

Examination of job and life satisfaction of academicians

Sevgi Nehir¹, Nihan Durgu¹, Fatih Ozcan², Emin Oryal Taskin³

¹Department of Nursing, Mental Health and Disease Nursing, Faculty of Health Science, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

²Department of Family Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

³Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Copyright@Author(s) - Available online at www.annalsmedres.org

Content of this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License



Abstract

Aim: The aim of the study is to examine the job and life satisfaction levels of academicians and determine the relationship between job and life satisfaction.

Materials and Methods: The sample of this cross-sectional descriptive study consisted of 338 academic staff (health, social) working at Manisa Celal Bayar University between November 2018 and June 2019. Data were collected via Information Form, Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS) and Job Satisfaction Scale (JSC). Data were analyzed using number, percentage, Kruskal Wallis H test, Student t test, One way ANOVA test, Spearman Correlation Analysis and Linear regression analysis.

Results: According to the results of the correlation analysis, there was a high positive correlation ($r_s: 0.608$) between the total score of LSS and JSC of academicians. According to regression analysis, it was seen that disease condition, mobbing and physical conditions satisfaction variables explained 15% of LSS score variance. Also, it was seen that disease condition, working year in the institution, managerial duties in the institution, mobbing and physical conditions satisfaction variables explained 36% of JSS score variance.

Conclusion: Job and life satisfaction of academicians positively affects each other. Another important result, disease condition, mobbing and satisfaction with physical conditions, is very important for both the job satisfaction and life satisfaction of individuals.

Keywords: Academician; job satisfaction; life satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

The concept of life satisfaction, which first appeared in 1961, is defined as the positive evaluation of individuals' life in accordance with the criteria determined by the individual and the satisfaction of life in general (1,2). In other words, life satisfaction is the result of comparing individuals' expectations from life with their real situations (3,4).

Job satisfaction is a concept which includes an individual's happiness and pleasure in individuals' job, whether or not people enjoy their jobs (5,6). Factors affecting job satisfaction are divided into individual and environmental factors. Individual factors are expectations from the work environment, age, gender, norms of life, duty type, marital status, education level and working year; on the other hand. Environmental factors are the quality of work, wage, development and promotion opportunities, working conditions, relations with the manager (6). Increasing the job satisfaction of the staff facilitates the achievement of organizational goals (7). Individuals who are unable to

satisfy their jobs can develop different reactions such as giving long rest breaks, delaying work, opposing authority in order to make the time they spend in the workplace bearable (8).

In the literature, it is seen that the effects of variables such as working year, age, and the school that individuals graduated from are examined in terms of job satisfaction, but the variables with significant effects such as life satisfaction is not adequately examined. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction are intertwined concepts (2). The concepts of life satisfaction and job satisfaction are important variables for people to be happy from their lives and gain meaning in their lives (3).

Universities require knowledge production and qualified people. Because of that it is important that academic staff receive satisfaction from their jobs and lives (9). Therefore, it is worth examining to determine the variables that affect the job and life satisfaction as well as satisfaction levels of academicians working in our universities. Determining the job satisfaction and life satisfaction levels of

Received: 22.04.2020 Accepted: 22.06.2020 Available online: 19.02.20201

Corresponding Author: Sevgi Nehir, Department of Nursing, Mental Health and Disease Nursing, Faculty of Health Science, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey E-mail: sevginehir78@gmail.com

academicians, which is an important element in the education system, will contribute to the development and renewal of the system. The study is important in terms of revealing the relationship between life satisfaction, which is one of the individual factors affecting the job satisfaction of academicians. In addition, determining the variables that affect the life and job satisfaction of academic staff is considered important in terms of shedding light on the studies aimed at increasing the life and job satisfaction of academic staff.

The aim of the study is to examine the job and life satisfaction levels of academicians and determine the relationship between job and life satisfaction.

MATERIALS and METHODS

Study Design and Sample

The population of this cross-sectional descriptive study consists of 1,609 academic staff (faculty member, instructor, expert, lecturer and research assistant) working at Manisa Celal Bayar University (MCBU) between November 2018 and June 2019. Stratified sampling method was used. The sample of the study includes 338 academicians who work at Kula Vocational High School (VHS) (n=7), Technical Sciences (VHS) (n=7), Salihli VHS (n=8), Vocational School of Health Services (n=14), Turgutlu VHS (n=16), Soma VHS (n=17), School of Applied Disciplines (n=16), Faculty of Business Administration (n=19), Faculty of Education (n=30), Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences (n=57), Faculty of Health Sciences (n=59) and Faculty of Medicine (n=88), who were in the school at the time of the study, who volunteered to participate in the study and completed the data collection forms completely.

