunity, stress, leadership, work standards, fair rewards and adequate rewards.<sup>4</sup>

➡ In addition, more appropriately to this study, National center for Educational statistics has come up with statistical analysis report on job satisfaction among America's teachers. According to the report administrative support and leadership, students behavior and school atmosphere and teacher autonomy are working conditions associated with teacher satisfaction. The more favorable the working conditions were, the higher the satisfaction scores were. Although certain background variable, such as teacher's age and years of experience are not nearly as significant in explaining the different levels of satisfaction as are the work place condition, the report has underlined that in public schools, younger and less experienced teachers have higher levels of satisfaction than older and more experienced teachers. In private schools, the relation ship is bipolar- the very youngest and very oldest teachers had the highest levels of satisfaction, as did the leas than most experienced teachers.<sup>8</sup>

On the contrary, teacher's satisfaction showed a weak relationship with salary and benefits while work place conditions had a positive relationship with a teacher's job satisfaction regardless of whether a teacher is in a public or private school.<sup>8</sup>

In the context of job satisfaction of both Ethiopian private and governmental business instructors, no research documentation is available to explain how instructors are satisfied on the different facets of the job, to what extent their satisfaction and dissatisfaction have an impact on their professional contribution, and to what extent some variables like age, qualification, year of experience etc. are associated with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Specifically seeking information about job satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the members of a given academic institution is important and worthwhile. Among others, discovering attitudes on factors related to the job could help the college and the University administrators in correcting certain unfavorable situations and could be useful in retaining the existing staff and attract new ones.

It is true that assessing the factors affecting job satisfaction of business instructors will help universities and colleges to build their institutional man power capacity and run viable academic programs of good quality. Presumably, results obtained from this study are expected to have some implications to formerly established universities and business colleges as well as to the newly emerging ones in ensuring their survival and continuity as competent institutions with in

the national framework. In general it is expected that the study will assist in providing an insight to the universities and colleges administrators to improve the quality of work expected from the staff members and there by ensuring their primary mission of generating and imparting knowledge, attitude and skills.

The purpose of this study is therefore, to assess those factors that satisfy and dissatisfy business instructors on their job so that concerned bodies can take necessary actions on time.

## **2. OBJECTIVES**

### **2.1: GENERAL OBJECTIVE**

The main objective of this study is to examine factors affecting on the degree of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of business instructors in both universities and private colleges.

### **2.2: SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

- ☆ To examine in detail, instructors' extent of job satisfaction in line with F. Herzberg two –factors theory.
- ☆ To assess factors up on which instructors are highly impinged.
- ☆ To assess instructors extent of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in comparing governmental universities and private colleges.
- ☆ To recommend on the factors that will satisfy and dissatisfy instructors.

## SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

1. In combination with other subsequent studies the information produced from the study might help any concerned body to effectively manage job satisfaction of Instructors.
2. The study might initiate future research for better investigation in the area.
3. It may provide an insight in to the degree of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of business instructors in private colleges and universities so that management may be assisted in preparing strategic plan to get instructors satisfied.

## 3. METHODS

### 3.1: Back ground variables

☆ Qualification – Stands for official evidence that one has completed business and business related courses or programs from a recognized university or college . It is classified as:

- Diploma
- BA
- MA
- PhD

☆ Service year – refers to the number of years (nearest year) one has been teaching in university or colleges.

- $\leq 2$  years
- 3-5 years
- 5-10 years
- $> 10$  years

☆ Area of specialization – refers to the specific area of study one has opted for in his /her MA or Ph.D.

☆ Area of specialization – refers to the specific area of study one has opted for in his /her MA or Ph.D.

### **3.2: Independent Variables**

The variables used as independent variables are categorized in to two sets of issues.

☆ Intrinsic factors: refer to achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and the work itself.

☆ Extrinsic factors –refer to working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, organizational and administrative policies and supervision.

### **3.3: Dependent Variables**

Job satisfaction score as measured by the university or college instructors.

### **3.4: Sampling Technique**

Random sampling technique was used with universities and colleges being units of selection. Accordingly, from the selected colleges and universities randomly selected business instructors were included.

### **3.5: Instrument and Procedure for data collection**

The researcher collected data from the selected universities and colleges. To examine instructors' extent of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction a structured self-administered questionnaire was used. The items in the questionnaire are totally dependent on Herzberg's theory of job satisfaction.

### **3.6: Method and Procedure of data Analysis**

Primarily, data cleaning and checking were done and analyzed. The analysis only included calculation of frequencies and percentages for demographic characteristics, intrinsic, and extrinsic factors.

