

Employee Satisfaction in Higher Institution Management: Scale Development

Akande, Joshua Oluwagbotemi
Ogunnaike, Olaleke Oluseye
Omotoye, Tumininu Tolu
Olabamiji, Oluwaseun Jonathan

Abstract:- For every single organisation to push ahead it is necessary for the general population to be happy with the role they perform, and it is the point at which they are fulfilled that they would most likely work successfully and productively. This research paper presented an establishment to the idea of satisfaction, its impact on higher educational institution employees (academic and non-academic staff), and moreover looked at the suggestions on these employee's dimension of efficiency. It used a structured questionnaire scale process where a paper based survey was done and 50 participants participated in filling the questionnaire, which cut across professors, lecturers and non-teaching academic staff using Covenant University, which is an advanced education institution of Nigeria, Ogun state as a contextual investigation. The aftereffects of the exploratory factor exploration and confirmatory variables evaluation show the multi-stage nature of employs satisfaction within the higher educational institutions. Seven dimensions were identified: human resource function and policies, career/professional development, performance management, corporate culture and communications, employee satisfaction and compensation, employee roles, relations and fulfillment, and overall feelings about your employment experience. The study provides evidence of the reliability and the validity and of the measure. The scale proposes a new approach to evaluate employee satisfaction in higher educational institution. Suggestions for this theory and its exercise are also discussed. This study would be beneficial to those seeking to start up an educational institution, those educational institutions with high turnover rate and the less productive educational institutions.

Keywords:- Compensation, Education, Efficiency, Higher Educational Institution, And Satisfaction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Employee's satisfaction is an imperative apparatus for every organisation that wants to make progress. It is the phrasing exploited to depict if employees are cheerful, fought and pleased with their wants and desires in a workplace. It is additionally a factor for employee motivation, employee aim accomplishment and affirmative employee attitude in the higher institutions. Essentially satisfaction of an employee is a

proportion of exactly how upbeat people are with the work they perform and the workplace in general.

A noteworthy gap exists in the learning of employee's satisfaction in higher education. A number of past investigations have exclusively centered on estimating employee satisfaction among academic staff. Be that as it may, in a higher educational institution, there are 2 (two) classifications of personnel that buckle down in building up the university, they are the academic and non-academic staff. Thus, it is significant to examine their satisfaction in the university. Non-academic staffs are otherwise called non-instructing or academic support staff. Employee satisfaction level is a critical part for both academic and non-academic staff. Tooksoon (2011) expressed that higher worker satisfaction level would prompt higher workplace commitment, efficiency, and organizational success and subsequently diminish the turnover rate as well as the replacement cost.

Higher education dependably assumes a fundamental role in the improvement of a state and it's flourishing in both private and public divisions under the guiding principles of Higher Education Commission of Nigeria. In stipulations of employment both sectors have their merits and shortcomings. The main characteristic of education service is that it brings people to a full awareness as to what it is to be a human-being (i.e. total development of an individual). *Others are:* It helps to increase individual intellect, gives attention to social needs, helps to impact the economy, to build an effective work force, to groom students for job/career, and to raise a particular social or political system to mention a few.

The present study is grounded in content theories and process theories of employee's satisfaction. Content theories have to do with individual needs and objectives. It basically deal with "what" motivates employees. The content perspective theories used in this paper is Cloyton's ERG theory. Whereas, process theories is concerned with the "process" of motivation and "how" motivation transpire. The process theory used in this paper is Adam's Equity theory.

The theories proposes that an employee's wellspring of satisfaction rests in institutions capacity to provide for employees general needs (existence, relatedness and growth) and compensation should be impartial, fair and just. However,

previous employee's satisfaction theories on higher education have been based most time on just one of the theories (i.e. content or process theory); whereas this paper is based on both. The various theories utilized in this paper provides a means for institution to move forward (achieve its set goals and objective), increase satisfaction of employees with the job they do, because it is when they are satisfied that they would be able to work effectively and efficiently.

This study adds to the advancement of employee's satisfaction in two essential ways. Firstly, we identified a range of dimensions of employee's satisfaction (i.e. academic and the non-academic staff) in higher education. Secondly, an employee satisfaction in higher education scale was developed and validated. Proof with regards to the measure's factor construction, scale validity and reliability are also given; which helped in setting up the basis for research to distinguish the drivers and execution results of employee satisfaction in higher education setting.

This paper could also contribute to the following. First, the information gotten could fill in as a benchmark for various higher education institutions in similar grasslands. Second, the data could be used to upgrade the fulfillment level offered in higher education institutions. Finally, the information would help higher education institutions get a clear picture of employee's satisfaction level.

The fundamental framework of this study is separated into 4 (four) areas. The theoretic context espoused to examine the degree of employee satisfaction is introduced in segment two. Three portrays the methodology espoused. It incorporates the research plan, the depiction of the samples utilized and the questionnaire structure. Section four depicts the investigation and outcomes, and segment five exhibits the conclusion, managerial implication, limitation and recommendation for further studies.

The essential point of the paper is upon the satisfaction dimension of the employees (academic and non-academic staff) of higher education institutions under specific indicators. An endeavor was made to discover those indicators which can upgrade the satisfaction level of staffs. Specifically, this study will look at the satisfaction dimension of the employees on the institution human resource function and policies; career / professional development; performance management; corporate culture and communications; employee compensation; employee roles, relations, and fulfillment; and work environment.

II. CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

A. Theoretical Framework

The speculations of employee satisfaction have two alternate points of view which are Content and Process theories.

Content theories have to do with individual needs and objectives. It basically deal with "what" motivates employees. The content perspective theories used in this paper is Cloyton's ERG theory. Whereas, process theories is concerned with the "process" of motivation and "how" motivation transpire. The process theory used in this paper is Adam's Equity theory.

➤ ERG Theory

With empirical exploration, Clayton Alderfer harmonized Maslow's hierarchy of need theory of motivation. In vogue of his modification, he retained Maslow's essential composition however re-sorted it into 3 (three) uncomplicated and more wide-ranging divisions of needs and titled it "ERG theory".

- *Existence Needs:* It is the most minimal dimension of necessities comprising the ultimate requirements for survival. In institution locale it integrates compensation, enhanced and secure workplace, welfares, and job security. Taking all things together, it incorporates a person physical and security need.
- *Relatedness Needs:* These integrate the yearnings a person holds regarding keeping up relational relations with his partners, bosses, and subordinates. A sensation of belongingness, Passionate support, respect, acknowledgment, societal needs and self-esteem needs.
- *Growth Needs:* It incorporated the requisite for self-enhancement and advancement. This should be possible by using one's capacities minus all potential limitations. Self-actualization needs and the inborn segments of regard needs fall under this classification.

Clayton Alderfer built up this theory to clarify human inspiration perspective by and large. It is germane to the work environment of higher education institutions, and it is prevalently used to clarify work satisfaction. In the institution setting, the fundamental physiological necessities incorporate the compensation bundle and health advantages of an employee. Staff will be more satisfied and this would bring about an increase in loyalty and commitment.

➤ Equity Theory

John Stacey, Adams proposes that individuals would equate the rewards they receive with that of other employees on comparable positions. And if he discovers them fair, impartial and just, he feels satisfied.

He is of the view that employees constantly tries to keep up a harmony between their impacts to the organization and the rewards given to them by the organization. On the off chance that an employee notice any form of inequality, such an employee would get demotivated, unhappy and give poor results.

Equity is of two types, which are; **External equity**; this emerges when workers contrast themselves with other people who play out the activity they do, but work in an alternate organization. **Internal equity**; this happens when workers contrast themselves with other people who perform diverse occupation yet work in a similar organization (Nurun, Islam, Dip, & Hossain. 2017).

This theory clarifies employee satisfaction in regard to remuneration in general. In any case, it tends to be appropriate to the work environment of higher education institutions, as staff in higher institutions analyzes their rewards with that of other staff on comparable positions in other higher institutions. If he discovers them impartial, reasonable and just, he feels fulfilled, however on the off chance that he discovers them not-fair he feels disappointed and should need to leave.

B. Conceptual Framework

The term employee satisfaction, job satisfaction and workers satisfaction has been used in a lot of satisfaction literature, and has been used interchangeably. Most of previous research was only focused on evaluating job satisfaction level amid academic staff (Khalid, Irshad, and Mahmood, 2012). Studies' concentrating on employee satisfaction among non-academic staff is as yet ailing in giving proof. A few issues have been talked about with respect to employee satisfaction among non-academic staff in universities. One issue is the difficulties faced by university students especially in communicating and dealing with non-academic staff. Although students can obtain some of the information from other sources (i.e. senior students, websites, etc.), but still they need to interact with the non-academic staff for some other purposes that required their assistance (i.e. application, registration, examination, etc.) (Yuliarini, Mat and Kumar, 2012).

Thus, this study seeks to address not just the factors that influence employee satisfaction level among academic staff but also nonacademic staff in higher institution, in order to ensure that good quality and service are offered to the main customer (i.e. students).

Formerly, the meaning of employee satisfaction is depicted as "a pleasurable or positive enthusiastic state coming about because of the evaluation of that job or the job experiences" (Locke,1976). Likewise, in concentrate by Tomazevic, Seljak, and Aristovnik, (2014), they characterized employee satisfaction as a lovely or positive enthusiastic

express that will result from the view of work, origination of workplace, appraisal of workplace, work involvement and the impression of all the component of the work and working environment. They likewise expressed that employee satisfaction is a fundamental factor in guaranteeing a long haul proficiency and adequacy of both open and private sectors.

Ukil (2016) specifies employee satisfaction is also known as job satisfaction, in which he additionally characterized it as a positive passionate express that shows the apparent connection between the exemption of an employee from his activity and his apparent offering the job.

From the above definitions one can simply say employee satisfaction is an enthusiastic express that estimates how glad workers are with their activity and workplace. It is a significant component that institutions ought to procure so as to support in the market for a long haul, as more elevated amount of employee satisfaction turns into an upper hand for an institution to be an innovator in business advertises.

It is mind boggling wonder that is swayed by variables like reimbursement, workplace condition, independence, communication, and authoritative onus (Vidal, Valle and Aragón, 2007).

Numerous multiple times, the satisfaction level of employees is determined by the compensation (financial/non-financial) they receive. Diverse individuals translate compensation in an unexpected ways. American Association regarded compensation as "*cash and non-cash remuneration provided by the employer for services rendered*".

Compensation is truly profitable device for satisfaction. Employees want a compensation that is equal to their own input in order for them to be satisfied.

