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ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction and job performance have aroused interest in scholarly debates due to their importance and impact on organizational productivity. The purpose of this study was to examine academic staff’s job satisfaction and assess the extent to which this influences their performance. The main objectives of the study were: (a) to examine the relationship between recognition job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania (b) to assess the relationship between responsibility job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities (c) to determine the relationship between remuneration job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities (d) to examine the relationship between promotion job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities. The study was motivated by the situation in Tanzanian universities over the past three decades when universities encountered numerous challenges including funding shortage which negatively impacts teaching and research functions in universities. Consequently, strikes by academic staff have been on the rise demanding better terms of service as they are dissatisfied with the lack of recognition, low wages, responsibility and promotion practices, which ultimately cause high job turnover as a number of academic staff pursue other seemingly financially promising non-academic jobs, such as politics. The study was based on Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory. The study is significant because its findings may contribute to universities enhancing their motivation strategies so as to make academic staff satisfied and hence perform better in their teaching and research functions. The study adopted a correlational research design, which embraced both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The data for this study were collected using questionnaires from 826 academic staff from six universities, with a response rate of 50% (411 academic staff). The data was analysed using statistical package (SPSS) version 16. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 6 Deputy Vice Chancellors – Administration, 12 senior academic staff and 2 leaders of the academic staff union. Content validity was determined by seeking the expert judgement of an educational management specialist. Purposive sampling was used to select universities based on the following factors; geographical location, mode of academic programmes delivery, year of establishment and size of the university. Cronbach’s technique was used to ascertain reliability of the instruments. Qualitative data were analysed in themes while quantitative data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings indicated that there is no statistically significant relationship between recognition, responsibility, remuneration and promotion job satisfaction indicators and job performance of university academic staff. The study recommends that university management need to recognize academic staff’s efforts so as to encourage them to perform better in their job and hence increase universities’ performance.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

Over the past three decades, job satisfaction and job performance have been the subject of interest in the scholarly discourse. The popularity of the two concepts originated from their association with various key organizational practices. For example, the literature has shown that job satisfaction has a positive impact on job performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001; Pushpakumari, 2008; Faiz, 2013; Bayasgalan, 2015; Yousef, 2016) and a negative influence on productivity, job turnover intentions and burnout (Matin, Kalali & Anvari, 2012; Iqbal, Ehsan, Rizwan & Noreen, 2014; Hoboubi, Choobineh, Ghanavati, Keshavarzi & Hosseini, 2016; Alwi, Mustapha, Othman, Shahid & Azmi, 2016). Therefore, investigating employees’ satisfaction and their performance is essential since employees are very important for the success of an organization.

Spector (1997) expounded the concept of job satisfaction as an attitudinal indicator that evaluates how the worker feels about his or her job, including diverse dimensions of the job. Although numerous researchers have attempted to characterize job satisfaction from alternative points of view, taking into consideration several factors like age, gender, marital status, academic qualifications, length of employment, job position or rank (Noordin & Jusoff, 2009; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009; Ali & Akhter, 2009; Schroder, 2008; Masa’deh, Shannak, Maqableh &
Tarhini, 2017), this study adopted Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory of motivation (1984) because it is imperative to ensure the satisfaction of employees in the workplace for improved productivity (Hyun & Oh, 2011). Since most of the studies utilizing Herzberg’s Two-factor theory have been tested in developed countries, this study used it in a developing country setting.

Several studies on job satisfaction and job performance levels in organizations have mainly been conducted in developed countries (Webber, 2012; Webber, 2013; Dowling, 2014; Waqas, Bashir, Sattar, Abdullah, Hussain, Anjum & Arshad, 2014) and have demonstrated that employment-related variables are significant determinants of job satisfaction and job performance among employees. However, limited research has been done on this subject in Sub-Saharan Africa, and specifically in Tanzania. The prevailing view is that African organizations are operating in a different environment or culture from that of developed countries, so that western-derived and tested arguments cannot be used to explain and understand organizational problems in Africa countries (Aluko, 2003). In this regard, this study sought to assess the level of job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in a developing country context and to provide empirical evidence of how job satisfaction influences the job performance of academic staff.

This introductory chapter provides an overview of the context of the study through a brief review of job satisfaction in both developed and developing countries, and the development of education, focusing on higher education in Tanzania and academic staff’s job performance. Furthermore, the chapter presents the statement of the
problem, purpose and objectives of the study, research hypotheses, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, assumptions, theoretical framework, conceptual framework and operational definition of key terms.

1.1.1 Trends in Job Satisfaction

Although job satisfaction has been extensively researched in various specializations such as business, psychology, sociology and nursing since the early 20th century, there is no consensus on the real definition of the term and, as a result, has been criticized for its subjectivity (Hammer & Zimmermann, 2011; Blustein, Olle, Connors-Kellgren, Olle & Diamonti, 2016). The absence of objectivity has prompted disagreement by various studies. In this regard, Hulin and Judge (2003) and Ravari, Mirzari, Kazemi and Jamalizadeh (2012) argued that job satisfaction should be explored as a multidimensional concept as it contains the abilities, attitudes, beliefs, value system and psychological responses to the job of an individual. Thus, research studies have used numerous aspects to explain the development of job satisfaction. These include job attributes, social information processing and disposition (Glisson & Durick, 1988; Jex, 2002).

1.1.2 Academic Profession across the Globe

All over the world, universities and other institutes of higher education are viewed as the institutions responsible for generating, retaining and disseminating knowledge through research and teaching (Hohle & Teichler, 2013). Specifically, universities operate as the main foundation for almost all professional careers, whereby, in recent years, university education has become the entry point in many labour markets.
Academics working in various academic disciplines at these universities are tasked with the responsibility of transmitting knowledge, thereby shaping the knowledge of numerous policy makers and professionals in their respective occupations. Consequently, Altbach (2004) argued that the academic profession across the globe is connected through the advancement of teaching and research.

In most countries, academic staff are employed to both teach and do research. Studies by Hohle and Teichler (2013) and Teichler (2014) found that, in German universities, there is a close relationship between research and teaching, in that teaching and learning is expected to stimulate research, and so teaching needs to be of the highest quality so that the knowledge acquired is effectively utilized in today’s advanced knowledge-based economy.

The expansion of higher education worldwide may be regarded as a great success, but a closer look reveals that expansion is associated with numerous challenges. According to Jacob and Teichler (2011), a number of factors indicate that the academic profession is threatened in various countries due to the lack of academic freedom and shortage of funds. For instance, in the United States, Cummings and Finkelstein (2011) asserted that national and state government priorities have shifted to focusing on basic education, health and welfare at the expense of higher education, and so the decline in funding for higher education compels universities, especially those in the public sector, to explore new revenue sources and to cut costs. This has resulted in academic staff being put under enormous pressure to generate income for the university’s core functions of teaching, research and community service. To
ensure the availability of continuous funds, new strategies made been created, including privatizing most public institutions of higher learning through outsourcing non-essential services and establishing or expanding fund-raising mechanisms to enhance academic quality and the salaries of academic staff (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

In Australia, there is growing interest by scholars because of the development and expansion of the university system, the increased number of those retiring and, in addition, expanded global versatility. However, when Australian academic staff are compared with their counterparts worldwide, it was found that Australian academics were less satisfied with their work, unlike international colleagues and other professionals in Australia (Coates, Dobson, Edwards, Friedman, Goedegebuure & Meek, 2009).

It must also be mentioned that most of the conditions that affect the academic profession in less-developed countries happen elsewhere. For instance, Evans (2002) noted that the British academic profession has been drawn away from its traditional values that has in some ways weakened the universities. However, the situation in Africa is more worrying due to the fact that until the mid-1990s higher education was not considered important, and so most educational policies focused on primary education and almost all funding was channelled into it, because university education would benefit individuals rather than society, as supported by Woodhall (2007), who
maintained that funding primary education should be emphasized due to the spill-over effects on the wider society.

The academic profession in Africa traces its origins to the colonial era when the European higher education system was introduced, characterized by the presence of academics from the colonial powers in Europe. For instance, in the British and French colonies a few scholars were sent to teach in their respective African universities. However, the African post-independent higher education era witnessed some abrupt changes, as most newly-established universities had an acute shortage of academic staff and few study programmes. Hence, to address these challenges, African students were gradually sent to various European and American universities to pursue further education in the expectation that after they graduated they would return home to fill the gap left by the departing colonial academic staff.

However, sending African students to pursue further education abroad further retarded the development of African higher education institutions, as Altbach (2004) observed that, although Makerere University was designed to serve a population of students from East Africa countries, in 1963 it had less than a hundred African students. Further, West Africa was largely influenced by France, while Central and North Africa were divided between France and Germany. According to Maringe and Carter (2007), African students tended to migrate to former colonial masters’ universities for further education due to cultural ties and language similarities. It is also important to note that there was a similar situation in Lusophone countries, as there were only two higher education institutions, namely, the University of Luanda.
in Angola and the University of Lourenco (now Eduardo Mondlane University) in Mozambique. Unfortunately, during the 1960s these universities were mainly established for Portuguese settlers, as Woldegiorgis and Doevenspeck (2013) observed that in 1966 only one student was Mozambican in the 540 student population at the university.

It is thus not surprising to note that after more than 50 years of independence, most African countries still depend on foreign assistance to develop their own human resources and fund research, a typical example being former colonial masters’ scholarships and research funding schemes, such as the Commonwealth, Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst (DAAD), Fulbright, Netherlands Organisation for International Cooperation in Higher Education and European Union scholarships, which significantly influenced higher education funding in Africa.

