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Abstract

Job satisfaction in a work place is a feeling of contentment that an employee derive from his role and responsibilities in the workplace and is dependent upon a number of factors, pertaining to personal, organizational and environmental factors. Considering the job profile and the demand for quality education among universities, the job satisfaction of academic staff in higher education is also affected. This paper aims to examine the job satisfaction of academic staff in higher education as well as private universities in UAE.

This study adopts a quantitative research methodology using survey according to 5-point Likert scale instrument. The survey has been divided into ten internal and external factors to determine job satisfaction of academic staff. The data obtained from the survey has been analysed by using statistical and regression analysis.

The study concludes that the academic staff of the private universities in UAE has been significantly satisfied with their jobs. It also found that only few factors have positively influenced job satisfaction, especially, supervisor support, promotion and support from colleagues. On the other hand, the study found that recognition and rewards for work done had a negative impact on job satisfaction of academic staff.

This study has important implications for higher education management in the development of job satisfaction of academic staff in the UAE. The authors determined that the selected factors, with few exceptions, behaved accordingly to what was expected.
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1. Introduction

Job stress is an attribute that can often lead to decreased overall feeling of satisfaction and decreasing performance among individuals and create a feeling of constant stress at workplace. This causes decreased productivity and commitment issues in employees working in organizations. Such a situation can be faced in any sector, at any workplace including the academic sector. In UAE, education sector is a very important part of their whole structure because it forms the backbone of the economy like for any other economy. A number of research studies have been performed in the past to find the factors which effect job satisfaction among academic staff all over the world. Thus in the present study, researcher focuses on academic staff stress and job satisfaction at private universities in UAE. Specifically private universities are considered in this research because of their presence in large number when compared with public universities. (Knowledge and Human Development Authority, 2012). Thus have a much larger academic staff that could be facing the issue of concern of the present study that is job satisfaction.

Almost 60% of the higher education industry is covered by the private institutes (Knowledge and Human Development Authority, 2012). Because of its huge presence, the number of employees working there will also be huge. In a study conducted by Hijazi, Kasim, & Daud, (2017), it was found that the academic staff working across the higher education institutions are not satisfied with their jobs and are not motivated by the rewards as well. Thus it is important to study the scenario of job satisfaction of the academic staff of private universities in Dubai. Bodla, Hussain, & Chen, (2014) mentioned in their study that staff on the positions like that of an instructor, lecturers and professors feel uncertainty and anxiety because of the nature of their contract with the university which is usually short term or temporary which leads to reduced job satisfaction. Due to this, such institutions are facing the problem of work induced stress related, which further leads to decreased commitment from academic staff. Hundera, (2014) reasoned that because of above factors academicians are always in search of new job opportunities thereby leading to reduced commitment.

In the past decade, UAE has witnessed tremendous improvement in education system and quality, leading to changes in policies. As per President His Highness Sheikh Khalifa bin Zayed Al Nahyan, due to increase in the population increase in the country, it is of much importance to increase investment in the education sector (UAE Interact, 2014). According to the World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness Report (2016-2017), UAE has ranked 34th globally for „Higher Education and Training“, which has improved from the 37th rank in 2015-2016. The importance being given to education in UAE has affected a lot of sectors in the country like oil and gas, retail, advertising and infrastructure. A big support has been provided by private institutions in achieving these merits as there are 75 private higher education institutions against only three public universities (Swan, 2016). This has led to higher pressures and stress levels among academic staff, to meet the education quality demand. Universities recently are witnessing reduced productivity of their academic staff, which in turn is affecting the overall education quality. Against this, the increasing quality and higher standards of international education has presented private universities of UAE with more challenges. Due to these issues, universities are facing the problem of reducing job
satisfaction in academic staff (Hijazi et al., 2017). This reducing job satisfaction will be a major setback for whole higher education system in UAE because if the source of knowledge, academic staff is stressed, the quality of education will fall.

It has been predicted by PwC, (2016) that because of UAE's increasing tertiary enrolment rate, there will be a requirement of 42,000 additional seats will be required in higher education by 2020. Due to this it is of at most importance to improve the satisfaction level of the academic staff in order to manage the predicted increased demand in the higher education sector. According to Global Competitiveness Report, the country is showing tremendous growth in sectors wile IT, banking, infrastructure (Baller et al., 2016) and in order to continue on this path it needs to have well educated work force. Thus, with increasing demand for high skilled workers, the country requires major improvements in the quality of higher education and in order to do this, the academic staff of the higher education institutions will play a big role. Thus this study is needed to determine the level of satisfaction among academic staff of several private universities as well as the factors that lead to job satisfaction among them. This will help the universities to make changes in their policies and subsequently, lead to improvement of job satisfaction levels as well as retention levels among their staff.

