The Multifaceted Nature of Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in Public and Private Universities in Tanzania: A Critical Perspective of Counterproductive Behaviours

Dr. Ombeni Msuya

1 Department of Educational Foundation and Continuing Education, College of Education, The University of Dodoma (UDOM), Tanzania

Correspondence: Ombeni Msuya, Department of Educational Foundation and Continuing Education, College of Education, The University of Dodoma (UDOM), Tanzania. Tel: 255-754-843-942. E-mail: owmsuya@hotmail.com

Received: August 6, 2020 Accepted: June 8, 2021 Online Published: March 21, 2022
doi:10.5539/hes.v12n2p60 URL: https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v12n2p60

Abstract

This study investigated the multifaceted nature of job satisfaction among academic staff in the selected public and private universities in Tanzania. A cross-sectional survey design with mixed research approaches was employed. Probability and non-probability sampling techniques were used to get a total sample of 128 respondents; 84 from public and 44 from private universities. Data were collected by using four scale Likert-type questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussion and documentary review techniques. The study findings indicated varying job satisfaction levels among the academic staff in public and private universities in Tanzania. Despite the same regulatory authority of universities in Tanzania (Tanzania Commission of Universities – TCU), experiences of the academic staff working in universities were different on their work benefits, relationship with their leaders and communication feedbacks. On the other hand, the study revealed existing counterproductive behaviours which are detrimental to the attainment of universities’ core functions of teaching, research and consultancy. In spite their severity, counterproductive behaviours ranging from conflicts, absenteeism, revenge, emotional cruelty, divided loyalty and intention to quit (job exit) were reported as among the main threats to public and private universities in Tanzania. This study suggests that university leadership needs to consider factors such as fairness in promotion, improving work benefits and effective communications among others, to create a friendly organizational culture. It is also recommended that there should be dialogue, through regular academic staff meetings, effective communication, and enough academic freedom to foster a culture of curiosity, autonomy, and trust in public and private universities in Tanzania.
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1. Introduction and Background

Higher education is the indispensable means towards individual and communities’ socio-economic transformation. Universities around the world are perceived as homes of intellectuality and the only gastronomies for sharpening the minds of intellectuals ready to serve their communities and nations. In most developing countries, higher education is recognized as a key force for modernization and development (Bennell & Akyeampong, 2007). The importance attached to higher education has led to a rise in the demand for its access and utilization. For instance, it is globally estimated that by 2030 the number of graduates will reach 300 million (OECD, 2017) while in Tanzania by 2017 there were 46,294 graduates (URT, 2019). In Tanzania, higher education institutions, both public and private are entrusted with the responsibility of teaching, conducting research and providing consultancy services to the community as among their core functions (URT, 1999). Thus, it has been maintained that the quality of any university depends to a large extent on the degree to which it attains these core functions (UNESCO, 1991; URT, 2005).

Due to the greater importance attached to higher education around the world, Tanzania has been investing much in higher education (Nguni et al., 2006). It is now obvious: higher education is only gateway and ladder to community transformation in most developing countries. In the 21st Century, education is among the vital tools for sharpening the quality of human resources in Tanzania. The establishment of the Tanzania Commission for...
Universities (TCU) in 2005 opened a new chapter on the effective management and improvement of the quality of higher education in Tanzania (TCU, 2005). The Global Sustainable Goals, the Millennium Development Goals 2000-2015 and the Tanzania Development Vision 2025 focus on achieving this goal to enable the citizens to appreciate the importance of education in development and benefit from it. Consequently, from 2005, Tanzania has embarked on improving access and quality of higher education (URT, 2010).

