

Original Paper

Inclinations of Members of the Teaching Staff Towards Factors Leading to Job Satisfaction—A Comparative Study between Public and Private Universities

Dr. Hasan Y. El-Mousawi^{1*} & Khaldoun G. Farhat²

¹ Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Lebanese University, Beirut, Lebanon

² Beirut, Lebanon

* Hasan El-Mousawi, Email: h_mousawi@hotmail.com

Received: April 22, 2019 Accepted: April 29, 2019 Online Published: May 9, 2019

doi:10.22158/rem.v4n2p110

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/rem.v4n2p110>

Abstract

The study aimed at identifying job satisfaction and inclinations towards factors, such as salary, feeling of job security, extent of empowerment, nature of work relations among different parties and social status the instructor feels, all of which lead to job satisfaction among members of teaching staff in both public and private universities in Lebanon. Furthermore, the study aimed at prioritizing these factors as related to instructors at the Lebanese University and those at private universities. The study also tried to find whether instructors preferred teaching at public or private universities as related to the country from which they obtained their Ph. D's. To achieve this goal, a five-point Likert-style questionnaire was constructed and distributed to 100 instructors in the public university (Lebanese University) and to another 100 instructors in various private universities. Thus, the society of the study comprises instructors in both public and private universities. Of these questionnaires, the researchers retrieved 184 which were valid for analysis. The study yielded some important findings, mainly that there is a significant difference between instructors in public and private universities regarding some factors leading to job satisfaction (salary, feeling of job security, work relations among colleagues and students, and social status that the instructor feels) in Lebanon. The study also showed a difference in prioritizing factors which lead to job satisfaction relative to workplace (public or private university) in Lebanon. Moreover, the study concluded that instructors at universities have different preferences to work at the Lebanese University (public) relative to the country from which they obtained their Ph. D's.

Keywords

job satisfaction, salary, job security, empowerment, work relations, social status

1. Introduction

Interest in job satisfaction has been increasing steadily for the past few decades since a lot of people believe that there is a relation between the extent of job satisfaction and workers' productivity. Moreover, people usually try to satisfy their various needs and desires, and they might find work a good source of satisfaction for these needs and desires. This would urge them to select jobs that harmonize with whatever needs and desires they might have, which drives employers to try and match what applicants seek on one hand, and what the employer has to offer on the other. Bearing this in mind, employers need to understand factors that drive people to work in the first place, and factors which encourage their continuity in the second place as the increasing rate of labor turnover has so many negative aspects.

For decades, the private sector's participation in supplying educational services both in schools and in universities has helped supply new opportunities for members of the teaching staff to choose between private and public educational institutions. It also gave these institutions the chance to compete in attracting qualified personnel to work for them through offering what might satisfy the needs of these workers. Some of these institutions succeeded while others failed in attracting qualified personnel and managing to maintain a sufficient number of workers who have convenient qualifications. The successes came as a result of the varied options these workers have at the institutions they work.

The study at hand is a comparison among members of the teaching staff regarding their views about the causes of job satisfaction that educational institutions they work at seem to offer, whether it be public or private.

2. Literature Review

Studies about job satisfaction began in the industrial and business management sectors then moved to the academic sector, where the focus was on teachers of basic and secondary education. Close to the end of the twentieth century, interest increased in job satisfaction among academics in higher education institutes because of their importance in building a good generation which supplies the workforce for various public sectors who will contribute in defining the future policies of the state. It is evident that an individual's satisfaction of his/her job accomplishes psychological accordance, which is vital in satisfying the individual's basic and secondary needs since satisfaction is directly reflected on the individual's performance and loyalty.

Employee satisfaction is the term used to describe whether or not individuals are happy, satisfied, and are gratifying their desires and needs at work. Many measures maintain that satisfaction is an important aspect of employee motivation, employee objective accomplishment, and positive employee self-confidence in the workplace (Heathfield, 2016). Job satisfaction is a situation of both a positive

and a negative points of view of the university academic staff towards their job, which might demonstrate diverse, positive or negative reactions at their workplace (Aziri, 2011).

There exists a negative connection between a positive outlook toward work and the intention to quit. The main reason for quitting a job is depression, which workers feel as a result of their inability to perform their daily tasks efficiently or on time. However, workers with a positive outlook tend to face this depression more easily as they are used to seeing the bright side of their job in spite of insignificant impediments they might encounter on a daily basis. Despite these inconvenient circumstances, workers with a positive outlook tend to collect their energy fast and regain their positivity to face future challenges (Chiu & Francesco, 2003).

In his study, Altuntas (2014) concluded that job dissatisfaction decreases the performance of individuals and leads to diverse negative consequences such as low efficiency, absenteeism, and resigning from the job. The researcher also claims that preventing job dissatisfaction is not an easy task. Measuring job satisfaction is something complicated because job satisfaction is not only explained by job features, but also by personal traits, desires, values, and aspirations. Because of that, two employees working in the same job with the same work conditions, for instance, can face different job satisfaction levels (Harputlu, 2014).

There are mainly two kinds of job satisfaction in relation to the level of the workers' feelings with regard to their jobs. The first one is universal job satisfaction, which refers to employees' general attitudes towards their jobs. The second one is job surface satisfaction, which is related to workers' attitude with regard to specific job features, such as wages, benefits, job hierarchy, chances of growth, workplace environment and kind of relationships among colleagues (Mueller & Kim, 2008).

