

**INFLUENCE OF RECOGNITION, REWARDS, REMUNERATION,
COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS ON THE LECTURERS' JOB SATISFACTION
IN KENYAN UNIVERSITIES**

Henry Kiptiony Kiplangat

Vice Chancellor

Kabarak University

P.O. Box Private Bag - 20157, Kabarak, KENYA

ABSTRACT: *To have in place quality staff that can make meaningful contribution, certain supportive incentives and measures are necessary. This paper examines the influence of such supportive incentives on the lecturers' job satisfaction in Kenyan Universities. A study that targeted 2,773 members of university management and lecturers in the chartered public and private universities within Rift Valley Region of Kenya was undertaken. The study used a sample of 605 participants and employed convergent parallel mixed methods design. Purposive sampling was also used to select information-rich cases. Questionnaires, interview and document analysis guides were used for data collection. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation coefficient, independent-samples t-test, One-way ANOVA and regression coefficients, with the use of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20 were used. The study identified job satisfaction elements like fair promotions, assignment of additional responsibility as a result of outstanding work, among others. However, potential sources of job dissatisfaction included: lack of competitive rates; lack of adequacy of pay commensurate to work done; dissatisfaction with salary, among others. The author recommends that universities should work towards raising the level of job satisfaction through supportive incentives.*

KEYWORDS: Recognition, Rewards, Remuneration, Incentives, Job satisfaction, Benefits and Compensation

INTRODUCTION

The search for the causes of either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is an ongoing area of interest for managers and social scientists (Santhapparaj & Alam, 2005). The premise being that satisfied employees will be more productive and remain within the institution longer, whereas dissatisfied employees will be less productive and more persuaded to quit (Sarker *et al.*, 2003). Moreover, one major reason for the continuing interest in job satisfaction is that positive and negative attitudes or perceptions towards work may exert strong influences on many forms of organizational behaviour. Relevant research data have shown the importance of job satisfaction in an organization, particularly, in terms of its productivity, efficiency, employee relations, absenteeism and turnover (Santhapparaj & Alam, 2005).

According to Luthans (2005), job satisfaction is attributed to employees' perception of how adequately their job provides those things which are considered important. Muindi (2011) noted that job satisfaction is important for both the employer and employee. For the employer, employee satisfaction guarantees committed staff and stable workforce which drastically reduce recruitment and training costs. For the employees, job satisfaction makes

them feel secure and fulfilled. Consequently, it leads to employee commitment, decreased absenteeism and reduced employee turnover.

LITERATURE UNDERPINNING

Raising the level of job satisfaction is important for its humanitarian benefit and for its monetary value due to its influence on employee behaviour (Bavendum, 2000). Moreover, Bavendum has seen that workers with higher job satisfaction levels are convinced that the institution will be satisfying in the long run, care about the quality of their work, are more committed to the institution, have higher retention rates and are more productive. According to Küskü (2001), the fact that the level of job satisfaction is as important to the employee as it is for the organization, is an issue frequently emphasized in studies on management and organisational behaviour. She also pointed out that with the understanding of the importance of employee satisfaction many top managers have encouraged their institutions to make endeavours in this direction.

Santhapparaj and Alam (2005) found that pay, promotion, working condition and support of research had positive and significant effect on job satisfaction, whereas fringe benefits and support of teaching had negative effect on job satisfaction in private universities in Malaysia. From the late 1950s several researchers have theorized about the nature of job satisfaction and developed frameworks, which try to explain differences in job satisfaction as found out in empirical studies (Ssesanga & Garrett, 2005). One of the better-known theories was developed by Herzberg in 1959, as stated earlier. According to Herzberg *et al.*, (1959), this theory proposed that job satisfaction is not a unidimensional concept. But that intrinsic variables related to personal growth and development (satisfiers), such as achievement, recognition, responsibility and promotion, and which contribute to job satisfaction, are distinct and separate from those extrinsic factors, related to the work environment security (Hygiene factors), for example salary, and which account for job dissatisfaction or its reduction. The hygiene factors are not directly associated with increasing job satisfaction; but they can contribute towards decreasing dissatisfaction.

A study by Tansel and Gazioglu (2013) investigated the job satisfaction in relation to managerial attitudes towards employees and firm size using the linked employer - employee survey results in Britain. They first investigated the management - employee relationships and the firm size using maximum likelihood profit estimation. Thereafter, they related various measures of job satisfaction to the management - employee relations via maximum likelihood ordered profit estimates. Four job satisfaction measures not often used were considered, namely: satisfaction with influence over job; satisfaction with amount of pay; satisfaction with sense of achievement; and satisfaction with respect from supervisors.

The main findings indicated that the management - employee relationships were less satisfactory in the large firms than in the small firms. Job satisfaction levels were lower in large firms. Moreover, less satisfactory management - employee relationships in the large firms may be a major source of the observed lower level of job satisfaction in them. In this paper, the author questions whether such findings could be obtained from universities in a country with a different socio-economic environment such as Kenya.

