

# THE UNIVERSITY STAFF JOB SATISFACTION CHALLENGE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: AN EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE.

A. Kaziba Mpaata, Ph.D - Nkumba University

## Abstract

*The article explores the mandate of the National Council for Higher Education in Uganda and establishes that one of its major functions is to monitor the health of academic institutions. In context, the literature and empirical evidence here revealed that the health of the universities chartered by National Council for Higher Education will depend on the job satisfaction of staff in their various ranks. Currently, the reward system provided is weak and insignificant. It was concluded by suggesting a model on which university managers and other stakeholders should focus in order to influence staff satisfaction and ensure quality education delivery in the country.*

60

## Introduction

The last ten years or so in Uganda have witnessed the birth of a number of private universities. Apart from a few like the Islamic University in Uganda, Nkumba University and Uganda Christian University, most universities are less than ten years old. Today, we have more than 20 private universities in Uganda. With the growth and establishment of more universities both public and private, the government came up with the universities and other tertiary institutions act, in 2001 to which the President assented on 25/3/2001. It is stressed in this act that private implies a university registered under the act, the proprietor of which is a person, firm, or organization other than government and basically maintained out of funds other than public funds.

Moreover, the government thought it equally important to establish the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) whose objectives are: (a) to implement the objectives of the Act; (b) to promote and develop the processing and dissemination of information on higher education for the benefit of the people; (c) to advise the Minister on the establishment and accreditation of public and private institutions of Higher Education; (d) to receive, consider and process applications for the establishment and accreditation of public and private institutions of Higher Education; (e) to register all institutions of Higher Education established under this Act; (f) to receive and investigate complaints relating to institutions of Higher Education and take appropriate action; (g) to monitor, evaluate and regulate institutions of Higher Education; (h) in co-operation with the relevant Government department, private sector, or the different institutions of Higher Education, to evaluate the overall national manpower requirement and recommend solutions to the requirements; (i) to ensure minimum standards for courses of study and the equating of degrees, diplomas and certificates awarded by the different public and private institutions of Higher Education; (j) to set and co-ordinate national standards for admission of students to the different institutions of Higher Education; (k) to determine the equivalent of all types of academic and professional qualifications of degrees, diplomas and certificates obtained elsewhere with those awarded by Uganda institutions of Higher Education for recognition in Uganda; (l) to certify that an institution of Higher

Education has adequate and accessible physical structures and staff for the courses to be offered by it; (m) to promote national interests in courses of study and professional qualifications among the different types of institutions of Higher Education; (n) to ensure that adequate facilities and opportunities for carrier guidance and counseling are provided by the institutions of Higher Education; (o) to collect, examine and publish information relating to the different institution of Higher Education; (p) to generally advise the government on policy and other matters relating to institutions of Higher Education; (q) to perform any other function incidental to the objects of the Act or relating to higher education in Uganda or that may be conferred upon it by the Minister or any other law.

The above are definitely excellent objectives. However, while the government through such a council continue to press for quality education and high standards, employees of such universities like any other sector in the country, demand for satisfaction not only with the work design itself but with pay, supervision, promotion and the like. A case in point are the strikes by the government state owned institution and the largest in the country-like Makerere and Kyambogo Universities. Dissatisfaction with pay was a concern not only to the academic staff but other members in their various categories. For example on 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2004 the Vice Chancellor of Makerere University, during the graduation ceremony appealed to government to look into the current compensation package of staff members (New Vision and Monitor, March 2004). No sooner had the Vice Chancellor's appeal been put into consideration than the academic staff members were on strike. The strike was called off only when there was intervention by the President (New Vision, April 14<sup>th</sup> 2004). Aware, therefore, that all universities are run under the same act and are operating under the same environmental conditions, private universities cannot afford to sit on the fence and wait. Private universities are closely monitored but not significantly assisted with government resources. Makerere is a public university defined in the universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act of 2001, as established by the Ministry with the approval of parliament under Section 22 and maintained out of public funds. However, the public funds given to it have not yet satisfied staff and the activities there. To what extent does this phenomena exist in private universities? Thus, the main purpose of this research study was therefore to establish the extent to which staff in private universities are satisfied with different aspects of their job in order to help such institutions direct policy, plan ahead, and continuously improve for quality education service delivery as demanded by the National Council for Higher Education.

Indeed despite the well articulated function of National Council for Higher Education and the general need by all universities to provide quality education, there is urgent need to ascertain whether the employees are satisfied with their work, whether work is well designed, and to also to determine whether pay as well as promotion that are in place are satisfying. Quality education requires student focus, a focus on process as well as results, the use of employees expertise, fact based decision making and feedback. Universities need to completely avoid negative feedback in form of strikes like those that have occurred in our universities. We should have feedback through research, such as this, in order to move ahead as professionals. One cannot justifiably expect employees to appreciate quality, think quality and produce quality if institutional rewards such as compensation are perceived as poor and therefore not appreciated by staff members. Put another way, it is the climate of work quality which promotes pride and profession-

alism. To meet the challenges effectively and efficiently, private universities are challenged to work tirelessly to avoid strikes and instead promote satisfaction. They must easily acquire and be able to retain talented administrators and staff at all levels. It has been observed by the National Council for Higher Education in its Strategic Plan (June, 2003) that higher education be it private or public in Uganda is currently characterized among others with (1) inadequate instruction within or under crowded lecture rooms; (2) Obsolete and often non-existent equipment; (3) low motivation of staff which has resulted into a high rate of brain drain to the civil and global market; (4) limited research activities due to inadequate funding and a poor research policy. This research is aimed at verifying some of these assertions empirically.

Additionally, the National Council for Higher Education Strategic Plan (p.23) emphasized the importance of attraction and retention of academic staff. It is observed that the quality of tertiary education is dependant on its academic staff. The academic staff are the core of quality education provision. According to this document, to attract and retain good academic staff, the owners of tertiary institutions are asked to (1) Institute a salary package commensurate with the staff training and skills; (2) Establish and enforce appropriate staff student ratio; (3) Establish minimum qualification requirements in both the universities and other tertiary institutions; (4) Establish a competitive research fund, such that each higher education institution must find the equivalent monies equal to 5% of the gross annual salary of each member of staff for research; (5) Put in place clear transparent guidelines of procedures for selecting staff to benefit from staff development programmes and the choice of discipline to fund. These are some of the cardinal areas that this research seeks to investigate empirically and come up with practical recommendation for action.

Besides, Lambert, Hogan and Barton (2001) asserts that “the health of an educational institution depends on the job satisfaction of its employees, (p.58).” Roznowski and Hulin (1992) confirmed that after an individual is hired, knowledge of his or her job satisfaction becomes the most important piece of data a manager or organizational psychologist can have. Robbins (1998) also concluded that a satisfied workforce leads to higher productivity because of fewer disruptions such as absenteeism, departure of good employees, and incidents of destructive behaviour. The presence of satisfied employees also translates into lower medical and life insurance costs. Society in general benefits too because satisfaction on the job contributes to satisfaction off the job. High job satisfaction as a goal can lead to saving dollars and cents as well as increasing social responsibility, Lambert, Hogan and Barton (2001).

## Literature Review

The general purpose of this study is to document job satisfaction of employees in private universities. The primary goal of this literature review is to review important information about the construct of job satisfaction and other important organization outcomes. The literature review addressed the (a) meaning of job satisfaction, (b) importance of job satisfaction, (c) theoretical framework of job satisfaction, (d) measurement of job satisfaction, (e) job satisfaction as criterion variable, (f) job satisfaction as predictor variable, and (g) job satisfaction research in universities generally.

## Meaning of Job Satisfaction

People bring mental and physical abilities and time to their jobs. Many try to make a difference in their lives and in the lives of others through working. The reason for wanting a job is often considerably more than just a paycheck. Jobs can be looked at as a means used to achieve personal goals. When a job meets or exceeds an individual's expectation, the individual often experiences positive emotions. These positive emotions represent job satisfaction. Job satisfaction in turn is a major contributor to life satisfaction (Smith & Plant, 1982), a personal goal that many find worth pursuing.