It is additionally motivates an employee in duty with the establishment which in consequence upgrades fascination and maintenance (Chiu, Luk and Tang, 2002). It likewise fills in as correspondent when it is granted to employee against his administrations; it indicates the significance of the staff in the institution (Zobal, 1998).

Likewise, theories (ERG theory and Equity theory) gives a helpful system to understanding employee satisfaction, empowering us to characterize employee satisfaction as an organization's capacity to give certain requirements to employees, so as to make included an incentive for the institution and its investors (students). This definition takes an all-encompassing perspective of employee satisfaction develop as it not just thinks about a wide scope of employee satisfaction, yet additionally thinks about their execution suggestions.

➤ *Requirements for Employees Satisfaction*

It is essential for managements to comprehend employee dedication and happiness; how keen the workforces are and if workers are actually appeased by the fashion things are done in the institution.

A principle part of a HR Manager is the appraisal of employee satisfaction. Institutions are required to make certain that employee satisfaction is extreme amid the staff, which is a prerequisite for intensifying proficiency, excellence, responsiveness and client benefit.

In another exploration it is said that satisfaction impacts staff retention, efficiency and absenteeism. The achievement of any organization is specifically connected to the happiness of the employees who exemplify the organization. It is basic to keep skilled individuals in order to increase organization accomplishment, (Freeman, 2005).

Findings demonstrates that organizations which exceed expectations in employee satisfaction concerns diminish attrition by half, upsurge consumer loyalty to an mean of 95 % and bring down work cost by 12% (Carpitella, 2003).

Institutions should attempt their best to assess what fuels employee's dissatisfaction. Look at the underlying drivers – where does the issue lie? Is it profit or advantages? Does it have something to do with the job or work environment bolster? Or on the other hand is absence of appreciation or growth to fault. The onus is on the administration to keep employees connected with and cheerful, in order to convince them to remain. Actually, this is basic to institutions achievement.

C. *Conceptual measures*

Through survey of literatures, we can group the factors in employee satisfaction into primarily 2 general classes to be specific: Institutional Variables and Personal Variables

❖ *Institutional Variables*

This assumes an essential role in employee satisfaction. Since employees invest real piece of their energy in university, there are quantities of factors that decide the satisfaction of the employees. To expand employee satisfaction, the Institutional factors must be sorted out and very much oversaw.

Factors in this classification are:-

➤ *Institution Development*: this is an efficient process done to execute compelling modification in an institution. Its aim is to embolden institutions in adjusting well to the swift altering outer condition of modern markets, controls, and advances. It inaugurates with a watchful institution varied investigation of the present-day happening and of things to come necessities.

➤ *Strategies of Compensation and Gain*: it is the most essential factor. Employees have to be delighted with wages/salary bundles even when juxtaposing it with those insiders/outside who are operating in a related industry.

➤ *Advancement and Career Development*: There ought to be equivalent chance to develop in spite of being a male or female, likewise training projects ought to be set up for better skills, knowledge and behavior acquirement. Open door for advancement decides the level of satisfaction of an employee.

➤ *Job Satisfaction*: this is an estimation of employee's dimension of cheerfulness with their job and workplace. Job satisfaction is affected by job design.

➤ *Job Security*: this is a conviction by staff that they would persist in their existing employment. Staffs who exhibit an extreme level of job security have faint chances of leaving. Job security can be prejudiced by a worker's accomplishment, business success and the present-day economic milieu.

➤ *Working Environment & Condition*: great working conditions exceptionally motivate employees, as it gives a sentiment of comfort and safety. The level of comfort in an organization (e.g. accessibility of devices and equipment's, good ventilation, flawless offices and wash rooms, security monitors and so on), determines the satisfaction level of workers.

➤ *Relationship with Supervisor*: it is essential to have a good supervisor subordinate relationship because, one would need his/her expert information, helpful criticism, and overall perceptive.

➤ *Work Group*: it is essential that workers interact with one another so as to increase their sense of belongings. Isolated workers do despise their job.

➤ *Leadership Styles*: satisfaction is enormously improved/worse by the leadership style. Democratic leaders stimulate respect and cordial rapport amid employees. On the opposite, staff who work for dictatorial and bossy managers vent muffled dimension of happiness.

➤ *Other Factors*: other factors that influence satisfaction of employees are; sense of belongings, support and criticism, utilization of web and technologies for accomplishing tasks.

❖ *Personal Variables*

This likewise helps greatly in keeping up employee's motivation to work successfully and proficiently.

Factors in this classification are:-

- *Personality*: an individual's identity can be dictated by watching his mental condition. The components that decide the level of satisfaction here are recognition, frame of mind and learning.
- *Expectation*: satisfaction level is influenced by the level of employee's expectations. On the off chance that individual acquires additional result than projected, he will be extraordinarily satisfied and vice-versa.
- *Age*: It is believed that young employees having higher joie de vivre intensities are probably going to have extra employee satisfaction than aged employees. Old employees do oppose tolerating new styles.
- *Education*: this plays a noteworthy determinant of employee satisfaction as it gives a chance to building up one's identity and adlibs knowledge and analytical skill. Profoundly educated employees can figure out happening and survey it decidedly as they have steadfastness, objectivity and reasoning ability.
- *Gender Differences*: Women are bound to be pleased than men irrespective of being in similar work. For the most part ladies are bound to be fulfilled than men.
- ❖ *For what reason is employee satisfaction essential?*
This can be comprehended in 2 primary areas to be specific: to Institution and to Employee.

