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Job satisfaction among employees of education offices in Assosa zone: Implication for intervention, Assosa, Ethiopia
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Abstract: In this study job satisfaction among employees of education offices in Assosa zone was examined. Sixty-five regional education bureau and 50 woreda education office employees were selected with proportional stratified random sampling. One sample t-test, independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, and linear regression were used for data analysis. The findings revealed that employees were significantly dissatisfied. Regarding organizational location, there were no significant differences in satisfaction between employees of regional education bureau and woreda education offices except working condition, supervision, and organizational policies and practice. This finding also indicated that the dissatisfaction level of employees of woreda education offices were more severe in relation to working condition and supervision, whereas in terms of organizational policies and practice employees of education bureau were more dissatisfied. Additionally, the study indicated that working experience and educational level have no effect on overall satisfaction of the participants. However, there was significant satisfaction
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This study examined job satisfaction among employees of education bureau and woreda education offices in Assosa zone. The output of this research indicated that employees of education bureau and woreda education offices of the aforementioned zone were dissatisfied with their job. It is further showed that the woreda education officers were more dissatisfied in relation to working condition and supervision than employees of education bureau, whereas in terms of organizational policies and practice employees of education bureau were more dissatisfied than their counterparts at woreda level. In addition, the result showed that as working experience increases the chance for being promoted decreases. The overall result indicated that designing clear and fair promotion policy, assigning competent and enthusiastic supervisors, creating conducive working environment, and promoting participatory decision making are demanded.
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1. **Introduction**

Job satisfaction is defined more specifically in the literature, and several theorists have generated their own workable definitions. Of those researchers, Newstrom (1986) defined job satisfaction as a set of favorable or unfavorable feelings with which employees view their work. E. Locke (1969) suggested that job satisfaction was a positive or pleasurable reaction resulting from the appraisal of one's job, job achievement, or job experiences. Moreover, Vroom (1982) defined job satisfaction as workers’ emotional orientation toward their current job roles. Similarly, Schultz (1982) stated that job satisfaction is essentially the psychological disposition of people toward their work. Siegal and Lance (1987) stated simply that job satisfaction is an emotional response defining the degree to which people like their job. According to Hoppock (1975) job satisfaction may be defined as the degree to which personal wants, both material and psychological, are realized by individuals while performing tasks assigned to them. Although different scholars define the term job satisfaction differently, in this study, job satisfaction is defined as how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs (Spector, 1956).

Several researches conducted globally showed that there is a positive association between job satisfaction of employees and organizational performance. With regard to this, Amburgey (2005) stated that job satisfaction is an important element of success in an organization. Supporting this, Lusser (1990) indicated that job satisfaction can contribute substantially to the effectiveness of an organization. As to him, it contributes to productive output in the form of high quantity and quality products and services, as well as to maintain objectives of low absenteeism and turnover. Bruce and Blackburn (1992) also stated that satisfied employees are more likely to experience high internal work motivation, to give high-quality work performance, and to have low absenteeism and turnover.

It has also been argued that job satisfaction has a major effect on people's lives. Regarding this, Locke (1976) indicated that job satisfaction most commonly affects a person's physical health, mental health and social life. Moreover, Rain et al. (1991) wrote that job satisfaction is connected to life satisfaction, whereby people who are satisfied with their jobs will tend to be happy with their lives as well, and vice versa. Coster (1992) supported the view by stating that work could have influence on people's lives. Furthermore, Breed and Breda (1997) indicated that job satisfaction may affect absenteeism, complaints, and labor unrest.

In general, job satisfaction may be studied from two slightly different perspectives. Firstly, job satisfaction may be treated as a single, overall feeling toward a person's job. Alternatively, researchers may focus on the different aspects that impact upon a job, example, its rewards and social environment, and even characteristics of the job itself, such as its content. It is believed that this latter view permits a more comprehensive picture of job satisfaction, as an individual typically experiences different levels of satisfaction across different job aspects (Spector, 2003). It is this summed total of satisfaction with the different aspects of the job that many authors collectively refer to as job satisfaction.