Studies have also identified challenges in most African universities, including aging and retired academics, limited mentorship programmes for young academics and inadequate teaching and learning facilities that lead to congested lecture theatres and laboratories amidst increased enrolment. This had an impact on the universities’ core functions of teaching-learning and research, as most of them did not pay much attention to these undertakings (Sawyerr, 2004; Teferra, 2016). The situation is worrying in newly-established universities, which are principally dominated by younger, less experienced academic staff. Some job satisfaction indicators identified for this study are recognition, responsibility, remuneration and promotion opportunities and selected academic staff’s job performance. Recognition, such as
being recognized by their supervisors, has been found to enhance employees’ job performance level (Seddigh, 2015; Chiboiwa, Samuel & Chipunza, 2010). On the other hand, lack of recognition has negatively affected job satisfaction and job performance (Markey, Ravenswood & Webber, 2012; Parvin & Kabir, 2011; Eluka & Okafor, 2015).

In the Tanzanian higher education system, the academic profession is viewed as an important partner in higher education development, as argued by Luhanga (2009), in that academic staff are a crucial component of higher education. Therefore, for the effective running of higher education institutions, the efforts and active involvement of academic staff are undoubtedly needed. It is a fact that no higher learning institution can survive and succeed without academic staff due to their key role in implementing the core functions of the university, namely, teaching, research and community service. Studies by Materu (2007), Machado-Taylor, Soares, Ferreira and Gouveia (2011) further pointed out that the quality of higher education institutions depends on the standard of their academics. Therefore, if a university is to achieve the objectives of its establishment it needs to attract and retain academic staff of the highest standard, who are satisfied with their job, to ensure the provision of high quality education and research.

While universities are expected to bring fresh hope for Tanzania’s development, achieving this depends on numerous factors, namely, the type of academics that are employed to teach and conduct research and the provision of a conducive working
environment, which will ultimately harness the country’s economic potential. However, there is increasing competition from many sectors for qualified academics, the majority of whom are experienced PhD holders. Research by Geber (2013) illustrated that well-qualified university academic staff have often left for overseas universities, where opportunities appear more attractive than the meagre pay in most African universities.

The shortage of senior and more experienced academic staff retards these institutions of higher learning in terms of limited research output, which therefore has an impact on the quality of teaching (Kipkebut, 2010). Moreover, in the Tanzanian university context, all these imperatives have serious negative consequences in terms of a heavy teaching load, to the extent that less time is devoted to research activities.

Moreover, salaries in Tanzanian public universities are on a fixed scale with annual pay rises based on seniority. The value of salaries in the public sector is lower than that of the private sector, in addition to which there are no fringe benefits as in private universities, which are paid for marking and as extra duty allowances. These differences in terms of remuneration between public and private universities have adversely affected the academic staff’s satisfaction level, which has led to most highly-qualified academics preferring to either engage in consultancies or move to the private sector where they are well remunerated. It is a fact that Tanzania’s university remuneration policies are subject to a number of criticisms, such as there is no provision for rewarding top performers and punishing non-performers. The
policies are basically uniform and unattractive to academic staff in public universities, since they cannot attract the best scholars or reward and retain the best academics. Furthermore, academic staff chose to work in public universities based on their expectations and so they support the idea that private sector employees are motivated by aspects that are different from those of public sector employees (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006; Burges & Rato, 2003; Buberwa, 2015).

1.1.3 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been widely researched over the past decades. It has attracted the attention of scholars in the management discipline worldwide due to its relevance to the well-being of workers. Job satisfaction can be an important indicator of how employees feel about their jobs and a predictor of work behaviour such as absenteeism and turnover (Mustapha, 2013). Job satisfaction among academic staff is also very important, as it relates to the quality of teaching and the reason for the existence of the university, which is to produce quality students and conduct good quality research. Therefore, universities will need to find strategies for retaining the existing academic staff, reducing turnover and attracting the best brains into various academic disciplines in universities, and ensuring that academic staff are satisfied with their jobs.

Earlier literature focused on job satisfaction facets in developed countries (Bentley, Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure & Meek, 2012; Gruneberg & Startup, 1978). For instance, Skalli, Theodossiou and Vasileiou (2008) looked at academic staff's overall satisfaction in European countries using a community household panel. However, in
recent years, it has been observed that the number of studies on job satisfaction among academic staff has increased, as contended by Kusku (2003), which has been attributed to the fact that higher education institutions are labour intensive, their budgets are predominantly committed to personnel, and their effectiveness is largely dependent on their employees.

Organisations that have goals to achieve would require satisfied and happy staff in their workforce (Oshagbemi, 2000). What is important to note is that if a university is to take off and achieve its strategic goals it would strongly depend on its capacity to attract, retain and maintain competent and satisfied staff in its employment. Adelabu and Akinwumi (2008) argue that as a university is a higher learning institution that provides a contingent of educated personnel to serve the community and the entire nation through the different sectors of the economy, it must itself be capable of ensuring the provision of an adequate workforce, which means it cannot afford to neglect the aspect of manpower satisfaction.

Tanzanian universities can be categorized according to their year of establishment and so there are first, second and third-generation universities. The first-generation universities were established in the country from the 1960s to the 1980s. The second-generation universities are those established in the 1990s. The third-generation universities were established in 2000 and beyond. Universities constitute a training and research ground for students, academic staff, researchers and the wider community, where students pursue comprehensive courses in all kinds of disciplines
in order to put theory into practice. In line with this, Nyerere (1966) outlined that the key functions of a university were passing on knowledge from one generation to the next or acting as a springboard for further research and support and, through teaching, producing the manpower needed for the development of society. In that regard, Nyerere (1999) reiterated the importance of universities utilizing the available indigenous materials and knowledge and aligning them with modern science and technology for the development of the country and the world as a whole.

The Tanzania Commission for Universities (TCU) is a statutory institution that oversees university education, and its key responsibility is to regulate it and ensure that its quality complies with the established National Qualifications Framework. To date, there are 12 public universities and 19 private universities (see Table 1.1) offering various educational qualifications both at undergraduate and postgraduate level. This signifies the crucial role played by academic staff in producing not only high quality graduates but also research of a high standard, as explained by Chen, Yang, Shiau and Wang (2006) that the satisfaction university lecturers get from their job and working environment enhances the quality of university education and research.

1.1.4 Development of University Education in Tanzania

University education in Tanzania can be traced back to 1961 when the then Tanganyika attained its independence and a university college was established in Dar es Salaam as a constituent college of the University of London, which subsequently
became the University of East Africa in 1963 to cater for the East, Central and Southern African countries of Kenya, Tanganyika, the former North and South Rhodesia and Nyasaland (the current Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi, respectively). In 1970, the former University of East Africa was transformed into three independent national universities, namely the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) in Tanzania, the University of Nairobi in Kenya and Makerere University in Uganda. Consequently, UDSM became Tanzania’s first fully-fledged university through Parliament Act No. 12 of 1970, which charged the university with the responsibility of training graduates to meet the manpower requirements of government institutions, which was necessary because the demand for higher education in various fields was very high.

Later on in 1984, Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) was established as an agricultural college offering diploma courses in the discipline of agriculture and later on was transformed into the Faculty of Agriculture of UDSM, which has since grown to be the largest university in Tanzania (University of Dar es Salaam, 2013).

Since the 1990s, there has been a significant expansion in the number of public universities in Tanzania. To date, 12 public universities have been established, each by an Act of Parliament. SUA was established in 1984 and is best known for its degree programmes in agriculture, although it now offers a variety of other programmes in business and education. The Open University of Tanzania (OUT), established in 1992, offers its courses purely by the distance learning mode, when the
The total number of students stood at 61,860 in 2017 (Ministry of Education and Vocational Training, 2017). OUT conducts its operations through regional and study centres, currently with 29 regional centres and 69 study centres, and three overseas coordination centres in Kenya, Rwanda and Namibia.

The University of Dodoma was established in 2006 in Tanzania’s capital, Dodoma. It offers programmes in engineering, electronics, medicine, education and foreign languages (Korean, Chinese and Arabic) with over 40,000 students. Ardhi University and Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, former constituent colleges of UDSM, were elevated to fully-fledged university status in 2007. They specialize in architectural and health science courses, respectively. The State University of Zanzibar, Mzumbe University, Nelson Mandela Institute of Science and Technology, Mbeya University of Science and Technology, Katavi University of Agriculture and Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere University of Agriculture and Technology were established later on.

In fact, such expansion has resulted in the disappearance of most middle-level colleges in Tanzania as the government has elevated them to become fully-fledged universities without the commensurate efforts having been made to hire qualified academic staff, which has led to an acute shortage of academics in these newly-established universities, which rely mainly on part-time lecturers to cover the gap. In that regard, Anney (2014) observed that the majority of academics in public universities travel many miles for a short period within a semester to teach in these newly-established universities.
In addition to the public universities, the number of private universities has also risen in the last two decades. Up to December 2017 there were 19 private universities, 14 of which are fully-chartered universities and 3 operate with a letter of interim authority or certificate of registration from the TCU (TCU, 2017). This expansion in the number of private universities has been attributed to government efforts to establish private universities through the liberalization of higher education in Tanzania by amending the Education Act No. 10 of 1978, which was replaced by the Education Act No. 10 of 1995 and later by the Universities Act No. 7 of 2005. These acts have provisions for the establishment of private higher education institutions (United Republic of Tanzania, 2005). Recent years have thus seen a rapid increase in the number of universities, both public and private.