To the Institution:

- Increase efficiency due to stimulated employees.
- Decrease turnover, absenteeism, hiring, and training charges.
- Augment consumer loyalty and faithfulness.
- Increase solidarity.
- Improves a business picture.

To employees:

- Increases employee loyalty and commitment
- They will contemplate on the nature of their job.
- They would generate and provide top-quality help to the clients.
- They will make and convey better superior value to clients.
- Their work will be increasingly gainful.

III. METHODOLOGY

This division portrays the procedure that was utilized to build up the substance for the employee satisfaction dimensions and to approve the scale theoretically and psychometrically.

A. Item generation and content validity

➤ Study 1

In view of the meaning of employee satisfaction and an audit of the employee satisfaction literature, the foremost phase of the scale advancement procedure immersed item creation and an evaluation of subject matter validity. An interview with 18 individuals in Covenant University, which includes 3 lecturers, 5 non-academic staff, 2 PHD students, 6 Maters students and 2 undergraduate students, who are knowledgeable about employee's satisfaction in the university, was used to generate the item pool for my questionnaire. Some of which were from various colleges like college of business and social science, college of science and technology, college of engineering, leadership and development studies, as this make up the various colleges in the university.

Questionnaire administration is a brilliant technique to get understandings into a wonder of enthusiasm, as it provides nitty-gritty opinions of the staff (academic and non-academic) in Covenant University. Each respondent was able to fill the questionnaire under the space of 7 minutes as the questions were all closed ended which allows respondents to tick their choices. There was also no room for probing respondents as closed-ended questionnaire was used; respondents only have options to pick from.

Quantitative analysis was utilized to dissect the survey information, it is a trustworthy method which speaks to a deliberate and target methods for portraying and evaluating phenomena (Benoit & Holbert 2008). All questions were precise and easy to read by the respondents, which amounted to two (2) pages and a total of 30 questions. Coding was done utilizing the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 25 programming bundle, which is a broadly acknowledged investigation apparatus for quantitative research that permits a comprehensive exploration of questionnaire texts, it also limits the biasness of respondents and it is unassuming in nature (Krippendorff, 2013). Each theme of the questionnaire was coded and the findings and results were thoroughly analyzed.

Respondents where open to the nature of the questions that were asked in the survey, this is because of the research foundation in which the school is grounded. Respondents likewise concurred that employee satisfaction was not just regarded as essential to academic staff, but correspondingly regarded as important to non-academic staff. The closed-ended nature of the questions made it easy for respondents to tick from the available options, as valid to them.

As a major aspect of the item generation process, prevailing employee satisfaction measures were inspected. Scales created by Crosswell (2017), Best Companies Group (2017), Eco Canada Environmental Employer of the Year Awards (n.d), and Wellness Council of America (WELCOA) (2011) additionally inspected. In view of this an underlying pool of 62 items was spawned. Given that the point was to expand the content validity of the scale, a level of repetition was acknowledged in this phase of the scale's improvement (De Vellis, 1991).

So as to choose the supreme fitting things and check their appropriateness, the second phase included refining the item via a board of 2 Professors, 2 PHD students and 1 master's student. They professors were approached to survey and assess the importance of each inquiry concerning the classification to the category to which they are assigned to on a 5-point Likert-type scale which ran from "strongly disagree" (to) "strongly agree". In addition, Professors, doctoral and master's students in charge of the refinement were inquired as to whether they felt any of the inquiries reflected in more than one category, and if the questions were understandable, brief or excess. They eliminated the unnecessary questions, leaving a total of 27 questions which were used for this study.

The 27 retained questions were randomized and respondents were asked to scale their satisfaction level on a 5-point Likert-scale that ran from "strongly disagree" [1], to "strongly agree" [5]. The questionnaire contained two main parts which are part A and part B and all together the set of questionnaires consists of thirty-six items. Part A includes all

demographic profile questions with 6-item, questioned about the respondents' background (e.g. age, gender, education qualification, marital status, position in institution and length of service). Part B has seven (7) sections included dependent and independent variables of the research. Section B1, consists of 4-item for human resource function and policies. Followed by section B2 consists of 4-item for career/professional development, section B3 consists of 3-item for performance management, section B4 consists of 4-item for corporate culture and communications, section B5 consists of 4-item for employee satisfaction and compensation, section B6 consists of 4-item for employee roles, relations and fulfillment, and the last section B7 consists of 4-item for overall feelings about your employment experience.

To further improve the scale, the next phase included purifying the item, as it is laid out in the succeeding segment.

B. Item purification

➤ *Study 2*

Since the number of inhabitants in intrigue was employees (academic and non-academic), also, the reason for existing was to quantify employee satisfaction and not students satisfaction, employees (academic and non-academic) were surveyed. These respondents were workers of Covenant University. A paper-based poll overview was felt to be the most fitting information accumulation technique, as paper-based questionnaires saves time and cost less (Ward, 2004). (See table 1)

