

# **PSYCHOSOCIAL ENVIRONMENT OF UNIVERSITIES: HOW SATISFIED ARE ACADEMICS WITH WORK-RELATED FACTORS?**

**Eugene Yaw Milledzi**

*University of Cape Coast, Ghana*  
*emilledzi@ucc.edu.gh*

## **Abstract**

University academics are critical actors in knowledge production and human resource development through teaching and research. However, despite the significant roles of university academics in the knowledge society, the psychosocial work environment of universities particularly in developing nations has witnessed agitations, threats and strikes over one work-related issue or the other. The current study examined how academic staff of selected universities in Ghana perceived work-related factors in their psychosocial environment using the mixed methods explanatory sequential design. A sample of 376 academic staff were stratified and selected based on rank and gender. Structured questionnaire was employed to collect data for the quantitative phase of the study while semi-structured interview guide was used to gather the qualitative data. Results from the study showed that academic staff of universities were dissatisfied with criteria for promotion, salary, as well as training and development as they perceived these factors negatively in their psychosocial work environment. It was recommended that managements of universities in Ghana make pragmatic efforts to review conditions of service of academic staff in order to create favourable psychosocial work environments for university academics to promote effective teaching, research and innovation.

**Keywords:** Intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors, psychosocial work environment, academic staff, universities.

**Introduction**

Universities in global perspective are crucial intellectual milieus where knowledge is created and disseminated. Academic staff of universities play an important role as leaders in knowledge creation through teaching, research and innovation (Shek & Hollister, 2017). In this regard, university academics provide students with the professional training for higher-level jobs as well as psychosocial support in order to help students develop the critical mind needed for contemporary world of work. University academics, it should be noted, are expected to use appropriate technology in doing their teaching and research. However, few institutions provide adequate support for faculty members to integrate technology into their work (Rosser, 2004). For example, Obwogi (2011) in a study found that academics in public universities do not have access to technology as well as the basic facilities like office space and desks. However, the volumes of work for university academics have been increasing over the years; hence academic staff of universities have to teach and conduct their research from a shrinking resource base (Milledzi et al., 2018).

Evidence suggests that attracting and retaining competent academic staff has become a monumental problem for universities particularly in Sub-Saharan African countries. For example, in a study on the need for adaptation, transformation, reformation and revitalization of universities in Africa, it was found that competent and talented university academics in Sub-Saharan African countries are often drawn towards lucrative administrative careers (Amonoo-Neizer, 1998). In related studies, it was reported that academic staff of universities in low and middle-income countries work under deplorable conditions with regard to insufficient pay, lack of suitable office and poor housing facilities (Ghafoor, 2012; Malik, 2011; Obwogi, 2011). With regard to housing allowances for instance, Ghafoor (2012) in a study found that housing allowances paid to university academics are not enough to facilitate obtaining suitable accommodation in the open market. Similarly, other related studies further suggest that heavy workloads due to increase in student numbers as well as assignments to teach large classes may have negative effects on the health and psychosocial well-being of university academics (Yousaf, 2010; Metcalf, Rolfe & Weale, 2005). According to Tettey (2006), in most African universities, there is congestion in lecture theatres and

laboratories and overall limited facilities with which to provide effective teaching and learning.

It is significant to note, however, that the rise of the knowledge society due to scientific and technological advancement envisages changes to the traditional roles of academic staff of universities. Therefore, it has been argued that stakeholders in higher education seeking to influence the roles of university academics in the knowledge society understand the intrinsic and extrinsic variables within their psychosocial work environment that affect their everyday work life (Saba, 2011). Psychosocial work environment is generally viewed as an experientially based description of the work environment and more specifically employees' perceptions of the formal and informal policies, practices and procedures of their organisation (Schneider, 2008). Psychosocial work environment with regard to social support system in the workplace has a significant influence on employees' perceptions of work context and this affects their levels of commitment, and work engagement. In the field of industrial and organisational psychology, empirical studies indicate that work environment that is comfortable, relatively low in physical and psychological stress facilitates the attainment of work goals and tends to produce high levels of job satisfaction among employees (McGregor 2000; Likert, 1997). In contrast, stressful work environment results in low levels of commitment and satisfaction. According to Malik (2011), heavy workload in the psychosocial work environment among university academics appears to be one of the most stressful aspects of faculty careers.