As indicated in Table 1.1, public universities in Tanzania monopolized the provision of higher education from the independence era in 1961 until the last two decades, when the country experienced an unprecedented growth in the number of private universities, which was necessitated by a number of policies instituted by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, which imposed austerity through a reduction in government expenditure that led to a serious shrinkage in education (Stein, 2009). This ultimately affected the ability of public universities to offer quality education that resulted in the loss of the monopoly of public universities, leading to the emergence of private universities in the territory once dominated by public universities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Public Universities</th>
<th>Year of establishment</th>
<th>Private Universities</th>
<th>Year of establishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>University of Iringa</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sokoine University of Agriculture</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>International Medical &amp; Technological University</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Open University of Tanzania</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Hubert Kairuki Memorial University</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mzumbe University</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Tumaini University Makumira</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The State University of Zanzibar</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Aga Khan University</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Dodoma</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Zanzibar University</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ardhi University</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>St. Augustine University of Tanzania</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Muhimbili University of Health &amp; Allied Sciences</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Mt. Meru University of Tanzania</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Institute of Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Catholic University of Health &amp; Allied Sciences</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mbeya University of Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>University of Arusha</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Katavi University of Agriculture</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Teofilo Kisanji University</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere University of Agriculture and</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Muslim University of Morogoro</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Johns University in Tanzania</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sebastian Kolowa Memorial University</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Bagamoyo</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eckenforde Tanga University</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania International University</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Joseph University in Tanzania</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United African University of Tanzania</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tanzania Commission for Universities (2017)
The establishment of private universities began in 1996 with the founding of the then Iringa University College (now the University of Iringa, UNI). UNI was issued a charter in 2013 after fulfilling all the requirements stated by the TCU. The rapid growth in the number of private universities occurred from the early 2000s and at present Tanzania has 19 private universities, namely, 14 chartered universities (that are fully accredited by TCU) and 5 universities, namely, University of Bagamoyo, Eckenförde Tanga University and Tanzania International University, St. Joseph University in Tanzania and United African University of Tanzania that operate with a Certificate of Registration and Letter of Interim Authority (TCU, 2017).

1.1.5 Public Expenditure on Education

Since Tanzania’s independence, financing education has been the government’s key role. However, the 1970s economic and oil crises and the structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) introduced in 1986 brought about a dramatic turn in the government’s approach to funding education, because SAPs led to the introduction of user fees and a ban on employment. Due to decreased government expenditure, public universities sought alternative means to finance university programmes to supplement the government’s meagre budgetary allocation.

The severe budget cuts experienced by public universities led to frequent academic staff strikes over inadequate remuneration, and prompted them to engage in other income-generating activities (Mkude, Cooksey & Levey, 2003). As a further cost-cutting measure, public universities outsourced auxiliary services like catering, cleaning and off-campus student hostels. Income-generating companies were also
established, for example, at UDSM, the Silver Sands hotel, the Dar es Salaam University Press, University Computing Centre and the University Consultancy Bureau, as new outlets to broaden the University’s revenue base.

The government’s budgetary expenditure indicates that the largest percentage of it goes to primary, non-formal and other institutions and supporting services. The percentage allocated to education has been inadequate despite increased student enrolment.

Table 1.2 shows the Ministry of Education’s budget allocation, whereby in the 2016/17 financial year, primary education, non-formal and supporting services received the largest share (63.3%), followed by Technical and Higher Education (20.7%), with Teacher Education getting the least at 1.1%. In fact, primary education received the lion’s share (63.3%) due to the introduction of Free Basic Education in the 2016/17 financial year, which witnessed a considerable change in terms of funding priorities. This conforms to previous studies which indicated that there has been increased public funding for students in Sub-Saharan Africa in the past two decades (Hinchliffe, 2010).
Table 1.2: Budgetary distribution to education sector per education level 2004/05 – 2015/16 (in Million. Tshs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Total Education Sector</th>
<th>Primary, Non-formal, other education institutions &amp; Supporting Services</th>
<th>Secondary Education</th>
<th>Teacher Education</th>
<th>Technical Education &amp; Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Share</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Share</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>504,745</td>
<td>322,196 63.8</td>
<td>92,045</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>669,537</td>
<td>418,455 62.5</td>
<td>104,483</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>958,819</td>
<td>618,534 64.5</td>
<td>119,987</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>1,100,188</td>
<td>618,828 56.2</td>
<td>174,227</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1,430,372</td>
<td>966,633 67.6</td>
<td>133,058</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>1,743,900</td>
<td>1,211,332 69.5</td>
<td>108,323</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>47,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>2,045,400</td>
<td>1,272,584 62.2</td>
<td>201,147</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>28,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>2,283,000</td>
<td>1,159,526 50.8</td>
<td>465,979</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>35,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2,890,149</td>
<td>1,613,346 55.8</td>
<td>509,783</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>47,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>3,171,631</td>
<td>1,758,840 55.5</td>
<td>491,753</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>55,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>3,465,101</td>
<td>1,989,490 57.4</td>
<td>570,976</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>63,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>3,870,178</td>
<td>2,251,275 58.2</td>
<td>650,467</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>37,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>4,768,358</td>
<td>3,020,191 63.3</td>
<td>708,500</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>52,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: 1USD = TShs. 2,247
1.1.6 University Academic Staff Job Performance

Universities employ academic staff to teach, conduct research, engage in community service, supervise students and perform any assigned duty relating to the university’s mission (Norton, Sonnemann & Cherastidtham, 2013). However, Ishengoma (2007) observed that the majority of Tanzania’s private universities are mainly engaged in teaching rather than research to the extent that, in some universities, teaching is a criterion for promotion rather than research and publishing in peer-reviewed publications. In addition, the acute shortage of academic, technical and administrative staff in Tanzania’s universities was because of the ten-year ban on staff recruitment, imposed by the World Bank as part of the implementation of the SAPs. This had a negative impact on the implementation of the universities’ core functions of teaching, research and community service. In the wider context, it is reported further that Sub-Saharan Africa allocated as little as 0.3 percent of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to research and development (Seck, 2015), which is seven times less than what is spent in developed countries. As a result, in Africa, little research or publishing activities have been conducted due to the shortage of laboratory and other scientific equipment, poorly stocked and dilapidated libraries and the uncompetitive salaries of academic and research staff (Teferra & Altbach, 2004).

Furthermore, publishing in reputable, highly ranked referred journals for most academics has been extremely difficult. Studies have argued that academic staff, especially from developing countries, are struggling to get credible journals in which
to publish their academic work amidst counterfeit, predatory journals, hence making publishing in renowned, high-impact journals a challenging task, characterized by delays and a high rate of rejection (Mc Naught, 2015; Pho & Tran, 2016). The World Bank (2014) observed that research in natural sciences, technology, engineering and mathematics in Africa is lagging behind. For instance, a recent report shows that Sub-Saharan universities are held back by low output in terms of research (World Bank, 2016). In addition, due to the extreme shortage of funding to support research in most African universities, good research skills have also been inadequate which can be ascribed to ill-prepared researchers (Njuguna & Itegi, 2013).

Moreover, there is significant migration of highly educated and experienced academics and other professionals from Africa to Europe and North America searching for greener pastures and career advancement (Arthur, 2016). Other challenges facing most African universities, especially public universities, are that most academic staff spend a lot of their time teaching part time in other universities (Mawoli & Babandako, 2011; Ologunde, Akindele & Akande, 2013). In Tanzania, as in many other countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, academic staff do not seem to perform to the expected level, as observed by Peter (2014) that university lecturers spend their time moving from one university to another chasing part-time jobs. In that regard, despite the expansion of higher education in Tanzania, there is growing concern about deteriorating performance with regard to teaching and research. Ajayi, Awosusi, Arogundade and Ekundayo (2011) observed that in recent years academic staff have been more preoccupied with activities which seem to provide them with more money than their full-time academic job at the parent university. It has been
observed that among academic staff’s key responsibilities at universities teaching has been receiving little attention, which has been partly witnessed through using students to mark other students’ assignments or examination scripts. Tahir and Bakar (2009) argued that some academic staff place too much emphasis on publishing for the sake of getting promotion and a salary increase rather than on teaching.

Subsequently, Tanzania’s universities have been positioned in the lower ranks of the world’s universities, with UDSM being the only Tanzanian university among the top 5,000 universities, in the position of 2043 (Webometrics, 2017). This poor ranking connotes that research output and the visibility of Tanzanian universities are very low. In the latest 2017 Webometrics rankings, only two Tanzanian universities, namely, UDSM and SUA appeared in the top 100 African universities.

Studies have pointed out some challenges which hinder African academics from being productive in research unlike their counterparts in developed countries. For instance, it has been argued that academic staff in most African higher education institutions work beyond normal working hours in poor working conditions and receive poor remuneration (Teichler & Hohle, 2013; Bigirimana, 2016). In fact, there are substantial differences in the working environment in developed and developing countries’ universities, which is why this study was aimed at establishing to what extent job satisfaction influences job performance in public and private universities.
In this regard, this study sought to investigate the job satisfaction of academic staff and its effects on their teaching and research performance in universities in Tanzania.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite the rapid increase in the number of universities, academic staff in Tanzanian universities seem to be dissatisfied with their job, as evidenced by the exodus of academics from their academic job to other seemingly promising economic sectors, such as politics, senior administrative government jobs, donor-funded projects and international non-government organizations. This has led to a declining teaching and research workforce, a subsequently heavy teaching load for those who remain at the universities and a decline in research output. It has also been observed that academic staff tend to remain in the same academic rank for a long time without being promoted, mainly because promotion is based on research and publications. Therefore, this study sought to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the job satisfaction of academic staff in universities and assess the extent to which it influences job performance in terms of teaching and research in universities in Tanzania.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1) To examine the relationship between recognition job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

2) To assess the relationship between responsibility job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

3) To determine the relationship between remuneration job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

4) To examine the relationship between promotion job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

1.5 Hypotheses

To further interrogate the relationship between the job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested:

1) There is no significant relationship between recognition job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

2) There is no significant relationship between responsibility job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

3) There is no significant relationship between remuneration job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

4) There is no significant relationship between promotion job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.
1.6 Significance of the Study