Job satisfaction may be compared to another source of life satisfaction – marriage. When people lack marriage satisfaction or experience dissatisfaction in their union, they often get a divorce. It is similar with the relationship between employee and employer.

To grasp the meaning of construct like job satisfaction, it seems logical to look at how it is defined in the literature. The search for a universal definition of job satisfaction is not a difficult one; it is an impossible one. Even though many researchers define job satisfaction, the definitions vary. The three definitions most commonly referred to among researchers are Hoppock's, Locke's and Vroom's. In the thirties, Hoppock's (1935) response to the question "What is job satisfaction?" was: "... any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job" (p.47). Locke's (1976) answer to the same question in the seventies was: "... a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p.1300). Wanous et al (1997) who used the terms "job satisfaction" and "job attitudes" interchangeably, defined job satisfaction as "... Affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying" (p.99). Even though the definitions vary, a commonality among them seems to be that job satisfaction is a job-related emotional reaction.

## Definition of Job Satisfaction

In reviewing the literature it becomes apparent that job satisfaction can be defined in a number of ways. Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) define job satisfaction as "the favorable viewpoint of the worker toward the work role he/she presently occupies" (p.172). A succinct definition given by Spector (1987) states that "Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their job" Nine different operational definitions of job satisfaction are identified by Wanous and Lawler (1972). Each of the operational definitions are described in terms of how different aspects or facets of job satisfaction are measured and how they combine to achieve an overall measure of satisfaction. The definitions include: (1) overall job satisfaction as the sum of job facet satisfaction across all facets of a job, (2) job satisfaction as a weighted sum of job facet satisfaction, (3) job satisfaction as the sum of goal attainment or need fulfillment when summoned across job facets, (4) job satisfaction as a correspondence to Vroom's "valence of a job", (5) job satisfaction as a discrepancy between how much there is now and how much there should be, (6) job satisfaction as a result of comparison between fulfillment and desires or ideals in the present, (7) job satisfaction as a measure of desires or ideals of what one would like, (8) job satisfaction as the importance of a job facet that determines the degree of affect produced by an amount of discrepancy between fulfillment and desires, and (9) job satisfaction as the discrepancy between the importance

of a job facet and the perception of fulfillment from a facet. A person's perception of effort and rewards compared to others, employees will put less into their work and be less productive.

Reference group theory combines aspects of equity theory with the importance of understanding the group with whom the individual relates (Gruneberg, 1979). The theory speculates that since individuals compare themselves with others to determine if they are being treated equitably, then knowledge of the reference group will facilitate the understanding of workers' job satisfaction. How an individual chooses a reference group or what constitutes a reference group is not clear according to Gruneberg.

**64**

The situation theory of job satisfaction has been advanced by Quarstein, McAfee, and Glassman (1992). This theory posits that job satisfaction is determined by two factors which are labeled situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Situational characteristics include those things workers evaluate before taking a job such as pay, promotion, working conditions, and supervision. Situational occurrences are those things workers do not previously evaluate and include factors that can be positive or negative. Positive factors might be tangible or intangible, while negative factors might include typical inconveniences or irritations associated with the work environment. Quarstein et al (1992) maintain that both situational characteristics and situational occurrences affect job satisfaction and understanding them can facilitate improved worker satisfaction.

The theory of individual differences in job satisfaction (Motowidlo, 1996) is a cognitive approach to understanding the causes of job satisfaction. This model posits that when workers view their jobs favorably, their evaluation is based on retrieving stored memories from all positive and negative events associated with previous work environments.

### **Measurement of Job Satisfaction**

Ways to measure job satisfaction have been attempted since Hoppock's monograph was presented in 1935 (Ivancevick & Donnelly, 1968). Since then thousands of studies have been conducted to try to determine the sources of workers' satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their jobs (Locke, 1969; Spector, 1985). Locke (1969) notes that despite the number of studies completed, advances in understanding the phenomenon of job satisfaction have not kept pace with the research. In reviewing the literature it becomes apparent that many different methods of collecting data and analyzing it are used. Because of the numerous methods used to investigate job satisfaction, different results are obtained (Locke, Smith, Kendall, Hulin, & Miller, 1964). The data collection techniques most often used in studies of job satisfaction included questionnaires, interviews, rank order studies, sentence completion tests, and critical incident inquiries (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969).

The most commonly used technique to measure job satisfaction is the questionnaire (Fournet, Distefano, & Pryer, 1969, Spector, 1987). Spector (1987) states that using existing questionnaires is an easy way to assess job satisfaction. Since they have been used in previous studies, reliability, validity, and norms generally have been established (Spector, 1987). Other advantages of using questionnaires include increase likelihood of insured confidentiality, ease of administering, economical, and frankness in response

if used anonymously (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Because it is less likely to deviate from the instructions and administration methods, Pedhazur and Schmelkin observe that questionnaires are less susceptible to bias. In this study, the use of questionnaire amongst private university staff has been adopted.

Job satisfaction questionnaire can be divided into two types. One type measures overall job satisfaction and includes devices such as the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Scale or the Gallop Poll question, while the other type measures the various facets of the job and includes measures such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983). Scarpello and Campbell (1983) note that although both types of job satisfaction measures are useful depending upon the information sought, global measures and sum of facet measures are not equivalent measures. Scarpello & Campbell (1983) examined the relationship between the sum of facets on the MSQ and a single-item global satisfaction scale and found only a 0.32 correlation between the two measures. The literature discusses some disadvantages of using preexisting job satisfaction scales. Wanous and Lawler (1972) state that important construct and validity.

Gerhart (1987), for example, reported negative direct effects of education on job satisfaction. They concluded that younger workers, who have a higher level of formal education, may be dissatisfied with performing the routine tasks required in most jobs. DeSantis and Durst (1996) compared job satisfaction among public and private-sector employees. They identified many similarities between the two groups, but one of the clear differences concerned the education variable. The expected negative relationship between education and overall job satisfaction was much stronger for the private-sector individuals who were employed in unchallenging positions and experiencing larger gaps between expectations and realities.

### **Work-Related Characteristics**

Job satisfaction can be affected by the work situation. Any aspect of the job and employing organization is part of the work situation. Based on an extensive review of the literature, Bruce and Blackburn (1992), Locke (1976), identified challenging work, equitable rewards, supportive working conditions, and supportive colleagues as main determinants of job satisfaction (also cited in Robbins, 1998).

### **Challenging Work**

The work itself is another factor that correlates most highly with overall job satisfaction (Schneider, Gunnarson, & Wheeler, 1992). Employees' preference tends to be jobs that let them apply their abilities and skills and embody a diversity to tasks, freedom, and performance feedback. This preference makes work mentally challenging. Challenging has to be balanced. Not enough challenge can lead to boredom, but too much challenge can cause employees to experience frustration and feelings of failure. An appropriate level of challenge will cause feelings of pleasure and satisfaction (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976).

### **Equitable Rewards**

Pay and promotion are rewards employees tend to expect for their efforts. Pay and promotion lead to satisfaction when they are perceived as being fair. For pay to be

fair, decisions on the amount of pay should reflect job requirements, people's abilities and community pay standards. By the same token, employees encounter satisfaction when they perceive that promotion decisions are the result of fair policies and processes (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976, 1983).

### **Supportive Working Conditions**

People want to be comfortable and safe while they work (Mpaata, 1998). Appropriate lighting, temperature and noise level are several aspects that keep people from being uncomfortable, and therefore, from experiencing dissatisfaction. People want the tangible items that they need to work to perform their job well. In an office environment, examples for tangibles are computers, copiers, fax machines, and phones. Furthermore, people prefer cleanliness to dirt and living close to their jobs over living far away (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Locke, 1976).