Incentive and job satisfaction among university academics have a pivotal role in yielding positive outcomes in an institution's quality of teaching and students' learning, who will become the future workforce. This might prove to be true because the accomplishments and successes of a higher education institution depend greatly on the quality of its academic staff (Machado-Taylor et al., 2010). In their study about job satisfaction among university academics, Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) concluded that when academics are aware that they are valued when they get paid what their efforts are worth, they are more satisfied with their jobs. They are also satisfied when they see that their colleagues respect and appreciate the work that they do and the effort they exert.

A research report, by the Society for Human Resource Management, titled Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement, Revitalizing a Changing Workforce (2015) illustrated that the top contributors to employees' job satisfaction include respectful treatment of employees, salary, benefits, job security, relationship between parties at the workplace, opportunities to use your skills and abilities, relationship with immediate supervisor and feeling safe in the workplace. In their study, Jin and Lee (2012) found that continuous job training has a pivotal role for the individual's opportunities of development and helps employees to be more definite about their job; consequently, their job satisfaction increases. In

addition, programs of employee development enhance the level of workers' satisfaction by providing them with more confidence to control their work and boost feelings of positivity toward their job.

The study which Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) conducted was analyzed according to Herzberg's dual-factor theory in dividing factors which might cause an individual's job satisfaction or dissatisfaction into internal and external factors. The results of the study showed that the most important factors leading to job satisfaction include attitudes of colleagues and outer and inner features of the teaching process. On the other hand, the study reached a number of factors which lead to dissatisfaction of members in the teaching staff, which were mostly external factors. These include rewards, control (domination), promotion and work environment.

The study at hand is similar to some of the previous studies in dealing with certain variables such as feeling job security, nature of work relationships, employee empowerment and salary. However, it is different in other variables such as the social status that an employee feels when taking a certain job. Another difference is that the study tested instructors' preference to work at a public or private university as relative to the country from which they obtained their Ph. D's. It is also different in terms of the environment in which the study was conducted, in this case, Lebanon.

From the above review, it is evident that there is a wide range of factors which contribute to the employees staying at work and exerting more efforts or preferring to move on to another. These factors differ from one individual to another and have different impact range. In the following discussion, the researchers tried to point out the most important factors or incentives (including salary, job security, extent of prevailing empowerment, nature of work relations among different parties, and social status the individual feels when at a certain job) which are effective in job satisfaction of members of teaching staff at a certain university. The researchers also tried to reach the most valued factors from the teaching staff's point of view by means of comparing public and private universities. The researchers also tried to test instructors preference to work at the public university as relative to the county from which they obtained their Ph. D's.

2.1 Factors Which Cause Job Satisfaction

Some studies have shown that job satisfaction is affected by an individual's personality. Thus, people sometimes wonder why they prefer a certain workplace to another, and about the reason behind being totally consumed in one job, not in another. People also wonder why some employees go to work actively and with a positive attitude while others go to the same work less actively, if not reluctantly. All of these questions can be answered by pointing out the concept of motivation, which is also called the incentive to work. This expression was abundantly explained and studied to the extent that there are many more names for it (among which are motivation, incentive, drive, stimulus, impulse, inducement, enticement, etc.) all of which agree that it is responsible for moving the individual into a certain behavior (Afifi & Janaini, 2002). Some scholars define an incentive as an internal impulse or outer motivation that drives an individual to do something (Linz, 2003). Others point out that it is the force which affects an individual's conduct and moves him/her to perform a task.

The concept of job satisfaction is related to the amount of positive inclination which an individual has toward that job, which is usually relative to what this job achieves to satisfy the needs of the worker. It is related to how much satisfaction the job gives the worker toward what the individual does. Thus, the individual who feels satisfied with the job has positive inclinations towards it, while the unsatisfied individual has negative inclinations towards it (Atiya, 2003). This was asserted by Cullen (2002) when he emphasized that the meaning and value of a job include two concepts, the value of work in the individual's life as compared to other life activities and the importance of the work in achieving the individual's goals.

Causes of job satisfaction which drive an individual's positive behavior toward work include the following:

- Salary
- Job security
- The extent of prevailing empowerment
- Nature of work relations among different parties
- Social status the individual feels when at a certain job

2.1.1 Salaries

A salary is almost always vital in an individual's interests in performing a certain job since it is the most important source for him/her to support their families and maintain a decent standard of living. Salary and rewards which an individual gets for doing a certain job most normally constitute a strong drive for the individual to take a certain job, and might even be an incentive to continue working at that job. Christen et al. (2006) point out that a fixed salary has a considerable impact on job satisfaction because it is reflected on the following:

- An individual's social status
- An individual's financial level
- An individual's feeling of economic security

It is worth noting that the salary that an individual takes should be objective and just; otherwise, it would cause dissatisfaction and distress. When workers feel satisfied, they would exert more effort expecting more positive results.

2.1.2 Job Security

An employee would be more committed to his/her job and to the organization if he/she feels secure, which would also increase his/her performance and loyalty (Abdullah & Ramay, 2012). Job security represents all the benefits and guarantees which workers require and wish for such as being safe from losing their job without plausible reasons and being safe from managerial arbitrary measures. One important job feature which determines satisfaction is job security (Arts & Kaya, 2014). On the other hand, Moshoeu and Geldenhuys (2015) affirm that job insecurity is the worker's fear of losing his/her job. Sverke et al. (2013) assert that job insecurity can inflict corollary for both the employee and the workplace. Chirumbolo (2014) asserts that corollary includes stress and decreased health, which would

negatively affect the organization's performance and quality and increase workers' absenteeism and intentions to quit.