Data Collection

Information Form is a 16-question form created by the researchers to determine the individual and professional characteristics of the students participating in the study (2,8,9).

Life Satisfaction Scale (LSS) was developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin (1985). It is a seven-point Likert-style 5-item scale. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale ranged from 0.80 to 0.89.1 In our study, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.88. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Koker and Yetim in 1991. The lowest score is 5 and the highest score is 35. As the total score decreases, life satisfaction decreases. The scores of 7 and below indicates a low level of life satisfaction, a score of 13 points and above shows a high level of life satisfaction, and a score of 8-12 indicates moderate level of life satisfaction. High score on the scale refers to the height of life satisfaction (10,11).

Based on Herzberg's theory of two factors, Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) was developed by Kuzgun, Sevim and Hamamci (1999) in order to determine how happy individuals working in any job are members of that profession. The JSS is a five-point Likert-type scale consisting of a total of 20 items related to the suitability of the professional activities to the qualifications of the individual, taking

responsibility, and the possibilities of development and progress. The score that can be obtained from the scale is between 20-100. A high score on the scale indicates a high level of job satisfaction (12). In our study, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.91.

The dependent variables of the study are the individual and professional characteristics of the academicians, their independent variables, and the average scores of the JSS and LSS.

Data Analysis

In the evaluation of the study data, numerical values are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation. For parametric features, Student t-test, One way ANOVA and for non-parametric characteristics, Kruskal-Wallis H test were used. The significance level of the results was evaluated as $p < 0.05$. Also, Spearman correlation analysis and linear regression analysis were performed by coding the data in SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) package program.

Ethical Considerations: Ethics approval no 20478486-050.04.04 was obtained from MCBU Health Sciences Ethics Committee on 18 April 2019. Written permissions were obtained from the MCBU Vocational High Schools and its directorates where the study was conducted and from the deans of the faculties. Written informed consent was obtained from participants who were informed about the study and who volunteered to participate in the study.

RESULTS

It has been found that the average age of the academicians participating in the study are 41.21 \pm 9.99, 51.5% of the academicians are male, 76.3% are married, 60.0% are doctorate graduate, 70.7% have income expense balanced, 88.5% do not have disease, 76.3% do not have managerial duties, the working hours in institutions are 10.54 \pm 8.16 years, 24.0% are research assistants, 36.7% suffer mobbing, 76.9% are satisfied with job and 46.2% are partial satisfied with physical conditions (Table 1).

Table 1. Individual and job characteristics of academicians			
Variables	n	%	
Average Age	41.21 \pm 9.99		
Gender			
Female	164	48.5	
Male	174	51.5	
Marital Status			
Single	61	18.0	
Married	258	76.3	
Other	19	5.7	
Educational Status			
Undergraduate	30	8.9	
Postgraduate	105	31.1	
Doctorate	203	60.0	

Income Status		
Income less than expense	26	7.7
Income expense balanced	239	70.7
Income more than expense	73	21.6
Disease Condition		
Yes	39	11.5
No	299	88.5
Academic Titles		
Professor	70	20.7
Associate Professor	44	13.0
Assistant Professor	68	20.1
Lecturer	75	22.2
Research Assistant	81	24.0
Mobbing		
Yes	124	36.7
No	214	63.3
Satisfaction with Job		
Yes	116	34.3
Partial	156	46.2
No	66	19.5
Managerial Duties in the Institution		
Yes	80	23.7
No	258	76.3
Working Year in the Institution (year)	10.54±8.16	
Total	338	100.0

The average JSS score of the academics was 75.65±12.08 and the average score of LSS was 24.58±6.11.

A significant difference was found between JSS average scores (F=8.264, p≤0.01) and LSS average scores (F=3.304, p<0.01) with academic titles (Table 2).