66

### **Supportive Colleagues**

Many individuals' social need can be satisfied through their favorable interaction with both coworkers and managers at work. Sympathetic and helpful coworkers can increase employee job satisfaction. Managers who interact favorably with employees assist in solving problems are aware of employees' challenges and are able to communicate effectively and provide constructive feedback periodically. These managerial behaviours can be lead to increased job satisfaction for employees (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Herzberg et al., 1957; Locke, 1976, 1983) and Locke et al. 1983

### **Job Satisfaction and Performance**

During the 1930s-1950s, the notion existed that happy workers are productive workers. Research conducted based on that notion and with the goal to show a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance found little support for such a relationship Locke et al (1983). Bruce and Blackburn (1992) presented the fact that a positive job satisfaction-performance relationship is possible, but so is the possibility of no relationship as well as a negative relationship. Spector (1997) pointed out the potentiality of a performance-satisfaction relationship in addition to the satisfaction-performance relationship. In this opinion, more evidence exists that better performances experience more job satisfaction because they receive rewards associated with good performance. This may also be true for private universities.

Considering the financial performance in terms of annual returns of the 100 best companies to work for in America, Griffin (1981) asked the question: "Do employees make companies successful, or do successful companies make employees happy?" The researcher concluded that causation exists in both directions. Interesting was also the presence of happy workers in companies which under performed as indicated by very low annual returns or losses.

### **Job Satisfaction and Absenteeism**

Studies investigating the job satisfaction-absenteeism relationship have documented consistent, significant, but moderate negative relationship (Locke, 1976). Employees who are satisfied are less likely to be absent than employees who are dissatisfied. Absence is influenced by job satisfaction but also by, for example, pressure or lack of

pressure to attend. Incentives for attendance or punishment for absence can decrease absenteeism. Liberal sick leave policies can cause employees, including the highly satisfied ones, to be absent.

### **Job Satisfaction and Turnover**

According to Mobely (1982), a weak-to-moderate negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and turnover. High job satisfaction leads to low turnover. In general, dissatisfied workers are more likely to quit than those who are satisfied. But it is also a fact that some dissatisfied workers never leave, and some satisfied workers do take jobs in other organizations.

### **Compensation and Job Satisfaction**

Pfeffer, (1990) contends that high compensation contingent on organizational performance is one of the seven human resources practices of successful organization. In this way, some relationship exists between what a firm pays its employees and the quality of the workforce it attracts and retains. According to Pfeffer, the level of salaries sends a message to the organization's workforce whether they are truly valued or not. Hulin (1991) also observed that experienced job/work dissatisfaction leads to job withdraw which is a set of behaviours that dissatisfied individuals inact to avoid the work situation.

According to the equity theory, the relationship between compensation and job satisfaction include how fair the worker perceives the compensation as well as the actual amount of compensation received. Milkovich & Newman (1990) described two theories that illustrate how the equity theory operates. Milkovich & Newman 1990 proposed that individuals compare their inputs and outcomes to those of some relevant other person in determining whether or not they are treated fairly. While salary is only one aspect of reward, it is the most visible and the most easily modified even in universities.

The second equity theory of Milkovich & Newman (1990) suggested that feeling of inequity are not dependent on comparisons made between a worker and other workers within the same organization, but rather by comparisons the worker makes to people in other organizations considered relevant or similar to the one in which the worker is employed. This theory suggests that individuals make equity comparisons based on other organizations they consider relevant to their own. Employees consider their salaries fair if the salaries are viewed as equal to those of workers in other organizations the workers perceive as similar to their own.

Additionally, Locke et al (1983) considered compensation to be an important variable in job satisfaction and included high pay in his description of the key element of most satisfying work roles. For him, worker's perception of the fairness of compensation is more important than the actual amount received. Additionally, Locke et al (1983) contended that individuals are guided by a moral system which is basic tenet for fair distribution of rewards. If a worker receives less than what is perceived fair, the worker considers that an injustice. On the other hand, if the worker perceived that more is received than has been earned, he/she feels guilt. It can be concluded from the above analysis, that job satisfaction is a function of the difference between the amount of reward a person believes should be received and the amount the person actually receives.

Bruce and Blackburn (1992) supported the theory that pay equity is more important than



the actual dollar amount and thus “people at work have a clear idea of what they ought to be paid in comparison with others and in relation with their skill, experience, and so forth”. Gruneberg (1979) observed that, “Pay means more to an individual than just the potential of acquiring material goods”.

### **Promotion and Job Satisfaction**

It has been suggested that how a worker views the opportunity for advancement is important to how satisfied he/she is with the job. Earlier researchers like Locke et al (1983) found considerable evidence to suggest that promotional opportunities are important to a worker’s satisfaction with the job. It is emphasized that job satisfaction is directly related to the extent to which jobs provide individuals with rewarding outcomes. For example when a staff member believes that achievement of University goals will lead to such personal rewards as promotion, then it is likely to affect the his/her job satisfaction.

Other researchers like Schneider, Gunnarson, & Wheeler (1992) have proved that promotional opportunity is important to job satisfaction. They have concluded that employees who perceive few opportunities for advancement have negative attitudes toward their work and their organizations.

It is noted from the above literature that most university employees may consider their present positions as stepping stones to higher ones. The research by Sutter, (1994) also found promotional opportunities to be a predictor of job satisfaction.

### **Some studies on Job Satisfaction in Institutions of Higher Learning in Uganda**

Research on job satisfaction in tertiary institutions of Higher learning in Uganda has not been detailed. Thus, Ssesanga (2001) observed that there are very few scholarly and scientific studies in the area of academic job satisfaction in Uganda’s higher education. The few that are available show low levels of Academic staff satisfaction, for example Bameka (1996) explored the factors affecting academic staff productivity at Makerere University. Bameka was particularly concerned with motivation and concluded that the level of motivation of the academic staff has a significant effect on their productivity.

The most recent and comprehensive study was on work satisfaction of academic staff of Makerere conducted by Turyagyenda (2004). It confirmed that Makerere Academic staff were very dissatisfied with the current compensation practices but very satisfied with the promotion practices. Ssesanga (2001) and Turyagyenda focused only on the academic staff but not all university staff that this study put into consideration. Besides, Mulindwa (1998) particularly assessed job satisfaction among academic and administrative staff of Uganda Polytechnic Kyambogo and revealed that remuneration were the greatest contributor to job satisfaction among staff followed by government policy on the education sector.

Comparatively, Tizikara (1998) studied academic staff satisfaction in Makerere University compared with the Islamic University in Uganda (IUIU). It was concluded that there was a significant difference between these two institutions in respect to pay and incentives. Meanwhile, Ssesanga (2001) found no compelling evidence to show a gen-

der influence on supervision satisfaction. His study documented that both Uganda male and female dons expressed higher satisfaction with co-worker behaviour, collegial participation and delegation.

### **The study population and sample size**

The study population composed of all member of staff of Nkumba University (NU) and Uganda Christian University, Mukono totaling 268. The sample of 120 was selected on the basis of only those who had the requisite qualifications to understand the questionnaire, and those who had served in the university for at least 3 years. This consideration was reached because promotion opportunities come to those who have worked for at least 3 years. Secondly, it is those employees who have stayed for some time that have a clear understanding of the behaviour in the organization.

### **Data Collection instruments**

The questionnaire were constituted using the five Likert Scale type of questions. The staff respondents were asked to choose the answers from a scale ranging from strongly agree, to strongly disagree. Strongly agree was equal to 5 while strongly disagree was equal to 1.

This questionnaire was designed to collect data in the areas of personal characteristics, compensation, promotion, role conflict and ambiguity, and the aspect of the work itself.

In the questionnaire, the researcher used a number of items mostly developed from the original Job descriptive index (JDI) and integrated it with other items in the areas of the work scale. These were areas of the Promotion scale as was applied by Roznowski (1989) when examining the measurement properties of the job descriptive index.