The main objective of the study is therefore to determine the factors leading to job satisfaction among academic staff in higher educational institutes of private nature in UAE. It also aims to determine the current levels of satisfaction among these academic. Accordingly, this study discusses the literature pertaining to major antecedents of job satisfaction among academic staff, leading to development of Conceptual framework and hypotheses to be tested.

Section 3 presents the methodology of this study, which uses a qualitative approach through interviews and documents analysis. Section 4 presents evidence relating to the globalization of higher education in the UAE and provides context by understanding the background of development of the country’s higher education system. Section 5 provides the discussion and analysis from the interviews evidences about the internationalization of higher education UAE as well as other GCC countries. Section 6 presents the SWOT analysis, which presents a comprehensive view of the UAE’s internationalization of higher education, identifying capabilities and challenges. The discussion is concluding with the main findings of the study.

1.1. Literature Review

In order to understand the antecedents of job satisfaction among employees of any organization, a review of previous research has been undertaken, thereby extracting specific factors influencing job satisfaction.

1.1.1 Antecedents of Job Satisfaction: Empirical Review

Job satisfaction can be defined as “the collection of feeling and beliefs that people have about their current job” (Aziri, 2011). Job satisfaction can be thus stated to be employee’s expectations related to the workplace and their outlook towards the job and hence depends on several factors, like personal, organizational and environmental. A study was conducted by
Akafo & Boateng, (2015) to determine the impact of rewards and recognition on job satisfaction in academic staff of seven private universities in Nigeria. The study included the factors related to rewards like extra pay, increase in compensation and bonuses. A survey among 157 respondents which includes junior lecturers, senior lecturers, dean, vice dean and administrative officer, revealed that, there was a positive relation between rewards and job satisfaction.

Chepkwony, (2014) also conducted research to find the impact of rewards and recognition on job satisfaction. This study was done on employees of Teachers Service Commission Headquarters, Kenya. The factors included in the study were pay, basic pay and other bonuses. Data was collected via survey method. In this study, it was found that job satisfaction in the teachers can be increased by increasing the compensation.

A study conducted by Santhapparaj, A. Solucis, (2005) on academic staff in private universities in Malaysia to study the effect of pay, fringe benefits, promotion, support of research, working condition, support of teaching on job satisfaction. A sample of 173 teaching staff was selected and data was collected through survey. The results revealed that promotion, pay, support of research and working condition have positive effect on job satisfaction while support of teaching and fringe benefits had negative effect on job satisfaction.

Ssesanga & Garrett, (2005) conducted a study to find the factors that lead to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of lecturers in higher education in Uganda. For this study, a sample of 182 respondents was selected from two universities in Uganda. The factors under consideration were research remuneration, promotion, governance and working environment along with demographic factors like age, rank, and tenure. The results stated that position, age and tenure predict academic job satisfaction while gender had no impact on the same.

Malik, Danish, & Munir, (2012) conducted a study in the higher educational institutes in Pakistan to find the relation of pay and promotion with job satisfaction. A sample size of 200 respondents, who were educational staff, was randomly selected from the public and private universities in Punjab. Data was collected using questionnaire. The study found that both pay and promotion had significant effect on job satisfaction wherein pay had more and promotion had comparatively less impact on job satisfaction.

In a study conducted by James, (2011) on the relation between support from colleagues and job satisfaction, it was found that as the support from colleagues increase, job satisfaction also increases. For this study, a sample size of 250 respondents was selected who were the staff of Nigeria Breweries Ama Enugu State, Nigeria.

Derakhshani, Ghasemzadeh, & Branch, (2014) conducted a study on the topic “A Survey about the Correlation between Accountability, Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Job Tension and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) in Faculty Members of East Azerbaijan PNU”. The study was conducted faculty members of East Azerbaijan PNU, Iran. Data was collected using survey method. The results of the study stated that accountability increases the job satisfaction. As the employees are made accountable, they develop a feeling...
of belongingness and thus their job satisfaction increases.