#### **LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

- Unavailability of enough written documents and related research works made the task tedious.
- Unwillingness of most instructors to respond made the researcher confined to the feelings of few respondents and this might threaten the findings.
- The nature of the study that it is an attitude survey brought no means to check fake responses. The results are based on the extreme assumption that respondents are both volunteer and able to expose their actual feelings accurately.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of this study are presented under different but related headings. Accordingly number of respondents and percentages for demographic variables as well as extrinsic and intrinsic factors of job satisfaction are depicted. Subsequently related discussions for the results are presented.

Table 1. Number of percentage distribution of demographic characteristics of respondents in this study.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES	Governmental schools		Private schools	
	No	%	No	%
<b>*SEX</b>				
• Male	25	92.60	15	76.95
• Female	2	7.40	4	21.05
<b>Total</b>	27	100	19	100
<b>*NATIONALITY</b>				
• Ethiopian	24	88.89	19	100
• Expatriate	3	11.11	-	-
<b>Total</b>	27	100	19	100
<b>*Qualification</b>				
• Diploma	-	-	-	-
• BA	13	48.15	15	78.68
• MA	13	48.15	4	21.05
• PH.D	1	3.70	-	-
<b>Total</b>	27	100	19	100
<b>*SERVICE YEAR</b>				
• ≤2 Years	8	29.63	14	73.68
• 3-5 Years	9	33.33	5	26.32
• 5-10 Years	6	22.22	-	-
• > 10 Years	4	24.82	-	-
<b>Total</b>	27	100	19	100
<b>* MARITAL STATUS</b>				
• Married	10	37.04	4	21.05
• Single	17	62.96	15	75.95
<b>Total</b>	27	100	19	100

Analysis of the respondents who completed the questionnaire indicates [Table-1] that 27 [58.7%] are from governmental schools while 19 [41.3%] are from private schools. Out of the total of governmental business instructors 25[92.6%] of them are male while a small number 2 [7.4%] of them are female. It is also evident in the table that there is no diploma holder, an equal proportion of BA and MA degrees i.e. 13 [48.15%] each, and only 1 [3.7%] of them has Ph.D. Regarding service year in teaching, 8[29.63%] have served 2 and less than 2 years, 9[33.33%] between 3-5 years, 6[22.22%] between 5-10 years and 4{24.82%} have service year greater than 10 years. To talk about marital status, 10[37.04%] of them are married while 17[62.46%] of them are single. As for as Instructors of private schools are concerned, all respondents are Ethiopians. From the total of them, 15[78.95%] are BA holders, 4[21.05%] are MA holders, and there is no diploma and PhD holder. It is also clear that a greater proportion 14[73.68%] have 2 and greater than 2 service years in teaching, and 5[26.32%] of them have served between 3-5 years. Regarding marital status, 4[21.05%] are married while 15 [75.95%] are single.



**Table -2 Frequency distribution of responses on SALARY, which is one of extrinsic actors of job satisfaction**

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
1-1	-	2(7.41)	5(18.82)	10(37.04)	8(29.63)	2(7.41)	27(100)	1(5.26)	11(57.89)	7(36.84)	-	-		19(100)
1-2	-	1(3.70)	7(25.93)	6(22.22)	10(37.04)	3(11.11)	27(100)	3(15.79)	9(47.37)	5(26.32)	2(10.53)	-		19(100)
1-3	-	1(3.70)	5(18.82)	8(29.63)	7(25.93)	6(22.22)	27(100)	--	7(36.84)	4(21.05)	4(21.05)	3(5.26)	1(5.26)	19(100)
1-4	-	2(7.41)	6(22.22)	4(14.82)	7(25.93)	8(29.63)	27(100)	1(5.26)	8(42.11)	3(15.79)	3(15.79)	2(10.53)	2(10.53)	19(100)
1-5	7[25.94]	6(22.22)	4(14.82)	4(14.82)	1(3.70)	5(18.52)	27(100)	2(10.53)	12(63.16)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	-	1(5.26)	19(100)

\*The numbers in Parenthesis are Percentages.

In responding to the facets of salary which is one of extrinsic dimension of job satisfaction, as depicted in table -2, relatively a greater number of governmental instructors, 10(20.63%) and 8[37.04%] rated compatibility of base salary with the quality and quantity of the work being done from dissatisfied to very dissatisfied. Similarly, 10[37.04%] are very dissatisfied and 6[22.22%] are dissatisfied with base salary comparable to what other offices in the same area are paying. In addition, 7[25.93%] and 8[29.63%] of governmental Instructors are very dissatisfied and dissatisfied respectively to fringe benefits being provided on the job. Unlike to other facets of salary, a higher proportion of instructors, 7(25.94 %) and 6 (22.22%) rated from very satisfied to satisfied respectively.