In examining the literature, while there have been several local studies in area related to employee job satisfaction (Sebsibe, 2002; Shimelis, 2013 and Desalegn, 1997 as cited in; Sebsibe, 2002), the
majority of these studies tend to focus on in noneducational organization and to school level educational institutions; and no research has been done locally on employees’ job satisfaction at regional and woreda level education offices particularly in Benishangul Gumuz regional state. Likewise, even though Shimelis (2013) considered personal variables such as sex, age, work experience, and educational qualification in his study, these personal variables were not treated in light of their impact on job satisfaction rather they are examined in connection with respondents’ distribution in the institution.

Whatever theoretical approach is used to study job satisfaction, most of the researchers have identified two groups of variables: environmental factors and personal characteristics of individuals (Jan et al., 2012). However, Herzberg’s theory is the most useful model to study job satisfaction (Kim, 2004). Moreover, Karimi (2007) found out that as it helps in understanding the job satisfaction in the educational settings. On the other hand, Getahun et al., (2007) pointed out that as it is used to a theoretical framework for assessing the police officers’ job satisfaction.

In this regard, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory was adapted to provide a conceptual foundation of this study. The reason for adapting Herzberg’s model is that the theory provides a comprehensive classification of the facets of job satisfaction in general and as Karimi (2007) pointed out, it helps in understanding the job satisfaction in the educational settings in particular. Herzberg presents two sets of job conditions: dissatisfies (hygiene factors) and satisfies (motivators). Herzberg reasoned that because the factors causing satisfaction are different from those causing dissatisfaction, the two feelings cannot simply be treated as opposites of one another. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), job satisfiers/motivators include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement and the hygiene factors are contextual such as, company policy, administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, supervisor, and working conditions.

However, Spector (1997) argues that the most common facets or aspects of job satisfaction includes appreciation, communication, coworkers, fringe benefits, job conditions, nature of the work itself, organization itself, organizations policies and procedures, pay, personal growth, promotion opportunities, recognition, security, and supervision. Additionally, the research conducted by (Ololube, 2006; Spector, 1997; Greenberg & Baron, 1995) found that employees’ can be satisfied equally with the factors what Herzberg called hygiene factors and motivators. This indicates that dissatisfies (hygiene factors) and satisfiers (motivators) can be placed on the same continuum.

Thus, there is a controversy among researchers on what satisfies employees. This variation calls for further investigation to decide whether the aforementioned factors have an impact on employees’ job satisfaction. For the purposes of this study, the researcher found favorable Herzberg et al. (1959) two-factors theory while integrating Spector’s (1997) views on aspects of job satisfaction to represent the theoretical framework of the study and to investigate the level of job satisfaction among employees of education bureau and woreda education offices.

In light of these variables, the researchers formulated the following research questions:

1. To what extent are employees of education bureau and woreda education offices in Assosa Zone satisfied by their job (across the nine facets of a job)?

2. Is there significant difference in job satisfaction among employees of education bureau and woreda education offices in Assosa Zone with regard to location, working experience, and educational level (across the nine facets of a job)?

3. Which job satisfaction facets significantly contribute to employees’ overall job satisfaction in regional education bureau and woreda education offices of Assosa Zone?
2. Methodology

Descriptive survey design was used in this study. A total of 191 employees were the target population of the study which comprise 108 of them from regional education bureau and 83 employees from education offices of Assosa zone. For manageability reason, the researchers decided to select 60% of employees from the target population that accounts the sample size of 115, with 65 employees from the regional education bureau and 50 employees from woreda education offices of Assosa zone.

For data collection purpose the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by (Weiss et al., 1967) but modified and reconstructed to make it suitable for the study was used. It was adopted by integrating ideas from the literature review part of this study and long form of MSQ as part of the review since this form of MSQ measures satisfaction with several different aspects of the work environment. The questionnaire was close-ended and one set for both regional education bureau and woreda education offices employees. The entire questionnaire consisted of two main sections. The first section included demographic information in which the participants were asked to provide their personal background with regard to gender, age, qualification, working experience and location with the aim of drawing profile and its consequence on job satisfaction of the respondents whereas the second section requests the respondents to decide on a true picture of their feeling about their level of satisfaction based on specific aspect of job satisfaction.

The data gathered through the questionnaire were analyzed with the aid of both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Frequency, Mean and Standard deviation were mainly employed among descriptive statistics whereas one sample t-test, independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, and linear regression were used from inferential statistical techniques.