Table 2. The relationship between Job Satisfaction Scale and Life Satisfaction Scale with academic titles (n= 338)			
Variables	n	Job Satisfaction Scale	
		Mean±SD	Test/p
Academic Titles			
Professor	70	71.40±12.35	F/p* 8.264/0.000
Associate Professor	44	73.11±23.61	
Assistant Professor	68	79.00±10.00	
Lecturer	75	80.46±12.33	
Research Assistant	81	73.44±11.98	
		Life Satisfaction Scale	
Academic Titles		Mean±SD	Test/p
Professor	70	24.35±6.66	F/p* 3.304/0.011
Associate Professor	44	23.61±6.63	
Assistant Professor	68	25.48±4.81	
Lecturer	75	26.18±5.84	
Research Assistant	81	23.06±6.19	

*F: ANOVA, p≤0.01

A significant difference was found between JSS average scores and academicians' working place (KW=90.533, p≤0.01), age (t=2.470, p≤0.01), disease condition (t=-3.935, p≤0.01), working year in their jobs (t=2.402,

p<0.05), working year in the institution (t=2.567, p≤0.01), managerial duties in the institution (t=2.255, p<0.05), mobbing (t=-8.741, p≤0.01) as well as satisfaction with physical conditions (F=56.728, p≤0.01).

A significant difference was found between LSS average scores and academicians' working place (KW=44.966, p≤0.01), marital status (KW=10.416, p≤0.01), income status (KW=10.490, p≤0.01), disease condition (t=-3.095, p≤0.01), managerial duties in the institution (t=2.091, p<0.05), mobbing (t=-4.993, p≤0.01) as well as satisfaction with physical conditions (F=21.788, p≤0.01).

In the latest model, the variables that cause a statistically significant difference in the previous steps (such as age, working place, academic title, working year in the job) were analyzed. As a result of the regression analysis, five variables (disease condition, working year in the institution, managerial duties in the institution, mobbing and satisfaction with the physical conditions) were found to be effective on the JSS scores.

As a result of the regression analysis between the total score of JSS and the factors affecting it, it was seen that the independent variables included in the model explained 36% of the variance of the JSS score (Table 3).

Table 3. The relationship between Job Satisfaction Scale and introductory information: linear regression analysis results			
Variables		β	p
Disease Condition	R ² =0.366	5.666	0.001**
(1. Yes / 2. No)			
Working Year in the Institution	R ² =0.366	-0.016	0.005**
Managerial Duties in the Institution	R ² =0.366	-3.195	0.016*
(1. Yes / 2. No)			
Mobbing	R ² =0.366	6.262	0.000**
(1. Yes / 2. No)			
Satisfaction with Physical Conditions	R ² =0.366	-6.298	0.000**
(1. Yes/2. Partial/3. No)			

*p<0.05, **p<0.01

Table 4. The relationship between Life Satisfaction Scale and introductory information: linear regression analysis results			
Variables		β	p
Disease Condition	R ² =0.158	2.402	0.014*
(1. Yes / 2. No)			
Mobbing	R ² =0.158	1.957	0.005*
(1. Yes / 2. No)			
Satisfaction with Physical Conditions	R ² =0.152	-2.276	0.000*
(1. Yes/2. Partial/3. No)			

*p≤0.01

Finally, variables that caused a statistically significant difference in previous steps (marital status, income status, disease condition) were analyzed. As a result of

the regression analysis, only three variables (disease condition, mobbing and satisfaction with the physical conditions of the institution) were found to be effective on the LSS scores.

As a result of the regression analysis between the total score of LSS and the factors affecting it, it was seen that the independent variables included in the model explained 15% of the variance of the LSS score (Table 4).

According to Spearman Correlation Analysis findings showing the relationship between LSS and JSS, it was found that there was a high positive correlation ($r_s:0.608$) between the total score of LSS and JSS (Table 5).

Table 5. Correlation between the total score of Life Satisfaction Scale and Job Satisfaction Scale (n= 338)

	Job Satisfaction Scale	Life Satisfaction Scale
Job Satisfaction Scale		$r_s: 0.608$ $p=0.000^*$
Life Satisfaction Scale	$r_s: 0.608$ $p=0.000^*$	

*** $p<0.01$, r_s : Spearman Correlation Analysis**

DISCUSSION

In the studies, the contentment of the person in the working life leads to the increase of work efficiency, which is generally reflected positively on the life satisfaction (13,14).

A significant positive relationship was found between job satisfaction and life satisfaction of the academicians who participated in the study. As the job satisfaction of academicians increases, life satisfaction increases. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction affect each other positively. This result is consistent with many studies available in the literature (15-17). Ozel (2015) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction found that a significant and positive relationship between life satisfaction and job satisfaction (16). In the study, Coban (2017) found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction of both individuals working in the public sector and individuals working in the private sector (17). Working position can be associated with individuals' sense of belonging to the institution.