2.1.3 Extent of Prevailing Empowerment

Empowerment of employees means giving them a certain level of autonomy and accountability to make decisions about their definite tasks (Dobre, 2013). It leads to decision-making at lower levels of the organization, where employees have a distinctive view of the problems facing the organization at that level.

Employee empowerment is the practice of giving employees the power of decision-making regarding their own job (Brown & Harvey, 2006, p. 267). Gill (2011) defines employee empowerment as the employees' momentous job, their feelings of autonomy, proficiency, and involvement in the decision-making process.

The main factor of empowerment is the entrustment of authority to lower management levels and engaging employees in making decisions. This improves the employees' self-confidence, the feeling of pride, and responsibility (Brown & Harvey, 2006, p. 267). Engaging employees in management helps to increase the efficiency, quality and competitiveness of the organization (Durai, 2010, p. 421).

Outcomes of empowerment are numerous (Spatz, 2000), some of which are the following:

- Empowerment boosts employees' job satisfaction.
- Employees have positive feelings about their job and themselves.
- Employees use of all their potentials to improve their performance.
- Employees are more committed to the organization and have a sense of belonging.
- Employees have an increased sense of ownership towards their job, which help in reducing waste of time and resources. Profitability for the organization is the consequent result.
- Empowerment helps reduce direct supervision, which reduces personnel.
- It enhances teamwork and gives senior managers more time to focus on more strategic decisions.

2.1.4 Nature of Work Relations among Different Parties

It is viewed as a fair process of exchange between the management and the employee, which is also referred to as industrial relations. A good relationship between them would definitely lead to an increase in the level of job satisfaction, performance and organizational efficiency (Pyman et al., 2010). Industrial relations refers to the mood, standards, feelings and behaviors which reflect how workers, unions and managers of an industry interact communally with each other in the workplace, which affects the workplace outcomes (Kersley et al., 2006).

Industrial relations emphasizes outcomes that are directly related to the interaction of employees and employers coupled with the rules relative to employment which they, their organizations, and the government, create to rule employer-employee relations (Fiorito, 2011).

Relations among others at the workplace is divided into three types (Maslyn & Uhl-Bein, 2001):

- a. Relation with management

- b. Relation with colleagues
- c. Relation with underlying employees

However, in academic institutions, the relations among others include students as well.

2.1.5 Social Status the Individual Feels When at a Certain Job

Dowling (2004) stated that the reputation of an organization is the inclusive judgment reflecting the extent to which the public reflect on whether a certain organization is good or bad. A good reputation that an organization has may create regard, esteem, confidence and trust within the employee. However, if an organization has a bad reputation, it cannot create them. Employees consider organizational reputation as moral compensation that may increase employee engagement to the organization, hence improving the performance of the organization.

On the other hand, Owayda (2008) views that feeling job satisfaction is proportional to whatever grants the organization has to offer to the employee. In addition to the fact that employees prefer jobs whose goals are crystal-clear, they feel positively toward their job if it can satisfy the individual's needs from the point the society views the employee and the managerial degree of that job.

3. Research Problem and Hypothesis

The researchers conducted an exploratory study on a number of members of the teaching staff in both public and private universities, relying mainly on direct interviews to restrict causes they see as sources for their job satisfaction. The researchers reached some factors which lead to job satisfaction such as salary, job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, relations among colleagues, administration and students and social status. Accordingly, the main problem of the research can be summed in the following questions:

- 1) Is there a significant difference between public and private universities regarding factors leading to job satisfaction (salary, feeling of job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, work relations among different parties and social status that the instructor feels) in Lebanon?
- 2) Is there any difference in the importance of these factors (salary, feeling of job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, r work relations among different parties and social status that the instructor feels) with the difference in workplace (public or private university) in Lebanon?
- 3) Do instructors in universities prefer working at the Lebanese University (public) relative to the country from where they obtained their Ph. D?

Based on the questions above, the researchers have the following hypothesis.

H₁: There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding factors leading to job satisfaction (salary, feeling of job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, work relations among different parties and social status that the instructor feels) in Lebanon.

The following sub-hypotheses arise:

- H_{1.1}: There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding salary as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- H_{1.2}: There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding the feeling of job security as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- H_{1.3}: There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding the extent of prevailing empowerment as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- H_{1.4}: There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding work relations among different parties as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- H_{1.5}: There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding social status that the instructor feels like a factor leading to job satisfaction.

H₂: The importance of these factors (salary, feeling of job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, work relations among different parties and social status that the instructor feels) differ with the difference in workplace (public or private university) in Lebanon.

H₃: Instructors in universities prefer working at the Lebanese University (public) relative to the country from where they obtained their Ph. D.