Unlike governmental instructors, a higher percentage of private instructors, 11 (57.89 %) are satisfied with compatibility of base salary with the quality and quantity of the work being done. By the same token, 9 (47.37 %) of them rated satisfied with base salary comparable to what other offices in the same area are paying. Regarding perception of fringe benefits being provided on the job, greater proportion of private instructors, 7 (36.84 %) are satisfied, which is an opposite rating as compared to governmental instructors. Moreover, like governmental instructors, a higher percentage of numbers of private instructors, 12 [63.16%] are satisfied with availability of part-time employment (i.e. opportunities for additional income generation).

**Table- 3 Frequency distribution of responses on WORKING CONDITIONS, which is one of extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.**

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
2-1	1(3.70)	19(70.4)	4(14.80)	3(11.10)	--	--	27(100)	3(15.79)	7(36.84)	4(21.05)	4(21.05)	1(5.26)	----	19(100)
2-2	-	7(25.93)	5(18.52)	8(29.63)	7(25.92)	--	27(100)	----	3(15.79)	7(36.84)	8(42.11)	1(5.26)	----	19(100)
2-3	1(3.70)	9(33.33)	7(25.93)	7(25.93)	3(11.11)	--	27(100)	1(5.26)	2(10.53)	3(15.79)	9(47.37)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	19(100)
2-4	-	4(14.81)	10(37.04)	10(37.04)	3(11.11)	--	27(100)	----	5(26.32)	5(25.32)	6(31.58)	3(15.79)	---	19(100)

Working conditions- the environment in which people work has a tremendous effect on their level of pride for them selves and for the work they are doing <sup>12</sup>. As can be observed from Table-3, a greater percentage of governmental instructors 19 [70.40%] are satisfied with student's behavior and school atmosphere. These rating and proportion are almost similar with the rating and proportion of private instructors, which are 7[36.84%] of all. On the others hand, 8[29.63%] are dissatisfied and 7 [25.92%] are very dissatisfied with confortability of office condition which is almost the same with private instructors having a higher proportion 8[42.11%] being dissatisfied. Regarding to access to computers and Internet services a higher percentage of governmental instructors, 9 [33.33%] rated satisfied which is a direct opposite to private instructors that is 9[47.37%] of them are dissatisfied. Relatively, a higher percentage of instructors from both governing bodies are dissatisfied with administrative support to the teaching learning process like provision of equipments for practical and theoretical teaching and up-to- date library materials. Quantitatively, 10[37.04%] of them are from governmental schools while 6 [31.58%] of them are from private schools.

**Table-4 Frequency distribution of responses on SUPERVISION, which is one of extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.**

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
3-1	---	9(33.33)	12(44.44)	2(7.41)	2(7.41)	2(7.41)	27(100)	2(10.53)	8(42.11)	5(26.32)	2(10.53)	2(10.53)	----	19(100)
3-2	---	9(33.33)	9(33.33)	4(14.82)	3(11.11)	2(7.41)	27(100)	2(10.53)	6(31.58)	5(26.32)	2(10.53)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	19(100)
3-3	3(11.11)	7(25.93)	11(40.74)	1(3.70)	3(11.11)	2(7.41)	27(100)	1(5.26)	6(31.58)	5(26.32)	2(10.53)	4(21.05)	1(5.26)	19(100)

As it is apparent from the table 4, a greater proportion of instructors from both governmental and private schools rated all facets of supervision from satisfied to neutral state. From the total of governmental instructors 9(33.33%) are satisfied and 12[44.44%] are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the nature of supervision of the work [That is, its timeliness, consistence, fairness and regularity]. while 8 [42.11%] and 5[26.33%] of private instructors responded respectively to the same variable. Similarly, for the perception that supervisors possess readership skills, a higher percentage of instructors, 9[33.33%] from governmental and 6[31.58%] from private are satisfied. The proportion of governmental instructors who rated neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with this variable is precisely equal with the proportion of satisfied governmental instructors. In addition, a higher proportion of governmental instructors, 11[40.74%] rated the neutral sate and 7[25.93%] are satisfied with the feeling that they trust their supervisors. This is also similar to private instructors having 5[26.32%] of them are neutral and 6[31.58%] are satisfied.

**Table –5 Frequency distribution of responses on INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, which is one of extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.**

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
4-1	1(4.41)	26(59.26)	8(29.63)	1(3.70)	---	---	27(100)	3(15.79)	9(47.37)	5(26.32)	1(5.26)	1(5.26)	----	19(100)
4-2	3(11.11)	16(59.26)	6(22.23)	1(3.70)	1(3.70)	---	27(100)	3(15.79)	8(42.11)	5(26.32)	3(15.79)	----	----	19(100)
4-3	2(7.41)	18(66.67)	4(14.81)	3(11.11)	---	--	27(100)	4(21.05)	8(42.11)	5(26.32)	1(5.26)	1(5.26)	----	19(100)
4-4	2(7.41)	16(59.26)	4(14.81)	3(11.11)	2(7.41)	--	27(100)	7(36.34)	6(31.58)	2(10.53)	2(10.53)	---	2(10.53)	19(100)