This study is significant because its findings may contribute to enhancing the satisfaction strategies of universities, which do not have a plan to reward academic staff who perform better. In addition, the TCU is responsible for ensuring the quality of university education, and so it may use the data as a basis for policy-making and programme planning for university education, which will promote job satisfaction and job performance as well as the professional growth of academic staff to ensure quality university education. Universities will be made aware of the level of job satisfaction and job performance of their academic staff. The neglected areas of each university’s academic staff’s work situation will be identified, providing baseline data to be utilized for managing and operating the universities. The results may further help the universities' management to review existing motivational policies and practices in the hope that they can enhance the job performance and job satisfaction of academic staff. This will be the basis for academic staff development programmes that will lead to their professional growth. University management can utilize the findings of this study in numerous ways to motivate their academic staff effectively. The lack of significant relationship between recognition and job performance indicate that academic staff are dissatisfied with the way university recognize their efforts and this was confirmed in this study. Higher job performance is largely depending on how employees’ efforts are recognized by employer. Bradler, Dur, Neckermann & Non (2016) observed that in a workplace, employee performance is mainly influenced by employers’ public recognition to employees. Further, the study suggests that recognition not only increase employee job performance from those who receive it, but even to those around the recipient.
A policy and practical dimension where this study finding can be applied is promotion opportunities. Employee promotion represents a reward by employer to employee for his or her good job performance, associated with financial rewards such that employees who are dissatisfied with their promotion decrease their job performance. Data from this study indicated that academic staff from selected universities were dissatisfied with their promotion. It is therefore suggested that university management should put in place promotion policy which take into account academic staff job performance (Mustapha & Zakaria, 2013). Therefore, in order to enhance job satisfaction, university should embark on developing policies that rewards employees’ job performance timely (Hemmings & Kay, 2010, Kasper & Bajunirwe, 2012). Performance-based promotion is an example of promotion practice that can improve academic staff job satisfaction. This practice may provide academic staff with timely promotion unlike the current subjective, and time consuming promotion procedures that is prone to nepotism and political interference. For instance under the current promotion procedures, academic staff should wait for three years period before being allowed to apply for promotion to the next higher academic rank, universities should introduce promotion system basing on actual employee-job performance in line with university’s core functions of teaching, research and community services. Finally, the researcher feels this study is important because it will awaken academic staff to assess themselves periodically to improve their teaching and research performance.
Contribution to body of knowledge

This study has contributed to university academic staff job welfare in numerous ways. Firstly, the present study adds to knowledge on the applicability of Herzberg’s two-factor theory to an African universities context and Tanzania in particular.

Secondly, the current study further adds to the body of knowledge by examining the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among Tanzanian university academic staff, which have rarely been examined in previous scholarly researches. The study has shown that academic staff job satisfaction indicators had no significant relationship to job performance. This means that university management should be able to focus multiple job satisfaction indicators rather than on few academic staff job satisfaction indicators in order to increase their job performance.

Finally, the current study has both policy and practical implications for Tanzanian universities. By examining the extent to which selected job satisfaction indicators relate to job performance. With the present of highly dynamic and vibrant higher education sector including over-ambitious expansion programmes particularly in Africa’s universities, satisfied workforce is crucial in enabling the universities to achieve their core functions of teaching, research and community services.
1.7 Limitations of the Study

Like other studies, this study had several limitations which should be noted. Firstly, the access to financial data in universities was a great limitation as during interviews with Deputy Vice Chancellors – Administration, some of them were unwilling to provide the researcher with financial data, especially those related to academic staff salaries. This problem was resolved as the respondents were assured of confidentiality of the information provided.

Secondly, the widely dispersed geographical location of universities in Tanzania was another limitation. To overcome the delay in data collection, the researcher engaged two research assistants in the administration of questionnaires.

Finally, due to time and cost constraints, the researcher was unable to carry out research in a different countries (for example Uganda), thus limiting the study to a single country, Tanzania.

1.8 Delimitations of the Study

Although the problem of exodus of university academic staff to non-academic job is a national, the study confined itself to six universities of the twenty-eight universities in Tanzania. Thus, data should not be generalized to all other universities in the country.
1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made by this study:

1). The academic staff would respond honestly to all questions in the questionnaire.

2). The university management would know the job satisfaction and job performance levels of academic staff.

3). There is sufficient commonality between job satisfaction and job performance among university academic staff.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

Herzberg’s two-factor theory of motivation was used as the theoretical framework for this study, as it was considered relevant for gaining an understanding of academic staff’s job satisfaction and job performance in Tanzanian’s universities. Herzberg’s two-factor theory is somewhat different from previous motivation theories, such as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, which perceived that job satisfaction needs are ranked from lower psychological needs to higher psychological needs, which were too rigid and do not explain the dynamics and unstable characteristics of employees in an organization. Herzberg’s two-factor theory proposes that numerous job-related factors emerged as having a significant relationship with job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, namely, motivating and hygiene factors that operate in two different dimensions. One set of factors, the motivators, are actual factors (intrinsic to the job) while the other set of factors, hygiene, deal with the environmental setting of the job, the surrounding conditions, the job content (extrinsic to the job).
The motivating factors include recognition, responsibility, the work itself and advancement. The presence of motivating factors leads to personal growth and self-actualization and are commonly known as “satisfiers” (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). Herzberg’s theory indicated that the motivators contributed to job satisfaction more than other factors, because, it is argued, satisfiers produced a good attitude to work and are closely related to employees’ good performance and efforts. The hygiene or extrinsic factors include remuneration, promotion, working conditions and supervision. These factors are in a separate dimension of factors dealing with secondary conditions of a job. Therefore, Herzberg’s two-factor theory works with two different needs of an employee. One set of factors “hygiene” relates to the physical nature of employees, leading to the avoidance of bad feelings at work, but they do not produce growth, while the other set of factors, motivating factors, directly relate to growth or self-actualization needs. In this relationship, neither can motivating factors prevent bad feelings at work nor can hygiene factors lead to growth needs (Whitsett & Winslow, 1967). Hence, this theory proposes that one set of factors (hygiene) satisfies physical needs and the other set of factors (motivators) satisfies growth needs.

Herzberg’s two-factor theory therefore informed this study as it focuses on gaining an understanding of the characteristics of job satisfaction. It primarily emphasizes psychological growth as a requirement of job satisfaction. Further, Herzberg suggests that such growth originates from the work itself (Locke, 1976).
This study revolved around the Herzberg theory with its intrinsic and extrinsic needs and their influence on academic staff’s job performance. Several scholars such as Ssesanga and Garrett (2005) utilized the framework developed from the Herzberg theory to establish factors influencing the job satisfaction of academics in Uganda. Samuel and Chipunza (2009) also used the Herzberg theory to establish motivational variables influencing staff retention in private and public organizations in South Africa. Further, Sutherland (2004) revealed that both extrinsic and intrinsic factors influence employee retention in organizations.

Generally, the Herzberg two-factor theory explains that the wants of employees are divided into two groups. One group revolves around the need for one to develop in his/her occupation as a source of personal growth. The second group operates as an essential base for the first and is associated with fair treatment in terms of compensation, supervision, working conditions and administrative practices. Fulfilling the needs of the second group does not give individuals a high level of job satisfaction or motivate them to perform well in the job. It is expected that by satisfying this second group of needs, dissatisfaction and poor job performance will be prevented.

1.11 Conceptual Framework

This section presents the conceptual framework which was used to gain an understanding of and analyse the relationship between the job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in Tanzanian universities.
To develop the conceptual framework, Herzberg’s motivation and hygiene factors were utilized to gain an understanding of and interpret a particular phenomenon in detail. This theoretical perspective enabled the researcher to examine and analyse how academic staff’s job satisfaction level influences job performance.
Figure 1.1: The conceptual framework for analysing the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance in Tanzania’s universities
Job Satisfaction Indicators

The first component of the conceptual framework consists of the job satisfaction indicators. The study analysed four job satisfaction indicators, comprised of recognition, responsibility, remuneration and promotion. It has been established that job satisfaction indicators support academic staff to perform their core teaching and research functions. The provision of these indicators by employers, universities in this study, puts pressure on academic staff to perform better in their teaching and research jobs. In other words, these job satisfaction indicators act as a catalyst to motivate academic staff to improve their teaching and research performance.

Organisational culture

Organisational culture represents the internal set of characteristics that describe an organization and differentiate it from others. In the conceptual framework encompasses indicators such as university’s goals and objectives as well as supportiveness. These aspects act as either catalyst or barriers to employee achievements of their job performance (Abdulsalam & Mawoli, 2012). The conceptual framework shows that a supportive organizational culture including clear understanding of university goals and objectives for its establishment and supportive job working environment will support academic staff’s job performance while unclear or ambiguous university goals and objectives as well as poor supportive working environment will decrease job performance.
Job Performance Indicators

The academic staff job performance indicators are evaluated on the basis of the university’s core functions. In this study, job performance indicators were used to measure the productivity of academic staff in the universities. These indicators were chosen on the basis of teaching and research activities that are relevant to the context of Tanzanian higher education, such as the number of students taught and supervised by a particular academic staff member, teaching workload, number of presentations made at national and international conferences, the number of peer-reviewed academic articles published in national and international academic journals and number of academic books published. Therefore, the use of job performance indicators enabled the researcher to measure academic staff’s job performance in both public and private universities. However, this study focused on the number of academic activities (teaching and research) of academic staff rather than on their quality, since the number of publications does not necessarily attest to the quality of those publications.

1.12 Operational Definitions of Key Terms

Job Performance is the extent to which an academic staff member is able to accomplish the teaching and research task(s) assigned to him or her and how the accomplished task contributes to the realization of the university’s core functions.

Job Satisfaction is the positive or negative aspects of academic staff’s attitude towards their job or some features of the job. Academic staff’s satisfaction is the
terminology used to describe whether they are happy in fulfilling the needs of their job.

**Remuneration** is defined as the reward given to an employee after a specific period of time, normally after a full month of working in return for the employee’s performance in a given organization.

**Promotion** is the advancement of an employee to the rank or position within an organization. Promotion may be the outcome of an employee’s intense pursuance of a higher rank or as a reward for the employee’s job performance. Usually, promotion is associated with an increase in pay or a bonus.

**Research** is the organized inquiry into a certain phenomenon for the sake of either solving a societal problem or generating new knowledge. Universities are also research institutions whereby academic staff are required to conduct research and publish their findings to fulfil their research function. In universities, the number of research-based publications is one of the criteria for promoting academic staff. Research performance in universities is measured in terms of number of outlets, where it has been published and the quality of the published work.