### **Intrinsic Work-related Factors**

In industrial sociology as well as organisational literature, achievement as an intrinsic variable refers to successfully completing a task, finding solutions to problems, showing proof of work and seeing results of one's work. In academia for example, achievement is measured by using indicators such as faculty productivity with regard to the number of publications including journal articles, books, and presentations at conferences and seminars, attracting research grants to the institution where one works as well as mentoring and supervision of graduate and postgraduate students (August & Waltman 2004). Similarly, responsibility is another intrinsic variable that is key to scholars and researchers in industrial sociology and organisational

settings. It refers to what must be done to complete a task as well as the obligation created by the assignment of a given task. In the formal organisational settings, such as universities, responsibilities are determined by the employer to facilitate the achievement of organisational goals and objectives. According to Luthans (2002), responsibilities should be specific as to whether they are daily or weekly that employees must perform. This implies that employers should ensure that responsibilities are standardized for each job level and that each employee has a copy of his or her job description.

Promotion as an intrinsic variable is the degree an employee perceives his or her chances to grow within an organisation. Baron and Greenberg (2003) argue that workers should not only be rewarded with pay but they should be offered opportunities to grow within the organisations in which they work. It is significant to point out that, advancement in academia is associated with promotion to ranks and attainment of tenure and it is dependent upon research and publications, as well as teaching and community service (Hagedorn, 2000). Shah (2012) concludes that promotion is the strongest explanatory variable in faculty job satisfaction and commitment to their institutions.

The work itself, as an intrinsic variable, refers to the actual doing of the job or the task of the job as a source of good feelings about it (Dugguh & Ayaba, 2014). It is significant to point out that university academics live by the motto- teaching, research and community service. In this regard, academic staff have a wide variety of job responsibilities encompassing those of teacher, advisor, consultant, committee member, editor and researcher. It has been asserted that the nature of academic work in universities often cause new faculty members to be overwhelmed and stretched beyond their physical and mental capacity and this can lead to dissatisfaction in their psychosocial work life (Lacy & Sheehan, 1997).

### **Extrinsic Work-related Factors**

Empirical evidence suggests that salary, as an extrinsic variable, is one of the basic determinants of commitment to work as well as job satisfaction among employees in both public and private sectors. For example, Shoaib et al., (2009) indicate that attractive remuneration is a significant factor in determining commitment to work and job satisfaction because it fulfils financial and material desires of workers. Similarly, Oshagbemi (2000), in a study of academics in the United

Kingdom, reports that job satisfaction is significantly related to salary or pay benefits. Also, in a related study, Tettey (2006) concludes that dissatisfaction with salary, is one of the key variables undermining the job satisfaction and commitment of academics to their institutions and consequently their decision to leave

Organisational policy is viewed by industrial as well as educational sociologists as an extrinsic variable contributing to the effectiveness of educational system particularly in colleges and universities. For example, a clear organisational policy permits employees to use their discretion and initiative in the discharge of their duties. In contrast, the organisational policy of institutions of higher learning can be a great source of frustration to employees if the policies and procedures are not clear (Dugguh & Ayaga, 2014). In light of this, managements of educational institutions, particularly universities should boost the morale of academic staff by involving them in decision-making process that would eventually increase their levels of commitment. Similarly, university administrators should identify measures such as well-structured sensitization, attitude building and competency-based training programmes to create congenial work environment that would positively influence the commitment levels of academic staff towards their institutions (Goulet & Frank, 2002).

Relating well with colleagues or peers, and subordinates encourages job satisfaction and commitment to work among employees in any organisation. This is because part of the satisfaction in employment contract is the social contact it brings to employees. Therefore, reasonable time should be given for socialisation at the workplace especially in academic institutions such as universities for networking. For instance, Ducharme and Martin (2000) report that effective co-worker support at the workplace significantly enhances employees' job satisfaction and commitment. Similarly, Saba (2011), in a study of academic staff in Bahawalpur Colleges, concludes that relationship with co-workers contributes significantly to job satisfaction.