In particular, the permission for establishing private universities, building new universities, converting some former high schools and vocational training colleges to universities, the establishment of new schools and colleges within public universities were observed as efforts to expand higher education in Tanzania (URT, 2010). Before 2005 there were only twelve universities in Tanzania, (five public and seven private). However, in 2015, there were twenty-eight universities, (eleven public and seventeen private) (URT, 2016). Despite such commitments and investment in education higher education in Tanzania, universities do face critical challenges related to the quality of education and staffing. Omari (2013) insisted that universities have the most sensitive role of developing human resources to serve all sectors for national development. Similarly, Oshagbemi (2003) is of the view that higher education institutions are dedicated to the development of human capital through teaching, building a knowledge base through research and knowledge development, and dissemination and use of knowledge through interaction with it.

Universities are considered to be the hub of hatching qualified, employable and productive graduates. On the other hand, Omari (2013) observes that most public universities, regardless of their age and location, have a shortage of qualified academic staff to carry out academic activities. Earlier studies (Jawabri, 2017; Masanja, 2018) have linked the provision of quality education and staffing with employees’ job satisfaction. Academic staff job dissatisfaction syndrome may potentially impact the realization of the core functions of most higher learning institutions around the world (William, 2013; Msuya, 2016). Job dissatisfaction may result in staff turnover, divided loyalty, conflicts, and increased demands for better pay: all of which may lead to poor outputs (Oshagbemi, 1997). Other studies have shown that some job dissatisfied academic staff may be detrimental to the attainment of the mission and vision of their organizations (Robbins, 2001; Mateko and Nirmala, 2017).

All universities have some core functions to achieve in their existence in academia. For instance, in Tanzania, most universities have three core functions of teaching, research and consultancy (URT, 2005). In this light, universities would require satisfied and happy academic staff to accomplish these noble functions (Oshagbemi, 2000). What is important is the fact that the take-off and achievement of strategic goals of any university would strongly depend on its capacity to attract, retain and maintain competent and satisfied staff in its employment. The university must itself be capable of ensuring adequate manpower planning and development (Adenike, 2011). Qualified academic staff in various universities in Tanzania, like other staff around the world, tend to move from public universities to politics, private universities, or other professions with higher or greener remuneration. As earlier observed by Peter (2011), the value of salaries in public universities is considered unattractive compared to the private sector. As long as pay is associated with job satisfaction (Msuya, 2016), job exit among academic staff across public and private universities requires a meticulous study.

Despite the massive efforts made to invest in higher education, the teaching profession in higher education is facing problems related to job satisfaction among academic staff in Tanzania. Although academic staff are perceived as the most satisfied cadre in the teaching profession, complaints on job distress have been documented. Earlier studies (Mkumbo, 2014; Masanja, 2018) indicated that there is a high level of job dissatisfaction among academic staff of higher learning institutions in Tanzania. This study is highly urgent to explore the job satisfaction level among academic staff to improve and sustain the various government and individual universities’ efforts to accomplish the provision of higher education in Tanzania. Moreover, the study was undertaken to unveil the multifaceted nature of job dissatisfaction behaviours of academic staff in public and private universities in Tanzania.

2. Literature Review

Job satisfaction is an important human factor in effective work performance. Scholars (George, 2015) have various job satisfaction descriptions, such as the commitment that organizational employees have to their jobs, resulting in their job perceptions. Spector (1997) stated that job satisfaction notes how the individuals' environment is regarding their work and various aspects of their jobs. Similarly, Locke (1975) asserted that job satisfaction is an excellent emotional condition that results in an appraisal of one's job experience. Generally, all the concepts reflect the realization of work fulfilment as an emotional proclivity for the part of the job.

On the other hand, the multifaceted impacts of job dissatisfied academic staff are not new in contemporary global literature. For instance, Robbins (2001; 2005) propounded that dissatisfied academic staff may leave (exit)
an organization, create conflicts in their organization, may complain, may be insubordinate, steal organizational property, absent themselves from work, shirk (dodge) part of their responsibilities, divide their loyalty, and neglect responsibilities. Job dissatisfaction occurs when people perceive that they are being treated unfairly in salaries, benefits, incentives, job security, supervision and poor interpersonal relationships (Chung, 1997; Marriner-Tomey, 1996).