The study did not only use the primary data, but also extensively used the secondary data which was got mostly from the internet, textbooks, Uganda Government Publications, articles in international and local journals, conference papers and some internal reports from these two universities.

### **Data Quality Control**

The questionnaire was first pretested (piloting) using some of the members of the Academic staff who are part of the study population. The questions of the questionnaire were discussed with the experts, for modification and guidance in order to improve the reliability and validity of the study. The comments given by these experts and participants in piloting were incorporated into the final questionnaires. The reliability of the questionnaire went as high as 0.79.

### **Questionnaire administration/Data Collection**

This project employed five research assistants to physically deliver and collect the filled questionnaires from different departments of the universities. The five research assistants were given specific areas of operation and a detailed mode of data collection.

The questionnaires were first delivered to the respective respondents in different departments and were left there for the respondents to fill them. After five working days, the

research assistants went for the first follow-up. The fully filled questionnaires were retrieved leaving behind those that were not ready. After three days a second follow-up was made, to those who did not return the questionnaire. After one week, a third follow up was made. Finally a fourth follow-up was made after a week. In all a total of 95 usable questionnaires were returned representing 79% response rate. It was the 95 questionnaires that were used in the subsequent data analysis.

## Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using not only descriptive statistics to determine the different kinds of responses and their frequencies to each question but other methods as well. For example, in order to determine the commonality of different responses, factor analysis was employed. This was followed by regression analysis and the analysis of variance in order to provide answers to the different questions raised for this research. Thus, the most common computer package of special programmes for social sciences (SPSS, 2000) was employed.

70

## Factor Analysis results

Factor Analysis was employed in this research because of the large number of items that were used to investigate each facet as was indicated by each section in the questionnaire. It helped this study to identify two or more questions that result in a set of responses that are highly correlated among the data. It also helped the researcher to identify appropriate variables for inclusion in subsequent analytical procedures.

### Factor Analysis I: Pay Satisfaction Component Analysis

Bartlett's sphericity test was performed to determine whether the correlation matrix of the 28 items should be factored. The null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.001 significance level and the principal components method was used to extract factors from the correlation matrix. The use of an eigenvalue cut-off point of 1.0, as suggested by Kaiser, resulted in eight factors. The factors were then rotated using varimax rotation. The factor loadings for eight factors are exhibited in table 1. The loadings smaller than 0.40 have been omitted for the sake of readability. The results of factor analysis for the 28 items as explained in terms of factors from varimax rotation matrix can be detailed in table 2.

**Table 1: the initial Eigen values, percentages of variance, sum of squared loadings, and**

Rotation sums squared loadings for the pay satisfaction items.

Component	Initial Eigen Values			Extraction sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9712	34685	34685						
2	2370	8466	43151						
3	2008	7171	50321						
4	1824	6514	56836						
5	1328	4742	61578						
6	1200	4287	65866						
7	1104	3945	69810						
8	1010	3607	73417						
9	890	3179	76595						
10	859	3067	79662						
11	680	2428	82090	9712	34685	34685	5369	19174	19174
12	632	2259	84349	2370	8466	43151	3221	11502	30677
13	552	1971	86321	2008	7171	50321	2979	10639	41316
14	479	1710	88030	1824	6514	56836	2591	9254	50569
15	444	1584	89615	1328	4742	61578	1872	6685	57254
16	408	1458	91073	1200	4287	65866	1835	6553	63807
17	367	1310	92383	1104	3945	69810	1426	5091	68899
18	311	1110	93493	1010	3607	73417	1266	4518	73417
19	285	1017	94510						
20	263	941	95451						
21	231	826	96277						
22	218	778	97056						
23	206	737	97793						
24	164	586	98378						
25	143	512	98890						
26	137	488	99378						
27	114	406	99784						
28	6,044E-02	216	100000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

This table shows that there are eight extracted factors from the question items on pay satisfaction. The details were analyzed in the subsequent table.

**Table 2 Factor loadings and communality estimates for pay satisfaction items**

Factor 1: Current pay package			Factor 2: Professional Concentration		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
10	Income not enough for expenses	0.806	25	Pay and hostility towards adm.	0.75
11	Pay is less than the deserved	0.62	24	Pay and Psychological trauma	0.50
15	Skill and effort not paid	0.82	26	Low levels of research	0.71
17	Overall not satisfied with pay	0.74	28	Little focus on the job	0.58
21	Low pay creates low morale	0.67	30	Unable to pay for biological children	0.56
14	Payment inadequate given skills	0.84			
29	Pay cannot attract and retain staff	0.55			
Factor 3: University Fund Accountability			Factor 4: Professional Ethics		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
37	University funds & resource availability	0.79	20	Satisfaction by working elsewhere	0.73
36	University fund doing the expected	0.88	33	Practicing academic dishonesty	0.68
35	University fund proper utilization	0.82	34	Poor pay making one unprofessional	0.69
Factor 5: Corruption/Theft Practices			Factor 6: Dual Employment Practice		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
31	Poor package contributing to theft	0.85	18	Part time working elsewhere	0.697
32	Poor package contributing to no accountability	0.71	19	Working full time elsewhere as well	0.84
Factor 7: Future Pay Assurance			Factor 8: Pay Linked to Performance		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
13	Future pay being assured	0.871	16	Pay depending on how well one performs	0.75

The Factor analysis on the pay satisfaction items do reveal that there where eight factors identified as current remuneration package, professional concentration, university fund accountability, professional ethics, corruption/theft of university property, dual employment practice, future pay assurance, and pay increase tied to performance. All the eight factors explained a total of 73.4% of the rotation sums of squared loadings. This implies that the above identified factors are very important in the minds of the university staff. Put another way, they are factors that have the potential to influence staff satisfaction given the pay practices at such universities.

### **Factor Analysis 2: The Present Promotion Satisfaction**

Just like in the first case, Bartlett’s test of sphericity was performed to determine whether the correlation matrix of the 20 items should be factored. The null hypothesis was rejected at 0.001 significance level and immediately, the principal components method was used to extract factors from the correlation matrix. The factor loadings for seven factors are indicated in table 3. It is indicated that the total variance for the 20 items is as high as 72.0% indicating that this is another very significant factor to the satisfaction of university employees.



Extraction Method: Principal Component

Given the above results, analysis was performed on the theoretical implications of the above factors. The results are also indicated in table 4.

**Table 4: Factor loadings and communality Estimates for Promotion Satisfaction Measures**

Factor 1: Clear Policy for Promotion			Factor 2: Promotion Transparency		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
45	Specified rules for promotion	0.71	46	Promotion based on whom you know	0.695
48	Opportunities for promotion	0.69	56	Promotion based on teaching	0.468
50	Regular promotion policy	0.57			
44	Promotion policy communicated	0.692			
49	Promotion policy fair	0.80			
47	Promotion based on favoritism	0.77			
51	Promotion are arbitrary	0.53			
Factor 3: Qualified Promotion Committee			Factor 4: Merit Based Promotion		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
52	Regularly does its job	0.630	40	Promotion rewards for hard workers	0.587
53	Qualified people on it	0.768	41	Promotion is for top performers	0.765
54	Policy is realistic and practical	0.66	42	Using your voice to get ahead	0.746
Factor 5: Academic based promotion			Factor 6: Promotion Criteria		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
46	Knowing the right person for promotion	0.674	56	Based on teaching experience & seniority	0.715
55	Academic based qualification	0.782	57	Based on research & publication	0.78
Factor 7: Family based recruitment					
Item	Content	Loading			
39	University managers selecting and promoting people who see things the way they do				

The factor analysis indicated that factor loading for the promotion satisfaction items can be summarized using seven facets. These contributed 72% of the total cumulative variance. These factors were identified as clear policy for promotion, promotion transparency, qualified promotion committee, merit based promotion, academic based promotion,



promotion criteria, and family based recruitment. These are the important factors in the minds of staff concerning promotion satisfaction in such private universities.