Kazemzadeh & Bashiri, (2005) conducted many researches on employee satisfaction and identified ten main groups namely relation between employees, management and personnel relationship, employees’ “commitment, employees’” motivation, wage and salary, other welfare facilities, job promotion, performance, education, organization’s systems and processes. Similarly Coomber & Barriball, (2007) stated that job satisfaction can include any feature of the job such as organizational factors, co-workers, pay, supervisors and work environment. Further in a study on job satisfaction conducted by Aziri, (2011) stated that financial compensation impacts the overall job satisfaction of employees.

Table 1. Systematic review of studies on Job Satisfaction among academic staff

| S. No | Study | Population | Methodology | Predictors | Results |
|------|-------|------------|-------------|------------|---------|
| 1    | Asan & Wirba, (2017) | Academic staff from different institutions in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia. (N = 30) | Survey | Pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operational conditions, co-workers, nature of work, and communication on job satisfaction | Pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards have positive impact on job satisfaction |
| 2    | Akafo & Boateng, (2015) | Academic staff of private universities (7) in Nigeria. (N = 157) | Survey | Impact of rewards and recognition on job satisfaction in academic staff | Positive relation between rewards and job satisfaction. |
| 3    | Chepkwony, (2014) | Employees of Teachers Service Commission Headquarters, Kenya. (N = 155) | Survey | Impact of pay, basic pay and other bonuses on job satisfaction | Job satisfaction in the teachers can be increased by increasing the compensation. |
| 4    | Derakhshani, Ghasemzadeh, & Branch, (2014) | Faculty members of East Azerbaijan PNU, Iran. (N = 55) | Survey | Correlation between Accountability, Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Job Tension and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) | Accountability increases the job satisfaction |
| 5    | Malik, Danish, & Munir, (2012) | Educational staff in public and private universities in Punjab, Pakistan. (N = 200) | Survey | Relation of pay and promotion with job satisfaction | Pay and promotion has significant effect on job satisfaction wherein pay has more and promotion had comparatively less impact on job satisfaction |
| 6    | James, (2011) | Staff of Nigeria Breweries Ama Enugu State, Nigeria (N = 250) | Survey | Relation between support from colleagues and job satisfaction | Support from colleagues has significantly positive effect on job satisfaction |
| No. | Authors | Group | Method | Measure | Findings |
|-----|---------|-------|--------|---------|----------|
| 7   | Abdullah M. Al-Rubaish, Sheikh Idris A., Mahdi S., & Wosornu | Academic staff of King Faisal University – Dammam (KFU-D). (N = 248) | Survey | Measure job satisfaction | “Supervision”, “Responsibility”, and “Interpersonal Relationships” have highest job satisfaction |
| 8   | Hassan Al-Tamimi & Anood Bin Kalli | UAE national investors. (N = 290) | Survey | Assess the financial literacy of the UAE individual investors who invest in the local financial markets | income level, education level, and workplace activity affects financial literacy |
| 9   | Santhapparai, A. Solucis | Academic staff in private universities in Malaysia. (N = 173) | Survey | Impact of pay, fringe benefits, promotion, support of research, working condition, support of teaching on job satisfaction | Promotion, pay, support of research and working condition have positive effect on job satisfaction while support of teaching and fringe benefits had negative effect on job satisfaction |
| 10  | Ssesanga & Garrett | Lecturers of Universities in Uganda. (N = 182) | Survey | Impact of research remuneration, promotion, governance and working environment along with demographic factors like age, rank, and tenure on job satisfaction | Position, age and tenure predict academic job satisfaction while gender had no impact on the same. |

Based on the review of literature, a range of antecedents were determined to prominently impact faculty members of the academia. These factors have been presented in Table I. From the above review of literature, it can be inferred that a large amount of research has been done in the field of job satisfaction but not much research has been done on measuring the job satisfaction in the academic sector, specifically of the higher education. Further, some studies on job satisfaction in education sector have been performed in several geographical areas, however no study has been conducted among universities of UAE. Thus there is a significant research gap regarding the factors influencing job satisfaction among the academic staff of private universities in UAE.

2. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

Based on the antecedents that have been determined to influence job satisfaction among academic staff of the private universities of UAE, a conceptual model has been built, suggesting the relationship among them (Figure I).
This study explores the following Research Questions:

1. What is the overall level of job satisfaction among the academic staff in private universities in UAE?

2. What are the factors responsible for job satisfaction among the academic staff in private universities in UAE?

As seen from the figure, ten antecedents/factors have been identified from the literature, which could increase or decrease job satisfaction of academic staff. Based on these factors and the existing literature, a hypothesis has been defined.

$H_0$: Several factors do not increase the job satisfaction in the academic staff of private universities in UAE.

$H_a$: Several factors increase the job satisfaction in the academic staff of private universities in UAE.
3. Research Methodology

3.1 Sample

The target population for the present study includes all the academic staff working in 15 private universities located in UAE. The survey was conducted among 212 academic staff of these universities, including mainly dean, vice dean, senior lecturer, junior lecturers and administrative officers. The sample respondents were selected through Random Probability sampling technique, where each staff member of the target population had the same probability of being chosen as the sample of the study (Barreiro & Albandoz, 2001).

3.2 Questionnaire Design

A 5-point Likert scale questionnaire was constructed based on ten parameters of job satisfaction identified during the literature review. This questionnaire also consisted of sections on demographic profile and general background of job satisfaction in private universities. The reliability of this questionnaire was assessed by conducting the Cronbach alpha test (Table II). Since the value is higher than the minimum required value of 0.6, it was asserted that the collected data is reliable and hence further analysis could be conducted.

Table 2. Reliability Test

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|-----------|
| .896             | 11        |

3.3 Data Analysis Procedures

The collected survey responses from university staff were coded in MS Excel and transferred to SPSS v21.0. Descriptive statistics was performed on the demographic profile and general background responses. However, to test the hypothesis, Correlation and Regression tests were performed on the Likert scale questions. The casual relationship between the dependent and independent variable was studied to determine the most influential factors leading to job satisfaction among academic staff of private universities. The level of significance for all the null hypotheses was tested at 95%.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Demographic Profile

Figure II shows that out of total academic staff surveyed, 40% are female and 60% were males. This shows a higher proportion of female teaching staff. Further, their age wise distribution analysis (Figure IIa) was also studied. As seen from the graph, the maximum respondents are in the age group of 31-40 years that is 61.4% whereas minimum number of respondents belongs to the age group of 21-30 years that is 5.7%. Further, 23.3% and 8.4% belong to age groups 41-50 years and more than 51 years respectively.
Further, the marital status of these academic staff (Figure IIIa) who undertook the survey revealed, that 30% of respondents are single, where 62% the respondents are married and 8% are widowed. Further, the education qualifications of the staff surveyed was analysed, considering the importance of their educational background in their job. As seen in Figure IIIb, maximum respondents are PhD holders that are 49.8% of the respondents. The maximum number of respondents holds the doctorate degree because this is basic requirement of teaching staff at university level.
Table 3. Descriptive Summary of Demographic Profile

| Characteristic          | Frequency | Percentage | Mean  | Standard Deviation |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|-------|--------------------|
| **Gender**              |           |            |       |                    |
| Male                    | 128       | 60.4       | 1.4   | 0.49               |
| Female                  | 84        | 39.6       |       |                    |
| **Age**                 |           |            |       |                    |
| 21-30 years             | 12        | 5.7        | 2.35  | 0.716              |
| 31-40 years             | 132       | 62.3       |       |                    |
| 41-50 years             | 50        | 23.6       |       |                    |
| More than 51 years      | 18        | 8.5        |       |                    |
| **Marital Status**      |           |            |       |                    |
| Single                  | 64        | 30.2       | 1.77  | 0.572              |
| Married                 | 132       | 62.3       |       |                    |
| Widowed                 | 16        | 7.5        |       |                    |
| **Qualification**       |           |            |       |                    |
| Bachelor's degree       | 20        | 9.3        | 2.6   | 0.788              |
| Post-graduation degree  | 65        | 30.2       |       |                    |
| PhD                     | 107       | 49.8       |       |                    |
| Post doctorate          | 20        | 9.3        |       |                    |
| **Years of Experience** |           |            |       |                    |
| 2-5 years               | 101       | 47.0       | 1.75  | 0.861              |
| 6-10 years              | 75        | 34.9       |       |                    |
| 11-15 years             | 25        | 11.6       |       |                    |
| More than 15 years      | 11        | 5.1        |       |                    |
| **Designation**         |           |            |       |                    |
| Dean                    | 17        | 7.9        | 3.88  | 1.097              |
| Vice Dean               | 7         | 3.3        |       |                    |
| Senior Lecturer         | 18        | 8.4        |       |                    |
| Junior Lecturer         | 112       | 52.1       |       |                    |
| Administrative Officer  | 58        | 27.0       |       |                    |