In industrial and organisational settings, training/development as an extrinsic variable is considered as a form of human capital investment whether that investment is made by the individual or by the organisation. Training/development, it is significant to note, provides employees with specific skills to correct deficiencies in their performance while development is an effort to provide employees with

abilities the organisation will need in the future (Chew, 2004). The purpose of training in the work context, it should be pointed out, is to develop the abilities of the individual that would meet the current and future manpower requirements of the organisation. According to Dockel et al., (2006), investment in training is one way to show employees how important they are to the organisation in which they work.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Herzberg's (1959) Theory of Job Satisfaction which argues that employees are motivated by internal values rather than values external to their work provides the theoretical orientations and support for the current study. The theory posits that motivation to work is propelled by variables that are intrinsic to the work. These variables include achievement, the work itself, responsibility and opportunities for advancement or promotion. Conversely, certain variables induce dissatisfaction among workers. These are also known as extrinsic variables. They include salary, organisational policy, training/development, and co-worker relationship.

Several authors and researchers (Varrett, 2012; August & Waltman, 2004; Grunwald & Peterson, 2008; Castillo & Cano, 2004; Corley & Sabhawal, 2004) have used this theory in different industrial sociological and organisational work-related context areas; therefore, the theory can be used to provide support for the current study. The significance of Herzberg's work to the present study on psychosocial environment of university academics is that, both the independent variables (intrinsic and extrinsic factors) and the dependent variable (work environment) have been derived from the theory. Therefore, in applying this theory to the current study, the key findings have been contextualized and explained in light of the framework of the theory.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Previous studies by researchers such as (Chew, 2004; Ghafoor, 2012; Likert, 1997; Schneider, 2008) examined work-related factors in the psychosocial environment of employees. However, it appears from empirical literature that in spite of plethora of studies on psychosocial work environment of employees; the academic environment of universities, particularly in developing countries has not been fully explored. Earlier studies on psychosocial work environment by

(Dugguh & Ayagah, 2014; Goulet & Frank, 2002; Dockel, Basson & Coetzee, 2006; Baron & Greenberg, 2003) focused on industrial and organisational settings and did not touch on education; particularly academic staff perceptions of intrinsic and extrinsic work-related factors within their psychosocial environment. The present study, however, is in education and it sought to examine work-related factors in the psychosocial environment of universities. Milledzi et al., (2018) have suggested that insufficient research has been conducted into the nature of work-related factors in the psychosocial environment of universities in developing countries. Therefore, the purpose of the current study was to fill the gap in the area of psychosocial work environment of universities in Ghana.

### **Research Questions**

1. How do academic staff of public and private universities perceive intrinsic work-related factors in their psychosocial environment?
2. How do academic staff of public and private universities perceive extrinsic work-related factors in their psychosocial environment?

### **Methods**

#### **Research Design**

The study drew on the pragmatist research philosophical orientation where the mixed methods explanatory sequential design was used. This study, in the first place, sought to explore academic staff' views on intrinsic and extrinsic work-related factors in their psychosocial environment. This, therefore, calls for the gathering of standardised information by using the same instruments and questions for all sampled respondents (Creswell, 2014). To achieve this objective, the cross-sectional survey was used through the administration of a questionnaire to gather data from the selected sample concerning academic staff' current views on intrinsic and extrinsic variables in their psychosocial work environment and analyse the responses. Also, in order to capture in greater detail, the meaning and understanding that academics of universities give to intrinsic and extrinsic variables in their psychosocial work environment, a direct interview was needed. The focus of this aspect of the study falls under the qualitative paradigm where the case study was used.

### **Population and Sample**

The target population for this study was academic staff of four selected universities in Ghana. This consists of assistant lecturers, lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors. The total population of academic staff in the four universities under study was 1737. The sample size of the study is 376. This represents 21.6% of the target population of 1,737. The sample size is in line with the recommendation of Kirk (1995) who posits that it is appropriate to select a sample size of 20 % or more for a population of 1,737. The probability sampling, specifically the proportionate stratified sampling, and simple random sampling techniques were used to draw the sample for the study.

With regard to the interview, which forms the qualitative part of the study, the same proportionate stratified sampling procedure that was employed for the quantitative study was adopted to select five (5) percent of the sample size (376) used. That is, approximately, (19) participants were selected for the interview using both proportionate sampling and stratified sampling procedures. In selecting the participants, the study has taken into consideration the gender, rank and category of universities (public and private) of the participants in order to capture qualitative data from all the strata for the study.