In the study, a significant relationship was found between institutional managerial duties of academicians, physical conditions of the workplace as well as job satisfaction. As a result of the study, it was found that the level of job satisfaction of individuals with managerial duties was higher than other individuals without managerial duties. The working environment of the staff and the physical conditions affecting them affect the individuals. Compliance with these conditions will affect the morale level of the staff as well as their integration with the institution they work in and their job satisfaction as well as their life satisfaction. Factors such as transportation,

heat, humidity, lighting, ventilation, noise, cleaning, working hours, adequacy of the working tools affect the job satisfaction resource. For this reason, the physical conditions of the working environment, the pace and desire of the staff should be done to increase (18,19). Working conditions of the workplace should be such as to allow individuals to increase, achieve success and develop their skills. If these conditions are appropriate for the person, it motivates the person. A person can work more productively and consistently if he/she becomes aware that his/her work is important and useful for himself/her, his/her institution and his/her society and experiences his/her sense of success more often (20). When the literature is examined, a number of studies on this subject are as follows. In the study of Kaplanoglu (2006), a statistically significant relationship was found between the collaboration of executive nurses with their colleagues and job satisfaction (21). A study by Coban (2017) found a relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction of individuals working in the private sector (17). Studies on academics have mainly indicated that they find their work stressful, have suffered burnout and they have to work at home in the evening, at the weekend (14,22-24). We can say that this situation causes conflict between business and social life.

In the study, when the job satisfaction is examined according to the working year variable in the institution, it is seen that the job burnout of academicians, especially those working for a long time in the institution and in the jobs, has increased. It can be said that new academicians are more enthusiastic, willing and productive in their jobs at the same time they use their energy more for their jobs. It is seen that academicians with longer working time show signs of decrease in job satisfaction. It is clear that a legal regulation is necessary in terms of retirement and working hours, since it is seen that the decrease in job satisfaction occurs in long-term staff. When the job satisfaction of the academicians is high, the development of quality students and healthy generations will be ensured thanks to the high quality academicians.

A significant relationship was found between job as well as life satisfaction and disease status. In the literature, it has been reported that individuals are more likely to experience negative moods and be affected by negative life events as well as the presence of disease condition, are more prone to experiencing negative emotions such as fear, anger, sadness, and are more difficult to deal with stressful events (25).

It was found that there was a negative significant relationship between the exposure of academics to mobbing and their job and life satisfaction. It is an expected result that mobbing have negatively affect the professional satisfaction of academics. The racing between the employees, injustice in getting promoted, irregularities in sharing responsibilities, conflicts, are effective in the occurrence of mobbing (26). Mobbing negatively affects individuals psychologically and physically. The individual reflects these negativities to

business and private life (27). When mobbing continues, the quality of work life, work efficiency and commitment to the institution decrease (28). The studies indicate that mobbing reduces job satisfaction (27,29,30). The results obtained from the research are in parallel with the results of the study.

CONCLUSION

In this study, it was observed that mobbing exposure affected job satisfaction as well as life satisfaction. When this result is taken into consideration, mobbing behaviors in the institution and the factors causing this behavior should be determined. Taking measures to eliminate the phenomenon of mobbing may increase job and life satisfaction. For the educational and scientific development of the universities, positive perceptions and attitudes of the academicians should be increased and sufficient physical conditions should be provided to increase the motivation of the academicians. Furthermore, efforts should be made to increase the cooperation among the staff and to create a team spirit. The physical conditions of the institution can be an advantage to increase the motivation of the staff.

Conflict of interest : The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

Financial Disclosure: There are financial supports. This work was supported by a grant from the Manisa Celal Bayar University Scientific Research Project in 2018 (Project Number: 2018-195).

Ethical approval: Ethics approval no 20478486-050.04.04 was obtained from MCBU Health Sciences Ethics Committee on 18 April 2019.