3. Findings and discussion

3.1. Extent of Job Satisfaction among Employees of Education Bureau/Offices

To draw out the findings, the level of respondents’ satisfaction was determined by considering the Best’s criteria as cited in Drukpa (2010). The criteria and interpretation of the rating scale indicates 1.00–1.80 = very dissatisfied; 1.81–2.60 = dissatisfied; 2.61–3.40 = neutral; 3.41–4.20 = satisfied and 4.21–5.00 = very satisfied. For one sample t-test, the observed mean scores in satisfaction were compared with the value (3.41), “satisfied,” to determine the satisfaction level of employees.

As a result, if the observed mean score of the respondents’ level of job satisfaction is significantly less than the value (3.41), then employees of education bureau and woreda education offices were dissatisfied. While if the observed mean score of the respondents’ level of job satisfaction is equal to or significantly greater than the value (3.41), then these employees were satisfied.

As indicated in Table 1, respondents level of job satisfaction with facets of job satisfaction revealed that the mean scores of employees’ response with the satisfaction of work itself (3.03), recognition (2.76), advancement (2.65), responsibility (2.95), organization policies and practices (2.88), pay (2.06), working condition (2.35), supervision (3.01), and interpersonal relationship (3.22) were significantly lower than the expected mean value (3.41) at the respective t value and degree of freedom (where p < 0.05 in all cases). This result shows that employees of education bureau and woreda education offices were dissatisfied with the aforementioned facets of job satisfaction.

Regarding overall job satisfaction, Table 4 revealed that the mean score of employees’ responses (2.77) were significantly lower than the expected mean (3.41) at (t = -11.286, df = 114, p < 0.05). This result indicated that employees of education bureau/offices were dissatisfied by their job.
The result of this study with respect to work itself indicated that employees were dissatisfied with the work features in their organization. This implies that employees were not experiencing autonomy, challenging and exciting jobs, and task that enable them to use their ability and competency.

The result of this study, therefore, supports the previous research findings of Landy (1989) and Luthans (2005) who reported that employees derive satisfaction from work that is interesting and challenging.

In addition to this, the result of the current study is consistent with the previous work of Sharma and Bhaskar (1991) whose finding postulated that the single most important influence on a person’s job satisfaction experience comes from the nature of the work assigned to him/her by the organization. On the other hand, the present finding is contrary to the work of Alebachew (2013) which indicated that teachers were satisfied with the features of the work they are doing. The variation of these findings might be due to the case that the teaching profession provides freedom to teachers in performing their duties based on their plan, which is unlikely to the condition that might faced to employees of education bureau/offices.

The result of this study further portrayed that employees were dissatisfied with advancement. In this study, aspects related to advancement included: opportunities to be promoted, the fairness of promotion, the accessibility and the way promotion policy was practiced. The result of the present study is in line with the previous research findings of Drafke and Kossen (2002), and McCormick and Ilgen (1985) that pointed many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are good. Whereas, Herzberg et al. (1959) indicated that promotion opportunity is found to be the phenomenon of job satisfaction (motivational factors) rather than hygiene factor. Thus, the present study contradicts with the study of Herzberg et al. (1959).

The findings of the current study also showed that employees were dissatisfied with the responsibility offered to them. Thus, the result of the current study supports the previous research findings of (Bowen; Bowen & Radhakrishna, Hertzberg et al., Padilla-Vallez, as cited in Verret, 2012) indicated that responsibility and job satisfaction have a positive effect on each other. On the other hand, the present study contradicts with the works of Herzberg et al. (1959) who reported that responsibility as a motivating factor can lead workers to feel satisfied but its absence will not necessarily lead to dissatisfaction. Moreover, contrary to the current study (as cited in Verret, 2012) found that responsibility and job satisfaction have no effect on each other.
The result of one sample t-test for employees’ job satisfaction indicated that employees were dissatisfied with the organizational policies and practices having in their organization. This implies that the clarity and the way policies were practiced and communicated as well as opportunity for staff involvement in decision and policy making processes were not instrumental in their organization. The result of the present study supports the previous research findings of (Ponec & Brock, 2000; as cited in Drukpa, 2010) which demonstrated that local and state administrative policies influence satisfaction with work.