In addition, Santhapparaj and Alam (2005) examined the relationships between pay, promotion, fringe benefits, working condition, support of research, support of teaching, gender and academic staff job satisfaction in private universities in Malaysia. The study

population comprised private university academics in Malaysia. A total of 400 questionnaires were administered to potential respondents who were randomly selected from three universities. Among the 400 survey questionnaires mailed, 31 were returned due to obsolete addresses. Of the remainder 369 questionnaires, 173 usable responses were returned, for a final response rate of 43 per cent.

The regression results showed that pay, promotion, working condition and support of research had positive and significant effect on job satisfaction. However, this study found that fringe benefits and support of teaching had negative effect on job satisfaction. Moreover, Mann-Whitney U test results indicated that female academic staff were more satisfied with all the facets than their male counterparts. It seemed that women enjoyed their working environment and did not have higher expectations in terms of promotion or pay, in general. Can such findings be replicated in a study involving chartered universities in Kenya?

METHODOLOGY

Mixed methods design, particularly convergent parallel mixed methods, was used. This involved both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Many designs exist in the mixed methods field, but Creswell (2014) focuses on three basic mixed methods designs namely: Convergent parallel mixed methods, explanatory sequential mixed methods and exploratory sequential mixed methods. The study targeted all the Vice Chancellors (VCs), Deputy Vice Chancellors (DVCs), Registrars, Deans, Head of Departments (HoDs) and lecturers in the chartered public and private universities in Rift Valley Region (RVR) of Kenya. The manner in which the university management discharges its duties and responsibilities will directly affect the lecturers in the context of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction on their jobs. The study targeted 2,773 members of university management and lecturers in the chartered public and private universities with their main campuses in Rift Valley Region. A sample size of 605 participants was then obtained through purposive sampling which enabled the author to select information-rich participants for the study. The study used three research instruments to collect data namely: questionnaire, interview guide and document analysis guide. Data analysis was done by coding and categorizing qualitative data into themes while quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics. This was done with the help of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study sought to establish whether university's recognition, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits had any effect on academic staff job satisfaction. The attitudes of deans and lecturers concerning recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits were sought. To determine whether deans were satisfied with their own performance, they were asked to rate various aspects on recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits with results as displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Deans' Attitude on Recognition, Promotion, Rewards, Remuneration, Compensation and Benefits (N=120)

	SD	D	Av.	A	SA	Av.
Likert items	%	%	%	%	%	%
Promotions are done fairly by management	4.2	8.5	6	41.5	31.4	16
Management ensures that the most competent/qualified person is promoted	4.2	9.3	7	41.5	28.0	35
If my work is outstanding I can count on additional responsibility	0.8	8.5	5	44.9	26.3	36
Individual initiative is encouraged at my faculty/school/department	1.7	5.1	3	44.9	33.9	39
Management gives timely recognition for work that is well done	4.2	18.6	11	28.8	13.6	21
Creativity is rewarded by my university	3.4	18.6	11	30.5	11.9	21
Surpassed targets are rewarded by my University	4.2	25.4	15	24.6	17.6	21
I am rewarded fairly for the job I do	19.3	14.4	17	34.7	10.2	22
Benefits at my univeristy are better than for other universities in Kenya	11	22	17	15.3	11.9	14
My salary is adequate for the work I do	17.8	32.2	21	22.9	10.2	17
Generally, academic staff are satisfied with their salary and other material benefits at my university	19.5	22	21	23.7	4.2	14
There is respect for my ideas	1.7	12.7	7	49.2	11	30
There is appreciation for my input	1.7	11.9	7	47.5	13.6	31
I think my salary is low in relation to the work I do	18.6	15.3	17	24.6	23.7	24
Total Average	16	16	13	34	18	24

The findings in Table 1 show that majority of the deans rated management's efforts in compensating the academic staff with good scores. Certain areas that concerned pay did not receive strong support from the deans, indicating a need in that area. The issues concerning recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits by management are discussed in detail in subsequent paragraphs. On the other hand, to determine whether lecturers were satisfied with recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits, they were asked to rate various aspects of these and results displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: Lecturers' Attitude on Recognition, Promotion, Rewards, Remuneration, Compensation and Benefits (N=360)