4. Procedures and Methods

4.1 Population and Sample Selection

The population of the study consists of instructors in both public and private universities in Lebanon. The study was limited to a random sample of 100 instructors at the Lebanese University (public) and another random sample of 100 instructors at private universities. Thus, the total number of the sample is 200 instructors. The questionnaire was distributed to all of the instructors, of which 184 were retrieved and were valid for the study. The following table illustrates:

Table 1. Country from Where Ph.D. Was Obtained

Country from where Ph. D. was obtained	Frequency	Percent
USA	19	10.3
Britain	10	5.4
Russia	40	21.7
Syria	17	9.2
France	61	33.2
Lebanon	24	13.0
Egypt	13	7.1
Total	184	100.0

4.2 Instrumentation

Based on the literature review and on an informal discussion with both public and private university colleagues, the researchers constructed a Likert Style five-point scale and asked members of the sample to respond to the 30 items included in the questionnaire. The scale ranges as shown in Table 2 which follows:

Table 2. Five-Point Likert Style Scale

Answer	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Degree	5	4	3	2	1

The researchers used the Cronbach's Alpha and the split-half for all items of the questionnaire to test the reliability of the tool of the study as shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3. Cronbach's Alpha

Cronbach's Alpha		Split-Half	
No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Correlation Between Forms	Guttman Split-Half Coefficient
30	.770	.758	.704

It is evident from the above table that the value of Cronbach's Alpha for the questionnaire "Inclinations of Members of the Teaching Staff Towards Factors Leading to Job Satisfaction" is 0.770, while the split-half coefficient is 0.704. This signifies reliability in the data in the study; consequently, the data in the study is reliable, can be processed and the results can be applied to the society of the study.

4.3 Data Analysis

In order to define the level of approval over each item and domain within the tool of the study, the mean and relative weight were used in the following Table 4, which clarifies the level of approval based on five levels: very low, low, medium, high and very high.

Table 4. Mean and Relative Weight for the Scale

		Approval level				
		Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high
Positive items	Mean	< 1.8	1.8-2.59	2.6-3.39	3.4-4.19	> 4.2
	Rel. weight	< 36%	36%-51.9%	52%-67.9%	68%-83.9%	> 84%
Positive items	Mean	> 4.2	3.4-4.19	2.6-3.39	1.8-2.59	< 1.8
	Rel. weight	> 84%	68%-83.9%	52%-67.9%	36%-51.9%	< 36%

It is evident that when the mean is less than 1.80, there is a very low level of approval (or a very high level of rejection) over the item or domain. When the mean ranges from 1.8 to 2.59, there is a low level of approval (or a high level of rejection) over the item or domain. When the mean ranges from 2.6 to 3.39, there is a medium level of approval (or being neutral) over the item or domain. When the mean ranges from 3.40 to 4.19, there is a high level of approval over the item or domain. When the mean is equal to or more than 4.2, there is a very high level of approval. This distribution is defined according to the five-point Likert Scale that has been used.

5. Testing and Discussing the Hypotheses

5.1 Testing the First Sub-Hypothesis

There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding salary as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

The researchers used the T-test for two independent samples to test the existence of differences of statistical significance in the responses of the sample of instructors in the public university and private universities regarding salary as a factor leading to job satisfaction. The results were as follows in Table 5:

Table 5. T-Test Results for Salary As a Factor Leading to Job Satisfaction

Question	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig
The salary that I get is adequate relative to costs of living.	Public	90	4.40	.493	3.634	.000**
	Private	94	4.66	.476		
The salary that I get is adequate relative to the importance of my job.	Public	90	4.50	.503	.865	.388**
	Private	94	4.56	.499		
The salary that I get is adequate relative to my academic degree.	Public	90	4.58	.497	.479	.633**
	Private	94	4.54	.501		
The salary that I get is adequate in comparison to my colleagues' salaries.	Public	90	4.56	.500	14.769	.000**
	Private	94	3.20	.727		
The salary that I get encourages me to do my job in a better way.	Public	90	3.00	.000	31.025	.000**
	Private	94	4.59	.495		
Salary	Public	90	4.21	.191	3.281	.001**

Private	94	4.31	.238
---------	----	------	------

****Significant at the 0.05 level**

It is evident from the above table that there are differences of statistical significance among the members of the sample in public and private universities regarding salary, where the mean for job satisfaction of the instructors in the public university is 4.21, which is less than the mean for instructors in the private universities, which is 4.31. Also, the value of T is equal to 3.281 at the significance less than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is accepted. The existence of differences in the inclination of instructors regarding salary between public and private universities may be explained by the fact that the law in the public university prevents full-time instructors from working anywhere else as the salary there can be considered acceptable and sufficient to satisfy the needs of instructors. Whereas instructors at private universities can teach at more than one educational institution at the same time, which raises their income. Another reason may be that, at the public university, the full-time instructor is required to teach an average of 250 hours annually, but if the university needed more hours, the extra teaching hours are for free. On the other hand, instructors at private universities get paid for every additional hour they teach. In addition, reputable universities always consider the current standard of living and raise salaries accordingly, without the need for instructors to ask for a raise. A final reason may be that at the public university, salaries are not affected by competence or experience, whereas instructors at private universities can negotiate their salaries according to supply and demand.

5.2 Testing the Second Sub-Hypothesis

There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding the feeling of job security as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

The following Table 6 shows the results of the T-test for two independent samples to test the existence of differences of statistical significance in the responses of the sample of instructors in the public university and private universities regarding the feeling of job security as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

Table 6. T-Test Results for Feeling of Job Security As a Factor Leading to Job Satisfaction

Question	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig
My present job enhances my job security feeling.	Public	90	4.58	.497	28.944	.000**
	Private	94	1.66	.824		
I feel my presence at the faculty is temporary.	Public	90	2.51	.974	17.287	.000**
	Private	94	4.50	.503		
There are no specific standards for continuity	Public	90	4.29	.974	21.024	.000**
	Private	94	1.53	.799		

of work at the faculty.						
I feel high confidence	Public	90	4.54	.501		
from the administration					27.599	.000**
regarding my work.	Private	94	1.66	.862		
	Public	90	3.98	.352		
Feeling of job security					23.689	.000**
	Private	94	2.34	.560		