Earlier studies including Chung (1997) and Marriner–Tomey (1996) stressed that poor planning, poor communication, inadequate explanations of decisions affecting jobs, unclear rules and regulations, unreasonable pressures, excessive work, understaffing, uncooperative heads of departments/units, and non-academic duties are all sources of dissatisfaction within an organization. Chung (1997) classifies the factors leading to job dissatisfaction as external and internal barriers. In other words, job dissatisfaction may arise from the individual themselves or the organization or employers. Moreover, employees’ job dissatisfaction has been associated with poor working conditions, low pay, and hostile relationship with the management and co-workers as well as leadership ineffectiveness (Akintoye, 2000).

Consequently, the presence of an adequate number of qualified academic staff may not be sufficient to determine the effectiveness of job performance because some may always be unsatisfied with the working environment. Whatever the case, dissatisfied employees may never overcome situations where they are disappointed; rather they may “disengage” themselves from the job with their minds somewhere else (Altbach, 2006). Such work disengagement, reluctance and unhappier moments may obscure the provision of better services among the students and local communities (Khan, Nawazi, Aleem & Hamed, 2012). Academic staff may attend to work and continue with their activities or can perform their duties with maximum errors and engage in other unethical practices (misconducts) (Judge & Watanabe, 1994).

2.1 Theoretical Review

This study was guided by Hertzberg’s two–factor theory developed in 1959. The theory illuminates the role of motivators and hygiene factors in explaining employees’ job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In this theory, Hertzberg proposed a set of two different factors, namely hygiene and intrinsic factors, which he believed contributed to employees’ job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Basically, the theory differentiates between intrinsic (hygiene or job content) and extrinsic (contextual) or pull factors.

The extrinsic motivators, known as the job content factors, define things that the people actually do in their work responsibility, and achievements. These factors are the ones that can contribute a great deal to the level of job satisfaction an employee feels at work. Herzberg et al., (1959) observed that factors such as company policy, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary, are important in employees’ job satisfaction. According to Herzberg et al., (1959), these factors do not motivate employees. However, when they are missing or inadequate, hygiene factors can cause serious dissatisfaction. Hygiene factors are all about making an employee feel comfortable, secure, and happy. Also, few anecdotal examples of university management – staff conflict have so far centred on such job context aspects.

On the other hand, motivating factors are those which deal with fulfilling employees’ needs and personal growth. These are such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement. These factors are commonly called satisfiers or motivators and were found from the study to be related to the nature of the work itself and the rewards that result from the performance of that work. The most significant of these involve characteristics that promote an individual’s needs for self-actualization and self-realization in his work (recall the Abraham concept of man). These factors are essentially linked to job content, which means they are intrinsic to the job itself. Herzberg analysed and classified job content factors or satisfying experiences as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth (Schmerhorn, 2003).

As earlier observed by Herzberg et al., (1959) on the potential relationship between motivation and hygiene; once the hygiene facets have been achieved, the motivators will promote satisfaction and enhance performance. Therefore, this study used this theory to illuminate its intuitive appeal to the job satisfaction level among academic staff in public and private universities in Tanzania.

3. Methodology

Cross-sectional study design and mixed research approach were used to collect data on job satisfaction level and dissatisfaction behaviour among academic staff in universities in Tanzania. The mixed methods approach is suitable for the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, and integrating the two sets of results at some point in the research to draw inferences from both data results (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Creswell, 2012). Simple random, purposive sampling and convenient sampling techniques were used to get 128
academic staff from public and private universities (84 from public and 44 from private). Data were collected on the meanings, attitudes, experiences and understandings of the academic staff towards job satisfaction facets and counter-productive behaviours.

The use of multiple data collection tools of Likert-type questionnaires, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and documentary analysis brought rich information for an in-depth understanding of job satisfaction among academic staff in higher education institutions in Tanzania. The sampled public universities were from Morogoro and Iringa regions and were assigned pseudo names Highlands University (private) and Westlake University (public). Data obtained from the Likert scale or questionnaires were analysed descriptively to provide necessary information for experienced job satisfaction level among academic staff in public and private universities. On the other hand, the qualitative data were analysed using thematic and content analysis guided by Miles and Huberman of 1994. In order to observe and comply with research ethics, the researcher sought permission from the host institutions before the actual day of study. All study participants were asked for their consent to be involved in the study. There were no personal identifiers or names of participants used during the study. The research observed anonymity and participants’ consent throughout the study.