Likert items	SD %	D %	Av. %	A %	SA %	Av. %
Promotions are done fairly	7.7	17.1	12	40.5	12.9	27
Management ensures that the most competent/qualified person is promoted	7.7	17.4	13	40.5	13.5	27
If my work is outstanding I can count on additional responsibility	7.7	14.6	11	38.8	9.9	24
Individual initiative is encouraged at my faculty/school/department	5	16.5	11	43.8	10.2	27
Management gives timely recognition for work that is well done	6.6	24	15	35.3	7.2	21
Creativity is rewarded by my university	6.9	26.7	17	29.8	6.3	18
Surpassed targets are rewarded by my university	8.5	27.8	18	22.6	3.9	13
I am rewarded fairly for the job I do	8	24.6	16	33.3	4.4	19
Benefits at my university are better than for other universities in Kenya	15.7	22.6	19	17.4	8	13
My salary is adequate for the work I do	17.6	35.3	26	24.5	5.5	15
Generally, I am satisfied with the salary and other material benefits	17.9	30.9	24	27.5	5.8	17
There is respect for my ideas	6.1	23.1	15	39.9	3.9	22
There is appreciation for my input	5.5	18.2	12	44.4	5	25
I think my salary is low in relation to the work I do	9.6	19.8	15	32.5	19.3	26
Total Average	9	23	16	31	9	21

The discussions that follow on recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits are based on the results displayed on Table 1 and Table 2. The deans and lecturers' responses showed that promotions were done fairly by management as depicted by 16% and 27% respectively for deans and lecturers.

To confirm this finding was an interview response from one Registrar who revealed that prudent financial management and fair promotion criteria made the academic staff generally comfortable with the university as an employer, R1, (Personal communication, February 23, 2015). In addition, interview data from a Vice Chancellor gave insight on relationship between promotion criteria and job satisfaction by revealing that "clear university policies on, say, promotion criteria lead to job satisfaction among academics whereas unclear policies result in dissatisfied academic staff" (VC1, personal communication, December 3, 2014).

Despite this finding, another Registrar, responding to the question on challenges management faced, revealed that one challenge was promotion criteria: "Why was so and so promoted?" (R1, personal communication, February 23, 2015). According to yet another Registrar: "complaints related to promotions are rampant. Lecturers who have served for long are not promoted promptly. Complaints arise about the timing of promotions. For example, I have received complaints from a lecturer who said I have published enough

research papers but I have not been promoted. The process from advertisement to promotion is too long” (R2, personal communication, December 9, 2014).

In addition, data from document analysis revealed that in one university, 2014/2015 senior staff promotion criteria and process from the advertisement(s), short listing, interview and the promotion policy document(s) had glaring discrepancies that hatched faulty and unfair process to all the players as illustrated by the following irregularities: three different promotion criteria were applied; the short listing committee was not fairly constituted; some candidates met the minimum prerequisite qualifications but were not short-listed for interviews; some candidates were short-listed, interviewed then told that they lacked minimum prerequisite qualifications; some candidates had their documents plucked out and hence unfairly denying them their promotion and, other candidates had been compelled to reapply for their promotion for no apparent reason.

The union demanded an urgent redress into this anomaly through the following measures: all the university teaching staff members due for their promotion be fairly subjected to the same promotion policy as approved by senate; which is the only one currently known policy; members who have had their applications submitted should not be compelled to reapply but be interviewed based on their earlier application; the short-listing committee be reconstituted transparently and be made public and independent and lastly, and of much interest to this study, was that the promotion exercise should be redone urgently to those unfairly disadvantaged to avoid further demoralization of the staff. Demoralization has serious consequences for an institution as illustrated by findings of a study by Mustapha and Zakaria (2013). They observed that the respondents who did not agree that promotions were done fairly may consider leaving the institutions where they work, if they do not experience equal promotion opportunities.

Lambert and Paoline (2008) cited in Kipkebut (2010) argued that the promotion procedures must be seen to be fair, clear and objective (as opposed to informal methods) therefore mitigating the negative feelings of employees who are not promoted. Naveed *et al.* (2011) examined promotion as a predictor of job satisfaction and found that an effective promotion policy enhances job satisfaction among employees, which increases productivity and organization performance in general.

On promotion of the most competent person, an average of 7% deans disagreed, while 35% agreed that promotion was competence based. The lecturers’ responses on the same showed that a smaller percentage (13% averagely) disagreed to it. The lecturers who agreed that promotion was based on the competence of a person, accounted for 27% on average. The study therefore established that management ensured that the most competent person was promoted. However, according to information from one of the interviewed Registrars, “promotion or appointment based on loyalty and not competence or meritocracy leads to discontentment hence dissatisfaction” (R6, personal communication, December 9, 2014).

Academic staff is reportedly satisfied when there are promotional opportunities. Academic staff are motivated, committed, have increased morale, performance and job satisfaction (Kosteas, 2009, cited in Amzat & Idris, 2012). Ngethe *et al.*, (2012) observed that the degree an employee perceives his or her chances to grow and be promoted within the organization is crucial to staff job satisfaction, hence, retention. Employees expect to work in jobs that provide them with opportunities to be promoted to new and challenging positions. Kipkebut

(2010) observed that employees who were promoted receive increased pay, high status and their self esteem is boosted resulting in increased job satisfaction unlike employees who stagnate in the same position.