### **Research Instruments**

A survey questionnaire on academic staff's perceived intrinsic and extrinsic factors in their psychosocial work environment was developed and used to gather the quantitative data for the study. The survey questionnaire was divided into four sections namely A, B, C, and D. Section A dealt with the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. Section B sought to gather information from academic staff on how they perceive intrinsic factors. Section C dealt with how academic staff perceive extrinsic factors while section D sought to elicit information on how academic staff perceive their psychosocial work environment. The content validity of the survey questionnaire was assessed by two professors who are experts in educational measurement and evaluation. A pre-testing of the instrument was undertaken on 42 academic staff of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. The reliability co-efficient of the survey questionnaire was established using the Cronbach's alpha; a reliability co-efficient of 0.91 was obtained. Regarding the qualitative data, the interview questions were generated

taking into consideration the purpose of the study as well as the variables of interest to the study. The questions for the interview have been grouped into three thematic areas as follows: 1. How academic staff perceive intrinsic factors (achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and promotion) 2. How academic staff perceive extrinsic factors (salary, organisational policy, co-worker relationship, and training /development). 3. Statements on psychosocial work environment of academic staff.

### **Measurement of Variables**

**Independent variables:** The independent variables were intrinsic and extrinsic factors (achievement, responsibility, promotion, the work itself, salary, organisational policy, co-worker relationship, training/development). Each variable was made up of multiple closed-ended items that were used to collect data from respondents. These items were pooled together to measure each construct. The responses to the items were measured numerically using discrete values on a five-point Likert-type scale such that one (1) indicating the least agreement to the issues while five (5) representing the strongest agreement to the issues.

**Dependent variable:** The dependent variable for this study was psychosocial work environment, which refers to a combination of social, psychological and environmental circumstances that contribute to the well-being of the individual at the work place. Psychosocial work environment, for the purpose of this study has been conceptualised as academic staff contentment with social, psychological, and environmental factors within their institutions. Six closed-ended items were used to elicit data on the various aspects of academic staff views on their psychosocial work environment. The responses to the items were measured numerically. An academic staff is perceived to be satisfied in his or her psychosocial work environment if the mean score regarding the six items is equal or more than 3.0.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

The consents of academic staff selected to participate in the study were sought and contacted. The purpose of the study was explained to them and copies of the questionnaire were given out to the 376 selected academic staff to complete. At the end of the data collection, 361 completed copies of the questionnaire were retrieved

representing 96.0 percent response rate. With regard to the one-on-one interview, participants were contacted through phone calls. Some of the sampled participants granted the interview at their respective offices while others were interviewed at home. The study was able to interview 17 participants out of the nineteen (19) sampled representing 85.0 percent rate of participation.

### **Ethical Issues**

Ethical clearance to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. The participants were informed and asked to sign a consent form. Participation in the study was voluntary and confidentiality was maintained during data collection. Names were not used and numbers were assigned to participants.

### **Results**

Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) were used to analyse the quantitative data in this study. According to Ary et al., (2010), the mean and standard deviation coefficients are used when the distribution is normal. In addition, the mean and standard deviation were used based on the five-point Likert-type numerical scale employed. The cut-off point score used in grouping the views of respondents with regard to positive/agree and negative/disagree was a mean score of 3.0. That is  $(1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5) / 5 = 3.0$ .

Regarding qualitative data analysis, the NVivo software was adopted in establishing a pattern from the data elicited from the participants. Further, convergences and divergences that emanated from the various perspectives were also established using the axial coding approach. The mutual use of deductive and inductive reasoning was espoused to string together participants' reactions to the interview.

**Research Question One:** How do academic staff of public and private universities perceive intrinsic work-related factors in their psychosocial environment?

The rationale for this research question was to examine how academic staff of public and private universities in Ghana perceived intrinsic factors in their psychosocial work environment. The results are presented in Table 1

**Table 1: Public and Private Universities’ Academic Staff View on Intrinsic Factors**

Variables	Public (N = 324)		Private (N = 37)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Achievement	3.56	0.65	3.59	0.81
The Work Itself	3.78	0.56	3.58	0.55
Responsibility	3.24	0.76	2.88	0.78
Promotion	2.50	1.07	2.78	1.21