The finding of this study showed that employees were dissatisfied with working conditions, which enlightens the existence of unfavorable working conditions in their organization. The result of the current study is consistent with the previous research findings such as (as cited in Krittharpon, 2011; Luthans, 2005) who indicated working conditions that are compatible with employee’s physical comfort and favorable in doing a good job contribute to job satisfaction. Furthermore, the finding of the present study indicated that employees were dissatisfied with the supervision practiced in their organization. In this study the aspects of supervision included the competency of the supervisor in decision making, the way of delegating work, and the nature of relationship he/she practiced with subordinates. The finding of the current study is consistent with the study done by Graham and Messner (1998) whose finding indicated that supervisors with high relationship behavior strongly impact on job satisfaction. In line with this, studies have also shown that employees who have positive interactions with supervisors are generally more satisfied at work (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Vroom, 1982).

The results of one sample t-test for employees’ job satisfaction with respect to interpersonal relationship indicated that employees were dissatisfied with the social interaction having in their organization. This implies that employees of education bureau/offices did not have the opportunity to work in a team, develop close friendship and experiencing spirit of cooperation to the expected level. The present research finding is consistent with the previous research findings of Berta (2005), Luthans (2005), and Maynard (1986) who reported that employees are likely to experience job satisfaction if their need for interaction with others at work place is being met. Maynard (1986) further pointed out that workers who belong to a social group and have friendships on the job tend to be more satisfied, and those who lack social support at work experience more stress, have less coping techniques, and are generally less satisfied.

### 3.2. The Mean Differences in Employees’ Job Satisfaction by Location, Experience and Educational Level

As shown in Table 2, it was found that the mean job satisfaction level of employees working at regional education bureau were higher than employees working at woreda education offices with variables work itself, recognition, responsibility, pay, working condition and supervision. On the contrary, it was identified that the mean job satisfaction level of employees working at woreda education offices were higher than employees of regional education bureau with variables advancement, interpersonal relationship, and organizational policies and practices. However, the independent samples t-test result confirmed that there was no statistically significant mean difference between employees working at regional and woreda level in terms of work itself, recognition advancement, responsibility, pay, and interpersonal relationship at the respective t value and degree of freedom (in all cases, p > 0.05).

On the other hand, the independent samples t-test revealed that there was a significance mean difference between employees working at regional and woreda education offices in relation to working condition (t = 3.828, df = 113, p < 0.05), organization policies and practices (t = -3.154, df = 113, p < 0.05), and supervision (t = 2.079, df = 113, p < 0.05).

This finding indicated that even though both employees of education bureau and woreda education offices were dissatisfied with their job, the dissatisfaction level of employees of woreda education offices were more severe in relation to working condition and supervision whereas in
### Table 2. Independent Samples t-test for Employees’ Job Satisfaction by Organizational Location

| Variable                          | Location     | N  | Mean | SD   | Mean differe. | t    | df  | Sig. (two-tailed) |
|----------------------------------|--------------|----|------|------|---------------|------|-----|------------------|
| Work itself                      | Regional     | 65 | 3.12 | 0.824| 0.19          | 1.273| 113 | 0.206            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 2.93 | 0.739|               |      |     |                  |
| Recognition                      | Regional     | 65 | 2.81 | 0.832| 0.12          | 0.831| 113 | 0.407            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 2.69 | 0.690|               |      |     |                  |
| Advancement                      | Regional     | 65 | 2.54 | 0.955| -0.25         | -1.418| 113 | 0.159            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 2.79 | 0.944|               |      |     |                  |
| Responsibility                   | Regional     | 65 | 2.97 | 0.898| 0.05          | 0.276| 113 | 0.783            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 2.92 | 0.835|               |      |     |                  |
| Organizational policies and practice | Regional | 65 | 2.61 | 0.767| -0.63         | -3.154| 113 | 0.002            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 3.24 | 1.344|               |      |     |                  |
| Pay                              | Regional     | 65 | 2.17 | 0.947| 0.24          | 1.375| 113 | 0.172            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 1.93 | 0.927|               |      |     |                  |
| Working condition                | Regional     | 65 | 2.60 | 0.819| 0.58          | 3.828| 113 | 0.000            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 2.02 | 0.787|               |      |     |                  |
| Supervision                      | Regional     | 65 | 3.17 | 0.974| 0.38          | 2.079| 113 | 0.040            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 2.79 | 0.971|               |      |     |                  |
| Interpersonal relationship       | Regional     | 65 | 3.17 | 0.984| -0.11         | -0.634| 113 | 0.528            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 3.28 | 0.934|               |      |     |                  |
| Overall satisfaction             | Regional     | 65 | 2.79 | 0.646| 0.06          | 0.543| 113 | 0.588            |
|                                  | Woreda       | 50 | 2.73 | 0.566|               |      |     |                  |