Another area examined was whether one was given additional responsibility as a result of outstanding work. The deans' reactions were as follows: 0.8% and 8.5% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with a total average of 6% while 44.9% and 26.3% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 36%. For the lecturers, the following reactions were recorded: 7.7% and 14.6% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with an average of 11% while 38.8% and 9.9% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 24%. Hence, the study found that one was given additional responsibility as a result of outstanding work. A Vice Chancellor shed light on the advantages of having a clear promotional criterion by asserting that:

Power struggles can be remedied by developing clear promotion criteria and implementing them fairly. When the most deserving candidates are recognized and promoted in a transparent and fair manner, confidence in the university processes and procedures is built thereby greatly diminishing or eradicating power struggles within the institution (VC1, personal communication, December 3, 2014).

Promotional procedures and the presence of promotional opportunities and career paths have a positive relationship with organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Public universities should establish a clear system of promotions that is based on performance and merit, and thereby cushion the promotion process against unfair practices such as favouritism and ethnicity (Kamoche et al. 2004; Lambert & Paoline, 2008 cited in Kipkebut, 2010).

Whether individual initiative was encouraged at the faculty was also scrutinized by seeking the deans' responses to it. 1.7% and 5.1% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with an average of 3% while agree and strongly agree had 44.9% and 33.9%, in that order, with an average of 39%. On the other hand, the lecturers' responses were as follows: 5% and 16.5% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with an average of 11% while agree and strongly agree had 43.8% and 10.2%, with an average of 27%. The study therefore established that individual initiative was encouraged at the faculty. According to response from one of the Registrars, individual initiative benefits through performance appraisal which in turn enhances academic staff's job satisfaction:

We assess the performance of our lecturers through performance appraisal. Performance appraisal places lecturers where they belong and helps them to know how they are performing so as to adjust. Performance appraisals are consultative, that is, between the supervisor and concerned lecturers. The lecturers correct any existing deviation. Feedback on individual's performance is received annually. Performance appraisal is a feedback tool that tracks a lecturer's performance. It encourages mobility by assuming new job assignments, gives honest and objective feedback, inspires individuals to explore and try new ideas. It is a part of sharing information with supervisors. It is a mentoring programme because you subject the lecturer to performance appraisal throughout the year. It also provides a basis for promotions (R4, personal communication, December 11, 2014).

The study examined if management gave timely recognition for work well done and the deans reacted as follows: 4.2% and 18.6% indicated strongly disagree and disagree, in that order, with a total average of 11% while 28.8% and 13.6% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 21%. On the lecturers' part, the responses on whether management gave timely recognition for work that was well done were as follows: 6.6% and 24% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order with a total average of 15% while 35.3% and 7.2% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 21%. Hence, the study found that management gave timely recognition for work that was well done. Mirza (2005) defined encouraging the heart as the process of recognition and appreciation of workers' contributions and efforts.

However, document analysis from correspondences between UASU (University Academic Staff Union) and the university management (2012-2015) indicated that lecturers were dissatisfied with delayed payments due them. The study found the following serious grievances as were raised by UASU for managements' attention in one university: Privately Sponsored Students Programme (PSSP) payments not paid because the anticipated fee collection was not realized due to student unrest; PSSP money was used to pay salaries because capitation delayed; post graduate supervision not paid; loss of external part timers because of non payments; delays in preparing and releasing appointment letters; handing over asserts taking too long, affecting payment of postgraduate supervision; external examiners not paid, as a result, some external examiners left exams halfway marked.

In addition, delayed payment of salaries causing inconvenience with reason being due to month of February being too short, hence delayed capitation from the treasury; delays in remittance of statutory and loan deductions led to penalties for late payments; union members who left the university not been paid their CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement) arrears; examination results and transcripts withheld due to lack of part time payments; members blacklisted by Credit Reference Bureaus (CRB) due to salary delays; delay in payments of salaries for the month of June, July and August led to members failure to pay school fees; and lastly, bank penalties on late loan repayments. On a brighter side, interview contribution from a Vice Chancellor gave insight on the relationship between recognition and job satisfaction by revealing that:

Recognition is key for academic staff job satisfaction. We have student evaluation of academic staff every semester. At the end of every year in June, analysis is done, peers informed, then moderated, agree and recognize the deserving lecturers. The best lecturer of the year for small, medium and large classes; the best researcher of the year; and the best fundraiser are recognized annually. We have a Recognition Day in June of each year, when the University Governing Council members are invited to award certificates and other tokens of appreciation (VC1, personal communication, December 3, 2014).

Johnson and Holdaway (2004) explained that recognition is a very important motivator for staff and contribute to high job satisfaction. This is in line with Armstrong (2010) who found the criterion of recognition and compensation as the only ability to do the job and enhance satisfaction. Another area examined was if creativity was rewarded by the university. The deans' reactions were as follows: 3.4% and 18.6% indicated strongly disagree and disagree, in that order, with a total average of 11% while 30.5% and 11.9% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 21%. On whether creativity was rewarded by the university, the lecturers' reactions were as follows: 6.9% and 26.7% indicated strongly

disagree and disagree in that order, with a total average of 17% while 29.8% and 6.3% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 18%. Hence, the study found that creativity was rewarded by the university.