****Significant at the 0.05 level**

It is evident from the above table that there are differences of statistical significance among the members of the sample in public and private universities regarding feeling of job security, where the mean for job satisfaction of the instructors in the public university is 3.98, which is greater than the mean for instructors in the private universities, which is 2.34. Also, the value of T is equal to 23.689 at the significance less than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is accepted. This is mainly because instructors at the Lebanese University (public) are appointed by a decree which is issued by the cabinet of ministers and is permanent till retirement age. So, instructors are not subject to the personal inclinations of their superiors since both are appointed the same way. Nevertheless, in the private universities, the relation between instructors and their superiors might be affected by the superiors' personal evaluation and relations with the instructors. Consequently, they can terminate the contract, which the university devises to fit their needs, whenever they find another alternative.

5.3 Testing the Third Sub-Hypothesis

There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding the extent of prevailing empowerment as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

The following Table 7 shows the results of the T-test for two independent samples to test the existence of differences of statistical significance in the responses of the sample of instructors in the public university and private universities regarding the extent of prevailing empowerment as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

Table 7. T-Test Results for Extent of Prevailing Empowerment As a Factor Leading to Job Satisfaction

Question	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig
I get to do what I find	Public	90	4.62	.88		
appropriate without being					1.820	.070**
dictated by the	Private	94	4.49	.503		
administration.						
The administration	Public	90	1.50	.503	29.455	.000**

always takes my opinions into consideration.	Private	94	4.49	.839		
The work I do is totally clear.	Public	90	4.54	.501	30.121	.000**
	Private	94	1.62	.791		
The faculty administration provides everything I need to perform my duties efficiently.	Public	90	4.59	.495		
	Private	94	4.41	.495	2.383	.018**
The extent of prevailing empowerment as a factor leading to job satisfaction	Public	90	3.81	.289		
	Private	94	3.75	.221	1.548	.010**

****Significant at the 0.05 level**

It is evident from the above table that there are differences of statistical significance among the members of the sample in public and private universities regarding the extent of prevailing empowerment, where the mean for job satisfaction of the instructors in the public university is 3.81, which is greater than the mean for instructors in the private universities, which is 3.75. Also, the value of T is equal to 1.548 at the significance less than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is accepted. This might be due to the fact that, at the Lebanese University, a certain recommendation should be taken at the branch board, which is composed of the manager of the branch, heads of the academic departments (chairpersons) and a representative on behalf of the instructors. The recommendation is then reported to the unit board, which is composed of managers of the branches, representatives on behalf of the branches and the dean. After that, the recommendation is reported to the university board, which is composed of the president of the university, the deans, and representatives on behalf of the faculties, where a decision is made about that recommendation. This means that decisions are taken in collaboration among minor and senior employees. However, at private universities, a decision might be taken in accordance with a colleague's recommendation, who has good personal relationship with the administration, or a senior's recommendation.

5.4 Testing the Fourth Sub-Hypothesis

5.4.1 Work Relations among Colleagues

There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding work relations among colleagues as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

The researchers used the T-test for two independent samples to test the existence of differences of statistical significance in the responses of the sample of instructors in the public university and private

universities regarding work relations among colleagues as a factor leading to job satisfaction. The results were as follows in Table 8:

Table 8. T-Test Results for Work Relations among Colleagues As a Factor Leading to Job Satisfaction

Question	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig
I feel mutual geniality and harmony between my colleagues and I.	Public	90	4.48	.502	21.574	.000**
	Private	94	3.07	.366		
The relationship with colleagues at the department is excellent.	Public	90	2.18	.894	6.104	.000**
	Private	94	1.52	.502		
The administration always intervenes to solve problems among colleagues.	Public	90	4.29	.939	2.855	.005**
	Private	94	4.61	.491		
Disputes are obviously dominant in relationships among colleagues.	Public	90	3.00	.000	28.732	.000**
	Private	94	4.49	.503		
My relationship with my colleagues affects my work at the faculty negatively.	Public	90	4.54	.501	30.959	.000**
	Private	94	1.63	.748		
Relationship with colleagues	Public	90	3.70	.275	15.523	.000**
	Private	94	3.06	.279		

****Significant at the 0.05 level**

It is evident from the above table that there are differences of statistical significance among the members of the sample in public and private universities regarding work relations among colleagues, where the mean for job satisfaction of the instructors in the public university is 3.70, which is greater than the mean for instructors in the private universities, which is 3.06. Also, the value of T is equal to 15.523 at the significance less than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is accepted. This might be due to the fact that instructors at the Lebanese University need to have good relations with their colleagues if they want to be promoted since promotions take place by colleagues electing one among

themselves, such as electing a representative of the instructors or the like. While at private universities if an instructor wants to be promoted, he/she should have good relations with the management regardless of the relation with colleagues.

5.4.2 Relationship with College Administration

There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding work relations with university administration as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

The researchers used the T-test for two independent samples to test the existence of differences of statistical significance in responses of the sample of instructors in the public university and private universities regarding work relations with college administration as a factor leading to job satisfaction. The results are in the following table (Table 9).