Employee satisfaction dimension	Examples drawn in questionnaire
HR Function and Policies	Staff issues are taken care of secretly, fairly, and in time.
	Managers live the fundamental beliefs of the university
	Management are free to contribution from employees
	The management policies creates a conducive work environment
Career / Professional Development	I am contented that this university offers all staff with training openings.
	I trust that the training strategy here is reasonable.
	This university provides the technology, equipment and resources needed carry out my responsibilities well
	I am urged to investigate development or headway openings inside the university
Performance Management	My administrator/supervisor offers me with clear heading.
	My administrator/supervisor offers me with beneficial criticism.
	My administrator/supervisor holds reliable performance assessments with me.
Corporate Culture and Communications	I trust there is a spirit of teamwork in this university
	I can trust what this university tells me
	The university allows a culture of diversity
	I know I can convey my true feelings without dread of negative outcomes.
Employee Satisfaction and Compensation	Salaries are competitive compared to other similar universities
	I'm satisfied with this university's benefits package
	We have many different benefits in addition to salary.
	The pay is fair for the work performed
Employee Roles, Relations, and Fulfillment	There are great working relations and cooperation at most levels in most departments.
	I enjoy the job I do
	Most days, I have the impression that I have made progress at work
	I am capable to sustain a rational harmony among job and personal life
General Feelings about Your Employment Experience	Most days, I anticipate going to work
	Am proud to work for this university
	Work is a real plus in my life.
	I would endorse a friend to work here

Table 1:- Dimensions of Employee Satisfaction

Source: Field Survey, 2018

The sample of target population was drawn at from all academic and non-academic employees from all colleges and departments. In order to determine the sample size, simple random sampling modus operandi was used to choose the list of samples of respondents from the total population. The simple random sampling strategy is conducted to make sure that every one of the populace has an equivalent shot of being chosen. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011),

simple random sampling technique includes choosing aimlessly from a rundown of populace that required number of subjects for the test. As this technique gives the affirmation that example will precisely mirror the genuine populace and this technique makes it easy to assemble the sample (Johnson & Christensen, 2010). Each component in the populace has indistinguishable equivalent opportunity to be chosen from the subject sample.

An aggregate of 50 responses were obtained, these respondents amounted to 26 males and 24 females, of which 4 of the respondents were between ages 16-25 years, 22 stood between ages 26-35 years, 18 stood between ages 36-45 years, and 6 stood between ages 46-55. Also, 13 respondents were single, 35 were married and just 2 divorced respondents. 4 of the respondents were BSc holders, 26 were MSc/MBA holders, and 20 were PHD holders. A number of 16 non-

academic staff was among the respondents, just 1 graduate assistant, 3 assistant lecturers, seven (7) lecturer 2, 13 were lecturer 1 and 10 senior lecturers. Just two (2) of the staff has worked in the university for not exactly a year, 9 has worked between 1-3 years, 25 respondents has worked between 4-6 years and 14 respondents have worked between 7-10 years. (See table 2)

Indicators	Gender		Age				Marital Status		
	Male (N=26)	Female (N=24)	16-25 years (N=4)	26-35 years (N=22)	36-45 years (N=18)	46-55 years (N=6)	Single (N=13)	Married (N=35)	Divorced (N=2)
HRFP	4.40	4.33	4.00	4.22	4.49	4.83	4.38	4.41	3.63
CDP	4.59	4.47	4.19	4.47	4.57	4.87	4.50	4.59	3.75
PM	4.51	4.35	3.83	4.41	4.41	5.00	4.36	4.49	4.00
CCC	4.42	4.32	3.89	4.20	4.61	4.58	4.19	4.45	4.25
ESC	3.99	4.18	3.50	3.88	4.18	4.92	3.96	4.19	3.00
ERRF	4.40	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.58	4.54	4.38	4.46	4.13
OYFEE	4.44	4.60	4.25	4.43	4.53	5.00	4.48	4.54	4.38
TOTAL- Σf/No. of indicators	26.94	26.76	23.80	26.08	27.49	29.45	26.41	27.24	23.39

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Indicators	Educational Qualification			Position in the institution					
	BSc (N=4)	Msc/MBA (N=26)	PhD (N=20)	Non-academic (N=16)	Graduate assistant (N=1)	Assistant lecturer (N=3)	Lecturer 2 (N=7)	Lecturer 1 (N=13)	Senior lecturer (N=10)
HRFP	4.19	4.24	4.58	4.22	4.00	4.08	4.43	4.62	4.38
CPD	4.25	4.51	4.61	4.31	4.00	4.42	4.82	4.73	4.50
PM	4.58	4.25	4.63	4.25	3.33	4.33	4.52	4.54	4.67
CCC	4.31	4.19	4.63	4.31	4.00	3.08	4.50	4.58	4.55
ESC	3.50	3.91	4.41	4.02	4.00	2.42	3.86	4.48	4.33
ERRF	4.63	4.33	4.51	4.50	3.75	3.58	4.46	4.62	4.35
OYFEE	4.75	4.35	4.70	4.50	4.75	4.08	4.29	4.56	4.78
TOTAL- Σf/No. of indicators	26.14	26.05	28.04	26.25	19.76	22.49	27.20	28.22	27.46

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Indicators	Length of service			
	Less than 1 year (N=2)	1-3 years (N=9)	4-6 years (N=25)	7-10 years (N=14)
HRFP	3.88	4.56	4.33	4.39
CDP	3.88	4.56	4.56	4.55
PM	4.17	4.52	4.39	4.50
CCC	4.38	4.36	4.32	4.48
ESC	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.13
ERRF	4.38	4.58	4.29	4.57

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 2:- Mean Score of Employee Satisfaction Variables by Demography

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

A. Item reduction and exploratory factor analysis

So as to make the employee satisfaction scale and its structure valid, a sequence of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were embraced (Bearden, Hardesty & Rose, 2001). Preceding this, the data were inspected to recognize outliers and to test for defilements of the suppositions of multivariate analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 25) was utilized to attempt this fundamental analysis and the underlying exploratory factor analysis (EFA), while SPSS was utilized to gauge the several confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) methods.