4. Study Findings and Discussion

4.1 Perceived Levels of Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in Public and Private Universities in Tanzania

The findings regarding job satisfaction experiences among academic staff between the selected public and private universities in Tanzania indicated a varying job satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels. Both descriptive quantitative data and qualitative (narratives) data indicated the heterogeneous levels of job satisfaction in different facets among academic staff working in public and private universities.

Table 1. Job satisfaction levels among academic staff in public universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES N = 84</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>SATISFACTION LEVEL</th>
<th>DISSATISFACTION LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT</td>
<td>(1)VD</td>
<td>(2)D</td>
<td>(3)S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with:</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Benefits</td>
<td>43 51.2</td>
<td>21 25</td>
<td>16 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD’s relationship with co-workers</td>
<td>21 25</td>
<td>40 47.6</td>
<td>10 11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to utilize skills and talents (innovation)</td>
<td>24 28.6</td>
<td>24 28.6</td>
<td>16 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication and feedbacks</td>
<td>27 32.1</td>
<td>24 28.6</td>
<td>18 21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University management support in training and academic development</td>
<td>21 25</td>
<td>44 52.4</td>
<td>15 17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: VD = Very Dissatisfied, D = Dissatisfied, S = Satisfied and VS = Very Satisfied. 1-1.4 = VD, 1.5-2.4 = D, 2.5-3.4 = S and 3.5 – 4.0 = VS.

Source: Field Data (2017)

Table 2. Job Satisfaction Levels among the Academic Staff in Private Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES N = 44</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>SATISFACTION LEVEL</th>
<th>DISSATISFACTION LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT</td>
<td>(1)VD</td>
<td>(2)D</td>
<td>(3)S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with:</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work benefits</td>
<td>6 13.6</td>
<td>5 11.4</td>
<td>17 38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD’s relationship with co-workers</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>9 20.5</td>
<td>14 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to utilize skills and talents (innovation)</td>
<td>2 4.5</td>
<td>4 9.1</td>
<td>30 68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication and feedbacks</td>
<td>8 18.2</td>
<td>5 11.4</td>
<td>17 38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University management support in training and academic development</td>
<td>21 47.7</td>
<td>14 31.8</td>
<td>5 11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: VD = Very Dissatisfied, D = Dissatisfied, S = Satisfied and VS = Very Satisfied. 1-1.4 = VD, 1.5-2.4 = D, 2.5-3.4 = S and 3.5 – 4.0 = VS.

Source: Field Data (2017) 68.2 18.2
4.1.1 Satisfaction with Work Benefits

Quantitative data from Table 1 and Table 2 above reveal that majority of the academic staff from the public universities were generally dissatisfied with their work benefits (51.2% very dissatisfied and 25% dissatisfied) unlike their counterparts in private universities who were generally satisfied (38.6% satisfied and 36.3% very satisfied). Similarly, qualitative data obtained from in-depth interviews with academic staff from public universities revealed that salaries were the specific work benefits that academic staff were not satisfied with. One academic staff from Westlake University indicated that:

“For years, academic staff have been requesting the central government to increase salaries. The current harmonized scheme of service is not updated according to actual living costs. Dissatisfaction with salaries is one of the monsters in most public universities. Currently, consultancy activities are very limited and there is competition with privately registered companies. Most academic staff have decided to embark on other entrepreneurship activities and some have been looking for political positions”.