REFERENCES

1. Diener E, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *J Pers Assess* 1985;49:71-5.
2. Recepoglu E, Tumlu GU. Analyzing the relationship between life and job satisfaction of university academic staff. *Kastamonu Education J* 2015;23:1851-68.
3. Ozer M, Karabulut OO. Satisfaction of life in elderly individuals. *Turk Geriatri Derg* 2003;6:72-4.
4. Dilmac B, Eksi H. Examination of life satisfaction and self-esteem of students in vocational high schools. *The J Institute of Social Science* 2008;20:279-89.
5. Erturk E, Kececioglu T. Relations between the levels of employees job satisfaction and burnout: A sample application on the teachers. *Ege Academic Review* 2012;12:39-52.
6. Koruklu N, Feyzioglu B, Kiremit HO, et al. Examining teachers job satisfaction level according to some variables. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University J of Education Faculty* 2013;13:119-37.
7. Akgoz S, Ozcakilir A, Kan I, et al. The Professional satisfaction of nurses employing in health, application and research center (SUAM) of Uludag University. *Turkiye Klinikleri. J Med Ethics* 2005;13:86-96.
8. Sun HO. A study on job satisfaction: The Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey General Directorate of Banknote Printing (Master Thesis). Central Bank of Turkey Republic General Directorate of Banknote Printing, 2002.
9. Dost MT, Cenkseven F. Faculty members' job satisfaction according to socio-demographic variables and their views on circumstances of their respective universities. *Education and Science* 2008;33:28-39.
10. Koker S. Comparison of life satisfaction levels of normal and problematic adolescents (Master Thesis). Ankara, Ankara University, 1991.
11. Yetim U. Life Satisfaction in terms of organization and pattern of personal projects (Doctoral Thesis). Izmir, Ege University, 1991.
12. Kuzgun Y, Sevim SA, Hamamci Z. Developing a Job Satisfaction Scale. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance J* 1999;2:14-8.
13. Keser A. The relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction: An application in automotive sector. *Labour and Society* 2005;4:77-96.
14. Hogan C, Hogan M, Hodgins M, et al. An examination of gender differences in the impact of individual and organizational factors on work hours, work-life conflict, and psychological strain in academics. *Irish Journal of Psychology* 2014;35:133-50.
15. Aziri B. Job Satisfaction: A literature review. *Management Research and Practic* 2011;3:77-86.
16. Ozel NK. Analyzing the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction in terms of demographic variables: An research in accommodation businesses (Master Thesis). Ankara, Turk Hava Kurumu University, 2015.
17. Coban F. Comparison of occupational satisfaction and life satisfaction of people working in public and private institutions (Master Thesis). Istanbul, Nisantasi University, 2017.
18. Asik NA. A conceptual evaluation of individual and organizational factors affecting employees' and results of job satisfaction. *Turkish Journal of Administration* 2010;467:31-51.
19. Karakisla Y. The perception of job satisfaction and organizational culture among nurses in public and private hospitals (Master Thesis). Istanbul, Halic University, 2012.
20. Dede M, Cinar S. Determine the job difficulties and job satisfaction in intensive care nurses. *Maltepe University Journal of Nursing Science and Art* 2008;1:3-14.
21. Kaplanoglu AE. The relationship between nurse manager's assertiveness and job satisfaction (Master Thesis). Istanbul, Marmara University, 2006.
22. Bell AS, Rajendran D, Theiler S. Job stress, wellbeing and work-life balance of academics. *Electronic Journal of Applied Psychology* 2012;8:25-37.

23. Boyd CM, Bakker AB, Pignata S, Winefield AH, Gillespie N, Stough C. A longitudinal test of the job demands–resources model among Australian university academics. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 2011;60:112-40.
24. Torp S, Lysfjord L, Midje HH. Workaholism and work–family conflict among university academics. *Higher Education* 2018;76:1071-90.
25. Baltas A, Baltas Z. *Stress and Coping Ways* (27. ed.). İstanbul: Remzi Publisher, 2011.
26. Sart G, Sezgin FH, Demir N. The effects of mobbing on the perception of occupational burnout: the case of women academicians. *Journal of Beykoz Akademi* 2018;6:118-35.
27. Karsavuran S, Kaya S. The relationship between burnout and mobbing among hospital managers. *Nurs Ethics* 2017;24:337-48.
28. Cogenli MZ, Asunakutlu T. Mobbing in Academy: An investigation at Adım Universities. *International J Erzincan Social Sciences Institute* 2016;9:17-32.
29. Steele NM, Rodgers B, Fogarty GJ. The relationships of experiencing workplace bullying with mental health, affective commitment, and job satisfaction: application of the job demands control model. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;24:17.
30. Ariza-Montes, A, Leal-Rodríguez AL, Leal-Millán AG. Workplace bullying among teachers: An analysis from the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model perspective. *J. Occup Environ Med* 2016;58:818-27.