Table –5 Portrays variables geared to interpersonal relation ship, which is also one of the criteria of extrinsic dimension of job satisfaction. Here, results revealed that a greater proportion of respondents from both governing bodies dominantly rated every variable satisfied. Numbers of governmental instructors who are satisfied with either working with students during teaching learning process, or working with immediate superior in relation to work requirements, or working with other professionals in the field are 16[59.26%], which is a greater proportion. Similarly, a greater proportion of these instructors, 18[66.67%] are Satisfied with working with other administrate staff like secretaries. Like governmental instructors a greater number of private instructors are also satisfied with the aforementioned variables of interpersonal relationship.



**Table –6 Frequency distribution of responses on ANIZATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES, which is one of extrinsic factors of job satisfaction.**

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
5-1	1[3.70]	4(14.32)	10(37.04)	4(14.81)	5(15.52)	3(11.11)	27(100)	1(5.26)	7(36.84)	5(26.32)	1(5.26)	2(10.53)	3(15.79)	19(100)
5-2	---	2(7.41)	8(29.63)	8(29.63)	8(29.63)	1(3.70)	27(100)	1(5.26)	7(36.84)	4(21.05)	3(15.79)	2(10.53)	2(10.53)	19(100)
5-3	-----	1(3.70)	9(33.33)	10(37.04)	5(18.52)	2(7.41)	27(100)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	3(15.79)	7(36.84)	2(10.53)	3(15.79)	19(100)
5-4	1(3.70)	1(3.70)	8(29.63)	8(29.63)	6(22.22)	5(18.52)	27(100)	1(5.26)	3(15.79)	5(26.32)	4(21.05)	4(21.05)	2(10.53)	19(100)
5-5	1(3.70)	4[14.81]	10(37.04)	10(37.04)	5(18.52)	6(22.22)	27(100)	2(10.53)	3(15.79)	5(26.32)	3(15.79)	---	6(31.58)	19(100)

In responding to the variables of organizational and administrative policies, as indicated in table-6, relatively a greater number of governmental instructors, 10 [37.04%] are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with regard to the nature of policies related with contractual agreement [That is, whether they are revised recently or not]. On the contrary, however, a greater number of private instructors, 7[36.84%] are satisfied with the same variable. Regarding policies of personnel development and capacity building in the academic and administrative area, dominantly equal proportion of governmental instructors, 8[29.63%] rated from very dissatisfied to neutral state. But this rating is not similar to the rating of private instructors as a greater proportion, 7[36.84%] rated satisfied. For the policies geared to service and training infrastructure 10[37.04%] of governmental instructors rated dissatisfied while 9[33.33%] of them are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. To these same policies 7[36.84%] of private instructors responded that they are dissatisfied. Though it seems there is a fare distribution over the five- likert scale to policies related to fringe benefits, promotion, and other disiplinary measures, relatively a greater proportion, of instructors, 8[29.63%] of governmental and 5[26.32%] of private governing bodies rated the neutral state. With regard to development of a gender policy, which focuses on affirmative action greater proportion, of both governmental instructors, 10[37.04%] and 5[26.32%] of private instructors are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

**Table – 7 Frequency distribution of responses on WORK ITSELF, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.**

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
6-1	3(11.11)	10(37.04)	10(37.04)	2(7.41)	1(3.70)	1(3.70)	27(100)	1(5.26)	7(36.84)	7(36.84)	----	1(5.26)	3(15.79)	19(100)
6-2	5(18.52)	14(51.85)	5(18.52)	2(7.41)	1(3.70)	----	27(100)	2(10.53)	13(68.42)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	----	----	19(100)
6-3	5(18.52)	15(55.36)	6(22.22)	----	----	1(3.70)	27(100)	5(26.32)	10(52.63)	2(10.53)	2(10.53)	----	----	19(100)
6-4	6(22.22)	10(37.04)	8(29.63)	2(7.41)	----	1(3.70)	27(100)	3(15.79)	9(47.37)	3(15.79)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	----	19(100)

As portrayed in table -7 a greater proportion, 10[37.04%] of governmental instructors and 7[36.85%] of private Instructors rated the degree to which the job involves physical strain and exertion from satisfied to neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. It is also apparent in the table that a higher number, 14[15.85%] of governmental instructors and 13[68.42%] of private instructors are satisfied with the meaning that they attach to their work [whether the object of the work promotes something that is valued by them]. In addition, a higher number, 15[55.36%] of governmental and 10[52.63%] of private instructors are satisfied with job enrichment [i.e. adding challenges to their job]. Similarly, 10[37.04] from governmental and 9[47.37%] from private schools rated satisfied.