**Teaching** is defined as the transmission of knowledge from various sources of knowledge to students. In the university context teaching is conducted in the form of lectures, seminars or tutorials, clinical and laboratory experiments. Therefore, in relation to the conventional teaching function of the university, academic staff are
required to teach students in the various academic programmes to which they have been admitted.

**Trade Union** is an organized group of workers formed to represent their common rights and interests. All aspects with regard to work are subject to discussion, negotiation and agreement between employee and employer through the trade union. Representatives of the trade union lead this discussion with regard to employees’ salaries, promotion and institutional policies on behalf of employees. Hence, the trade union is a broad network of workers formed to ensure that their needs are met, and in some circumstances membership of a trade union is compulsory for each worker.

**Recognition** is the formal or informal acknowledgement of employees’ efforts and contributions that support the realization of organizational objectives. Usually, recognition is given after employees’ remarkable performance. Recognition includes praising employees for their good work, which makes them feel that their work or contribution is being valued by others, thereby giving them a sense of achievement for their efforts. Recognition can be given to individual employees, to a team or organizational department.

**Responsibility** is the assignment of tasks to an employee, normally by a supervisor to a subordinate, to carry out specific job-related activities, although the supervisor
who assigned the task remains accountable for the outcome of the assigned responsibility.

1.13 Summary

This chapter dealt with the background to the study, statement of the problem, the study’s purpose and objectives, research hypotheses, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations, theoretical and conceptual framework, assumptions and operational definition of key terms. The next chapter covers the literature review.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

Chapter two provides a review of the literature and research relating to job satisfaction, studies on job satisfaction and job performance, an overview of job satisfaction and job performance in higher education, and gaps in the literature relating to the job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities addressed by this study.

2.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a function of numerous variables such as demographics, various tasks, promotional opportunities, remuneration and job security. Many studies on the determinants of job satisfaction in higher education institutions in various countries are available (Bexley, James & Arkoudis, 2011; May, Strachan & Peetz, 2013; AL-Hinai, 2013; Masum, Azad & Beh 2015; Hanaysha, 2016). However, in developing countries in general, and Tanzania in particular, there is little literature in this area of specialization.

Job satisfaction means employees being content with their job. It is their evaluation of the job’s conditions (the job itself, the attitude of the administration) or the consequences (wages, occupational security) resulting from the job (Fletcher & Williams, 2006). Job satisfaction also means ascertaining the contentment of the
employee and that his or her qualifications match the demands of the job (Reichers, 2006). In line with these definitions, job satisfaction might be the consequence of comparing the expectations of the employee of his or her job and the job being performed. The consequence may emerge as satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the employee with the job. The study sought to find out if this is the case in Tanzanian universities.

When the employee sees that his or her desires are not being met by the job, dissatisfaction emerges (Sakovska, 2012; An, 2013; Gill, Murad & Gillani, 2016 & Khanijor, 2016). This prompts a decline in workforce productivity, responsibility, commitment to the job and organization and an increase in the number of employees leaving their job (Payne & Morrison, 2002; Redfern, 2005; Denizer, 2008; Gellatly, 2005; Sagie, 2002; Adeniji, 2011). The medical conditions of employees might also be negatively affected. Dissatisfaction with the job has been observed to bring about insomnia and headaches as well as emotional negativeness such as stress and disappointment (Denizer, 2008). In that regard, a deterioration in an employee’s work is proof of his or her lack of job satisfaction, which results in lower productivity and may lead to losing a competent and qualified member of staff (Asegid, Belachew & Yimam, 2014).

Job satisfaction can be described as one’s feelings or perspective in regard to the way in which the work can be affected by an assortment of elements, for example, the nature of the academic staff’s relations with their supervisors, the nature of the
physical conditions in which they work and the level of satisfaction with their work (Almazyed, Almaswad & Olabi, 2015; Vatsa, 2013; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnisky, 2002; Lambert, Pasupuleti, Cluse-Tolar & Jennings, 2008). Job satisfaction has a positive effect on performance (Almazyed, Alaswad & Olabi, 2015). Nevertheless, Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnisky (2002) argued that job satisfaction is certainly not by any means the only element that causes individuals to produce high quality work, because as Wilson and Rosenfeld (1990) pointed out, a positive or negative state of mind regarding work may powerfully affect many types of organizational behaviour. Different research data have shown the significance of job satisfaction in an organization, especially as far as its effectiveness, efficiency, employee relations, absenteeism and turnover (Baron, 1996, Maghradi, 1999; Fajana, 2001) are concerned.

In addition to performance being influenced by the level of satisfaction, it is affected by a worker’s ability and a number of situational and environmental factors, such as mechanical breakdowns, low quality materials, inadequate supply of materials, availability of stock and market forces (Hlungwani, 2009). Nevertheless, in lower-level jobs where little capacity is required, job satisfaction seems to be one of the key determinants of performance (Cockburn & Perry, 2004; Boro, Thopeson & Paton, 2001).

Therefore, job satisfaction is crucial for an organization because if employees are dissatisfied, their job performance and commitment to work tend to decline (Fajana, 2001).
For instance, in an organization where job performance is not recognized through promotion and salary increases, the productivity of employees tends to be lower. This study was determined to find out if these variables affected academic staff’s job performance in Tanzanian universities.

In an effort to satisfy the needs of employees, many managers make use of rewards, but studies have indicated that money alone cannot lead employees to become satisfied or motivated (Joyce & Slocum, 2004). Fajana (2002) identified many factors that affect an individual’s level of satisfaction. These include leadership style, job design and rotation, working conditions and friendly interactions between management and employees.

Most studies acknowledge that job satisfaction is a global phenomenon that comprises various facets. The most typical categorization of facets by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) comprises five: pay, promotion, co-workers, supervision and the work itself. Locke (1976) adds a few other facets: recognition, working conditions and the company’s management. Furthermore, Fajana (2002), who refers to job satisfaction as the general attitude of employees to their job, divided job satisfaction into five major components to involve attitude toward the work group, general working conditions, attitude toward the organization, monetary benefits and attitude toward supervision, said that these job satisfaction facets are intricately connected to the individual’s state of mind concerning the work itself and life in general.
2.2.1 Selected Job Satisfaction Indicators

The following job satisfaction indicators have been identified as critical for academic staff in universities in Tanzania: recognition, responsibility, remuneration and promotion.

Recognition and Job Satisfaction

Research evidence suggests that both financial and non-financial rewards lead to employees being satisfied with their job (Danish & Usman, 2010; Tausif, 2012). Therefore, employees are satisfied and improve their job performance when given non-financial rewards including recognition. Akafo and Boateng (2015) are of the view that recognition in the workplace caused employees to perform better in their jobs. Moreover, it is argued that timely recognition of employees by the management has a positive impact not only on individual employees, but on the entire team of employees in an organization. A study conducted by Abdullah, Shorubi, Hashim and Hamid (2016) found that there is a positive relationship between recognition and job satisfaction. Bustamam, Teng and Abdullah (2014) argued that when managers frequently recognize their subordinates this increases their self-esteem and engagement with the job, leading to better performance at work. The authors also indicated that employees who are recognized tend to be loyal to the respective organization, are satisfied and experience better health than employees who are not recognized (Waqas, Bashir, Sattar, Abdullah, Hussain, Anjum, Ali & Arshad, 2014; Kyguoliene, Zikiene & Grigaliunaite, 2017). With this in mind, this study sought to examine the relationship between recognition and the overall job satisfaction of academic staff in Tanzanian universities.
Remuneration and Job Satisfaction

Some scholars have pointed out that a regular rise in employees’ salaries and other payments will ultimately enable them to meet their daily needs and thus motivate them to work efficiently (Li-Ping Tang, Luna-Arocas, Sutarso & Shin-Hsiung Tang, 2004; Froese & Xiao, 2012; Schreurs, Guenter, van Emmerik, Notelaers & Schrumacher, 2015). Furthermore, salaries and incentives like houses or vehicles make employees more satisfied and lift their morale (Mustapha, 2013; Amutuhaire, 2010). In the same vein, Peretomode (2012) argued that salary, job security and promotion are major factors that motivate employees to perform better.

Responsibility and Job Satisfaction

Responsibility in this study means that an employee is given specific activities by his or her supervisor. In that regard, the supervisor should give a subordinate ownership of the work; in other words, supervisors should reduce control over subordinates but maintain accountability. The study by Valentine (2001) revealed that male employees are more satisfied with responsibility than their female counterparts. Furthermore, Iqbal (2007) argued that managers do not assign adequate job responsibilities to their subordinates because they fear their managerial power will be reduced. This implies that employees are given less responsibility in their jobs, which has a negative impact on their job satisfaction. Ganguli and Matar (2016) and Okirima (2013) observe that assigning job responsibilities to subordinates is crucial for ensuring their job satisfaction, developing their skills and enhancing their careers, as well as reducing delays in the work through waiting for supervisors to take on the task. Moreover, assigning subordinates more responsibilities will give supervisors
more time to concentrate on strategic tasks. However, Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer and Ferris (2012) argued that it is important to spare enough time to explain what subordinates need to do in the delegated work to ensure that it is done properly as expected. Rockstuhl, Dulebohn, Ang and Shore (2012) also studied the effect of being given responsibility on job satisfaction across 23 countries and concluded that delegating responsibility reduces the work of the manager, thereby giving him or her more time to do more challenging tasks that in return will increase organizational productivity. On the employees’ side, this will ensure job enhancement as they will begin to effectively utilize their abilities and take initiative. Furthermore, when Al-Jammal, Al-Khasawneh and Hamadat (2015) examined the impact of being given responsibility on job satisfaction they found that it guarantees efficiency, flexibility, a balanced workload and teamwork.

**Promotion and Job Satisfaction**

A number of researchers are of the opinion that job satisfaction is strongly related to opportunities for promotion (Peterson, Puia & Suess, 2003). This view is supported in the study conducted by Ellickson and Logsdon (2002), where satisfaction with promotional opportunities was found to be positively and significantly related to the job satisfaction of employees. The study by Busari, Mughal, Khan, Rasool and Kiyani (2017) revealed that limited opportunities for promotion were common in public universities, thereby discouraging qualified employees from remaining in the job.