terms of organizational policies and practice employees of education bureau were more dissatisfied than employees of woreda education offices. Generally, it was found that the observed mean overall job satisfaction level of employees of regional education bureau (2.79) was higher than employees working at woreda education offices (2.73). However, the independent samples t-test result confirmed that there was no statistically significant mean difference between employees of education bureau and woreda education offices with respect to overall job satisfaction ($t = 0.543, df = 113, p > 0.05$).

The findings of several studies have shown the existence of job satisfaction difference between urban and rural employees. Most of them support the present study in that they found urban employees were more satisfied than rural. For instance, (Finley, 1991) as cited in Akhtar et al. (2012) investigated higher levels of job satisfaction in urban educational professionals when compared with rural settings. On the contrary, the current study is contradictory with the study of Alebachew (2013) whose findings indicated that leaders and teachers working in rural area were more satisfied than their colleagues in urban area.

The results in Table 3 showed that almost in all variables except in advancement, the respondents have no statistically significant mean difference ($p > 0.05$) across the four subgroups of working experience (3 years and below, 4–6 years, 7–9 years, 10 years, and above) for the variables work itself recognition, responsibility, organizational policies and practice, pay, working condition, supervision, and interpersonal relationship. Additionally, as displayed in Table 7, there is no statistically significant mean difference in the overall satisfaction of employees across the four categories of working experience at ($F (3,111) = 0.887, p > 0.05$). This study implies working
experience has no significant effect on job satisfaction for employees of education bureau and woreda education offices.

The results in Table 4 showed that almost in all variables except supervision, there is no statistically significant mean difference in job satisfaction across the categories of educational level (Diploma and below, First Degree, MA/MSC, and above) of respondents, that is, on the variables work itself, recognition, advancement, organizational policies and practice, pay, working condition, and interpersonal relationship. In the entire of these variables, the value of p is greater than 0.05. However, there is significant mean difference in satisfaction with supervision (F (2,112) = 3.827, p < 0.05) across the three categories of educational level.

The result of the present study pointed out that there were no significant mean differences across the three subgroups of educational level with regard to overall job satisfaction. Additionally, the result indicated that those with lower level of education, that is diploma and

| Variable               | Source of variation | Sum of squares | df  | Mean square | F    | Sig.  |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|-------|
| Work itself            | Between Groups      | 0.913          | 3   | 0.304       | 0.481 | 0.696 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 70.320         | 111 | 0.634       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 71.233         | 114 |             |      |       |
| Recognition            | Between Groups      | 0.286          | 3   | 0.095       | 0.156 | 0.925 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 67.787         | 111 | 0.611       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 68.073         | 114 |             |      |       |
| Advancement            | Between Groups      | 11.130         | 3   | 3.710       | 4.440 | 0.005 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 92.758         | 111 | 0.836       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 103.887        | 114 |             |      |       |
| Responsibility         | Between Groups      | 2.020          | 3   | 0.673       | 0.892 | 0.448 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 83.808         | 111 | 0.755       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 85.827         | 114 |             |      |       |
| Organizational policy  | Between Groups      | 7.687          | 3   | 2.562       | 2.196 | 0.093 |
| and practice           | Within Groups       | 129.505        | 111 | 1.167       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 137.192        | 114 |             |      |       |
| Pay                    | Between Groups      | 0.592          | 3   | 0.197       | 0.218 | 0.884 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 100.496        | 111 | 0.905       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 101.088        | 114 |             |      |       |
| Working condition      | Between Groups      | 0.209          | 3   | 0.070       | 0.094 | 0.963 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 82.628         | 111 | 0.744       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 82.837         | 114 |             |      |       |
| Supervision            | Between Groups      | 1.748          | 3   | 0.583       | 0.592 | 0.621 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 109.207        | 111 | 0.984       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 110.954        | 114 |             |      |       |
| Interpersonal          | Between Groups      | 3.278          | 3   | 1.093       | 1.191 | 0.317 |
| relationship           | Within Groups       | 101.840        | 111 | 0.917       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 105.118        | 114 |             |      |       |
| Overall satisfaction   | Between Groups      | 0.995          | 3   | 0.332       | 0.887 | 0.450 |
|                        | Within Groups       | 41.513         | 111 | 0.374       |      |       |
|                        | Total               | 42.508         | 114 |             |      |       |
Table 4. One Way ANOVA for Employees Job Satisfaction by Educational Level