Arguably, academic staff in public universities have a sustainable source of salary (the central government) compared to their counterparts in some private universities whose salaries, which are collected from students fees are sometimes delayed for months; yet they are satisfied. In the same way, dissatisfaction with work benefits and, specifically, salaries in public universities may result from higher expectations and life commitments among young academicians who are the majority in public universities compared to older staff working under contracts in private universities. The study findings tie the knot with the hygiene factors as postulated in the Two Factors Theory, that better work benefits may improve job satisfaction among employees (Msuya, 2016). On the same note, these findings line with earlier studies (Dulebohn, 2007 & Linh, 2018) who discovered that work benefits and the salary not only allow employees to meet their fundamental needs but provide job satisfaction at a higher level as well. Moreover, various researchers in management and academic staff job satisfaction (Fessehatision and Bahta, 2016 and Ahmad, & Riaz, 2011) have shown that salaries are an important determinant of job satisfaction, especially when employees consider this payment to be fair and on time.

4.1.2 Satisfaction with Leadership Support from the Heads of Department (HoDs)

Data from Table 1 and Table 2 indicate that academic staff in public and private universities were generally dissatisfied with the support they were getting from their heads of department. Data from public universities show that the academic staff were very dissatisfied (25%) and dissatisfied (47.5%) compared to their counterparts in private universities who were very dissatisfied (31.8%) and dissatisfied (22.7%). The qualitative data obtained during a focus group discussion with the academic staff from both the public and private universities indicated that academic staff were not happy with less sharing of decisions and too many directives from their leaders. Moreover, particularly in public universities, academic staff complained about the existence of high bureaucratic organizational structures which was affecting staff–leader interactions. The above findings mirror the previous studies (Cable and Judge (2003); Chen and Silverthorne (2005) who found a significant relationship between effective supervision and job satisfaction among staff in public educational organizations. Similarly, Robbins et al., (2003) argued that supervision is pivotal in creating effective job satisfaction when the leaders can provide to their subordinates emotional support and technical guidance on job-related tasks. On bureaucratic leadership, Rad (2006) alerted on its predominant characteristics of following predetermined rules and policies of organizations.

4.1.3 Satisfaction with Effective Communication and Feedbacks

Data in Table 1 and Table 2 above show varying satisfaction levels among academic staff in public and private universities on institutional communications. The quantitative data indicated that academic staff in private universities were very satisfied (38.6%) and satisfied (31.2%) with effective communication and feedback mechanisms compared to those in public universities who were very dissatisfied (32.1%), dissatisfied (28.6%), respectively.

From the organizational management perspectives, effective communication and feedback mechanisms between academic staff and university management act as the bridge between employees and management for the effective attainment of organizational goals. Similarly, it can be argued that academic staff, like other employees, need quick feedback and effective communication to address the issues at hand. As earlier observed by Msuya (2016), public universities in Tanzania follow the government systems and structures of leadership and management that have predetermined goals and chains of command compared to the open system (customized) of private universities; hence the bureaucratic model. This leadership style, commonly known as bureaucratic, is highly blamed for narrowing employees’ rights and consequently negatively affecting job satisfaction (Msuya, 2016). As earlier pointed out by Rad (2006), bureaucratic leadership follows the predetermined rules and policies
of an organization. This style moulds rigid leaders who are not dynamic and never adopt their behaviour with the changing environment. Similarly, Muindi (2010) observed that bureaucracy and professionalism in an organization have a significant impact on job satisfaction as more bureaucracy leads to more dissatisfaction among employees while more professionalism leads to increased job satisfaction.

4.1.4 Satisfaction with Training Opportunities

Quantitative data from Table 1 and Table 2 show that academic staff in public universities were satisfied with reliable opportunities for training and career development compared to academic staff working in private universities. During the documentary review, it was also revealed that public universities offer study sponsorships with soft conditions for pursuing higher studies compared to their counterpart private universities. In one interview session in a public university, a junior academic staff said:

“My friend who joined this public university eight years back with an undergraduate degree has now earned a PhD and has moved to other more paying jobs outside teaching. His academic success was the motive for my transfer from the human resources office to public academic institutions. I need to study and earn a professorial rank before the age of fifty”.