Table 9. T-Test Results for Work Relations with College Administration As a Factor Leading to Job Satisfaction

Question	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig
I feel mutual geniality and cooperation between the administration and myself.	Public	90	4.54	.501	11.177	.000**
	Private	94	3.72	.495		
The administration interferes with my work in an unsatisfactory way.	Public	90	2.64	.825	10.102	.000**
	Private	94	3.70	.565		
My relationship with the administration is dominantly formal.	Public	90	4.54	.564	10.583	.000**
	Private	94	3.67	.556		
I prefer that the faculty be managed by other people.	Public	90	4.07	.650	2.886	.004**
	Private	94	4.32	.533		
Relationship with college administration	Public	90	3.95	.329	2.131	.034**
	Private	94	3.85	.283		

**** Significant at the 0.05 level**

It is evident from the above table that there are differences of statistical significance among the members of the sample in public and private universities regarding work relationship with college administration, where the mean for job satisfaction of the instructors in the public university is 3.95, which is greater than the mean for instructors in the private universities, which is 3.85. Also, the value

of T is equal to 2.131 at the significance less than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is accepted. This might be due to the fact that at the Lebanese University, the instructor and the manager have equal ranks. Also, the manager of the branch is elected from the teaching staff and branch management only lasts for three years. Consequently, the manager of today will be changed after that, so everyone should have good relations with others. This is not applicable to private universities.

5.4.3 Relationship with Students

There is significant difference between public and private universities regarding work relations with students as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

The researchers used the T-test for two independent samples to test the existence of differences of statistical significance in the responses of the sample of instructors in the public university and private universities regarding work relations with students as a factor leading to job satisfaction. The results are as follows in Table 10.

Table 10. T-Test Results for Work Relations with Students As a Factor Leading to Job Satisfaction

Question	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig
Students at the faculty are characterized by respect.	Public	90	3.59	.763	21.617	.000**
	Private	94	1.52	.502		
My relationship with my students is generally satisfactory.	Public	90	4.54	.501	30.121	.000**
	Private	94	1.62	.791		
The most tiring thing in this job is the quality of students.	Public	90	4.27	.859	21.082	.000**
	Private	94	1.65	.826		
I find it difficult to deal with students at the faculty.	Public	90	1.49	.503	40.923	.000**
	Private	94	4.52	.502		
Relationship with students	Public	90	3.47	.356	49.934	.000**
	Private	94	2.33	.413		

****Significant at the 0.05 level**

It is evident from the above table that there are differences of statistical significance among the members of the sample in public and private universities regarding work relationship with students, where the mean for job satisfaction of the instructors in the public university is 3.47, which is greater

than the mean for instructors in the private universities, which is 2.33. Also, the value of T is equal to 49.934 at the significance less than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is accepted. This might be due to the fact that instructors at the Lebanese University appreciate students' desire to learn and the respect they show to instructors. While at some private universities, students are considered as customers; thus, instructors feel they are obliged to please them; otherwise, students can complain to the administration, which might lead, at some private universities to terminate the contract with the instructor.

5.5 Testing the Fifth Sub-Hypothesis

There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding social status that the instructor feels as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

The researchers used the T-test for two independent samples to test the existence of differences of statistical significance in the responses of the sample of instructors in the public university and private universities regarding social status that the instructor feels as a factor leading to job satisfaction. The results were as follows in Table 11:

Table 11. T-Test Results for Social Status That the Instructor Feels As a Factor Leading to Job Satisfaction

Question	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test	Sig
The name of the university	Public	90	4.24	.998	19.046	.000**
I am working at makes me feel proud.	Private	94	1.74	.761		
People's attitude toward me has changed since I started working at this university.	Public	90	4.54	.501	28.214	.000**
	Private	94	1.61	.870		
I feel self-importance as a result of working at this university.	Public	90	4.51	.503	30.643	.000**
	Private	94	1.48	.800		
I prefer working at a public university since it is socially more acceptable.	Public	90	2.30	1.353	4.195	.000**
	Private	94	1.64	.653		
Social status that the educator feels	Public	90	3.90	.407	32.892	.000**
	Private	94	1.62	.525		

****Significant at the 0.05 level**

It is evident from the above table that there are differences of statistical significance among the members of the sample in public and private universities regarding social status that the instructor feels, where the mean for job satisfaction of the instructors in the public university is 3.90, which is greater than the mean for instructors in the private universities, which is 1.62. Also, the value of T is equal to 32.892 at the significance less than 0.05, which means that the hypothesis is accepted. This might be due to the fact that instructors at the Lebanese University have a long-term contract with the university, which enables the instructor to achieve many personal goals like the feeling of being appreciated by others or like reaching high positions, which is achieved more easily by being employed in the public sector.

5.6 Testing the Second Hypothesis

The importance of these factors (salary, feeling of job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, work relations among different parties and social status that the instructor feels) differ with the difference in workplace (public or private university). Results are shown in Table 12 below.

Table 12. Ranking of Different Factors Leading to Job Satisfaction

Domains	Public University		Private University	
	Mean	Ranking	Mean	Ranking
Salary	4.21	1	4.31	1
Work relations among different parties	3.71	5	3.08	3
Feeling of job security	3.98	2	2.34	4
The extent of prevailing empowerment	3.81	4	3.75	2
Social status that the instructor feels	3.90	3	1.62	5
Job Satisfaction	3.87		3.08	

It is evident from the above table that the most factor which causes instructors at the public university to feel job satisfaction is the salary since the mean is 4.21, which is the highest among all other factors. This is due to the salary they take is fairly acceptable relative to the difficult current financial situation in Lebanon. Feeling of job security comes in second place with the mean of 3.98; social status that the instructor feels is third with the mean of 3.90; the extent of prevailing empowerment is fourth with a mean of 3.81; work relations among different parties is last with a mean of 3.71.