| Variable                      | Source of variation | Sum of squares | df | Mean square | F     | Sig. |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Work itself                   | Between Groups      | 0.152          | 2  | 0.076       | 0.120 | 0.887|
|                               | Within Groups       | 71.081         | 112| 0.635       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 71.233         | 114|             |       |      |
| Recognition                   | Between Groups      | 2.973          | 2  | 1.486       | 2.557 | 0.082|
|                               | Within Groups       | 65.101         | 112| 0.581       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 68.073         | 114|             |       |      |
| Advancement                   | Between Groups      | 0.451          | 2  | 0.225       | 0.244 | 0.784|
|                               | Within Groups       | 103.437        | 112| 0.924       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 103.887        | 114|             |       |      |
| Responsibility                | Between Groups      | 0.476          | 2  | 0.238       | 0.312 | 0.733|
|                               | Within Groups       | 85.352         | 112| 0.762       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 85.827         | 114|             |       |      |
| Organizational policy and practice | Between Groups  | 1.149          | 2  | 0.574       | 0.473 | 0.624|
|                               | Within Groups       | 136.043        | 112| 1.215       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 137.192        | 114|             |       |      |
| Pay                           | Between Groups      | 0.028          | 2  | 0.014       | 0.016 | 0.984|
|                               | Within Groups       | 101.059        | 112| 0.902       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 101.088        | 114|             |       |      |
| Working condition             | Between Groups      | 0.893          | 2  | 0.447       | 0.611 | 0.545|
|                               | Within Groups       | 81.944         | 112| 0.732       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 82.837         | 114|             |       |      |
| Supervision                   | Between Groups      | 7.097          | 2  | 3.549       | 3.827 | 0.025|
|                               | Within Groups       | 103.857        | 112| 0.927       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 110.954        | 114|             |       |      |
| Interpersonal relationship    | Between Groups      | 0.036          | 2  | 0.018       | 0.019 | 0.981|
|                               | Within Groups       | 105.082        | 112| 0.938       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 105.118        | 114|             |       |      |
| Overall satisfaction          | Between Groups      | 0.408          | 2  | 0.204       | 0.542 | 0.583|
|                               | Within Groups       | 42.100         | 112| 0.376       |       |      |
|                               | Total               | 42.508         | 114|             |       |      |

below, had higher levels of job satisfaction as compared to respondents with higher level of education (First degree and postgraduate levels of education). The study also demonstrated that the relation did not show consistent pattern. Thus, the findings of this study is consistent with a study done by Gazioglu and Tansel (2002) who observed that those with First degrees and postgraduate holders had lower levels of job satisfaction compared to individuals with lower levels of education. Furthermore, Kh Metle (2003); Clark and Oswald (1996) argued that due to expectation differentials between different levels of education, the relationship between education and job satisfaction is unclear. This implies that the relationship between the level of education and job satisfaction showed no consistent pattern, and in that it supports the current study. Strengthening the present work, Lambert et al. (2001) found that education has no significant effect on job satisfaction. Similarly, Rogers (1991) and (Herzberg, 1966 as cited in Kalleberg, 1974) did not also support for a link between job satisfaction and educational level. However, the study conducted by Quinn and Mandilovitch; Glenn and Weaver as cited in Bull (2005) revealed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and educational level, which contradict with this study.
3.3. The Contribution of Job Satisfaction Facets on Employees Overall Job Satisfaction

To look at job satisfaction facets contribution, stepwise regression method was employed as shown in Table 5. Thus, employees’ overall job satisfaction is considered as dependent variable while the nine job satisfaction facets are treated as independent or predictor variables.