Whether surpassed targets were rewarded by the university was also scrutinized by seeking the deans' responses to it. 4.2% and 25.4% indicated strongly disagree and disagree, in that order, with an average of 15% while those who agreed and strongly agreed had 24.6% and 17.6% respectively, with an average of 21%. The study therefore established that surpassed targets were rewarded by the university. Whether surpassed targets were rewarded by the university was also scrutinized by seeking the lecturers' responses to it. 8.5% and 27.8% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with an average of 18% while those who agreed and strongly agreed had 22.6% and 3.9% respectively, with an average of 13%. The study therefore established that surpassed targets were not rewarded by the university, according to the lecturers. Receiving formal performance appraisals has a positive and highly significant effect on job satisfaction when linked with monetary outcomes (Kampkotter, 2014). According to one Registrar, surpassed targets were rewarded by the university and he explained that performance appraisal was the gateway to rewards:

Performance appraisal is a decision making tool in staffing, turnover planning, compensation and career development. Since performance appraisal is defined and structured, it is unambiguous. In addition, we use reward management to enhance academic staff motivation. We promote lecturers based on their performance as determined through performance appraisal. We also motivate lecturers through salary increment, letters of commendation and letters of appreciation. Additional responsibilities are given to the lecturers as a result of their hard work and commitment to duty (R4, personal communication, December 11, 2014).

The study also examined if benefits at one's university were better than for other universities in Kenya and the deans reacted as follows: 11% and 22% indicated strongly disagree and disagree, in that order, with a total average of 17% while 15.3% and 11.9% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 14%. The lecturers on their part reacted as follows: 15.7% and 24.6% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with a total average of 19% while 17.4% and 8% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 13%. Hence, the study found that benefits at one's university were not better than for other universities in Kenya.

Interview data from a Vice Chancellor affirmed that "competitive remuneration makes academic staff happy on the job" (VC1, personal communication, December 3, 2014). In addition, a Deputy Vice Chancellor said confirmed competitive edge on his side; "our university has improved commuter, medical and leave allowances ahead of other universities through local collective bargaining Agreements. This enhances academic staff job satisfaction (DVC1, personal communication, December 8, 2014). Further responses on competitive benefits were from discussions by a Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor and one Registrar. The Deputy Vice Chancellor commented that "for us to enhance academic staff job satisfaction, we have to increase the salary to match the salary of other universities in the Country because ours is still low" (DVC 2, personal communication, December 9, 2014). According to the Vice Chancellor:

In University of Nairobi, a Law lecturer is paid Ksh.5,000/= per hour and a Medicine lecturer is paid Ksh.7000/= per hour. In our university we pay Ksh.3500/= per hour for Medicine lecturers. Thus, we are working to match what is paid by UoN to attract and retain them, due to our location (VC1, personal communication, December 3, 2014).

Indeed some universities have more attractive packages compared to others as evidenced by experience of the Registrar who confirmed this as follows:

Low remuneration makes lecturers uncomfortable despite the good geographical location and environment. Those who come say they are coming for experience. They say ‘my joining the university will earn me a recommendation letter that will be useful for seeking jobs elsewhere.’ Those who enjoy the environment and have landed employment elsewhere ask the management if they can match what the competitors are offering. Unfortunately, we have not the ability to match (R5, personal communication, January 15, 2015).

Another area examined was whether salary was adequate for the work done. The deans’ reactions were as follows: 17.8% and 32.2% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with a total average of 21% while 22.9% and 10.2% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 17%. The lecturers’ reactions were as follows: 17.6% and 35.3% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with a total average of 26% while 24.5% and 5.5% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 15%. Hence, the study found that salary was not adequate for the work done. This was alluded to through interview with a Vice Chancellor, who recognized financial instability as a challenge in university management, which could explain why salary was not adequate. He revealed that “if the university’s financial stability is not guaranteed, then management performance becomes problematic or a nightmare. Fire fighting all the time becomes the norm.” In addition, he gave insight on relationship between timely disbursement of salaries and job satisfaction by revealing that:

Timely disbursement of salaries enhances academic staff job satisfaction. We communicate to all the staff that salary shall always be paid by the 30th day of every month. In our university Service Charter, it is indicated that the salary shall always be paid by 30th of every month. This commitment has been met for the last three years (VC1, personal communication, December 3, 2014).

Luthans (2005) observed that job satisfaction is attributed to employees’ perception of how adequately their job provides those things which are considered important. Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) carried out a study which probed the factors contributing to academic staff satisfaction and dissatisfaction in higher education in Uganda. Their investigation reported that the stimuli that cause academic dissatisfaction were primarily contextual or extrinsic factors like governance, remuneration, working environment and research.