**Table 5: The Initial Eigen values, percentages of variances, sum of squared loading, and rotation sum of squared loadings for role conflicts and ambiguity items.**

Component	Initial Eigen Values		Extraction sums of Squared Loadings		Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Total	% of Variance	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.552	32.513					
2	1.805	12.896					
3	1.354	9.674					
4	1.140	8.146					
5	.937	6.693		32.513			
6	.851	6.078	4.552	12.896	3.172	22.656	22.656
7	.775	5.535	1.805	9.674	2.271	16.223	38.880
8	.669	4.781	1.354	8.146	1.868	13.340	52.219
9	.495	3.535	1.140		1.541	11.010	63.229
10	.436	3.115					
11	3.49	2.494					
12	.257	1.838					
13	.215	1.539					
14	.163	1.162					

Extraction Method: Principal Component

The results revealed that there are four important factors that were extracted from the items on role conflict and ambiguity. The factors accounted for 63.2% of the total variance and therefore with high potential to determine the extent to which role conflict and ambiguity exists among staff in private universities. These factors were identified as the job description and resource availability, group conflict, job clarity, and time management. The detailed summary is indicated in table 6.

**Table 6: Factor loadings and communality Estimates for role conflict and ambiguity items.**

Factor 1: Job description and resources available	Factor 2: Group Conflict
---	--------------------------

Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
89	Assignment without man-power	0.703	90	Working with two or more groups differently	0.686
91	Break a rule or policy in order to do work	0.733	97	Knowledge of responsibilities	0.740
87	Work on unnecessary things	0.645	98	Knowledge of expected work	0.874
88	Assignment without re-sources	0.79			
92	Incompatible requests from different people	0.65			
Factor 3: Time Management			Factor4: Job Clarity		
Item	Content	Loading	Item	Content	Loading
96	Knowledge of time division	0.67	94	Sure of the available au-thority	0.78
86	Doing different things	0.79	95	Clear planned goals and objectives	0.68
			99	Explanation is clear for jobs	0.58

### Hypothesis Testing

The major purpose of this research was to establish the effects of the present institutional rewards, role conflict, and role ambiguity on job satisfaction of staff in private universities in Uganda. Nkumba and Uganda Christian University, Mukono were used to identify and establish the above effects. The hypotheses were therefore tested as follows:

### Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis stated that there is a positive and significant contribution of institutional rewards, role conflict and role ambiguity on the job satisfaction of staff in private universities. In order to test the above hypothesis, a regression analysis was performed using institutional rewards, role conflict and role ambiguity generated factors (from factor analysis) as the independent variables. Job Satisfaction was then used as the dependent variable. Thus, the regression model was determined as follows:

$$Y = B_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \Sigma$$

**Where:**

- Y = Job satisfaction factor items
- B0 β 1 β 2 β 3 = Constants in the model
- X1 = Promotion satisfaction extracted factors
- X2 = Pay satisfaction extracted factors

X3 = Role conflict and ambiguity extracted factors  
 Σ = Error term

The analysis in table 7 reveals that among the extracted factors only two link with the present staff job satisfaction. Put another way, the job satisfaction of staff in private universities of especially Mukono and Nkumba is currently based on only two factors. The first is “**Job Clarity**” and the second is “**promotion criteria**”. It is these that such private universities have put in place to the satisfaction of staff in their institutions. As indicated in table 4:107 there was significant constant for both variables ( $\beta_0 = 93.4, t = 123.0, p < 0.000$ ). The promotion criteria yielded ( $\beta = 0.432, t = 3.485, p < 0.001$ ) and job clarity factor ( $\beta = 0.369, t = 3.230, p < 0.002$ ). This indicated that, the two factors were very significant at 1% level.

**78** **Table 7** **Two significant factors that link with Job Satisfaction in Private Universities**

**Coefficients <sup>a</sup>**

		Unstandardized		Standardized		
1	(Constant)	93.459	.760		123.027	.000
	Promotion Criteria	2.855	.819	.432	3.485	.001
2	(Constant)	93.430	.700		133.478	.000
	Promotion Criteria	2.746	.756	.415	3.634	.001
	Job Clarity	2.178	.674	.369	3.230	.002

a.

Job Clarity as per the factor analysis had items measure (94) which asked whether the respondents feel certain about how much authority they have, whether there are clear, planned goals and objectives for one’s job (item 95) and item 99 which sought to determine whether explanation is clear of what one has to do while on the job (job description)..

Similarly the promotion criteria factor had two items that sought staff opinion on whether promotion should be based on teaching experience and or seniority of the academic staff and whether promotion should be based on research and publication on part of the academic staff. It is concluded that the promotion based on these facets is the one needed in these two universities. It is important to note that all the other extracted factors in factor analysis have not yet been practiced to a significant level in these two institutions. There are very important factors in the satisfaction of staff but not yet significantly practiced. These factors were extracted by stepwise regression analysis while still using job satisfaction as the dependant variable. They are indicated in table 8.

**Table 8** **Set backs for staff satisfaction in the two Universities Excluded Variable b**

Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
					Tolerance

Current Remuneration Package	-.165 <sup>a</sup>	-1.380	.173	-.175	.998
Professional Concentration	-.031 <sup>a</sup>	-.258	.797	-.033	.988
University Fund Accountability	.076 <sup>a</sup>	.622	.536	.080	.983
Professional Ethics	.030 <sup>a</sup>	.242	.810	.031	.972
Corruption and Theft	-.054 <sup>a</sup>	-.444	.659	-.057	.995
Dual Employment Practice	.227 <sup>a</sup>	1.930	.058	.242	1.000
Future Pay Assurance	.166 <sup>a</sup>	1.388	.170	.176	.997
Pay Increase Linked to Performance	.199 <sup>a</sup>	1.674	.099	.211	.987
University	.162 <sup>a</sup>	1.263	.211	.161	.865
Sex	-.001 <sup>a</sup>	-.005	.996	-.001	.954
Age	.005 <sup>a</sup>	.037	.970	.005	.959
Marital Status	-.009 <sup>a</sup>	-.075	.941	-.010	.953
Title/Rank	-.137 <sup>a</sup>	-1.114	.270	-.142	.944
Education	-.196 <sup>a</sup>	-1.653	.104	-.209	.999
Period of Service	-.037 <sup>a</sup>	-.299	.766	-.039	.936
	-.011 <sup>a</sup>	-.090	.929	-.012	.999

- a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), SECAQ02
- b. Dependent Variable: WORK 1

It is indicated in table 8 that the major challenge private universities face is the current remuneration package. The present one is insignificant and one that contributes to the dissatisfaction of staff in the universities of Nkumba and Uganda Christian University, with ( $t = -1.380$   $p < 0.173$ ) Therefore the present package is insignificant and negatively contributing to job satisfaction of staff in these institutions.

It should be noted that this was the largest factor derived from factor analysis. Descriptive statistics had consistently indicated that the largest percentage of staff were dissatisfied with these items. Items in this factor alone contributed 19.1% of the total variance. The items asked respondents about the income they receive. The majority of the staff agreed that the income from the university is inadequate for normal expenses, it is less than what they deserve, it does not reflect the skills and effort they put into their work, they are not satisfied with pay, pay contributes to low moral amongst the members of staff, the package contributes to inability to attract and retain them, and finally the present package contributes to inability to pay for biological children to study in good schools. Scientifically, all these items had strong and significant commonality given that the extracted sum of squared loadings was as high as 34.685%.

The second insignificant factor in the study was professional concentration. The staffs in private universities have not significantly practiced this to their satisfaction leave alone to that of the universities. It, also contributes insignificantly to job satisfaction and the contribution is negative ( $t = 0.258$ ,  $p < 0.797$ ). This factor had items like hostility towards members of the university, lack of focus leading to decreased contact/assistance to students and other customers of the university and the like.