The step wise regression revealed that 99.0 % of employees’ job satisfaction was explained by eight predicting variables of this study. The model using a stepwise regression method revealed that there was a significant model at (F (8, 106) = 1306.637, p < 0.05). The value of coefficient of determination were found at (0.142) for recognition, (0.117) for supervision, (0.117) for organizational policies and practice, (0.118) for pay, (0.149) for responsibility, (0.114) for interpersonal relationship, (0.122) for working condition, and (0.105) for advancement. The value of p is less than 0.05 across these variables. The finding indicates that these predictor variables were significantly contributing to the overall job satisfaction. It also pointed out that when the value of every predictor is equal to 0, the predicted value of the dependent variable of the model will be 0.073. In general, this result shows that 99.0% of employees’ overall job satisfaction was explained by the variables recognition, supervision, organizational policies and practice, pay, responsibility, interpersonal relationship, working condition, and advancement while the rest (1.0 %) depended on other variables which were statistically excluded in the regression, that is, work itself and variables that were not considered in this study.

The results of the current study in relation to recognition is consistent with the previous findings of Herzberg et al. (1959) in that they claimed recognition as an intrinsic factor that can positively affect job satisfaction. In connection with advancement, a number of researchers are of the opinion that job satisfaction is strongly related to opportunities for advancement (Pergamit & Veum; Peterson et al.; Sclafane; as cited in Luddy, 2005) which is consistent with the current study. This view is supported by Ellickson and Logsdon (2002) whose findings revealed that municipal government workers satisfied with promotional opportunities was found to be positively and significantly related to job satisfaction.

Similarly, many studies have shown that responsibility and job satisfaction have a positive effect on each other (Bowen; Bowen & Radhakrisha, Hertzberg et al., Padilla-Velez, as cited in Verret, 2012), and is consistent with the current study. Similarly, Moxley (1977) reported that responsibility was related to job dissatisfaction. On the contrary to the present study, other studies found that responsibility and job satisfaction have no effect on each other (Cano & Miller, 1992; Castillo, Conklin & Cano, 1998; as cited in Verret, 2012) However, the present result of employees’ job satisfaction in relation to organizational policies and practice contradicts with Herzberg’s Two Factors Theory in that it demonstrated organizational policies and practices are the sources of job dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959; Robbins & Judge, 2008).

Regarding pay, on the other hand, recent studies have generally shown a positive relationship between pay and job satisfaction (as cited in Worrell, 2004). A study conducted by Oshogbemi (2000) also confirmed the present study by pointing out the existence of statistically significant relationship between payments of employees with their level of job satisfaction. However, a study done by Young et al. (1998) in the public sector failed to find any significant relationship between pay and satisfaction, which contradicts with the finding of this study. Similarly, results from a survey conducted by Brainard (2005) amongst postdoctoral scientific researchers found pay and benefits to be weakly associated with job satisfaction.

Moreover, the result of step wise regression indicated that working condition significantly contributed to employees’ job satisfaction. In contrast, a study conducted by (as cited in Bull, 2005) showed that working conditions have a moderate impact on the employee’s job satisfaction. On the other hand, in connection with supervision the finding of a study investigated by Graham and Messner (1998) indicated that supervisors with high relationship behavior strongly impact on job satisfaction, which supports the present study. They explain further that supervisory behavior
Table 5. Stepwise Regression for the Contribution of Job Satisfaction Facets to Employees' Overall Job Satisfaction

| Model | Dependent variable | Independent variables (predictors) | R square | Unstd. coefficients | Std. coefficients | t | Sig. | 95.0% confidence interval for B |
|-------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------|---------------------|------------------|---|------|--------------------------------|
| 8     | Overall Job Satisfaction | (Constant) | 0.99 | 0.073 | 0.027 | 2.678 | 0.009 | 0.019 | 0.128 |
|       |                    | Recognition                           |          | 0.142 | 0.010 | 0.179 | 13.868 | 0.000 | 0.121 | 0.162 |
|       |                    | Supervision                           |          | 0.117 | 0.008 | 0.189 | 15.313 | 0.000 | 0.102 | 0.132 |
|       |                    | Organizational policy and practice    |          | 0.117 | 0.007 | 0.210 | 17.436 | 0.000 | 0.103 | 0.130 |
|       |                    | Pay                                  |          | 0.118 | 0.007 | 0.181 | 15.915 | 0.000 | 0.103 | 0.132 |
|       |                    | Responsibility                        |          | 0.149 | 0.009 | 0.212 | 16.792 | 0.000 | 0.132 | 0.167 |
|       |                    | Interpersonal relationship            |          | 0.114 | 0.008 | 0.179 | 14.140 | 0.000 | 0.098 | 0.130 |
|       |                    | Working condition                     |          | 0.122 | 0.009 | 0.171 | 13.714 | 0.000 | 0.105 | 0.140 |
|       |                    | Advancement                           |          | 0.105 | 0.008 | 0.165 | 13.425 | 0.000 | 0.090 | 0.121 |
strongly affects the development of trust in employees’ relationships and trust may in turn have a significant relationship with job satisfaction.