Lastly, the level of experience of the surveyed academic staff of the private universities was analysed. As seen in Figure IVa, maximum respondents have 2-5 years of experience that is
47% and minimum number of respondents has more than 15 years of experience that is 5.1%. Further, in case of designation of the academic staff (Figure IVb), it can be inferred that maximum respondents in the study are junior lecturers that is 53%, 27% are administrative officers, 9% are senior lecturers, 8% are deans and finally minimum number of respondents are serving as Vice Dean. This could be because it is difficult to reach out to the employees at senior level positions as that of senior dean or dean.

4.2 General Background

4.2.1 Hours Devoted In University

It can be inferred from Figure V, that maximum respondents spent an average of 7 hours at university, although a significant section spent higher than 7 hours. Further only 0.5% of respondents spend 5 and 6 hours at university.

4.2.2 Tasks Handled at University
With respect to the different tasks handled by academic staff, Figure VI shows the percentage distribution. 55.3% of the respondents of the respondents mostly handle academic tasks, 31.2% of the respondents handle the administrative tasks and finally 12% of the respondents handle both academic and administrative tasks. This shows that most of the respondents in the study were involved in teaching and research programs in the universities.

4.3 Level of Job Satisfaction

From figure VII, it can be inferred that 45.5% of the academic staff strongly agreed with the statement that they are satisfied with their job at the university, followed by 27% agreeing significantly to being satisfied in their job. Further, 16% of the employees strongly disagreed and stated that they are not satisfied with their job. However, a cumulative 72.3% of academic staff surveyed stated that they are satisfied with their job hence have job satisfaction.

Table 4. Mean of Job Satisfaction parameter scores on basis of gender of respondents

| Item                      | Item Score | Males       | Females     | Total      |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Working hours             | 2.06       | 75.80%      | 76.20%      | 76.00%     |
| Promotion                 | 2.00       | 73.50%      | 82.20%      | 76.90%     |
| Suggestions and Feedback  | 2.65       | 49.20%      | 48.80%      | 49.10%     |
| Job responsibilities      | 2.10       | 74.30%      | 77.40%      | 75.50%     |
| Recognition and rewards   | 2.41       | 58.60%      | 59.50%      | 59.00%     |
| Supervisor Support        | 2.18       | 71.80%      | 83.40%      | 76.50%     |
| Opportunities             | 2.68       | 46.10%      | 46.40%      | 46.30%     |
| Job Enrichment            | 2.41       | 56.20%      | 54.70%      | 55.70%     |
| Salary                    | 2.17       | 68.80%      | 73.80%      | 70.80%     |
| Colleagues Support        | 2.36       | 56.30%      | 61.90%      | 58.50%     |

Table IV represents the average item scores given by respondents for agreement on Job Satisfaction on basis of several parameters. Subsequently, it can be interpreted that the respondents agree maximum with the item “Chances of promotion” that is as the chances of
promotion increase, job satisfaction increases. Similarly, the value of item score for “Opportunities to use abilities” is maximum when compared with other items stating the item does not hold importance when it comes to job satisfaction.

Further it can be seen in the table that women favoured “Support from supervisor” to be more important for job satisfaction. Similar results were found by Bhaté, (2013) who stated that women are more satisfied on their jobs when they get support from their supervisors.

Table 5. Mean Job Satisfaction parameter scores on basis of Educational qualifications and designation of respondents