Table-8 Frequency distribution of responses on ACHIEVEMENT, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
7-1	4(14.81)	11(40.74)	8(29.63)	---	4(14.81)	---	27(100)	9(47.37)	4(21.05)	4(21.05)	2(10.53)	---	---	19(100)
7-2	1(3.70)	4(14.81)	14(51.85)	4(14.81)	4(14.81)	---	27(100)	2(10.53)	7(36.84)	3(15.79)	3(15.79)	2(10.53)	2(10.53)	19(100)
7-3	1(3.70)	4(14.81)	11(40.74)	6(22.22)	3(11.11)	2(7.41)	27(100)	2(10.53)	1(5.26)	4(21.05)	6(31.58)	4(21.05)	2(10.53)	19(100)
7-4	3(11.11)	13(48.15)	8(29.63)	2(7.41)	1(3.70)	---	27(100)	4(21.05)	6(31.58)	4(21.05)	4(21.05)	---	1(5.26)	19(100)

In responding to the facets of achievement, which is one of intrinsic dimension of job satisfaction, as depicted in table –8, a higher percentage of governmental instructors, 11 [40.74%] and 8[29.63] rated opportunities to utilize their talents, abilities and skills satisfied and neutral state respectively while a higher proportion of private instructors, 9[47.37%] responded very satisfied. In addition, a higher proportion, 14[51.85%] of governmental instructors are neutral with opportunities to receive regular and timely feed back on how they are doing while a greater proportion, 7[36.87] rated satisfied. For opportunities to conduct a research on their favorite area, a higher proportion of governmental instructors, 11 [40.74%] responded that they are neutral while a greater percentage of private instructors, 6[31.58%] are dissatisfied. Nevertheless, for the extent that they know clear, achievable goals and standards of their position, a greater percentage of both governmental and private instructors, 13[48.15%] and 6[31.58%] respectively rated satisfied.

Table-9 Frequency distribution of responses on ADVNCEMENT which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
8-1	----	2(7.41)	10(37.04)	5(18.52)	5(18.42)	5(18.52)	27(100)	1(5.26)	4(21.05)	6(31.56)	1(5.26)	2(10.53)	5(26.32)	19(100)
8-2	-----	2(7.41)	8(29.63)	6(22.22)	5(18.52)	6(22.22)	27(100)	----	5(26.32)	4(21.05)	2(10.53)	1(5.26)	7(36.84)	19(100)
8-3	1(3.70)	3(11.11)	10(37.04)	3(11.11)	3(11.11)	7(25.93))	27(100)	2(10.53)	3(15.79)	2(10.53)	1(5.26)	2(10.53)	9(47.37)	19(100)
8-4	1(3.70)	2(7.41)	3(11.11)	6(22.22)	9(33.33)	6(22.22)	27(100)	1(5.26)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	2(10.53)	5(26.32)	7(36.84)	19(100)

As it is clearly stated in table-9, a higher percentage of both instructors, 10 [37.04%] of governmental and 6[31.56%] of private are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with rewards of their performance, which is one of intrinsic variables of advancement. Similarly, a higher proportion of governmental respondents, 8[29.63%] responded neutral state, but a greater percentage of private respondents, 7[36.84%] rated not applicable. For appropriate from within promotion again a greater proportion of governmental instructors, 10[37.04%] rated neutral state while this same variable is not applicable for 9[47.37%] of private instructors, which is a greater proportion. Regarding to scholarship opportunities for further education and personal growth a higher percentage of both instructors, 9[33.35%] governmental and 7[36.84%] private, responded that the variable is not applicable.



**Table –10 Frequency distribution of responses on RECOGNITION, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.**

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
9-1	---	1(3.70)	4(14.81)	5(18.52)	8(29.63)	9(33.33)	27(100)	----	3(15.89)	5(26.32)	2(10.53)	4(21.05)	5(26.32)	19(100)
9-2	---	----	7(25.93)	7(25.93)	7(25.93)	6(22.22)	27(100)	2(10.53)	4(21.05)	2(10.53)	4(21.05)	3(15.79)	4(21.05)	19(100)
9-3	----	1(3.70)	7(25.93)	6(22.22)	7(25.93)	6(22.22)	27(100)	1(5.26)	2(10.53)	3(15.79)	2(10.53)	6(31.58)	5(26.32)	19(100)
9-4	---	----	2(7.41)	3(11.11)	6(22.22)	16(59.26)	27(100)	----	1(5.26)	3(15.79)	2(10.53)	7(36.84)	6(31.58)	19(100)