The finding of the current study in relation to interpersonal relationship is in line with a study done by Brown et al. (1998) who claimed that employees’ supervision and interaction have been found to be the two most significant interpersonal factors when looking at job satisfaction. Coinciding with this, Marks (1994) indicated that the social context of work is also likely to have a significant impact on a worker’s attitude and behavior. Supporting the present finding, Hoole and Vermeulen (2003) also found that employees who have more social interaction with colleagues, staff, and clients experienced significantly higher levels of job satisfaction than those who did not have much social contact with others at work. This implies that interpersonal relationship among employees play an important role in employees’ job satisfaction. Conversely, the finding of the current study was inconsistent with Herzberg’s Two Factors Theory in which interpersonal relationship is the sources of job dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959; Robbins & Judge, 2008).

Finally, the results of the current study showed that work itself has no significant effect on overall job satisfaction. Thus, this finding contradicts with the previous findings of Vitell and Davis (1990) who indicated that employees in a management information system environment, found a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and the dimension of work itself. Similarly, Landy (1989) advocates work which is personally interesting to employees is likely to contribute to job satisfaction. Conversely, this study contradicts with the study conducted by (Landy, 1989; Larwood, 1984; Luthans, 2005; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; as cited in Bull, 2005) who confirmed that the nature of the work performed by employees has a significant impact on their level of job satisfaction.

3.4. Conclusion
The findings of the study indicated that employees of education bureau and woreda education offices were dissatisfied with their job. The overall job satisfaction level of employees of education bureau/offices were much below the expected level. This shows that unless the regional education bureau and woreda education offices give special attention to the satisfaction issue of the employees, the performance of the education sector and maintaining experienced and competent workers will be in question.

3.5. Recommendations
Based on the main findings of this study, the following points were recommended.

- Employees’ desire for promotion is strong for different reasons. For instance, the desire for higher earnings, the desire for social status and the desire for greater responsibility. Thus, in order to avoid the imbalance of promotion with working experiences, regional education bureau in collaboration with woreda education offices should design a clear and fair promotion policy not only to keep the existing employees but also to attract new employees to the sector that in turn leads to job satisfaction in particular and organization effectiveness in general.
- Education bureau and woreda educatin offices should create healthy interpersonal relationship among employees by facilitating conditions that leads to spirit of cooperation, team work and friendship to make them enjoy with their work and retain in the organization.
- Education bureau and woreda education offices should assign competent and enthusiastic supervisors by designing and implementing appropriate recruitment policy to fill the gap of employees and reduce their dissatisfaction.
- Education bureau and woreda education offices should create conducive working environment for employees through supplying adequate resources, allocating appropriate tasks, arranging favorable working rooms and maintain the job security of employees, as good working
conditions are likely led to physical comfort. This helps for employees to exert much effort and thereby the education bureau and woreda education offices become more productive.

- Employees of regional education bureau and woreda education offices of Assosa zone were significantly dissatisfied with the policies and the way these policies are practiced in their working environment. Thus, these organizations should design clear policies and implement them fairly and transparently through offering chance for employees to participate in decision and policy making to get them motivated for work and thereby enhance performance.

- Educational leaders and planners of regional education bureau and woreda education offices should focus on different factors that contribute toward employees’ job satisfaction so as to maintain optimally satisfied and productive employees.

3.6. For Further Research

- Further research needs be conducted in order to widen understandings of employees’ job satisfaction across regions as this study focused on BGRS regional education bureau and woreda education offices in one Zone, which may not represent the whole region. So to make the results more credible and valid, it is important to conduct more extensive investigation.

- This research did not exhaust all the job satisfaction variables that previous researchers and theorists identified. Future research should therefore address job satisfaction factors that are not covered so far.
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