The third factor was university fund accountability. Most members of staff were not sure whether there is accountability in their institutions. In other words, the present accountability practices do not contribute to satisfaction of staff ( $t = 0.622$   $p < 0.536$ ). This

implies that the present degree of transparency is low if not insignificantly practiced.

The factor that followed was professional ethics or unethical behaviour. This has not been practiced significantly in these two institutions. It had items such as the present package contributing to academic dishonesty like giving grades without fully marking the student's scripts. Not covering the syllabus, bringing back past examination papers due to lack of time to prepare new ones and the like. Although some members of staff may have no professional ethics, the practice of such unethical behaviour is presently not significant at all ( $t = 0.622$ ,  $p < 0.536$ ). In the same way, corruption and theft is not at present significant. Presently it is insignificant in these private universities and even negative with ( $t = -0.444$ ,  $p < 0.659$ ). There is no corruption practices in these two chartered institutions.

**80** Besides, dual employment practice is another factor that was significant and one that can be handled by providing a realistic remuneration package ( $t = 1.930$ ,  $p > 0.058$ ). This was significant and a positive factor. It is implied here that in as long as pay is not sufficient as perceived by the staff in private universities, there is likelihood of practicing dual employment. Put another way, it may be presently some staff members who might be having some other full time job elsewhere. This is what the items in the questionnaire asked.

In the same way, universities have to continue to make future pay assurances and most important link pay increase to performance. Presently, these are insignificant factors. The other variables also show that there is no link between the name of the university and job satisfaction. This means that both universities have the same challenges ( $t = 1.263$ ,  $p < 0.211$ ) while gender too is not a factor in determining who is satisfied or not ( $t = 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.996$ ). Both male and female have it the same way. The same happens to marital status, age, highest formal education, length of service, and nature of employment. They are all insignificant when considering staff pay satisfaction at university.

### Job Satisfaction and Promotion Practices in Private Universities

In order to determine which of the extracted factors from promotion factors, do influence job satisfaction of staff in private universities, a multiple regression was performed using job satisfaction as the dependant variable and all the extracted seven factors as the independent variables. Thus

$$Y = B_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \Sigma$$

where

Y = Job Satisfaction factor items

$B_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_7$  = Constants in the model

$X_1$ , to  $X_7$  = all the extracted factors from promotion items

$\Sigma$  = Error item.

The results in table 9 reveal that only promotion criteria has the significant main effect on the job satisfaction of staff in the private universities with a beta constant ( $t = 118.1$ ,  $p > 0.000$ ) and promotion criteria itself ( $t = 4.063$ ,  $p > 0.000$ ). These were highly significant even at the 1% level. This confirms the earlier finding that these two private universities have got a significant promotion criterion and the staffs in these institutions are satisfied with it given their jobs. Staff therefore emphasised it here that keep promo-

tion based on academic qualification, teaching experience, as well as seniority of the staff. This is what satisfies them on the job and can inspire them to produce results.

Table 9 The Effects of Promotion Criteria on Job Satisfaction

**Coefficients <sup>a</sup>**

		Unstandardized		Standardized		
1	(Constant)	93.867	.795		118.109	.000
	Promotion Criteria	3.123	.769	.447	4.063	.000

Besides, on the results in table 10, it can also be deduced that the name of the university is not a significant factor when analyzing the link between promotion facets and job satisfaction ( $t = 0.664$   $p < 0.509$ ) implying that people in the two universities perceive it in the same way. Similarly, the faculty institutions/schools or department is also not significant ( $t = -1.432$ ,  $p < 0.157$ ). The sex of the respondent was not significant ( $t = 0.216$ ,  $p > 0.830$ ), the same is true for the age bracket of the staff ( $t = 0.09$ ,  $p < 0.993$ ) and all the other demographic variables of marital status current title, highest formal education length of service in the university as well as the nature of employment. However it is noted here that these university need to make clear the promotion policy and rule. This, as indicated was not significantly practiced ( $t = 0.405$   $p. < 0.687$ ). Promotion should be made transparent and the qualifications as well as the names of those on the promotion committee should be published and made known since descriptive statistics showed that most respondents were undecided on most the items concerning this factor.

Table 10 Insignificant variables on the Promotion Facet Items and Job Satisfaction

Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
					Tolerance
University	.074 <sup>a</sup>	.664	.509	.082	.993
Department	-.164 <sup>a</sup>	-1.432	.157	-.175	.913
Sex	.026 <sup>a</sup>	.216	.830	.027	.838
Age	.001 <sup>a</sup>	.009	.993	.001	.967
Marital Status	-.083 <sup>a</sup>	-.749	.457	-.092	.988
Title/Rank	-.094 <sup>a</sup>	-.816	.418	-.101	.913
Education	-.158 <sup>a</sup>	-1.383	.171	-.169	.915
	.004 <sup>a</sup>	.039	.969	.005	.984
	.007 <sup>a</sup>	.066	.948	-.008	.990
Clear Promotion Policies and Rules	.045 <sup>a</sup>	.405	.687	.050	.996
Promotion Transparency	.010 <sup>a</sup>	-.086	.932	-.011	.998
Qualified Promotion Committee	.069 <sup>a</sup>	.624	.534	.077	.998
Merit Based Promotion	.157 <sup>a</sup>	1.433	.157	.175	.999
Promotion on academic basis only	.144 <sup>a</sup>	.391	.697	.048	.989
Family based Recruitment	.122 <sup>a</sup>	1.104	.274	.136	.994

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), SECAQ02

d. Dependent Variable: WORK 1

Finally, family based recruitment is not significant in these two institutions ( $t = 1.104$   $p < 0.274$ ). However, it is noted that all these are potential factors that can cause work dissatisfaction in these universities, once practiced.

## Conclusion, and Implications

The results analysed leads this research to the following conclusions:

1. There is a weak institutional reward system of pay in the private universities of Nkumba and Uganda Christian University Mukono.
2. The promotion criteria and jobs are very clear in these two institutions and they are significantly linked to job satisfaction of staff working there. Thus, more than 70% of the staff approve promotion based on academic qualification, research and publication, and not seniority per se.
3. Job satisfaction of staff in these two private universities is at present influenced by job clarity and the promotion criteria but not pay. Clarity referred to an understanding and acceptance of what to do, when to do it, and how to do it. Therefore staff have a through understanding of the job, what the goals or objectives are,

- and how they should be accomplished.
4. There is no significant role conflict and ambiguity in these two institutions.
  5. There are three significant moderators/personal characteristics on the effects of institutional rewards, role conflict and ambiguity on job satisfaction of staff in Uganda Christian University Mukono but not for Nkumba. These are tenure, gender and highest formal education.
  6. There is no significant difference between staff satisfaction in Nkumba and Uganda Christian University Mukono.
  7. It was found that 73.7% of the staff in these institutions supplement pay by practicing part time employment and therefore there is a weak professional concentration which is linked to poor pay.
  8. It was established that 61.3% of the staff reported that the present compensation practices do not reflect their skill and effort.
  9. Despite the poor pay reported, results revealed that there is a strong professional ethical behaviour in these two universities. Consequently, 60.7% perceived that the examination system is well managed. Similarly, it was established that the poor package does not contribute to corruption and theft of university resources. Perhaps this is explained by the strong moral fiber behind these two chartered universities.
  10. While funds in these two institutions are perceived to be utilized properly, there is a weak transparency processes as perceived by staff in these institutions.
  11. The most satisfied department/faculty with the job itself is the School of Commercial Industrial Art and Design (CIAD) followed by law and then the School of Business Administration (SBA). While the least satisfied members come from the Academic Registrar's office and those working under the Dean of Students. However, satisfaction with the current pay and promotion varies with academic rank for Uganda Christian University Mukono.
  12. It was established that 75% of the staff perceived work as routine while 73.4% think that there is no link between pay and performance. However, as many as 78% of the responds confirmed that the work they do use the best of their abilities and indeed 80.4% of the respondents disagreed with the statement that their work is boring.
  13. The most interesting finding is that despite the poor pay, 93.5% of the respondent agreed that their work is useful to them and 80.2% consider it challenging.
  14. It was found that 96.7% of the respondents reported that they know what their responsibilities are which implied that they are qualified for the type of work they are doing at present. In addition 94.4% (table 4:98) added that they know exactly what is expected of them.