According to the Equity Theory (Adams, 1963), staff’s perception of fairness in terms of evaluating the exchange link with the organizations they work at, are based on the ratio between the effort spent and the rewards received at work. Job efforts include employee’s competencies and the wide-range of investments, such as experience, qualification, skills,

and intelligence. On the other hand, job rewards include pay and remuneration, challenging job related responsibilities, recognition, promotional opportunities, and social identity.

Another area examined was whether lecturers were rewarded fairly for the job they do. The lecturers' reactions were as follows: 8% and 24.6% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with an average of 16% while 33.3% and 4.4% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 19%. Hence, the study found that lecturers were rewarded fairly for the job they do. However, according to one Registrar; "there are complaints surrounding promotion. There are lecturers who want promotion having met the laid down criteria but feel unfairly treated because they fail to be promoted. Some academic staff feel others are preferred. For example, some bosses tend to favour their friends. Somebody may influence someone's coming or promotion. Others observe, think and conclude they are not preferred" (R7, personal communication, January 21, 2015). For academics, universities have to give serious consideration to the weighting of teaching vis-a-vis research and other services such as supervision, administration among others, in the promotion process Kipkebut (2010).

Whether academic staff was satisfied with their salary and other material benefits at the university were also scrutinized by seeking the deans' responses to it. 19.5% and 22% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with an average of 21% while agree and strongly agree had 23.7% and 4.2% respectively, with an average of 14%. The lecturers' responses were as follows: 17.9% and 30.9% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with an average of 24% while agree and strongly agree had 27.5% and 5.8% respectively, with an average of 17%. The study therefore established that academic staff was not satisfied with their salary and other material benefits at the university. Registrar confirmed this by saying: "If you look at what a university professor earns and compare with the earning of the commissioners of the constitutional commissions formed, some parastatal CEOs and even the MCAs (earning Ksh.256,000/= per month), the professors become frustrated which lowers their job satisfaction" (R5, personal communication, January 15, 2015).

Substantial rewards for workers trigger better job satisfaction and better performance for workers (Saba, 2011, quoted in Amzat & Idris, 2012) because a person who never has enough money wants to have more money, as having money is considered to be the most important goal in life (Tan & Amna, 2011). Toker (2011) investigated the levels of job satisfaction among academics in the universities of Turkey and examined the effects of demographics on levels of satisfaction among them. The findings indicated that the levels of job satisfaction of the academics were moderately high. The study also showed compensation was ranked the lowest and social status was ranked the highest of the examined items in relation to job satisfaction. Oshagbemi (1996, 2000 cited in Kipkebut (2010), in his study of UK academics found that pay affected the overall job satisfaction or dissatisfaction of an employee and that British dons were generally dissatisfied with their pay.

The study also examined if there was respect for one's ideas at the university and the deans reacted as follows; 1.7% and 12.7% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with an average of 7% while 49.2% and 11% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 30%. The lecturers reacted as follows: 6.1% and 23.1% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with a total average of 15% while 39.9% and 3.9% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 22%. Hence, the study

found that there was respect for one's ideas at the university. It has been recommended that to have in place quality staff that can make meaningful contribution, certain supportive incentives and measures need to be put in place, such as better remuneration, conducive working environment (facilities, values, culture), and support for intellectual growth through staff development, fair treatment and respect for one's ideas and appreciation for one's input (Republic of Kenya, 2006).

Another area examined was whether there was appreciation for one's input. The deans' reactions were as follows: 1.7% and 11.9% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with an average of 7% while 47.5% and 13.6% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 31%. The lecturers' reactions were as follows: 5.5% and 18.2% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with a total average of 12% while 44.4% and 5% showed agree and strongly agree respectively, with an average of 25%. Hence, the study found that there was appreciation for one's input.

However, according to interview response from one of the Registrars, "the lecturers say they were forced to take extra classes during double intake of new students with the promise that they would be paid overtime. They are unhappy that they were not paid" (R1, personal communication, February 23, 2015). In addition, according to another Registrar: "There were complaints on PSSP because there was an agreed number of courses to be taught by a lecturer per semester (3 courses per semester) and anything above that was to be paid as a part-time. Despite this agreement, payment was not prompt, especially for part-timers due to inadequate and delayed capitation from the exchequer" (R2, personal communication, December 9, 2014).

On a positive side, a Deputy Vice Chancellor explained how appreciation was carried out in his university:

As for incentives, the academic staff should be facilitated to attend conferences and present research papers. The academic staff who receive a lot of hits on the website are recognized. We also identify the lecturer(s) of the month and year and give them a shield. Long-service awards are also given to academic staff. Evaluation of the lecturers by the students is conducted to determine the lecturer of the month or year. The lecturer of the year is usually awarded during the graduation days/ceremonies by being presented with either a plaque or monetary incentives. The criterion for identifying the lecturer of the year is being worked on together with UASU (DVC5, personal communication, February 2, 2015).