2.3 Academic Staff’s Job Satisfaction in African Universities

The aim of this section was to discuss the job satisfaction issues that academic staff in African universities face while performing their duties. The available literature indicates that academic staff in universities are facing numerous challenges, including job dissatisfaction. Adeniji (2011) investigated academic staff’s job satisfaction in private universities in Nigeria and revealed that most of them were dissatisfied with the overall academic working conditions, poor remuneration and promotion procedures and staff development programmes, which ultimately prevent the development of the knowledge and skills that are necessary for the provision of quality education, with the result that people decide to quit teaching at the university to search for work in organizations with a more attractive working environment.

It is important to note that these challenges to higher education occur not only in Africa, but also across the globe. They include, among others, reduced per capita funding for universities, competing demands by other sectors of the economy and globalization. Each of these challenges has implications for the functioning of universities and ultimately their contribution to national development. Having an understanding of these challenges may hopefully inform the policy steps that need to be taken by university managements to address them. The challenges incorporated in this review are discussed below.
2.3.1 Declining per capita funding for universities

The literature suggests that one of the most pressing challenges facing higher education institutions in Africa is the decline in public funding relative to the rapid growth and development of universities (Teferra & Altbach, 2004). In the period immediately after most African countries gained their independence, especially in the 1960s to 1970s, university education was limited to one university per country across Africa (Teferra, 2017). Getting access to universities was the privilege of the selected few, whereby every country wanted its national university to be evidence that it had indeed become independent. However, this changed in the 1980s and 1990s, when higher education was not considered that important for development in Africa. Most education funding was shifted to the primary education sub-sector on the assumption that university education benefited individuals rather than whole community or economies (Ngalomba, 2016).

It is a fact that the reduction in the funding of universities had an effect on the quality of academic staff in terms of greater productivity. Mushemeza (2016) argued that the substantial decline in government investment in several African public universities overlooked the fact that highly qualified staff and research are critical for designing appropriate policies and legislation to respond to the challenges existing in society today.

From the 1980s to the 1990s, there was a dramatic shift of public funds from higher education to primary education. Mamdani (2007) mentioned factors that gave rise to
this funding shift. Firstly, the government cut budgets when it faced an unexpected budgetary problem, and so universities were unable to recruit the required number of academic staff in many African countries. Secondly, the World Bank discouraged the funding of universities because they were perceived as unimportant for development. This funding shift had a negative impact on the development of the sector in developing countries (Kotecha, 2012). For instance, the share of World Bank assistance for higher education declined from 17% between 1985 and 1989 to under 7% between 1995 and 1999 (Bloom, Canning & Chan, 2006).

Further, the World Bank (2010) revealed that, from 1991 to 2006, African countries allocated 0.63% of their GDP to higher education while the number of students quadrupled. This low allocation of funds for higher education in Tanzania was the norm and not the exception. For example, at UDSM, the ratio of the government’s approved budget to the university declined significantly from 77.8% in 1985/86 to 28.9% in the 1994/95 academic year (Luhanga & Mashalla, 2005). This decline in funding for the higher education sector had two effects. Firstly, academic staff embarked on other income-generating activities to supplement the meagre salary they received from their employer. Secondly, universities adopted a business-model approach to generate extra revenue through enrolling more students in unconventional or parallel programmes concentrating on non-academic activities to solicit funds for running their academic activities, such as running hotels, and renting university facilities such as buildings and playing fields for social functions and
raising the consultancy institutional fee from 20 percent to the current 30 percent (UDSM, 2017).

The competing demands of other sectors of the economy put immense pressure on the budgets allocated to various sectors of the economy. As a result, in many instances, the government decided to implement “popular programmes” which were likely to appeal to the majority of potential voters, such as free basic education, infrastructure development, and security or defence, which jeopardized the quality of university education provision, including academic staff’s working environment. Consequently, as a survival strategy, numerous public higher education institutions adopted exclusive evening and part-time degree programmes to raise income to cover the budget deficit (Jamshidi, Arasteh, Navehebrahim, Zeinabadi & Rasmussen, 2012; Wangenge-Ouma, 2012). For instance, some public universities offered certain academic programmes, particularly those in great demand and with high returns, such as business studies and information technology. They established the evening or weekend learning mode to attract more working class, part-time students. In Tanzania, UDSM’s Business and Education schools established evening and executive-mode classes, and many other universities such as Tumaini, St. Augustine, Mzumbe and OUT adopted a similar strategy to raise their income. Most of them charge students doing these parallel programmes much higher fees than conventional full-time students are charged. Academic staff engaged in teaching or supervising students doing these parallel programmes are relatively better remunerated than those involved in conventional programmes (Freudenthal, 2014; UDSM, 2017).
Unpredictable government funding is equally problematic. For instance, in Tanzania, during the 2016/17 financial year, the government’s national budget amounted to Tsh. 11.82 trillion (USD 5.4 billion) (Ministry of Finance and Planning, 2016). However, it later gave new directives to cut the operating costs of all public institutions, to freeze recruitment of new civil servants and postpone the promotion of existing staff, leaving them with an additional workload and responsibilities, which affected their morale and overall organizational performance (Ngalomba, 2016). It should be understood that the delay or sometimes non-disbursement of budgeted funds to construct, renovate and maintain infrastructure or research facilities on campus may pose a threat to the universities’ ability to accommodate more students, motivate their staff and conduct research.

2.3.2 Globalization and higher education

A number of scholars agree that the 21st century will be dominated by the knowledge-based economy, and universities will be the prime institutions for producing and disseminating knowledge, as well as producing graduates with the knowledge to compete in a globalized labour market (Woldegeorgis, 2017). In that regard, Ng’ethe, Namusonge and Iravo (2012) assert that universities are operating in a highly competitive environment which requires them to retain their core employees in order to gain and retain competitive advantage. In fact, knowledge is viewed as a new factor of production. Maasen and Cloete (2004) assert that globalization encourages higher education institutions to operate as business entities. This connotes that globalization has transformed the character of higher education
institutions from being restricted by national boundaries to focusing on both national and global development priorities, thereby producing knowledge and skills for global market consumption. Hence, globalization has resulted in academic staff becoming more mobile, thus promoting the migration of skilled labour and fostering the brain drain. Therefore, it is important for higher education institutions in Africa to reform their motivational strategies so as to mitigate the exodus of academic staff to non-academic jobs after their employer’s huge investment in them in terms of financial resources and time spent training them. Teichler and Hohle (2013) argued that the academic career ladder consists of a time-consuming series of training courses, demonstrations, presentations, and the defence and publication of scholarly work before being considered a fully-fledged member of the academic profession.

2.4 Job Performance among University Academic Staff

2.4.1 Teaching Performance among Academic Staff

Generally, academic staff in universities are expected to take part in teaching, conducting research and serving the community. The high demand for academics in universities has been necessitated by the increase in the number of higher education institutions across the globe, Tanzania being no exception. For instance, in Tanzanian universities there has been a substantial increase in student numbers and academic staff employed in them as, in the 2015/16 academic year, the number of university student numbers rose to 189,732 from 166,484 in the 2011/12 academic year, while the number of academic staff numbers stood at 6,286 (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 2016). The difference between the number of students and academic staff employed in universities impacted the teaching load as
the majority of academic staff had to accommodate increased enrolment, besides which, in most cases, teaching responsibilities were not considered when promoting academic staff. However, there has been increasing pressure for the academic staff’s teaching load to be included in promotion criteria (Fahnert, 2015).

In a typical university environment, on top of teaching responsibilities, academics are increasingly engaged in administrative roles both within and outside the university, which may partly affect their teaching effectiveness (Chen, Hsien & Do, 2015). This may prevent academic staff from undertaking other academic tasks, including research-based activities. Therefore, this study sought to find out how job satisfaction had impacted teaching performance in universities in Tanzania.

2.4.2 Research performance among university academic staff

Although job performance evaluation varies from one university to another, studies indicated that academic staff’s research performance did not receive enough attention from the government and policy makers in the past (Alam, 2009; Jacob, Xiong & Ye, 2015). Despite its major contribution to enhancing not only university global rankings but also national development, research appears to have been ignored. It is further argued that universities adopted a ‘business-as-usual’ approach to performance management and thus operated on a high-trust basis in an environment that emphasized independence of thought and scholarship, academic freedom and collegiality (Alam & Khalifa, 2009). Similarly, Mofele (2011) observed that the high-trust mode of operation therefore meant that academic staff were not closely
monitored or assessed. However, it is important to note that universities, like other organizations, are now expected to adopt both corporate and economic operational modes. Muthamia (2016) argued that universities should become more responsive to their clients, including students, by providing quality and prompt services, which is only possible if academic staff are satisfied and subsequently perform their jobs better.

**Research performance and promotion**

Richardson (2014) contends that opportunity for promotion increases the level of employees’ job performance. In that context Musaazi (2005) observes that promotion brings about an increased feeling of belongingness, higher wages and status in an institution. According to Takahashi (2006), employees are willing to work hard in pursuit of promotion, and through the provision of promotion the majority will see to it that their performance is enhanced. With this in mind many researchers group promotion with other external rewards (Nujjoo & Meyer, 2012). Furtmuller, Garaus and Guttel (2011) conducted a study which examined the impact of promotion on productivity in French universities and found that the removal of incentives immediately after promotion does not lead to a decline in productivity in French universities, suggesting that promotion has no significant correlation with job performance. As a result, this study aimed to investigate whether there is a relationship between promotion (one of the job satisfaction indicators) and the job performance of university academic members of staff in Tanzania.
2.5 Relationship between job satisfaction and job performance

The Hawthorne Studies served as a prelude to the study on job satisfaction. The studies were in five phases conducted over eight years. The Hawthorne studies focused on reinterpreting workers’ nature, whereby workers were accorded the opportunity to set their own agendas, which made it possible to incorporate various human needs in the management of organizations in a favourable way (De Bono, 2011). The study on the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance in the light of the Hawthorne Studies conducted in the 1930s is frequently attributed to making researchers aware of the impact of employee attitudes to performance. Most earlier reviews of the literature suggested a weak and somewhat inconsistent relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Bowron and Todd (1999) and Bakotic (2016) revealed that there is a strong connection between job satisfaction and employee retention, which had a major impact on researchers, and in some cases on organizations, thereby showing an insignificant relationship between job satisfaction and performance.