### Practical Implications

The results of the present study add to knowledge of the most important factors that determine job satisfaction of staff in private universities such as Nkumba and Uganda Christian University Mukono. The most appropriate model to which these universities should concentrate in order to influence job satisfaction so as to perform better can be summarized as shown in Figure 1:

Figure 1 Challenges to Satisfaction of Staff in Private Universities



Potential Predictors	Moderators	Outcome Satisfaction of staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the current remuneration package</li> <li>• Create professional concentration</li> <li>• Provide university fund accountability-transparency</li> <li>• Link pay to performance Publication, and research</li> <li>• Emphasize professional ethics</li> <li>• Stop any dual employment practice</li> <li>• Clarify the promotion policy</li> <li>• Promote on merit</li> <li>• Transparent recruitment</li> <li>• Ensure resource availability</li> <li>• Practice time management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• Highest formal education</li> <li>• Tenure (experience)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the job itself</li> <li>• With high self esteem</li> <li>• With Security of service</li> <li>• With high morale</li> <li>• Quality research and publication</li> <li>• Increased focus to students</li> <li>• Increased creativity and opportunity to develop new skills.</li> <li>• Best use of abilities</li> </ul>

The proposed model suggests that private universities have to revisit their reward system. How rewards such as pay and promotion are distributed influence the satisfaction of staff members. Satisfaction is enhanced by reward systems employee view as fair and reasonable but reduced by systems they consider unfair or unreasonable. Various characteristics of the reward system can respond to the university's environment, help it accomplish its goals, and contribute to its culture (the pattern of basic assumption about the way the employee adapt externally and integrate internally). Top management in these universities need to determine, for example, whether it will assign pay on the basis of the jobs held by the workers or skills or competencies that workers have. Job-based pay rewards people for performing specific jobs and moving up the hierarchy, where as skill based programmes reward people for building more competencies and developing their skills. Job based pay emphasizes the relationship between an individual's job performance and organizational outcomes as indicated in the model. This supports a culture that emphasizes bottom-line performance. Lecturers, for example, should not be allowed to stay at the same rank for more than five years without any research and publication.

Reward systems should also consider the market position of the pay levels offered. The market position chosen certainly influences the university's ability to cope with its environment; when a tight labour market exists, organizations with an aggressive "leader" strategy typically fair best in searching the workers they need. It is suggested here that for private universities, an effective reward system should tie rewards to performance. Individuals who work harder, produce more research work, or produce better quality, should receive greater rewards than poor performers. It is noted however, that private universities do not have resources to offer enough extrinsic rewards to motivate staff to perform or to encourage their satisfaction. Such universities should also consider job-enrichment or quality-of-work life, programs as ways of increasing intrinsic rewards. It is also noted here that the criteria used for the allocation of rewards must be clear and

complete. Individual university members should know whether they receive rewards for level quality performance, attendance, innovativeness, or effort.

Similarly, the criteria for receipt of specific wages, benefits, and incentives must be clearly defined. In the same way, university rewards should compare favourably with rewards in similar universities. For the university to attract, motivate, and retain qualified and competent staff, they must offer rewards comparable to their competitors.

Additionally, the model also suggests that there must be professional concentration created. This should be through the perceived quality of supervision. When staff members perceive their supervisors as fair and competent and believe that such supervisors have their best interests at heart, satisfaction tends to be high. This was perhaps the reason why CIAD employees ranked the best satisfied staff members followed by the School of Law and Business Administration. The supervisors there are most likely to be perceived as fair. In contrast, when employees view their supervisors as unfair, incompetent, or as pursuing self motives, satisfaction tends to be low.

The model also suggests that there must be transparency in university fund accountability. Transparency should not merely be in words. It should be by action. The ability to inform others of what one “thinks” does not concern them increase the level of participation in decision making.

The universities should also continue to emphasize professional ethics. This was an aspect that was important in the minds of university staff but not practiced at present which implies that even if staff is paid poorly, they highly respect their professional. The model also suggests that management has to work to stop dual employment practice. The items in this factor were concerned with having two permanent jobs at the same time. Most of the respondent staff indicated that they do not practice it. This, if practiced, would be unethical.

There is also need to clarify the promotion policy. The appointment letter given should have a detailed promotion policy appended. The purpose of the promotion should be (a) to utilize the employee skills, knowledge at the appropriate level in the university hierarchy resulting in organizational effectiveness and staff satisfaction; (b) to develop competitive spirit and inculcate the zeal in staff to acquire the skill, and knowledge required by higher-level jobs; (c) to develop a competent internal source of staff ready to take up jobs at higher levels in future; (d) to promote staff self-development and make them wait their turn of promotions (this reduces labour turnover) (e) to promote a feeling of content with the existing conditions in the university and a sense of belongingness. (f) to promote interest in training, and development initiatives; (g) to build loyalty and boost morale and (h) to reward committed and loyal members of staff of the university.

Moreover, staff in these institutions approved promotion based on seniority, education level and research. Seniority referred to relative length of service in the same job or similar organization. The logic behind considering seniority as a basis of promotion is that there is a positive correlation between the length of service, the amount of knowledge and the level of skill acquired by an employee in a university. This type of promotion gives a sense of certainly of getting promotion to every employee. Communicate policies. Managers play the most crucial communication role because of

their day-to-day interaction with their employees. Therefore private universities must be prepared to explain why, for example, the pay structure is designed as it is and judge whether staff concerns about the structure need be addressed. An old philosophical question is “if a tree falls in the forest and no one is there to hear it, does it make a sound?”. In compensation management an analogous question arises. “If a new or improved pay structure is a great idea but no one understands why it is great, is it really a great idea?”. The answer is probably “no” hence the need for communication.

Private universities should maintain the reported job clarity and good promotion practices which significantly linked to job satisfaction. They should continue having the right number of qualified employees performing essential work activities in the most effective and efficient manner. Job clarity typically entails building greater individual planning, decision making, and control into jobs as investigated here. At the support staff level, it entails work simplification and minimizing relatively unsatisfying work activities which are felt to be repetitive, dull or routine. Staff in these universities indicated that they want to perform activities that utilize their highest-level skills. By refocusing activities, employees may perform work that they find more challenging and which adds greater value. Jobs may be restructured, and people take on different tasks. And where individuals lack the needed skills, training may be recommended.

An analysis of the most satisfied department in Nkumba University shows that Deans or Heads of Department are the glue that keeps systems from falling apart, from running down, and from spinning out of control. Yet they are also expected to be creative and bring about change necessary for the growth of these institutions. Thus, the need by all departments to lead by example.

There is need to develop a culture of time management and professional concentration and this is moderated by the above suggestions. The day-to-day university operation should emphasize this so that it becomes part of its practical values.

There is an urgent need for the National Council for Higher Education to develop a private universities’ government assistance proposal that should be forwarded to government for possible assistance. This proposal should be in respect of waving all taxes that private universities pay in respect of their operations. These may be VAT on the loans secured by the university or income tax on employment incomes of staff members; the provision of university grants to cater for specific areas of expenditure such as supplementing university staff salary; supplementing the research and publication fund; construction, and the general need to equip the laboratories and libraries so as to make the government science policy a reality. The proposal should also suggest Guaranteeing private universities desirable loans and connecting them to donors for possible assistance as it is done for public universities. Government may also consider extending its sponsorship scheme of students to include private universities as well. By so doing, staff satisfaction will be enhanced and UPE can succeed beyond the projected secondary level in future.