Regarding instructors at private universities, salary is the most factor which causes job satisfaction with a mean of 4.31. This is because instructors at private universities can work at more than one university, which would increase their salaries to more than those at the public university to satisfy their needs and luxuries. While the extent of prevailing empowerment comes in second place with a mean of 3.75; work relations among different parties is third with a mean of 3.08; feeling of job security comes fourth with a mean of 2.34; social status that the instructor feels is last with a mean of 1.52.

As a result, the second hypothesis, which is the importance of these factors (salary, feeling of job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, work relations among different parties and social status that the instructor feels) differ with the difference in workplace (public or private university) is accepted.

5.7 Testing the Third Hypothesis

Instructors in universities prefer working at the Lebanese University (public) relative to the country from which they obtained their Ph. D.

To test the degree of preference of the sample to work at the public university, the researchers used the One-Sample T-test to test the null hypothesis which assumes that members of the sample do not prefer to work at the public university, which is when the mean is equal to or less than neutral value (3). Whereas, the members of the sample prefer to work at the public university when the mean is greater than the neutral value (3). The results are as follows in Table 13:

Table 13. **Preference to Work at the Public University**

Country from where Ph. D. was obtained	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Test value	T-test	Sig
USA	Public	0	.	.			
	Private	19	3.02	.092	3	1.000	.331**
Britain	Public	8	3.90	1.397	3	18.143	.000**
	Private	12	3.01	.096	3	0.502	.626**
Russia	Public	19	3.96	.097	3	43.089	.000**
	Private	21	3.06	.108	3	2.353	.029**
Syria	Public	8	3.83	.081	3	28.750	.000**
	Private	9	3.03	.099	3	.896	.396**
France	Public	36	3.83	.113	3	44.058	.000**
	Private	15	3.05	.078	3	2.632	.020**
Lebanon	Public	16	3.86	.118	3	29.233	.000**
	Private	8	3.05	.087	3	1.487	.181**
Egypt	Public	3	3.71	.135	3	9.143	.012**
	Private	10	3.44	.491	3	2.857	.019**

One-Sample T-test: **Significant at the 0.05 level

It is evident from the table above that all sample members who obtained their Ph. D from American universities work at private universities. Although the mean for these members is 3.02, which is slightly greater than 3 while the significance is greater than 0.05, this means that these members do not prefer to work at the public university. This might be due to the fact that they have higher and better

work opportunities than other members, such as working at a reputable university like the American University of Beirut at high salaries and good incentives and/or being in committees, all of which grant them more chances of development and a lot more.

The mean for members of the sample who obtained their Ph. D from Britain and are working in the public sector is 3.90, which is greater than 3, while the significance is less than 0.05. This means that they prefer to work at the public university. This may be because their feeling of job security is high at the public university. However, the mean of the members who obtained their Ph. D from Britain and are working at private universities is 3.01, which is slightly greater than 3, while the significance is greater than 0.05. This means they do not prefer to work at the public university. Based on this, the researchers believe that these members of the sample may prefer to work at reputable private universities since they get higher salaries and have more incentives than at the public university.

The sample members who obtained their Ph. D from Russia, France and Egypt prefer to work at the public university since their mean is greater than 3 and it is significant for both who work at public and private universities. This might be because the job opportunities they are offered at private universities are not suitable for most of them since reputable universities require mastering of English language, which they do not generally have. Consequently, they prefer to work at the public university since they get more and better job benefits than what is offered at private universities, especially new ones.

Furthermore, members of the sample who obtained their Ph. D from Lebanon or Syria and are working at the public universities prefer to work at the public university as the mean for both samples is greater than 3, and the significance is less than 0.005. Nevertheless, members of the sample who obtained their Ph. D from Lebanon or Syria and are working at the private universities do not prefer to work at the public university. The researchers believe that this is because the members of this sample have their own businesses which they can follow up easily when working at private universities, unlike those who work at the public university who are not allowed by law to have any other kind of work.

6. Results and Recommendations

Based on the empirical study, the researchers reached some important results including the following:

- 1) There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding salary as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- 2) There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding the feeling of job security as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- 3) There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding the extent of prevailing empowerment as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- 4) There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding work relations among colleagues as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- 5) There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding work relations with university administration as a factor leading to job satisfaction.

- 6) There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding work relations with students as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- 7) There is a significant difference between public and private universities regarding social status that the instructor feels as a factor leading to job satisfaction.
- 8) The importance of these factors (salary, feeling of job security, the extent of prevailing empowerment, work relations among different parties and social status that the instructor feels) differ with the difference in workplace (public or private university).
- 9) There is a significant difference among instructors in universities regarding their preference to work at the Lebanese University (public) relative to the country from which they obtained their Ph. D.

Based on the findings, the researchers recommend the following:

- 1) Raising the instructors' salaries at the public university in accordance with the standard of living will lead to better job satisfaction.
- 2) Allowing instructors at the public university to teach a limited number of hours at private universities will increase their salaries and may help them gain new experiences.
- 3) Reinforcing feeling of job security at private universities helps instructors feel job satisfaction. This may be accomplished through adopting long-term contracts with instructors or through sending graduates abroad to seek Ph. D's and having these instructors work at the university which sent them.
- 4) Rising the extent of prevailing empowerment at private universities also helps enhance job satisfaction through allowing them more flexibility and autonomy as related to accomplishing their work at the university, which make them feel they are sharing the responsibility of the decision. This will, no doubt, lead to job satisfaction among these instructors.
- 5) Both public and private universities can collaborate in enhancing their instructors' job satisfaction if they benefit from one another's experiences in higher education teaching.