A progression of exploratory factor analyses were at first embraced on the analysis test utilizing principal component analysis as there was no from the earlier motivation to expect the measurements were not related. The Kaiser– Meyer– Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.682, recommending that factor analysis was correct. An iterative procedure was utilized to dispose of items with low loadings or high cross loadings (Hair, Bush and Oritnau, 2006), which prompted the retention of 27 items shown in Table 3.

SCALE ITEM		FACTOR LOADINGS					
Human Resource Function and Policies (HRFP)							
Item 1	Staff issues are taken care of secretly, fairly, and in time.	0.493					
Item 2	Managers live the fundamental beliefs of the university	0.606					
Item 3	Management are free to contribution from employees	0.494					
Item 4	The management policies creates a conducive work environment	0.522					
Career / Professional Development (CPD)							
Item 5	I am contented that this university offers all staff with training openings.		0.507				
Item 6	I trust that the training strategy here is reasonable.	0.729					
Item 7	This university provides the technology, equipment and resources needed carry out my responsibilities well	0.422					
Item 8	I am urged to investigate development or headway openings inside the university					0.414	
Performance Management (PM)							
Item 9	My administrator/supervisor offers me with clear heading.	0.621					
Item 10	My administrator/supervisor offers me with beneficial criticism.	0.600					
Item 11	My administrator/supervisor holds reliable performance assessments with me.	0.336					
Corporate Culture and Communications (CCC)							
Item 12	I trust there is a spirit of teamwork in this university	0.535					
Item 13	I can trust what this university tells me	0.623					
Item 14	The university allows a culture of diversity	0.516					
Item 15	I know I can convey my true feelings without dread of negative outcomes.	0.705					
Employee Satisfaction and Compensation (ESC)							
Item 16	Salaries are competitive compared to other similar universities					0.597	
Item 17	I'm satisfied with this university's benefits package	0.726					
Item 18	We have many different benefits in addition to salary.	0.669					
Item 19	The pay is fair for the work performed	0.680					
Employee Roles, Relations, and Fulfillment (ERRF)							
Item 20	There are great working relations and cooperation at most levels in most departments.	0.661					
Item 21	I enjoy the job I do	0.575					
Item 22	Most days, I have the impression that I have made progress at work				0.539		
Item 23	I am capable to sustain a rational harmony among job and	0.662					

	personal life						
Overall Feelings about Your Employment Experience (OFYEE)							
Item 24	Most days, I anticipate going to work	0.560					
Item 25	Am proud to work for this university			0.560			
Item 26	Work is a real plus in my life.				0.470		
Item 27	I would endorse a friend to work here	0.553					

Table 3:- Exploratory Factor Analysis for Employee Satisfaction
Source: Field Survey, 2018

An examination of the factor loadings recommended that the primary factor was labeled Human Resource Function and Policies (i.e. an institutions ability to create policies that would lead to an increase in employee satisfaction).

The second dimension reflects Career / Professional Development (i.e., an institution ability to develop the career of it staff through the provision of tools, resources, and training and development programs, which would in turn lead to an increase in the satisfaction of employees).

The third dimension measured Performance Management (i.e., an institutions ability to appraise the performance of its staff, and provide constructive feedback that would help employees grow in their career, and would in turn lead to an increase in the satisfaction of employees).

The fourth dimension reflects Corporate Culture and Communications (i.e., an institution ability to increase in the satisfaction of it staff through corporation, enabling a culture of diversity and good communication network).

The fifth dimension measured Employee Satisfaction in relation to Compensation (i.e., an institution ability to increase in the satisfaction of it staff through paying them fairly for the work they perform, the remuneration has to be equal to the staff input and also competitive in relation to other universities).

The sixth dimension measured Employee Roles, Relations, and Fulfillment (i.e., an institution ability to increase in the satisfaction of it staff through good working relations and teamwork, which would make employees feel satisfied with the job they perform).

The seventh dimension reflects the Overall Feelings staff have about their Employment Experience (i.e., If they look forward to going to work and would recommend the work place to their friends).

Cronbach alphas for the seven measurements were 0.721, 0.685, 0.816, 0.768, 0.848, 0.772, and 0.771, respectively. All dimensions, but Career / Professional Development were well over the prescribed lower farthest point of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2006), proposing that the scales are inconsistent. (See table 4)

EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION VARAIBLES	CRONBACH ALPHA
Human Resource Function and Policies	0.721
Career / Professional Development	0.685
Performance Management	0.816
Corporate Culture and Communications	0.768
Employee Satisfaction and Compensation	0.848
Employee Roles, Relations, and Fulfillment	0.772
Overall Feelings about Your Employment Experience	0.771

Table 4:- Cronbach Alpha Analysis for Employee Satisfaction
Source: Field Survey, 2018

B. Exploratory factor analysis

So as to evaluate the scale factor structure, the researcher attempted a confirmatory factor analysis. Ceaseless changes were made in which an item was expelled in every one of the emphasis until the parameter arrived endorsed standards. Along these lines a portion of the items were wiped out, bringing about the 27 items dimensional scale that is appeared in table 3. Table 3 above demonstrates the different fit insights for employee satisfaction scale for both the analysis and validation samples.