The above quote indicates that public universities can attract determined junior and energetic academic staff who have plans to develop their careers compared to private universities which may attract more senior and retired academic staff. Also, it can be perceived as a growing tendency that public universities are responsible for training and developing their academic staff that, soon after completion of their studies, join private universities and move to other occupations due to better pay and working environment. The study by William (2013) argue that public universities produce at their costs what they do not consume and embrace neither synergetic nor economical practices to their growth. Most public universities have many junior academic staff who require higher training on the assumption that they will come back to work with their universities.

This assumption sometimes does not reflect the reality and employees’ needs. The above findings mirror an earlier study by Jiang and Klein (2000) which argued that training opportunities do not improve employee retention because employees regard them as hygiene factors that are necessary to be available but their availability does not necessarily lead to either job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Similarly, Maria et al., (2010) also found the training to be negatively related to employees’ retention.

Gloomily, although the qualitative data obtained during group discussion revealed that private universities had the training and staff development policies, the researcher realized that they were not active and supportive to academic staff. For instance, some terms and conditions in staff training policies were challenged by most interviewees as unrealistic and unfeasible. During documentary review, some of the sections of the staff training and development policy of one private university read:

“All money paid to the academic staff as part of sponsorship shall be deducted from his or her salary after his/her completion of studies and resuming work, pg. 12”.

In this matter, Carrel et al., (2005) state that training and development are key factors in meeting the employer’s strategic, business and operational goals. In the same way, Chipunza (2009) declares that regular employee training has a potential effect on academic staff job satisfaction.

4.1.5 Freedom for Creativity and Innovation

Quantitative data from Table 1 and Table 2 above show that more satisfied academic staff were more creative and innovative. Descriptive data in Tables 1 & 2 show that academic staff in private universities were more satisfied with opportunities and support for creativity and innovation (68.2 18.2) compared to their counterparts in public universities who were satisfied (19%), very satisfied (23.8%). Similarly, the qualitative data obtained during an in-depth interview with academic staff from private universities revealed that recognition through prizes, moral and financial support influenced staff creativity and innovations. On these, one academic staff commented:

“Last year I was the overall winner in the university innovation week and won 5,000 United States Dollars. I spent that money on improving my digital community library which will soon become a commercial venture. The University is providing free laboratory and grants”.

From the above verbatim quote, one could argue that academic staff experience positive feelings and enthusiastic spirit once their works are valued and they are given enough support by the university management. These findings reflect what Marsland et al. (1999) observed that satisfied academic staff tend to be more creative and committed to working in organizations. In this discussion, one could relate this scenario of an employee
producing quality outputs after he or she has received rewards to the famous term “garbage in garbage out” in the field of Information Technology. In the same line, Porter and Syptak (1968) observed that the coverage of employee job pleasure reflected the collective level of met workforce hope. Academic staff full of hope can produce new knowledge through research that produces elastic choice to students and the community. Similarly, Hurley and Hult (1998) observed that employees’ capacity to innovate is one of the most important aspects pushing the business performance of any organization.

Generally, satisfied academic staff can create a good organizational climate that can foster the attainment of core goals of any university; namely research, teaching, and consultancy. This was also echoed in the recent study by Khalid et al., (2012) who found that academicians have personal and professional interests in their universities, including pressure to pursue excellence and to make the right decisions regarding research agenda and course load. The attainment of the above goals needs a satisfied and job-committed academic staff.

4.2 The Counterproductive Behaviours among Academic Staff

There is a consensus (Greenberg & Baron, 1993; Robinson & Bennett, 1995) that counterproductive behaviours have direct detrimental impacts either on an individual employee or the entire organization. Most previous studies mention counterproductive behaviours to include anger, workplace violence, deviation, retaliation, emotional cruelty, mobbing, service sabotage, impoliteness, protest and revenge (Greenberg & Baron, 1993; Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Banks et al., 2012).