Whether salary was low in relation to the work done at the university was also scrutinized by seeking the deans' responses to it. 18.6% and 15.3% indicated strongly disagree and disagree in that order, with an average of 17% while agree and strongly agree had 24.6% and 23.7% respectively, with an average of 24%. Whether salary was low in relation to the work done at the university was also scrutinized by seeking the lecturers' responses to it. 9.6% and 19.8% indicated strongly disagree and disagree respectively, with an average of 15% while agree and strongly agree had 32.5% and 19.3%, with an average of 26%. The study therefore established that salary was low in relation to the work done. Qualitative data confirmed this finding through response from a Registrar who said that "pay dissatisfaction among academic staff is rampant. This has led to undercurrents of dissatisfaction on the part of lecturers hence many resignations" (R3, personal communication, December 9, 2014).

On the importance of pay, Kipkebut (2010) found that pay satisfaction was a positive predictor of job satisfaction. Employees who were satisfied with their pay became satisfied with their jobs. In addition, Jehangir, Kareem, Jan and Soherwardi (2011) found that overwhelming majority of female nursing staff have expressed their opinion that the potent factors which cause enormous stress at work place are excessive workload (97.1%), unhealthy and dangerous working environment (92.4%), insufficient resources (93.3%), lack of promotion chances (85.1%) and, inadequate pay and benefits (90.2%). Moreover, Santhapparaj and Alam (2005) examined the relationships between pay, promotion, fringe benefits, working condition, support of research, support of teaching, gender and academic staff job satisfaction in private universities in Malaysia and found that pay, promotion, working condition and support of research had positive and significant effect on job satisfaction.

To identify the dynamics of the level of faculty satisfaction along recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits, the general results from the questionnaire were reviewed. Based on the instrument, the entire list of 14 comparable items was compiled. By completing the job satisfaction questionnaire; the researcher was able to identify those aspects of his current job that were rewarding as well as those that contributed to dissatisfaction. The results helped to clarify the aspects of a job that most directly contribute to career satisfaction. Satisfaction levels of employees on recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits, within the organization were gauged on poor, satisfactory, very good and excellent. From the results displayed on Table 3, 6% of the lecturers indicated performance as poor, 38% indicated satisfactory, the majority, 47%, indicated very good while 9% indicated excellent performance. On the side of the deans, 0.8% indicated performance as poor, 22% indicated satisfactory, the majority, 55%, indicated very good while 20% indicated excellent performance against recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits.

Table 3: Management Performance in Recognition, Promotion, Rewards, Remuneration, Compensation and Benefits

Performance	Scale	Lecturers		Deans	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Poor	14 – 27	21	6	1	.8
Satisfactory	28 – 41	136	38	26	22
Very Good	42 – 55	166	47	67	55
Excellent	56 – 70	32	9	24	20

Cross tabulation results displayed on Table 4 show lecturers rating by management, indicating very satisfied while the deans were satisfied as shown in Table 5, with recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits packages from their respective universities.

Table 4: Academic Staff Job Satisfaction and University Staff Recognition, Promotion, Remuneration, and Reward Cross Tabulation

Academic job satisfaction (categorized) * Recognition Promotion Remuneration Reward Cross tabulation			Recognition Promotion Remuneration Reward				Total
			Poor	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent	
Academic job satisfaction (categorized)	Very Dissatisfied	3	0	0	1	4	
	Dissatisfied	6	18	0	0	24	
	Satisfied	2	55	15	1	73	
	Very Satisfied	0	16	59	11	86	
Total		11	89	74	13	187	

Table 5: Recognition Promotion Rewards, Remuneration Compensation and Benefits and University Job Satisfaction, Cross Tabulation for Deans

			Recognition Promotion Remuneration Total Reward			
			Poor	Fair	Satisfactory	Excellent
University Job Satisfaction	Very Dissatisfied	1	4	2	1	8
	Dissatisfied	0	16	18	1	35
	Satisfied	0	5	44	9	58
	very satisfied	0	1	2	13	16
Total		1	26	66	24	117

Finally, the study sought to determine whether recognition, reward, remuneration, compensation and benefits had a significant effect on staff job satisfaction and found a strong positive significance ($r = .671, p = 0.00$), as indicated in Table 77. The p value of recognition, reward, remuneration, compensation and benefits is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 and indicates that overall, the model applied is significantly good enough in predicting the outcome variable. The hypotheses H_0 stating that there is no significant relationship between recognition, reward, remuneration, compensation and benefits and lecturers' job satisfaction was tested. The study failed to accept the hypothesis hence the alternative hypothesis was accepted. This is to suggest that the research finding is statistically significant.

IMPLICATIONS TO RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

There is little research regarding academics' job satisfaction conducted in the context of developing countries, though there are mentionable research works in the context of western and developed countries. The findings in this paper will act as a bridge, filling a gap in the job satisfaction literature for countries with developing economies and, in particular, for Kenya. In Kenya, many universities are facing severe turnover of skilled academics as dissatisfaction factors influence them to leave the organizations. To retain these experienced academics, the findings of the present study provide a guideline for university management to develop a plan for exploring the job satisfaction supportive incentives and dissatisfaction elements for academics of universities in Kenya.