| Qualification (%) | Designation (%) |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Bachelor's Degree | Post-Graduation Degree | Ph.D | Post Doctorate | Dean | Vice Dean | Senior Lecturer | Junior Lecturer | Administrative Officer |
| Working hours | 75 | 63.1 | 80.3 | 95 | 64.7 | 85.7 | 88.9 | 74.1 | 77.6 |
| Promotion | 70 | 72.3 | 78.5 | 90 | 70.6 | 100 | 88.9 | 76.8 | 72.5 |
| Suggestions and Feedback | 50 | 41.5 | 53.3 | 50 | 58.8 | 71.5 | 44.5 | 49.1 | 44.9 |
| Job Responsibilities | 80 | 63 | 78.5 | 95 | 64.7 | 85.7 | 83.4 | 77.7 | 70.7 |
| Recognition and rewards | 65 | 63.1 | 57.9 | 45 | 70.6 | 71.4 | 66.7 | 57.2 | 45.2 |
| Supervisor Support | 75 | 67.7 | 80.4 | 85 | 64.7 | 100 | 83.4 | 77.7 | 72.4 |
| Opportunities | 45 | 38.4 | 50.5 | 50 | 52.9 | 71.5 | 44.5 | 45.5 | 43.1 |
| Job Enrichment | 50 | 58.5 | 55.1 | 55 | 70.6 | 28.6 | 61.1 | 55.4 | 53.5 |
| Salary | 75 | 58.4 | 72.9 | 95 | 58.8 | 85.7 | 88.9 | 70.6 | 67.3 |
| Colleague Support | 65 | 53.9 | 62.6 | 45 | 53.1 | 71.4 | 66.7 | 57.2 | 58.6 |

Above Table V shows the extent of Job Satisfaction agreement of respondents based on qualification and designation towards the factors responsible for job satisfaction. It can be seen that post-graduate staff are more satisfied with their “Promotion”, contributing towards their overall job satisfaction. Similarly bachelor degree holders are more inclined towards “Job responsibilities” and PhD holders towards “Supervisors support” for the same. On conducting designation wise analysis, deans, vice deans and senior lecturers, all three favour “Promotion” to be most important factor leading to job satisfaction while junior lecturers“ consider supervisors support” to be responsible for job satisfaction. This could be due to the reason that junior lecturers are still in the early phases of their career thus need and value support from supervisors or seniors.

Table 6. Satisfaction On The Basis Of Demographic Factors- Gender, Qualification and Designation
The above table VI shows the job satisfaction of academic staff in private universities in UAE. It can be seen that more number of female staff is satisfied than male staff which is in contrast to the findings of Hesli & Lee, (2013) who found that males academic staff is more satisfied in private universities. Thus it can be stated that gender does not play a role when it comes to job satisfaction among academic staff in private universities in UAE. Further people holding doctorate degree are more satisfied when compared with other degree holder. The reason for the same could be the fact that doctorate degree holders are mostly into research and thus are satisfied with their academic job at university level.

4.4 Inferential Analysis

Table 7. Correlation Results for Factors Leading To Job Satisfaction

| Variables                        | Pearson Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Working hours                   | .766**              | .000            |
| Promotion                       | .756**              | .000            |
| Suggestions and Feedback        | .011                | .868            |
| Job Responsibilities            | .877**              | .000            |
| Recognition and rewards         | .763**              | .000            |
| Supervisor Support              | .908**              | .000            |
| Opportunities                   | .024                | .731            |
| Job Enrichment                  | .065                | .343            |
| Salary                          | .746**              | .000            |
| Colleague Support               | .781**              | .000            |

Correlation test (Table VII) conducted to determine the extent of relationship between the antecedent factors and level of Job satisfaction showed, Promotion (.756), Job Responsibilities (.877), Supervisor Support (.908) and Salary (.746) are all statistically significant (p= .000) and positively correlated with job satisfaction. This means that as the salary increases, promotion increase, job responsibilities increase, job satisfaction level also increases. In a study conducted by Kula & Guler, (2014) also found that support from supervisors lead to increase in job satisfaction which is in agreement with our present correlation results wherein Supervisor Support (p=0.000) has the highest Pearson correlation value of 0.908.

Further, Regression analysis was also conducted, to determine the major predictor variables (antecedents) that significantly affected job satisfaction levels among academic staff of
private universities of UAE.