In the case of this study, recognition as one of intrinsic dimension of job satisfaction embodies four variables. For the first variables, which are existence of formal recognition program [e.g. once in every 3 months], a higher percentage of both instructors, 9[33.33%] governmental and 5[26.32%] private rated that it is not applicable. For this same variables the same proportion of private instructors, 5[26.32%] also rated neither satisfied nor dissatisfied while a greater proportion of governmental instructors, 8[29.63%] following those who rated not applicable rated dissatisfied. With regard to management recognition for their major accomplishments on the job, a greater proportion of governmental instructors, 7[25.93%] rated from very dissatisfied to neutral state while a greater percentage of private instructors, 4[21.05%] rated for satisfied, dissatisfied and not applicable. Similarly, a greater proportion of governmental instructors, 7[25.93%] rated dissatisfied and neutral state for the nature of recognition [i.e. in a timely, publicly, and meaningful way for handling a situation particularly well.]. For this variable, a higher percentage of private instructors, 6[31.58%] are dissatisfied. The last facet of recognition, which is existence of appropriate bonus, is not applicable for a higher percentage of governmental instructor, 16[59.26] while a greater proportion of private instructors, 7[36.84] rated dissatisfied

Table -11 Frequency distribution of responses on RESPONSIBILITY, which is one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction.

Ref No	FOR GOVERNMENTAL SCHOOLS							FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS						
	RATING							RATING						
	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL	5	4	3	2	1	NA	TOTAL
10-1	8(29.63)	14(51.85)	2(7.41)	3(11.11)	----	----	27(100)	7(36.84)	7(36.84)	3(15.79)	---	2(10.53)	----	19(100)
10-2	11(40.74)	10(37.04)	3(11.11)	2(7.41)	----	1(3.70)	27(100)	<b>8(42.11)</b>	6(31.58)	2(10.43)	1(5.26)	2(10.53)	-----	19(100)
10-3	6(22.22)	11(40.74)	8(29.63)	1(3.70)	1(3.70)	-----	27(100)	2(10.53)	7(36.84)	5(36.32)	3(15.79)	1(5.26)	1(5.26)	19(100)

In responding to the facets of responsibility, which is the last intrinsic dimension of job satisfaction, as depicted in table-11, a greater proportion of both governmental instructors, 14[51.85%] and private instructors, 7[36.84%] responded that they are satisfied with their ownership of the work [i.e. their being autonomy on teaching activity.] With this same variable the same proportion, 7[36.84%] of private instructors are also satisfied. With regard to carryout their task, a higher percentage of both governmental instructors, 11[40.74%] and private instructors, 8[42.11%] are very satisfied. In addition, a greater proportion of both governmental instructors 11[40.74%] and private instructors, 7[36.84%] are satisfied with compatibility of additional challenging and meaningful work with greater responsibility.

## 5. FINDINGS

The most commonly accepted definition views job satisfaction as depending on an evaluation the employee makes of the job and the environment surrounding the job. This evaluation depends on two components: (1) what the employee actually experiences at work *what is* and (2) what values or desires for rewards the employee brings to the workplace *what should be*. Satisfaction is high where 'what is' corresponds to 'what should be'. Dissatisfaction occurs when the employee believes that these two components do not correspond<sup>6</sup>.

The major assertion of this study is that the extent of job satisfaction of both governmental and private schools of business instructors is affected by the interaction of extrinsic and intrinsic factors.

### 5.1: *EXTRINSIC FACTORS*

A greater proportion of governmental instructors rated all specified facets of salary somewhere between dissatisfied and very dissatisfied while a higher proportion of private instructors dominantly rated satisfied. Although a higher percentage of instructors of private schools responded between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and dissatisfied, a greater proportion of governmental instructors rated dominantly satisfied with all variables of working conditions. With regard to different aspects of supervision, as one of extrinsic factors, a greater number of governmental instructors responded between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied while a greater proportion of private instructors rated satisfied. As far as the overall response of interpersonal relation ship is concerned, a greater proportion of instructors

from both governing bodies are satisfied with every aspect mentioned. On the contrary for the facets of organizational and administrative policies, a greater proportion of governmental instructors rated somewhere between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and dissatisfied while there is almost an evenly rating percentage distribution of private instructors over the five likert-scale.

## **5.2: Intrinsic Factors**

In responding to all facets of work itself, dominant proportion of both schools of instructors are satisfied. With regard to all specified variables of achievement, though there is almost an evenly distribution of private instructors over the five likert- scale ratings, a greater proportion of governmental instructors rated between satisfied and neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Nevertheless, the existing variables of advancement are not applicable for most of private instructors while a greater proportion of governmental instructors are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. For the variables of recognition, as one of intrinsic factors of job satisfaction, both schools of instructors are almost evenly distributed over the given scale of ratings. On the other hand, with regard to all mentioned variables of responsibility a greater proportion of both schools of instructors rated between satisfied and very satisfied.

Table-12- Distribution behavior of respondents for every factor of two dimensions job satisfaction.