References

- Abdullah, A., & Ramay, I. (2012). Antecedents of Organizational Commitment of Banking Sector Employees in Pakistan. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 7(1), 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.5937/sjm1201089A>
- Afifi, S., & Janaini, K. (2002). Modern Trends in Managerial Behavior. *Hors Publishing and Distribution*, 89.
- Atiya, M. (2003). Behavior of an Organization—Behavior of an Individual and a Group. *Shorok Publishing and Distribution*, 102.
- Altuntaş, S. (2014). Factors Affecting the Job Satisfaction Levels and Quit Intentions of Academic Nurses. *Nurse Education Today*, 34(4), 513-519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.07.002>

- Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: A Literature Review. *Journal of Management Research and Practice*, 3(4), 77-86.
- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job Satisfaction among University Faculty: Individual, Work, and Institutional Determinants. *Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-186. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2011.0011>
- Brown, D. R., & Harvey, D. (2006). *An Experimental Approach to Organizational Development* (7th ed). Delhi, India, Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Chiu, R. K., & Francesco, A. M. (2003). Dispositional Traits and Turnover Intention: Examining the Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(3), 284-298. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720310479741>
- Chirumbolo, A. (2014). The Impact of Job Insecurity on Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Moderating Role of Honestly-Humility Personality Trait. *Journal of Psychology*, 149(6), 554-569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2014.916250>
- Christen, M., Lyer, G., & Soberman, D. (2006). Job Satisfaction, Job Performance and Effort: A Reexamination Using Agency Theory. *Journal of Marketing*, 70, 137-150. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.70.1.137.qxd>
- Cullen, J. (2002). Multinational Management: A Strategic Approach. In *South-Western Thomson Learning* (2nd ed., pp. 505-506).
- Dobre, O. I. (2013). Employee Motivation and Organization Performance. *Review of Applied Socio-Economics Research*, 5(1), 53-60.
- Dowling, G. R. (2004). Corporate Reputations—Should You Compete on Yours. *California Management Review*, 46(3), 19-36. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166219>
- Durai, P. (2010). *Human Resource Management*. Noida, India, Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement, Revitalizing a Changing Workforce (Nov. & Dec. 2015). A Research Report. In *Society for Human Resource Management* (pp. 6-7).
- Fiorito, J. (2011). Industrial relations. In *References for Business Encyclopedia of Business* (2nd ed.).
- Gill, R. (2011). *Theory and Practice of Leadership* (2nd ed.). London, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Harputlu, Ş. (2014). *Job Satisfaction and Its Relation with Perceived Workload: An Application in a Research Institution*. Middle East Technical University, Department of Industrial Engineering.
- Heathfield, S. (2016). *How to Foster Employee Satisfaction*. [online] About.com Money. Retrieved January 26, 2019, from <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/employee-satisfaction-1918014>
- Jin, M. H., & Lee, M. Y. (2012). The Effects of Autonomy, Experience, and Person-Organization Fit on Job Satisfaction: The Case of Public Sector. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 18-44.
- Kersley, B. et al. (2006). *Inside the Workplace: Findings from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey (WERS)*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e589592011-001>

- Maslyn, J. M., & Uhe-Bien, M. (2001). Leader-Member Exchange and Its Dimensions: Effects of Self-Effort and Other's Effort Relationship Quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 697-702. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.697>
- Machado-Taylor, M. L., Meir Soars, V., & Gouveia, O. (2010). The Role of Job Motivation Among University Academic Staff. *Global Business and Economics Anthology*, 2(2), 242-246.
- Mueller, C. W., & Kim, S. W. (2008). The Contented Female Worker: Still a Paradox? In K. Hegtvedt, & J. Clay-Warner (Eds.), *Justice: Advances in Group Processes* (Vol. 25, pp. 117-150). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0882-6145\(08\)25006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0882-6145(08)25006-X)
- Linz, S. J. (2003). Motivation and Reward: A Case Study of Russian Workers. *Problems of Post Communism*, 50(2), 46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10758216.2003.11656030>
- Moshoeu, A. N., & Geldenhuys, D. J. (2015). Job Insecurity, Organizational Commitment and Work Engagement Among Staff in Open Distance Learning Institutions. *Southern African Business Review*, 19(1), 22-43. <https://doi.org/10.25159/1998-8125/5832>
- Owayda, I. (2008). *Impact of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Loyalty within Non-Governmental Organizations* (Unpublished thesis). Islamic University, Gaza. Retrieved February 10, 2019, from <https://www.mobt3ath.com/uplode/book/book-13839.pdf>
- Pyman, A., Holland, P., Teicher, J., & Cooper, B. K. (2010). Industrial Relations Climate, Employee Voice and Managerial Attitudes to Unions: An Australian Study. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(2), 460-480. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2009.00772.x>
- Spatz, D. (2000). Team-Building in Construction. *Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction*, 5(3), 93-105. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)1084-0680\(2000\)5:3\(93\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)1084-0680(2000)5:3(93))
- Ssesanga, K., & Garrett, R. (2005). Job Satisfaction of University Academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Education*, 50, 33-56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6346-0>