Standard Regression Equation:

\[ Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + \ldots + b_{10}X_{10} \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = dependent variable (Job Satisfaction)
- \( X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{10} \) = Independent factors (10 factors taken into the study to be responsible for job satisfaction)
- \( a \) = intercept
- \( b \) = slope

Table - Summary of Model, ANOVA and Regression coefficients for Regression of Factors Leading to Job Satisfaction

| Model                        | Standardized Coefficients (Beta) | t     | Sig. | \( R^2 \) | F             | Model Significance |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|
| (Constant)                   |                                  | .094  | .925 | .869      | 133.611       | .000              |
| Working hours                | .109                             | 1.339 | .182 |           |               |                   |
| Promotion                    | .089                             | 1.928 | .050 |           |               |                   |
| Job Responsibilities         | .052                             | .675  | .500 |           |               |                   |
| Recognition and rewards done | -.223                            | -2.297| .023 |           |               |                   |
| Supervisor Support           | .559                             | 7.097 | .000 |           |               |                   |
| Salary                       | .113                             | 1.409 | .160 |           |               |                   |
| Colleagues Support           | .327                             | 3.499 | .001 |           |               |                   |

From Table VIII, it can be analyzed that the adjusted R Square value of the model was found to be 0.869, which implies that 86.9% of the variation in the dependent variable was a direct result of the independent variables (antecedents of job satisfaction). Also, considering the ANOVA results, the F-value of 133.611 and a high significance of this model at \( p = .000 \), confirms that the null hypothesis can be rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

Regression coefficient analysis (Table VIII) was done to determine the significance of the predicted variable and how the independent variables (10 parameters) influenced overall job satisfaction of academic staff in private universities of UAE. From the table, it can be seen that only few variables were significantly influencing job satisfaction among the academic staff of private universities of UAE. When evaluation of the standard coefficients was done it was found that; “Supervisor Support” (.559) showed the highest influence towards job satisfaction in academic staff owing to its high Standardized co-efficient values. This suggested that Support from supervisor is one factor that is mostly contributes to increasing job satisfaction academic staff of private universities in UAE. Also, “Promotion” (\( p = 0.050 \)) was seen to be positively effecting job satisfaction. Thus as the chances of promotion increase, job satisfaction in the academic staff also increases. The study conducted by Kosteas, (2011) stated that as the chances of interview increase, the job satisfaction also increases as is
inferred in the present study also.

Besides this, “Colleague Support” was also seen to contribute to increasing job satisfaction with co-efficient value of .327 (p =0.001). This shows that as the support from colleague increases, the job satisfaction also increases. The study conducted by James, (2011) also stated that support from colleagues increases the job satisfaction level in the academic staff of the university.

Lastly, it can also be seen that the factor “Recognition and rewards” (p=0.023) showed negative coefficients of -.223. This suggests that there is an inverse relationship between these independent variables and the dependent variable reflecting that as the recognition and rewards increases, job satisfaction decreases in academic staff. This could be due to the reason that as the rewards and recognition increase, the pressure to perform increases even more. Chamorro-Premuzic, (2013) also stated that as reward increases, job satisfaction decreases and said that intrinsic goals like sheer curiosity, enjoyment, learning or challenges at work increase the job satisfaction.

Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted that, several factor increase the job satisfaction in the academic staff of private universities in UAE, namely, supervisor support, promotion and colleague support.

5. Discussions and Conclusions

In the present study aimed to determine the level of satisfaction in the academic staff in the 15 private universities in UAE, it was found that the academic staff is satisfied with the job and a very small part of the sample stated that they were not satisfied with the job at the private university. This clearly suggests that the work environment for academic staff in private universities of UAE was appropriate and stress free. Further, the respondents who reacted negatively might be facing difficulties due to the certain personal factors like family issues or lack of required qualification.

Further the study was aimed to find the factors that lead to job satisfaction. It was found from the regression model that support from supervisor, chance of promotion and support from colleagues increase the job satisfaction in the academic staff of private universities in UAE. Support from supervisor and support from colleagues creates a friendly environment at the workplace which further reduces the job stress due to which quality of work life increases and leads to job satisfaction. Chances of promotion increase the feeling of belongingness at work place and employees also see their growth graph going up due to which they start feeling satisfied at work. Further it was found in the study that as the Recognition and rewards for work done increases, job satisfaction decreases, which could be because rewards and recognition increase the pressure to perform and increases the expectation of self and others. This pressure to meet expectations and give consistent or even better performance induces feeling of stress thereby decreasing job satisfaction.

Thus it can be asserted that the satisfaction level in the academic staff of private universities in UAE can be increased by increasing support from supervisor, chance of promotion and support from colleagues.
The findings of the present study can be adopted by the private universities in UAE to increase job satisfaction in the academic staff thus reducing the attrition rate and creating a stable environment in the university. This will create a reliable and stable study environment for students which will be ultimately beneficial for the growth and development of the university.
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