Two dimensions of job satisfaction	Governmental schools	Private Schools.
<b>1. EXTRINSIC</b>		
• Salary	Between dissatisfied and satisfied	Dominantly satisfied
• Working conditions	Dominantly satisfied	Between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.
• Supervision	Between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and satisfied	Dominantly satisfied
• Interpersonal relationship	Dominantly satisfied	Dominantly satisfied
• Organizational and administration policies	Between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and dissatisfied.	Evenly distributed
<b>2. INTRINSIC</b>		
• Work it self	Dominantly satisfied	Dominantly satisfied
• Achievement	Between satisfied and neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Evenly distributed
• Advancement	Dominantly neither neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.	Dominantly not applicable
• Recognition	Evenly distribution	Evenly distributed
• Responsibilities	Between satisfied and very satisfied	Between satisfied and very satisfied.

***NB. Distribution behavior is based on a greater proportion of respondents.***

## RECOMMENDATION

*Handwritten note:*  
Have  
Program

Based on the findings of the study, the following is forwarded as recommendation.

- For governmental instructors greater emphasis should be given to the compatibility of base salary with the quality and quantity of the work being done.
- Improvement has to be placed on working conditions of private instructors.
- Improve policies geared to development and capacity building in the academic and administrative areas.
- Different opportunities to utilize talents, abilities and skills of instructors should be facilitated
- For better encouragement, formal recognition program for major accomplishments on the job should be arranged.
- Instructors to be autonomy on teaching activity, there should be sufficient provision of freedom and authority on the job.



## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it should be noted that this study set forth with an attempt to provide an insight in to the extent of job satisfaction of business instructors and indicated the areas that are in need of a thorough considerations. As it is clearly expressed in Table-12, it is not an easy task to draw a sound and general conclusion that instructors are better satisfied with one dimension of job satisfaction (say extrinsic) than the other (say intrinsic). Yet one should go through every facet of both dimensions. The study might be helpful for every concerned body in crafting strategies to get instructors very satisfied at work and yield good results. Moreover, it may initiate future research for better investigation in the area.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, Wright. Human Resource Management: Gaining a competitive Advantage. Second Ed. 1996.
2. Herzberg. F, Mausner. B and Snyderman. B. The motivation to work. N.Y John Wiley. 1959
3. Blum. M.L and Naylor.J.C. Industrial Psychology: A Theoretical and social Foundations. Harper and Row. 1984 New York.
4. Bavendam Research Inc. Special Reports on managing Job satisfaction, 2000: (6) [Internet ]
5. J. Michael Syptak, MD, David W. Marsland .MD. and Deborah Ulmer, PhD. Job satisfaction: Putting Theory in to practice
6. Heneman, Schwab, Fossum, Dyer. Personnel/Human Resource management. Forth Ed. 1996.
7. Michael Harris, Human Resource Management. A Practical Approach.
8. National Center For Education Statistics. Statistical Analysis Report. Job satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effect of work place conditions, Background characteristics, and Teacher compensation, Summer whitener at [summer-whitener@ed. Gov](mailto:summer-whitener@ed.gov)
9. Wendell L. French. Human Resources Management frothed
10. Margaret Atwood and Stuart Dimmock personnel management Third ed.
11. Lynda Grafton, Veronica hope Hailey, Philip stiles, and Gatherine Truss. Strategic Human Resource management.
12. J,Michael syptak, ND,David W.Marsland,MD,and Deborahulmer, PhD.Job sotisfaction: putting theoryInto practice [internet]

# ANNEXES

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### **Factors affecting Job satisfaction of Business Instructors.**

**[The case of Business schools in Addis Ababa city and Jimma town]**

#### **Dear study participant:**

Please find here a questionnaire prepared to assess the extent of work satisfaction and dissatisfaction of business instructors in universities and private colleges.

Believing that there is no right or wrong answer to the items provided, you are kindly requested to forward your true feelings. Responses that you provide won't be exposed to any other persons, group, and institution, but will only be used as a resource to conduct the study. Participation in this study is deliberately on voluntary basis.

Please respond to the items directed.

Thank you, for participation.

## I. BACK GROUND INFORMATION

In order to know who has participated in the study, you are kindly requested to fill the following background Information. Place a check mark (✓) to the items that apply in the box provided and give information in the space provided as requested.

○ Sex:

- Male . Female

○ Nationality:

- Ethiopian . Expatriate

○ Qualification

- Diploma  .BA  .MA

- PhD

- If others. Specify \_\_\_\_\_

1.4 Area of specialization(s), if any

---

1.5 length of experience in university I college teaching (nearest Year)

- ≤2 Years
- 3-5 Years
- 5-10 Years
- >10 Years

1.6 Marital status:

- Married . Single

1.7 Governing body of your university / College

- Ministry of Education
- Private

## II. RATING JOB SATISFACTION

Below are listed numerous factors structured around F.Herzberg's satisfaction and dissatisfaction theory. Here factors are geared to your position as an Instructor of Business college and /or university. Please rate your degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction on each track of the factors listed under the prevailing working conditions. If a factor is inapplicable to your extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction kindly make it as NA (not applicable). Please don't leave any question unfilled.