C. Reliability and validity assessment

Coefficient alpha approximations stood at 0.606 for the revised HR Function and Policies dimension, 0.729 for the revised Career / Professional Development dimension, 0.621 for the revised Performance Management dimension, 0.705 for the revised Corporate Culture and Communications dimension, 0.726 for the revised Employee Satisfaction and Compensation dimension, and 0.662 for the revised Employee Roles, Relations, and Fulfillment measurement, on account of the analysis sample. Majority of the indicator t-values were substantial (pb 0.05), supporting the convergent validity of each measurement (as shown in table 5).

		Loding	Indicator Reliability	Error Variance	Composite Reliability	Average	No. of Indicators
	Variables	> 0.7		< 0.5	> 0.8	< 0.5	
HR function and policies	Live core value	0.606	0.3672	0.6328	0.3672	0.3672	1
Career/Profession Develop.	Fair training policy	0.729	0.5314	0.4686	0.5314	0.5314	1
Performance management	Clear direction	0.621	0.3856	0.6144	0.3856	0.5656	1
	Constructive feedback	0.6	0.3600	0.6400	0.3600		1
Corp. culture & commun	Trust the university	0.623	0.3881	0.6119	0.3881	0.6366	1
	Express opinion without fear	0.705	0.4970	0.5030	0.4970		1
Employee satisfaction & compensation	Satisfied with benefit	0.726	0.5271	0.4729	0.5271	1.128	1
	Added many diff	0.669	0.4476	0.5524	0.4476		1
	benefits Fair pay	0.68	0.4624	0.5376	0.4624		1
Employee role, retention and fulfillment	Compensation	0.661	0.4369	0.5631	0.4369	0.656	1
	Employees Involvement	0.662	0.4382	0.5618	0.4382		1

Table 5:- Result of Validity and Reliability for Employee Satisfaction

All loading are significant at $p < 0.0001$

Source: Field Survey, 2018

D. Replication of the Operational Efficiency Scale

The result of the confirmatory factor analysis which was assessed for the validation of sample data gave additional proof that the operational efficiency display was a rational portrayal of data (see table 2).

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study was done at one of the private universities in Nigeria. This institution is involved in education sector. The present research makes a number of substantial inputs to theory and practice using an incorporated methodology, and thorough scale improvement techniques to empirically validate employee satisfaction scale in higher institution context. The study adds as per the satisfaction of employees in higher institution written works in a few imperative ways.

The study answers recent ongoing calls to gauge the routes through which higher institutions increase the satisfaction of its employees, since proof recommends the thought of satisfaction, which advanced dependent on concepts created in education sector, may not be the same in other sectors.

The present discoveries bolster this assertion and give an increasingly engaged comprehension of the employees satisfaction construct. Educated by bits of knowledge from earlier research, we conceptualized, built, refined and tried a

dimensional scale that estimates employee satisfaction. In the first scale development stage we picked up a top to bottom understanding into the scope of measurements of employee satisfaction in this specific setting, which shaped the reason for the consequent phases of scale development and refinement that utilized a paper-based study ($n = 50$). The procedure prompted the development of a seven-dimensional (human resource function and policies, career/professional development, performance management, corporate culture and communications, employee satisfaction and compensation, employee roles, relations and fulfillment, and overall feelings about your employment experience), and 27-item employee satisfaction scale that mirrors the attributes of higher education Institutions center obligations and exercises.

The study gives an increasingly point by point and logically quick conceptualization of employee satisfaction in higher education institution than what has previously been offered. The Human Resource Function and Policies dimension reflects an institutions ability to increase the satisfaction of its staff through the creation and execution of policies. The Career / Professional Development dimension reflects an institution ability to increase the satisfaction of its staff through the provision of tools, resources, and training and development programs. The Performance Management dimension reflects an institutions ability to increase the satisfaction of its staff through performance appraisal, and provision of constructive feedback. The Corporate Culture and

Communications dimension reflects an institution ability to increase the satisfaction of its staff through corporation, enabling a culture of diversity and good communication network. The Employee Satisfaction and Compensation dimension reflects an institution ability to increase the satisfaction of its staff through paying them fairly for the work they perform. The Employee Roles, Relations, and Fulfillment dimension reflects an institution ability to increase in the satisfaction of its staff through good working relations and teamwork; while Overall Feelings staff have about their Employment Experience dimension reflects if staff look forward to going to work and would recommend the work place to their friends.

The employee satisfaction measurement is vital in a higher institution setting, and connections two factors of employee satisfaction measurement (institutional variables and personal variables). In prior research, employee satisfaction was based on banking industry and manufacturing industry. The present study proposes that these conceptualizations are not fitting for higher institutions and that estimating employee satisfaction dependent on scales created in other ventures does not permit a precise estimation of employee satisfaction in this particular setting. Contemporary researches have shown the significance of higher institutions in adding to neighborhood financial advancement, top research, high critical occupations and development (Etzkowitz, 2002).

The analysis from the current study revealed that the satisfaction level of employees in higher institutions can be increased through provision of better and fair compensation, better performance appraisal, enabling a culture of diversity, better communication network, better health and family facilities, introducing new tools, resources, and training and development programs and introducing new institution policies.

The higher institutions administrators need to place more efforts on all these.