The current study findings show that academic staff both in public and private universities revealed some behaviours as a result of work dissatisfaction. This was achieved when the researcher interviewed some academic staff themselves and the Directors of Human Resource Management and Administration (DHRM&A) and some observed behavioural patterns among academic staff. Interestingly, the findings indicated different dissatisfied behaviours according to academic staff ranks and type in private and public universities.

4.2.1 Job Dissatisfaction Based on Academic Seniority

As it was observed, senior academic staff revealed more job dissatisfaction behaviours compared to junior academic staff. The findings are in line with the study findings by Abdullah, et al., (2009) who examined the role of academic ranks and age on job satisfaction among teachers and found that the higher the ranking, the more satisfaction among teachers. Older teachers were more satisfied than their younger counterparts. This study specifically found some senior academic staff having indolent behaviour compared to junior academic staff that were very busy accomplishing their duties and others assigned to them by their senior academic staff in public universities. This scenario was different in private universities where senior academic staff were present and working with junior academic staff for the goal of mentorship and coaching. Senior academic staff in some universities have a role to mentor and support the less experienced academic staff to fulfil their duties.

The current findings reflect previous findings by Schaufeli et al., (1993); Demerouti et al., (2001) and Maslach, et al., (2001) who found that employees’ lethargic behaviour was connected to burnout behaviour and that these had very detrimental impacts on employee’s job satisfaction. Moreover, the above study findings suggest ineffective accomplishment of academic staff job roles of teaching, research and consultancies. As observed by Rocca and Kostanski (2001) academic staff with a lot of burnout cannot find the peace they desire within the organization. They have a high degree of moral disorder. The demotivated academic staff cannot be able to support students and junior academic staff effectively.

4.2.2 Absenteeism

Further reflection of the findings in the present study reveals that most senior academic staff in public universities were absent from their respective offices. This is in line with Duflo (2006) who found absenteeism of academic staff in higher learning institutions as among the employees’ behaviours that were hindering academic staff from attaining their factual roles; and it was associated with less organizational and work commitment, hence leading to poor work productivity. It should be understood that the researcher is aware that senior academic staff may be away for consultancy activities or on official leave.

However, during the interview with DHRM&A, it was revealed that most of the senior academic staff were away without formal permission. As an emphasis, junior academic staff were complaining of taking some responsibilities of the senior staff while the latter were away for personal matters. At this point, it gives light to say that some public universities in Tanzania have many senior academic staff but in fact, these are not as committed to working as the junior staff are.

In the discussion above, the important point to note is that absenteeism by itself is a problem but it is worse when the senior academic staff at the rank of professors are not available for some months due to various reasons.
There is a possibility that students and junior academic staff do not get support from senior and well-experienced academicians as part of mentorship in offering quality education, research, and consultancies. These findings are in line with the studies by Banerjee and Duflo, (2006); Miller, (2007) and Whelan, (2008) which indicated that teachers’ absence negatively affects students’ academic performance.

4.2.3 Divided Loyalty

Based on the information obtained during observations, in some offices, the available academic staff were busy with their activities. The researcher asked the head of a department at W1 University if he was aware of what was going on during official working hours and he had these to say:

“It is not my duty to monitor what the academic staff are doing in their offices. Academic staff are legally bound to attend work and perform their duties every day. As a department, we shall appraise each academic staff annually and make recommendations to the higher university management. The university management puts efforts to find those who are absent”.

Based on this quotation, it may be argued that the availability of academic staff in their respective offices does not necessarily mean that they are committed to the job in question. Therefore, the availability of academic staff in their offices is not the appropriate tool to measure the rate of work done and its productivity. Furthermore, it was observed that most of the junior academic staff were available in their offices during official hours. Junior academic staff were busy with teaching, administering seminars, and helping students with different problems. During the interview, one junior academic staff said:

“I am doing all activities that are supposed to be done by the professor. However, the Professor is busy with the general election since he is contesting for a Parliamentary seat (MP). It is a month now and I am teaching, supervising seminars, and handling all students’ problems.”