The Hawthorne Studies were an attempt to apply the scientific management theory, propounded by Frederick Winslow Taylor, to the work being done at the Bell Telephone Western Electric manufacturing plant in Hawthorne (Gautschi, 1989). In 1928, the personnel managers of the plant consulted with Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School and Clair Turner, the professor of Biology and Public Health at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to interpret the results of the studies (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001). It was concluded that changes in working conditions can have an impact on a worker’s productivity. This was evidenced in workers’
increased productivity as they were being observed during the experiment, known as the “Hawthorne Effect”.

However, further research does not concur with this conclusion. Cook (2008) suggests that there is no true relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Jacobs, Hellman, Werest and Markowitz (2013) argued that job performance relates to the act of doing a job. Campbell (1990) also argued that job performance can be viewed as the effort to achieve a well-defined job-related objective. Scholars tend to emphasize the whole idea of job satisfaction by equating it with increased performance in an organization (Al Jenaibi, 2010).

Schiff (2010) observed that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance was significantly higher for professional jobs than less complex jobs. Along these lines, in spite of prior studies, it appears that job satisfaction is an indicator of job performance and the relationship is more apparent in professional jobs and even more so in complex, professional jobs than in less complex ones. Thus, contrary to earlier reviews, it appears that job satisfaction is in fact a predictor of performance, and the relationship is even stronger in professional jobs.

Zaniboni, Truxillo, Rineer and Bodner (2016) found that staff with long working experience are highly satisfied with their remuneration, but job performance remains low. In terms of age, studies have also indicated that older employees are more satisfied with different job characteristics unlike their younger colleagues, which ultimately affects job performance (Troxillo, Cadiz, Rineer, Zaniboni & Fraccaroli,
2012). Additionally, Zaniboni, Truxillo and Fraccaroli (2013) indicate that older employees are highly satisfied with having responsibility unlike younger employees, which reduces their turnover intention.

Furthermore, Jayaweera (2015) argued that there is a significant relationship between working conditions and job performance. This finding seems to agree with the contention of Hoy and Miskel (1989), Nkom (2000), Ariyo (2000) and Aiyegbusi (2000), who identified that the various components of working conditions are inducements to perform well. Considering the contradictory findings, this study sought to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in Tanzanian universities.

2.6 The Context of higher education in Tanzania

The historical background of Tanzania from colonial times to the present has an impact on the political and economic domains, which have played a significant role in the growth and management of the higher education sector in the country.

2.6.1 The political sphere

Until 9th December 1961 the then Tanganyika (now Tanzania) was a British colony. Soon after independence, the country declared war on three development enemies, namely, ignorance, disease and poverty. Hence, as a way to wage this war, investment in human capital was intensified through Universal Primary Education (UPE) which was built on “Ujamaa” (African socialism) and Education for Self-
Reliance (ESR). To some extent UPE managed to address some educational challenges, such as the elimination of segregation in accessing educational opportunities in the country, thereby ensuring egalitarianism (Nyerere, 1979).

A remarkable development of Tanzania’s educational policies was pronounced in the 1967 Arusha Declaration, whose fundamental undertaking was to nationalize and control all major means of production, including educational institutions at all levels to allow equal access by all citizens, regardless of their socio-economic background.

2.6.2 The economic sphere

During the first seven years after independence (1961-1967), Tanzania maintained a market-oriented economy inherited from the British, which stimulated the development and expansion of a free market economy. In fact, the economic situation in colonial Tanganyika was influenced by decisions made in the colonial master country in line with the key motive of acquiring raw materials from its colonial territories. Kaiser (1996) argued that immediately after Tanganyika’s independence attempts to establish various projects articulated in the first five-year development plan were geared to assisting the agricultural and industrial sectors. However, the plans were not implemented as expected, and so the government intervened with the introduction of a state-controlled economy, whereby all sectors of the economy, including the private sector, came under government control. However, this led to widespread corruption and natural monopolies, and the skills needed to run organizations were inadequate, which subsequently dragged the national economy down. Despite being given massive government subsidies,
unexpectedly by the mid-1990s all state-controlled companies had virtually collapsed.

It can therefore be argued that the current unstable private sector in Tanzania is a result of African socialism, “Ujamaa”, which actively discouraged the private sector, whereby strict regulations were put in place to bar civil servants, including university staff, from engaging in any private, part-time jobs apart from the place of work where they were originally employed. Such strict regulations prevented civil servants from contributing to national development, as argued by Levin (2001) that during the Arusha Declaration all private institutions, including schools, colleges and hospitals, were nationalized.

Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, Tanzania’s economy faced difficulties due to the oil crisis and decline in commodity prices as a result of the world recession. Internal problems, such as failed agricultural and industrial policies and repayment of the money borrowed to operate state-owned industries in previous years (Edwards, 2012; Coulson, 2013), compounded by the 1978/79 Uganda-Tanzania war and the collapse of the first East African Community, exacerbated the demise of the economy. The spiral effects of these crises are still noticed in the economy today.

Another challenge facing Tanzania’s economy dates back long before independence. Tracing the history, colonial Tanganyika was divided into two distinct zones, namely productive and labour reserve areas. The establishment of plantations for both cash and food crops required a large number of labourers to work on these plantations,
and so special labour-supply reserve areas were deliberately created to offer labour (Mbonile, 1996). Unfortunately, the creation of these productive versus labour reserve areas resulted in the unequal development of regions in the country, as productive areas where they usually grew cash crops had strong financially stable cooperative unions, which meant that cooperative union members were able to send their children to private schools if they failed to get access to public schools. As a result, the majority got access to universities and landed key positions in the country, and so location and key positions in universities reflected the colonial productive and labour reserves divide.

**Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs)**

The period from 1967 to the late 1980s witnessed increased state presence in all sectors of the economy. New state corporations were established while private ones were nationalized. The revenue accrued from these corporations was used to fund other sectors, including the provision of free education and health services. It is worth noting that these initiatives bore positive results, including an increased literacy rate. However, continuous political interference coupled with non-compliance with financial regulations ultimately affected employees’ job performance (Teskey & Hooper, 1999). In the early 1980s, the Tanzanian government realized that it was experiencing challenges in managing the economy. With the support of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, Tanzania adopted the Structural Adjustment Programme in 1986 for economic recovery (Muganda, 2004). Tanzania has since availed itself of donor support to address its financial woes.
Tanzania then subjected itself to structural adjustment conditions aimed at addressing its financial vulnerability (Stahl, 2015).

**Cost-sharing policy**

Tanzania’s post-independence period characterized by rapid expansion of its education system is partly attributed to various reforms and policies including the Arusha Declaration. The increased expenditure on education meant that the government needed to introduce a cost-sharing policy, which compelled other stakeholders, including parents, to contribute to education expenditure. Through the cost-sharing policy, the government discontinued the allowances usually paid to university students, it limits the number of students admitted to university and reduced the subsidy for tuition fees. It is further argued that the cost-sharing policy caused frequent strikes by students protesting against discriminatory treatment in issuing higher education loans for students and delays in payments (Omari, 1994; Makulilo, 2014).

**Impact of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs)**

The implementation of SAPs led to decreased government expenditure and the introduction of the liberalized economy, and their impact has continued to be experienced to date (Heidhues & Obare, 2011). For instance, in Tanzania, SAPs resulted in the retrenchment of civil servants and a 10-year freeze on employment, which led to a substantial loss to universities as they faced an acute shortage of academic staff. The decline in the government’s budget allocation to public universities also adversely affected their ability to provide quality university
education. Moreover, the poor remuneration in universities led to high job turnover and low motivation, with the result that the majority of academic staff either left their university job to seek better-paid jobs or they remained at the university doing their teaching job while engaging in extra-income activities (Fapohunda, 2012; Sule, Amuni, Obasan & Banjo, 2015). Public universities also developed alternatives such as introducing evening, distance-learning and part-time study programmes to supplement the inadequate budget (Ishengoma, 2013; Teferra, 2016). However, this approach has negatively affected universities’ ability to provide quality education.

2.7 Academic staff and Job Satisfaction in Tanzania

A study conducted by Ishengoma (2007) indicated that the major things that dissatisfied academics in Tanzania’s universities were the low salaries and poor working conditions. The relatively poor working conditions in Tanzania’s universities are attributed to funding shortage. Lodewijks (2011) also argued that working conditions in universities greatly deteriorated, as shown by the poor remuneration and the inability to groom young scholars, which led to the poor research productivity of university academic staff. It is therefore important that adequate funds are set aside for building new infrastructure, carrying out renovations and equipping universities to accommodate increased enrolment and to improve working conditions necessary for the attainment of the universities’ core functions of teaching, research and community service.
Therefore, on the basis of the literature reviewed, this study investigated the level of job satisfaction, determined the job performance level of academic staff and the effect of job satisfaction on job performance, and established the relationship between job satisfaction and the job performance of academic staff in public and private universities. It was important to investigate an effective job satisfaction model and an efficient job performance mechanism that would add value to the effectiveness of academic staff, which would therefore raise universities’ performance, leading to a greater number of graduates, world-class research outputs, quality teaching and efficient community service.

2.8 Summary of Literature Review

The first part of the literature review looked at the body of research pertaining to job satisfaction and its indicators. The second part examined the job performance aspect. The third part of the literature review pointed out the evolution of job satisfaction studies. The last part looked at academic staff’s job satisfaction and job performance in Tanzania. From the review of the literature and the themes mentioned it is possible to draw the following conclusions. The literature demonstrated the importance of job satisfaction in an organization and when an employee sees that his expectations are not being met by the job, dissatisfaction with the job emerges.