☆ Use the following five-point scale numerical code for rating.

5= Very Satisfied

4= Satisfied

3= Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

2= Dissatisfied

1= very dissatisfied

NA= Not applicable

Ref	Factors that may relate to the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction	Numerical codes					
		5	4	3	2	1	NA
<b>1</b>	<b>SALARY:</b>						
1.1	Compatibility of base salary with the quality and quantity of the work I am doing						
1.2	Base salary Comparable to what other offices in my area are paying						
1.3	My perception of fringe benefits provided on my job						
1.4	Fringe benefits comparable to what other offices in my area are offering						
1.5	Availability of part-time employment a part from my work (i.e. opportunities for additional in come generation).						
<b>2</b>	<b>WORKING CONDITIONS:</b>						
2.1	My perception of students' behavior and school atmosphere						
2.2	Conformability of office conditions (like my chair, my table...)						
2.3	Access to computers and Internet services						
2.4	Administrative support to the teaching learning process. (Like provision of equipments for practical / theoretical teaching and up-to-date library materials.						
<b>3</b>	<b>SUPERVISION</b>						
3.1	Nature of supervision of my work (i.e. its fairness, consistence, timeliness and regularity.)						
3.2	My perception that supervisors possess leadership skills.						
3.3	My feeling that I can trust my supervisors						
<b>4</b>	<b>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP</b>						
4.1	Working with students during teaching learning process						

Ref	Factors that may relate to the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction	Numerical codes					
		5	4	3	2	1	NA
4.2	Working with colleagues (a sense of friendships and relation ships)						
4.3	Working with my immediate superior in relation to work requirements						
4.4	Working with other administrative staff (e.g. secretaries etc.)						
4.5	Working with other professionals in the field (a sense of interaction and team work)						
<b>5.</b>	<b>ORGANIZATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES</b>						
5.1	Nature of policies related to contractual agreement (whether they are revised recently or not)						
5.2	My perception of policies of personnel development and capacity building in the academic and administrative areas. By motivating the university's /college's staff and improving the working environment.						
5.3	My perception of policies geared to service and training infrastructure.						
5.4	My perception of policies related to fringe benefits, promotion, demotion, and other disciplinary measures.						
5.5	Development of a gender policy focusing on affirmative action.						
<b>6</b>	<b>WORK ITSELF</b>						
6.1	The degree to which my job involves physical strain and exertion.						
6.2	The meaning that I attach to the work (whether the object of the work promotes something that is valued by me.)						
6.3	Job enrichment (i.e. adding challenges to my job.)						

Ref	Factors that may relate to the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction	Numerical codes					
		5	4	3	2	1	NA
6.4	Professional status of my work compared to other or related professions.						
<b>7</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT</b>						
7.1	Opportunities to utilize my talents, abilities & skills						
7.2	Opportunities to receive regular, timely feed back on how I am doing.						
7.3	Opportunities to conduct a research on my favorite area.						
7.4	The extent that I know clear, achievable goals and standards of my position.						
<b>8</b>	<b>ADVANCEMENT</b>						
8.1	Rewards for my performance						
8.2	Rewards for my loyalty						
8.3	Promotion from within, when appropriate						
8.4	Scholarship opportunities for further education and personal growth						
<b>9</b>	<b>RECOGNITION</b>						
9.1	Existence of formal recognition program (e.g. Once in every 3 months)						
9.2	Management recognition for my major accomplishments on the job						
9.3	My perception of the nature of recognition (i.e. in a timely, publicly, and meaningful way for handling a situation particularly well.)						
9.4	Existence of bonus, if appropriate						



Ref	Factors that may relate to the level of satisfaction and dissatisfaction	Numerical codes					
		5	4	3	2	1	NA
<b>10</b>	<b>RESPONSIBILITY</b>						
10.1	My ownership of the work (i.e. my being autonomy on teaching activity.)						
10.2	Provision of sufficient freedom and authority to carryout my tasks.						
10.3	Compatibility of additional challenging and meaningful work with greater responsibility						

**Table – 13: Schools where data were collected.**

Governmental	Private
<p><b>*Addis Ababa University</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Faculty of Business and Economics</li> <li>○ Commerce College</li> </ul> <p><b>*Jimma University</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Faculty of Business</li> </ul>	<p><b>*Unity College</b></p> <p><b>*Admas College</b></p> <p><b>*Queence College</b></p> <p><b>*Zega College</b></p>



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons  
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs  
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>