Also, these study findings are in line with a previous study by Clotfelter et al., (2007) which revealed that schools with higher teacher absence rates had lower student test scores. Further, in their study, it was found that teacher absenteeism was among the critical problems in developing countries, where absence rates were found to range from 20 to 44 per cent in Kenya and India. Similarly, Renatus, (2015) claimed that there was enough evidence that teachers’ absenteeism in the teaching profession was at an alarming situation in developing countries like Tanzania compared to the developed world.

The study findings also show that academic staff that were at work were busy with other activities outside academics. During the interview, one Head of Department from W2 University had these to share:

“It is very unfortunate that the DHRM&A and other top university management officials are pleased to see academic staff available in their offices without paying attention to what they are doing. As you may observe, some academic staff organize informal meetings to promote their network marketing and selling food supplements and medicines online. No one cares what the academics do in their offices. What is considered important here is to sign in by using an electronic system at the main gate.”

The above quote indicates that some academic staff in public universities were using the time for work for other activities outside their job descriptions. Allocating time on a task may have effects on the efficiency and quality output of the work that an academic staff is engaged in. It is very disastrous when an academic staff is engaged in other activities like the said “network marketing” which has nothing to contribute to the needed skills required to remain working as an academican at the university.

The above findings are supported by Hughes (2005) who found that most job dissatisfied employees develop temporary withdrawal behaviours from their main jobs as manifestations of job adaptation. This scenario suggests the likelihood of academic staff to remain working at public universities figuratively. This may be interpreted that academic staff may be available in public universities’ payroll but work fully in favour of their institutions.

In the same direction, Allen and Meyer (1988) found a strong relationship between employee loyalty and organizational commitment. Loyalty shows the bond between employees and the organization and that; employees are enthusiastic to give something to add to the organization’s health. Most importantly is that the academic staff’s divided loyalty is the sign of their intention to quit and less work commitment.

4.2.4 Hostility with University Management

The present findings revealed that some academic staff in public universities had a hostile relationship with the university management. Some academic staff were served with job termination letters and others had disciplinary proceedings at the university levels and courts of law. The researcher interviewed one member of
staff with disciplinary proceedings who blamed the university management for unfair treatment.

Although some studies have highlighted the positive benefits of conflicts in organizational growth, regular strikes and boycotting have been associated with poor organizational citizenship and quality work performance (Mkumbo, 2014). Academic staff involved in conflicts with the management are psychologically unstable and unproductive to effectively perform their duties. Harvey and Allard (2003) found that conflicts at work are associated with emotional exhaustion and are considered to be responsible for increasing the incidence of adverse events and negative emotions at work.

To support the afore-going remarks, Tosi and Tosi (1970) and Tosi (1971) showed that role conflict was significantly related to overall low job satisfaction. Greene and Organ (1973) showed that both role accuracy and compliance have significant positive correlations with a global measure of job satisfaction. In the frame of more recent studies, role conflict was found to increase the levels of job dissatisfaction (Um & Harrison, 1998) and emotional exhaustion (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Gil-Monte & Peiró, 1998).

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The findings of this study have provided an insight into job satisfaction level and its associated counterproductive behaviours in higher education. The study has identified a critical job dissatisfaction syndrome among the academic staff in public universities compared to their counterparts in private universities. Similarly, it is now obvious that work benefits which are the central goal of the employees and one of the basic human needs are among the major job distress elements in public universities in Tanzania. It has also pointed out the impacts of counterproductive behaviours resulting from job dissatisfaction towards the attainment and accomplishment of universities’ core functions.

More importantly, the study suggests vital measures which if undertaken, can help to eliminate or reduce the level of job dissatisfaction among academic staff in higher learning institutions. This study recommends creating and maintaining effective communication between management and academic staff, fair distribution of work and fringe benefits, fair and timely promotion and contingent rewards. Besides, the university management needs to use job satisfaction factors to create a cohesive community of academic staff, who will welcome the expertise and increase academic efficiency. Finally, the top university management must also evaluate and redesign the supervisory arrangement with principals and heads of departments, contingent rewards and fringe benefit schemes to improve departmental performance.
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