In conclusion, it must be pointed out here that although this research has focused on two important private universities in Uganda, it may reflect a general trend of what is happening in all universities that have the mission of academic excellence. While this research is confined to Nkumba and Uganda Christian University – Mukono, a similar

research by Turyagyenda (2004) confirmed poor pay structures at Makerere University. Turyagyenda (2004) recommended that the pay structure of Makerere academic staff should be overhauled immediately in order to bring its compensation package at par within the region. Therefore while the conclusion for this research might not be far from that, it is clear that there are very few universities (if any) in Uganda that are providing a realistic, competitive and satisfying remuneration package to its staff. While a solution has been found especially for the academic staff in public universities (through government intervention), private universities need to look deeply into this, despite their weak financial capacity. It is through responding positively that Nkumba and Uganda Christian University can maintain their position as strong and viable institutions.

## References

- Adam, J.S. (1963). Toward an understanding of equity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
- Bameka P. (1996). Factors affecting Academic staff productivity at Makerere University. Unpublished Master's dissertation. Makerere University, Kampala.
- Bruce, W.M., & Blackburn, J.W. (1992). **Balancing job satisfaction and performance**. Quorum Books, Westport, CT.
- Division of Human Resources, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy New York. **Employee Status and Classification**. <http://www.rpi.edu/dept/hr/index.html> Accessed on 02<sup>nd</sup> January, 2004.
- Fournet, G.P., Distefano, M.K., & Pryer, M.W. (1969). **Job satisfaction: Issues and problems**. *Personnel Psychology*, 19, 165-183.
- Gerhart, B. (1987). How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction? Implication for job design and other personnel programs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 366-373.
- Griffin, R.W. (1981); Task attributes and long-term employee productivity. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. 174-194.
- Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). **Understanding Job Satisfaction**. The Macmillan Press Ltd., New York.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Patterson, R.O., & Capwell, D.F. (1957). **Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion**. Psychological Services of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
- Hickson C. Oshagabani T. (1999). **The effect of age on the satisfaction of academicians with teaching and research**. *International Journal of Social Academicians* 26, (4), 537-544.
- Hulin C.L. (1991). In Muchiri K.M. and Dorokah M (2000). **Business Process Re-engineering: Worthwhile lessons from Quality of work life and employee involvement**. *Gadjahmada International Journal of Business* Jan 2: 1-14.
- Human Resource Department, Collin Country Community College Texas. **Staff and Administrative Compensation Plan**. <http://ftp.ccccd.edu/hr/index.htm> . Accessed on 10<sup>th</sup> January, 2004.
- Ivancevich, J.M., & Donnelly, J.H. (1968). **Job satisfaction research: A manageable guide for practitioners**. *Personnel Journal*, 47, 172-177.
- Kajubi, S. (1992). **Financing higher education in Uganda**. *Higher Education*, 3(2): 21-25.
- Kasozi A.B.K, Sam Katunguka, and Florence Nakayiwa (2003). *The Strategic Plan for*

Higher Education 2003-2015.

- Lambert E.G., Hogan N.L. & Barton S.M. (2001). **The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent, a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers.** *Social Science Journal*. 38(2), 233-251.
- Locke, E. (1969). **What is job satisfaction?** *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4, 309-336.
- Locke, E. (1976). **The nature and causes of job satisfaction.** In M.D. Dunette (ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, (pp.1297-1349). Rand McNally, Chicago.
- Locke, E.A., Fitzpatrick, W., & White, F.M., (1983). **Job satisfaction and role clarity among university and college faculty.** *The Review of Higher Education*, 6(4), 343-365.
- Locke, E.A., Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., Hulin, C.L., & Miller, A.M. (1964). **Convergent and discriminant validity for areas and methods of rating job satisfaction.** *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, (5) 313-319.
- Milkovich, G.T., & Newman, J.M. (1990). **Compensation.** BPI Irwin, Homewood, IL.
- Mobley W.H. (1982). **Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control.** Addison Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA.
- Mobley W.H., Griffith, R.W. Hand, H.H., and Meglino, B.M., (1979). **Review and Conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process.** *Psychology Bulletin*, 36: 493-522.
- Motowidlo, S.J. (1996). **Orientation toward the job and organization.** In K.R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behaviour in organizations* (pp. 175-208). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Mpaata A.K. (1998) An Investigation of the relationship between subordinate perception of managerial competence and organizational stress in the major hospitals of Yogyakarta. **Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation**, Gadjahmada University.
- Mulindwa S.K. (1996). **Job satisfaction among academic and Administrative staff in technical education institution in Uganda: A case study of Uganda Polytechnic Kyambogo.** Unpublished master's dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.
- Pedhazur, E.J., & Schmelkin, L.P. (1991). **Measurement, design and analysis: An integrated approach.** Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, New Jersey.
- Peil M. (1995). **"Social Science Research Methods"**, E.A. Educational Publishing Ltd., 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., Nairobi Kenya.
- Personnel & Employment Department, University of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia. **Conditions of Employment and Policies – Academic.** <http://www.uow.edu.au/admin/personnel/index.html>. Accessed on 05<sup>th</sup> January, 2004.
- Pfeffer J. (1990). **Unions and Job Satisfaction.** *Work and Occupation*. 17(3): 259-263.
- Quarstein, V.A., McAfee, R.B., & Glassman, M. (1992). **The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction.** *Human Relations*.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998). **Organizational behaviour: Concepts, controversies, applications.** Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Roznowski M. & Hulin, C. (1992). **The scientific merit of valid measures of general constructs with special reference to job satisfaction and job withdraws.** In C.J. Cranny, P.C. Smith, & E.F. Stone (Eds.), *Job satisfaction* (pp.123-163). Lexing-

- ton.
- Roznowski M. (1989). **Examination of the measurement properties of Job Descriptive Index with Experimental items.** Journal of applied Psychology vol. 74. No. 8 p.805-814.
- Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J.P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? Personnel Psychology, 36, 577-600.
- Schneider, B., Gunnarson, S.K., & Wheeler, J.K. (1992). **The role of opportunity in the conceptualization and measurement of job satisfaction.** In C.J. Cranny, P.C. Smith, & E.F. Stone (Eds.), Job satisfaction (pp.53-68). Lexington Books, New York.
- Shaw, J.D. (1999). "Job satisfaction and turnover intentions, the moderating role of positive affect" **Journal of Social Psychology**, 39(2) 242-245.
- Smith, D.B., & Plant, W.T. (1982). Sex differences in the job satisfaction of university professors. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 249-251.
- Spector, P.E. (1985). **Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey.** American Journal of Community Psychology, 13, (6) 693-713.
- Spector, P.E. (1987). **Interactive effects of perceived control and job stressors on affective reactions and health outcomes for clerical workers.** Work and Stress, 1 (2), 155-162.
- Ssesanga N.A.K. (2001). **Job satisfaction of University Academics: Perspective from Uganda**, unpublished ED. Dissertation, University of Bristol.
- Sutter, M.R. (1994). **Job and career satisfaction of secondary school assistant principals.** An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.
- Tizikara M.K. (1998). **Correlates of Academic staff satisfaction in Universities in Uganda.** Unpublished master's dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.
- Turyagyenda B. John (2004). The effects of the current compensation and promotion practices on work satisfaction of Makerere University Academic staff. **Unpublished Ph.D dissertation**, New Port University.
- The Government of Uganda, (2001). **The Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act.** UPPC Entebbe-Uganda.
- The Monitor 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2004
- The New Vision 14<sup>th</sup> April, 2004.
- The New Vision 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2004.
- The Republic of Uganda. 2001 The Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act.
- Wanous, J.P., Lawler, E.D. (1972). "Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 56(2), 95-105.
- Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A.E. & Hudy, M.J. (1997). **Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures?** Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 247-252.