As Table 1 shows, academic staff of public universities perceived intrinsic factors namely the work itself ( $M = 3.78$ ;  $SD = 0.56$ ), achievement ( $M = 3.56$ ;  $SD = 0.65$ ) and responsibility ( $M = 3.24$ ;  $SD = 0.76$ ) positively. This suggests academics of public universities derive satisfaction from doing their work and they feel a sense of pride in the work they do. With regard to academic staff of private universities, Table 1 shows that respondents perceived achievement ( $M = 3.59$ ;  $SD = 0.81$ ) and the work itself ( $M = 3.58$ ;  $SD = 0.55$ ) in positive terms indicating that they are satisfied with these variables within their psychosocial work environment. A participant who was a male senior lecturer from a public university indicated during the in-depth interview as follows:

It is interesting to be in academia. I love the job I do as a lecturer and I derive satisfaction from doing it especially mentoring graduate students to take up academic staff appointment and other positions in the civil service, industry, among others. In fact, it is an interesting job I must admit (A male senior lecturer).

However, academic staff of private universities perceived responsibility ( $M = 2.88$ ;  $SD = 0.78$ ) in negative terms. This suggests they are not satisfied with the amount of support they receive from university management in carrying out their assigned duties and responsibilities. Therefore, accepting additional responsibilities put a lot of stress on them. For example, a female senior lecturer had this to say:

Teaching in a university is a challenging job. It comes along with a lot of responsibilities such as serving on

committees, departmental examination officer, developing new academic programmes as well as reviewing existing ones. Apart from that you have to supervise both graduate and undergraduate research work. In fact, accepting additional responsibilities increase my work load and it is stressful (A female senior lecturer).

As the results in Table 1 show, academic staff of both public ( $M = 2.50$ ;  $SD = 1.07$ ) and private ( $M = 2.78$ ;  $SD = 1.21$ ) universities perceived promotion in negative terms. A male associate professor from a public university had this to say with regard to promotion:

I am not satisfied with the processes and procedures regarding promotion. Sometimes one becomes frustrated. For example, in most instances even if you have met the requirements, there are undue delays in processing application forms for one to be promoted. The criteria are not also clearly spelt out (A male associate professor).

A female lecturer from a private university also stated as follows:

The procedures for promotion are bureaucratic and getting promoted is sometimes frustrating and I am not satisfied with the processes as well as the requirements. (A female lecturer).

**Research Question Two:** How do academic staff of public and private universities perceive extrinsic work-related factors in their psychosocial environment?

This research question was intended to examine how academic staff of public and private universities in Ghana perceived extrinsic factors in their psychosocial work environment. The means and standard deviations of the variables are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Public and Private Universities’ Academic Staff View on Extrinsic Factors**

Variables	Public (N = 324)		Private (N = 37)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Salary	2.64	0.87	2.67	1.05
Organisational Policy	3.15	0.91	2.61	0.94
Co-Worker Relationship	3.48	0.76	3.51	0.77
Training/development	2.59	0.66	2.36	0.69

The results in Table 2 suggest that academic staff of public universities perceived salary ( $M = 2.64$ ;  $SD = 0.87$ ) in negative terms. Similarly, academic staff of private universities perceived their salary ( $M = 2.67$ ;  $SD = 1.05$ ) negatively. The results indicate that academic staff of both public and private universities are not satisfied with the kind of salary they receive and other paid-for activities such as research and supervision. A male senior lecturer from a public university indicated as follows:

The salary does not commensurate with the work I do as a lecturer. Sometimes I felt being cheated. I am not satisfied with the allowances or other monies paid for thesis supervision. It also takes a longer time, sometimes a whole year before one is paid after the candidate has even graduated. (A male senior lecturer).

As shown in Table 2, both academic staff of public ( $M = 2.59$ ;  $SD = 0.66$ ) and private ( $M = 2.36$ ;  $SD = 0.69$ ) universities perceived training/development in negative terms. The results further suggest that while academic staff of public universities perceived organisational policy ( $M = 3.15$ ;  $SD = 0.91$ ) positively, their counterparts in private universities perceived organisational policy ( $M = 2.61$ ;  $SD = 0.94$ ) negatively. A male lecturer in a private university had this to say with regard to organisational policy.

I am not satisfied with the organisational policy with regard to the mandate and direction of the university. People sometimes use their positions to influence decisions. Also, rules are not fairly applied to all (A male lecturer).