VI. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

This study generates quite a few implications for university management and faculty members within the university. Firstly, for managers in higher institutions, the study demonstrated the results of the effects of putting in place a better satisfaction strategy and inculcating it in the universities culture to enhance staff performance. Also, the study furnishes managers with a better grained depiction about how and where their institution needs to enhance its employee satisfaction in an increasingly successful way. For example, the dimension of a higher institution employee satisfaction should aid management in evaluating primacy satisfaction stretches that need to be focused on. Furthermore, the study also offers opinions about the discussion in managing employee satisfaction in higher institutions. It is apparent that by enhancing satisfaction in higher institutions it does not only

improve the institutions reputation but also the reputation of the members of the institution including students, alumni and faculty members. As a result, it is an expedient drive to bring about satisfaction and its functions alongside understanding the needs of staff for resourcefulness.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Research works are liable to one type of impediment or the other. The findings for the study are revealed to be the bases for the limitations. Firstly, the measures used to establish all constructs used were retrieved from one source (by choosing the institution that is currently being ranked as the best institution in Nigeria and West Africa using the Times Higher Ranking) and hence may be focused on the opinions of respondents. Therefore we endeavored to curtail this limitation throughout the scale development course by carrying out surveys with structured items in other to determine a valid result on the subject matter and not what managers or experts supposed they should be. Secondly, the study was carried out using a private church-based institution, and so the results may not be generalizable to public, state and private non-church-based institutions. Conceding that these limitations are acknowledged, they do not emasculate from the implications of the study discoveries but make available grounds for further research. The study offers vital discernments into how employee satisfaction in higher institutions can be improved for better performance, productivity and to gain a competitive height.

Further researches are promising in areas like; Researchers can utilize the structure and methodology to examine job satisfaction of employees in other institutions. Future research should additionally explore not just institution with satisfaction, like those accomplished by the staffs of the institution observed here, yet additionally institutions whose staff may express low satisfaction. Further researches should work on enhancing the legal bodies to employee satisfaction it is additionally attractive to reveal some insight into how demographic attributes such as gender, grades and social and economic foundation impact employee satisfaction. Another intriguing bearing could be to contrast the satisfaction level of alumni from Polytechnic Institutes with alumni in similar fields from Universities. Future research into these conceivably productive zones is heartened.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thankfully recognize the support from Covenant University Ota, Ogun state, Nigeria.

In addition, we want to stretch out our significant appreciation to the anonymous re-viewers who gave useful and point by point input, and to the editors of this exceptional issue, Prof. OGUNNAIKE, O. Also, Dr. BORISHADE, T. for their direction amid the survey procedure.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Benoit, W. C. and Holbert, L. R. 2008. 'Empirical Intersections in Communication Research: Replication, Multiple Quantitative Methods, and Bridging the Quantitative Qualitative Divide.' *Journal of Communication*, 58, 615-628.
- [2]. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Surveys, longitudinal, cross-sectional and trend studies. *Research Methods in Education*, 7th edition. Abingdon: Routledge, 261-4.
- [3]. De Vellis, R. F. (1991). Scale development: Theory and applications. London: Sage Publications.
- [4]. Den Hertog, P., Van der Aa, W., & De Jong, M. W. (2010). Capabilities for managing service innovation: Towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of Service Management*, 21(4), 490 -514.
- [5]. Etzkowitz, H. (2002). Entrepreneurial scientists and entrepreneurial universities in American academic science. *Minerva*, 21(2-3), 198–233
- [6]. Hair, J. F., Jr., Black, W. D., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- [7]. Khalid, S., Irshad, M. Z., & Mahmood, B. (2012). Job satisfaction among academic staff: A comparative analysis between public and private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 126.
- [8]. Krippendorff, K. 2004. *Content Analysis. An Introduction to its methodology*. 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- [9]. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*.
- [10]. Nurun, N., Islam, M., Dip, T. M., Hossain, A. A. (2017). Impact of Motivation on Employee Performances: A Case Study of Karmasangsthan Bank Limited, Bangladesh. *Arabian Journal of Business Management Review* 7, 293.
- [11]. SPSS (2018). *Statistical package for social sciences*. (Version. 25.00). SPSS Inc.
- [12]. Tomaževič, N., Seljak, J., & Aristovnik, A. (2014). Factors influencing employee satisfaction in the police service: the case of Slovenia. *Personnel review*, 43(2), 209-227.
- [13]. Tooksoon, H. M. P. (2011). Conceptual framework on the relationship between human resource management practices, job satisfaction, and turnover. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 2(2), 41-49.
- [14]. Ukil, M. I. (2016). The impact of employee empowerment on employee satisfaction and service quality: empirical evidence from financial enterprises in Bangladesh. *Business: Theory and Practice/Verslas: Teorija ir Praktika*, 17(2), 178-189.
- [15]. Vroom, V. H (1964) *Work and motivation*. New York, Wiley & Sons, 1964, 20-22.
- [16]. Ward, P., (2004). *360 Degree Feedback*. Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.
- [17]. Yuliarini, S., Mat, N. K. N., & Kumar, P. (2012). Factors Affecting Employee Satisfaction among Non-teaching Staff in Higher Educational Institutions in Malaysia. *American Journal of Economics*, 93-96.
- [18]. Zobal, C. (1998). The ideal team compensation system – an overview: Part I. *Team Perform. Management.*, 4(5) : 235-249.