CONCLUSION

The study found the following positive practices concerning academic staff satisfaction about recognition, promotion, rewards, remuneration, compensation and benefits in the university: promotions were done fairly; the most competent person was promoted; one was given additional responsibility as a result of outstanding work; individual initiative was encouraged at the faculty; there was timely recognition for work well done; creativity was rewarded; surpassed targets were rewarded; there was respect for one's ideas; there was appreciation for one's input and promotions were done fairly by management. However, according to the deans and lecturers' observations, the following areas were found as potential sources of job dissatisfaction: lack of competitive rates; lack of adequacy of pay commensurate to work done; dissatisfaction with salary and other material benefits and low salary in relation to the work done. In addition, document analysis from correspondences between UASU and the university management (2012-2015) indicated that lecturers were dissatisfied with delayed payments due them and unfair senior staff promotion criteria.

RECOMMENDATION

For attainment of higher levels of job satisfaction, the study recommended better academic staff remuneration. Universities should work towards raising the level of job satisfaction through supportive incentives.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an Understanding of Inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422 - 36.
- Amzat, I. H., & Idris, D. A. R. (2012). Structural Equation Models of Management and Decision-making Styles with Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff in Malaysian Research University. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(7), Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09513541211263700>
- Bavendum, J., (2000). *Managing Job Satisfaction*. New York: New York Research Inc.
- Jehangir, M., Kareem, H., Jan, M. T. & Soherwardi, S. (2011). Effects of Job Stress on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(7), 453 – 465.
- Johnson, N. L., & Holdaway, E. A. (2004). Facet importance and job satisfaction of school principals. *British Educational Research Journal*, 20(1), 29 - 30.
- Kampkotter, P. (2014). *Performance Appraisal and Job Satisfaction*. The German Socio Economic Panel Study in DIW Berlin SOEB Paper 672(2014) 1-30.
- Kipkebut, D. J. (2010). *Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction In higher Educational Institutions: The Kenya Case* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middlesex University, Middlesex, UK.
- Kosteas, V. D. (2009). *Job Satisfaction Promotions*. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland State University.
- Küskü, F. (2001). Dimensions of employee satisfaction: A state university example. *Middle East Technical University (METU) Studies in Development*, 28(3-4), 399 - 430.
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, N. (2008.) The Importance of Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment in Shaping Turnover Intent: A Test of a Causal Model. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96 - 118.
- Luthans, F. (2005). *Organisational Behaviour* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

- Mirza, S. (2005). *Job satisfaction among research and development scientists: the relationship between leadership practices and job characteristics (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. Capella University, San Francisco, U.S.A.
- Muindi, F. K. (2011). The Relationship between Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in the School of Business, University of Nairobi. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 1, 1 - 34. doi:10.5171/2011.246460.
- Mustapha, N., & Zakaria, Z. C. (2013). The Effect of Promotion Opportunity in Influencing Job Satisfaction among Academics in Higher Public Institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 2222 - 6990.
- Naveed, A., Usman, A., & Fatima, B. (2011). Promotion as a Predictor of Job Satisfaction A Study of Glass Industry of Lahore, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 2(16), 301 - 305.
- Ngethe, M. J., Iravo, E. M., & Namusonge, S.N (2012). Determinants of Academic Staff Retention in Public Universities in Kenya: *Empirical Review international journal of humanities and social sciences*. 2(13), 205 - 211.
- Oshagbemi, A. N. (1996). Job satisfaction of UK academics. *Educational management and administration*, 24(4), 389 - 400.
- Republic of Kenya. (2006). Transformation of higher education and training in Kenya to secure Kenya's development in the knowledge economy. *Report of the Public Universities Inspection Board*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Saba, I. (2011). Measuring the job satisfaction level of the academic staff in Bahawalpur Colleges. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Santhapparaj, A. S., & Alam, S. S. (2005). Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in Private Universities in Malaysia. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(2), 72-76.
- Sarker, A. H., Crossman, A., & Chinmeteepituck, P. (2003). The relationships of age and length of service with job satisfaction: An examination of hotel employees in Thailand. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18, 745 - 758.
- Ssesanga, K., & Garrett, R. M. (2005). Job satisfaction of university academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Education*, 50, 33 - 36.
- Tan, T. H., & Amna, W. (2011). Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and job satisfaction in the Malaysian retail sector: the mediating effect of love of money. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 16(1), 73 - 94.
- Tansel, A., & Gazioglu, S. (2013). Management - Employee Relations, Firm Size and Job Satisfaction. *Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA) Discussion Paper No.7308*, Bonn.
- Toker, B. (2011). Job satisfaction of academic staff: An empirical study on Turkey. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(2), 156 - 169.