Finally, the results as presented in Table 2 show that academic staff of both public ( $M = 3.48$ ;  $SD = 0.76$ ) and private universities ( $M = 3.51$ ;  $SD = 0.77$ ) perceived co-worker relationship positively in their psychosocial work environment. A female senior lecturer in a public university sated as follows:

I am very satisfied with the kind of people I work with especially when it comes to knowledge sharing and working on committees, projects, designing new academic programmes I feel safe when working with them. We collaborate and work as a team. (A female senior lecturer)

### **Discussion of Findings**

The findings showed that academic staff of both public and private universities in Ghana perceived intrinsic factors namely, achievement and the work itself positively in their psychosocial work environment. The findings of the current study give credence to the fact that academic staff of universities derive satisfaction from doing their work and they feel a sense of pride in the work they do. This corroborates the findings reported by Malik (2011) who in a study reported that the work itself accounted for 63% in the variance in the overall job satisfaction of faculty members. A study by Dugguh and Ayaba (2014) also showed that the work itself is an intrinsic factor that significantly influenced levels of job satisfaction among employees in an organisation. The results of the current study suggest that individuals tend to prefer jobs that are interesting and challenging in order to create opportunity for creativity, recognition and self-actualization.

The findings of this study indicated that academic staff of both public and private universities in Ghana perceive promotion in negative terms and are dissatisfied with the requirements such as the number of years and publications for promotion in their psychosocial work environment. This is in consonance with the works of Tettey (2006) who in a study reported that promotion criteria in African universities are long, stressful and cumbersome while the requirements for promotion are unreasonable and frustrating. The outcomes of the current study underscore the significance of promotion in the psychosocial work environment of university academics. As the results

suggest, academic staff of both public and private universities attach importance and meaning to opportunities for their promotion to the various ranks such as senior lecturer, associate professor or full professor. Promotion in academia, it should be noted tends to change the status and positions of academic staff in their respective institutions. It also provides them with the opportunities to be appointed to challenging positions (Saba, 2011; Cloete et al., 2015). According to Shah (2012), promotion is a significant explanatory variable in faculty job satisfaction and commitment to their universities.

Further, the findings showed that academic staff of public and private universities are dissatisfied with their salaries and other paid-for activities as an extrinsic factor in their psychosocial work environment. The results suggest that university academics are not satisfied because the salaries and other allowances they receive do not commensurate with the work they do. This is consistent with the works of (Obwogi, 2011; Rosser, 2004; Tetey, 2006; Oshagbemi, 2000) who in their respective studies reported that salary is a strong factor contributing to dissatisfaction among employees in academia. In line with the theoretical framework of this study, Herzberg (1959) indicates that salary is a significant extrinsic factor in determining job satisfaction and commitment of employees to their organisations. The findings of the current study provide evidence to suggest that salary or pay is a personal issue because attractive pay or remuneration is a key factor which fulfils the material desires as well as physiological needs of employees.

The findings of this study further suggested that university academics are dissatisfied with training/development as an extrinsic factor in their psychosocial work environment. Professional development of academics, it should be noted, is the engine that keeps universities true to their core mandates as centres of learning and innovation (Chew, 2004). It is significant to point out that university academics thrive on intellectual and collegial stimulation from peers when they attend national and international conferences. As the results of the current study suggest, it can be argued that training and development activities for academic staff continue to be an important aspect associated with their professional work lives. Therefore, offering training and development opportunities would make academic staff feel that the university is investing in him or her and that there are opportunities for growth within the job.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

This study shed light on how academic staff of public and private universities in Ghana perceived intrinsic and extrinsic variables in their psychosocial work environment. The findings showed that academic staff are satisfied with achievement, the work itself and co-worker relationship. On the other hand, the study revealed that academic staff are dissatisfied with promotion criteria, salary as well as training and development as they perceived these variables negatively in their psychosocial work environment. These findings, therefore, underscore the relevance of conducive psychosocial work environment of universities with specific reference to intrinsic and extrinsic factors in promoting commitment and satisfaction of academic staff. From the findings, it can be concluded that the satisfaction and commitment levels of university academics to their institutions is largely influenced and dependent upon the meaning and importance they attached to intrinsic and extrinsic job-related factors within their psychosocial work environment.

Based on the findings, the paper recommends that managements of universities as well as stakeholders in higher education in Ghana make pragmatic efforts to create favourable psychosocial work environments for academic staff to be able to promote effective teaching, research and innovation. In addition, conditions of service of academic staff with regard to salary, promotion and training and development should be reviewed by instituting attractive packages in order to make academic staff satisfied and committed to their work. Without efforts in this direction, intellectual capital can stagnate and the relevance of universities to the Ghanaian society may diminish.

### **References**

- Amonoo-Neizer, E. H. (1998). Universities in Africa: The need for adaptation, transformation, reformation and revitalization. *Higher Educational Policy*, 11, 301-309.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thompson/Wadsworth.
- August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(2), 177-192.

- Baron, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Behaviour in organizations: Understanding and managing the human side of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 78-96.
- Castillo, J. X., & Cano, J. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), 65-74.
- Chew, J. C. (2004). Influence of human resource management practices on the retention of core employees: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 76-85.
- Cloete, N., Maassem, P., & Bailey, T. (2015). *Knowledge production and contradictory functions in African higher education*. African Minds.
- Corley, E., & Sabharwal, M. (2004). Foreign-born academic scientists and engineers: Producing more and getting less than their U.S born-peers. *Research in Education*, 48(8), 909-940.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sage.
- Dockel, A., Basson, J. S., & Coetzee, M. (2006). The effect of retention factors on organizational commitment: An investigation of higher technology employees. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(2), 20-28.
- Ducharme, L., & Martin, J. K. (2000). Unrewarding work, co-worker support, and job satisfaction. *An International Sociological Journal*, 27(2), 223-243.
- Dugguh, I. S., Ayaga, D. D. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organization. *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5), 28-42.
- Ghafoor, M. M. (2012). *Role of demographic characteristics on job satisfaction*. Universities Press.
- Goulet, L. R., & Frank. M. L. (2002). Organizational commitment across three sectors. *Public Administration*, 34, 36-51.
- Grunwald, H., & Peterson, M. W. (2008). Factors that promote faculty job satisfaction with institutional and classroom student assessment. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(2), 173-204.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). *Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories and outcomes*. Jossey-Bass.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). Wiley and Sons.
- Kirk, R.E. (1995). *Experimental design*. Pacific Grove Brook.

- Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher Education, 34*, 305–322.
- Likert, R. (1997). Organisational climate: Relationship to organisational structure, process and performance. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance, 11*(4), 139-155.
- Luthans, F. (2002). *Organizational behaviour* (12th ed.). Mosby.
- Malik, N. (2011). Study of job satisfaction factors among university faculty members. *International Journal of Academic Research, 3*, 267-272.
- McGregor, D. M. (2000). *Leadership and motivation*. MIT Press.
- Metcalf, H., Rolfe, P., & Weale, M. (2005). Recruitment and retention of academic staff in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 43*, 87-103.
- Milledzi, E. Y., Boateng, W., Amponsah, M. O., & Opare, J. A. (2018). Socio-psychological predictors of job satisfaction among academic staff of universities in Ghana. *International Journal of Psychology and Education (IJOPE), 1*(1), 70-86.
- Obwogi, J. (2011). *Factors that affect quality of teaching staff in universities in Kenya*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology].
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Differences in job satisfaction of university teachers. *Women in Management, 15*, 331-343.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(3), 285-309.
- Saba, I. (2011). Measuring the job satisfaction level of the academic staff in Bahawalpur colleges. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Science, 1*, 221-235.
- Schneider, I. I. (2008). Motivation and organisational climate. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 29*(3), 371-392.
- Shah, M. J. (2012). Job satisfaction and motivation of teachers of public education institutions. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(8), 123-135.
- Shek, D. T., & Hollister, R. M. (2017). *University social responsibility and quality of life*. Springer.

- Shoaib, M., Noor, A., Tirmizi, S. R., & Bashir, S. (2009). Determinant of employee retention in telecom sector in Pakistan. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 6, 45-57.
- Tettey, J. W. (2006). *Staff retention in Africa universities: Element of sustainable strategy*. World Bank.
- Verret, L. B. (2012). *Factors affecting university STEM faculty job satisfaction*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate Faculty, Louisiana State University].
- Yousaf, A. (2010). One step ahead: Examining new predictors of affective organizational and occupational commitment. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 8, 68-82.