Since most research on job satisfaction and job performance has been undertaken in developed countries, the extent to which the research findings in those countries can be applied to Tanzania’s universities has not been established. The gap in these
studies showed the need for research-based information in order to fill the information gap in the job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research design and procedures of the study. It is organized as follows. First, the choice of correlational design is justified and the rationale given for the choice of methodology by contrasting two approaches, namely, quantitative and qualitative. Secondly, the data collection methods and sampling procedures are described. Lastly, instrumentation, validity and reliability, piloting of the study instruments and administration, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations are discussed.

3.2 Research Design

The correlation research design was used in this study. According to Lavrakas (2008), a correlational study is useful for establishing which variables are related. Indeed, the use of a correlational design provides the potential for finding relationships between variables at one point in time (Labaree, 2009).

The rationale for adopting the correlational design by this study was as follows. Firstly, the study was guided by the notion of relating job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities. Studies indicate that the correlational research design uncovers a relationship that enables conclusions to be drawn
regarding the causal relationships, and it allows the researcher to collect more data rather than doing experiments (Levin, 2006). In this regard, the correlational design enabled the researcher to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and the job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania. Data were collected over a period of three months from a large sample of academic staff in six universities in Tanzania, which were geographically scattered, contrary to longitudinal studies, which involve studying the same subjects over a long time, which may take years (Babbie 1995; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2005).

Specifically, the study intended to examine the relationship between academic staff’s job satisfaction and job performance in universities at a given period. This entails the use of job-related experiences (Gerring, 2007). Therefore, the study accessed multiple sources to obtain detailed information on the subject under investigation.

The mixed-methods approach was found to be appropriate for this study as it allowed the researcher to integrate the quantitative and qualitative data in order to find out about the experience of the respondents being studied (Creswell, 2009). Therefore, combining the qualitative and quantitative data was imperative for gaining an understanding of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among university academic staff.

3.3 Study Locale

The geographical location of this study was Tanzania. It involved six universities, three public, namely, Tanzania’s oldest university and largest in terms of schools,
University of Dar es Salaam, Sokoine University of Agriculture being the centre of excellence in agricultural programmes since it was established in 1984 and is situated in Morogoro region about 180 kilometres west of Dar es Salaam, and the Open University of Tanzania, which has been the centre of excellence in open and distance learning in the country. The three private universities that were selected have a larger number of full-time academic staff than the other private universities and are located in various geographical locations. The private universities are St. Augustine University of Tanzania situated in Mwanza region, about 1000 kilometres from Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar University located in Zanzibar archipelago (semi-autonomous region of Tanzania) and University of Iringa situated about 500 kilometres from Dar es Salaam. Leaders of the academic staff union, Tanzania Higher Learning Institutions Trade Union, THTU, were also involved. The choice of Tanzania as a study location was because of the challenges that universities have faced over the last 20 years as a result of rapid expansion and the establishment of both private and public universities, and due to the deterioration in teaching and research performance in universities.

3.4 Target Population

3.4.1 Universities

The study was confined to accredited universities in Tanzania. There are 31 universities in Tanzania (Tanzania Commission for Universities, 2017). Of these, 12 are public and 19 are private.
3.4.2 Academic Staff

Academic staff were the main focus of this study and constitute the majority of the respondents. There are 6286 university academic staff in Tanzania (Tanzania Commission for Universities, 2017). The participants were considered to have vital information for the study by virtue of their position as follows. Academic staff are the ones who participate in actual teaching, research and community service. They have the complete picture of the teaching and research workload in their respective academic departments or units.

3.4.3 Academic Staff Trade Union

Leaders of the academic staff trade union formed part of the respondents of this study. The academic staff trade union leads negotiations on better terms of service, such as wages, promotion, recognition, conducive working environment and job security. The leaders were selected to ensure that the views on academic staff’s welfare and job satisfaction were not one-sided.

3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.5.1 Universities

Since it was not possible in terms of time and cost to survey all the universities in Tanzania, purposive sampling was used to select six universities, because it provides a researcher with information-rich cases for in-depth study (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016), and so the six selected universities (three public and three private) represented all the universities in Tanzania. The following three factors were used as
a basis for purposefully selecting the universities, namely, geographical location, mode of programme delivery, age and size of the university. The age and size of the university were important factors because some private universities had been in existence for less than five years, had less than 500 students and depend mainly on part-time lecturers. The three private universities selected were established more than 10 years ago and had a larger number of full-time academic staff than other private universities. These private universities are also found in different geographical locations. The universities are St. Augustine University of Tanzania, situated in Mwanza city and founded by the Roman Catholic church, the second is the University of Iringa located in Iringa region and owned by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tanzania, and the third is Zanzibar University situated in Unguja, Zanzibar (semi-autonomous territory of Tanzania) owned by Daral Iman Islamic Charitable Association.

The three public universities selected purposively were the University of Dar es Salaam, which is Tanzania’s oldest university, Sokoine University of Agriculture, which was established in 1984 to become the second oldest university in the country situated in Morogoro region and the Open University of Tanzania, which was established in 1992 and is situated in Dar es Salaam city offering its academic programmes purely through distance learning.
3.5.2 Academic Staff

Academic staff were the majority of the respondents in this study. To obtain a quantitative sample of academic staff, Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) sample size formula was used. The sample size was estimated at a confidence level of 95%, .05 Alpha level (corresponding to Z-value of +/- 1.96) and a proportion of the population of .50, which accommodates maximum variability within the population (Bartlett, Kotrlik & Higgins, 2001). The formula and Table 3.1 helped the researcher to obtain a representative sample for the study.

The formula and the table are shown below.

\[
S = \frac{X^2 NP (1-P)}{d^2 (N-1) + X^2 P (1-P)}
\]

where:

- \(S\) = the required sample size
- \(X\) = Z - value
- \(N\) = population size
- \(P\) = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)
- \(d\) = the degree of accuracy (5%), expressed as a proportion (.05); it is the margin of error.
Table 3.1: Sampling matrix for academic staff in selected universities in Tanzania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Academic staff</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sokoine University of Agriculture</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Open University of Tanzania</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 St. Augustine University of Tanzania</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Zanzibar University</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 University of Iringa</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1733</strong></td>
<td><strong>826</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Afterwards, the academic staff were subjected to proportional stratification in order to get the representation of different teaching and research specializations. Within each stratum, the simple random method was used whereby each case was assigned a unique number and using a table of random numbers the respondents were selected. This is considered the best method for reducing sampling bias and achieving a high level of representation (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2007; Serakan, 2003).

3.5.3 Deputy Vice Chancellor - Administration

Deputy Vice Chancellors - Administration were thought to be key informants in the university. A total of six (6) Deputy Vice Chancellors – Administration were purposively selected, that is, one from each university.
3.5.4 Senior Academic Staff (Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors and Full Professors)

The senior academic staff were selected using the purposive sampling technique guided by the criterion of ten (10) years or more working in the university. Based on their teaching and research experience, they were expected to provide credible information on various aspects of academic staff’s job satisfaction and job performance in universities. Therefore, twelve (12) senior lecturers, associate professors and full professors were chosen, two from each university.
Table 3.2: Summary of senior academic staff involved in the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Faculty or School</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>13.07.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17.07.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>28.09.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30.09.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>22.10.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>29.10.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22.12.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>29.12.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11.01.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>18.01.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>08.02.2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16.02.2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.5 Academic Staff Union Leaders

Purposive sampling was used to select academic staff who are national union leaders in the THTU. These leaders were considered to have vital information by virtue of their position with regard to academic staff welfare at national level. In order to obtain valid data on academic staff’s job-related issues, academic staff union leaders were selected by virtue of their position. Hence, two academic staff union leaders, the Chairperson and a member of the THTU’s Executive Committee, were selected for this study.
3.6 **Instruments**

The selection of data collection methods depends on the nature of the research problem under investigation and how the methods selected would suit hypotheses of the study. Silverman (2015) argued that the selection of a data collection method depends, amongst other things, on the objective of the study, the questions being asked, the resources available and the skill of the researcher. This study used two methods to collect data, namely questionnaires and interviews. This was informed by the fact that any weaknesses inherent in one method would be compensated for by the strengths of the other (Desimone, 2009). Therefore, the study utilized more than one data source to establish convergence of the different perspectives of the diverse group of participants. The use of more than one method to collect data implies ‘triangulation’ in a study (Yin, 2009), which stresses that the phenomenon may be viewed and explored from multiple perspectives. To sum up, the use of more than one source of data ensured both the credibility and validity of this study.

3.6.1 **Questionnaire**

The questionnaire consisted of dependent, intervening and independent variables of the study. The independent variable was job satisfaction, the intervening variable comprised the demographic characteristics of the respondents and the dependent variable was job performance. The questionnaires were administered to academic staff in the six selected universities in Tanzania (Appendix I).
The questionnaire consisted of four sections, as follows;

**Section One**: asked the respondents to provide personal information

**Section Two**: was designed to measure the level of academic staff’s job satisfaction through the indicators of recognition, responsibility, promotion and remuneration.

**Section Three**: was designed to measure the level of academic staff’s performance with regard to teaching and academic supervision of students in the universities

**Section Four**: measured the extent to which academic staff were involved in research-based activities.

The advantage of using a questionnaire is that it is self-administered, although the interviewer’s probing is not possible (Reja, Manfreda, Hlebec & Vehovar, 2003). It also contained standard questions which were given to a large number of sampled respondents in different universities of Tanzania within a short time and at minimal cost.

### 3.6.2 Interview Schedule

Interview schedules were used to obtain information from the Deputy Vice Chancellor – Administration in the six selected universities (Appendix II), senior academic staff (Appendix III) and leaders of the academic staff union (Appendix IV). Their responses were analyzed and incorporated in the study findings. The purpose of these interviews was to clarify issues raised in the questionnaires and to use quotations from these interviews to support the quantitative data. The choice of interview schedules for the collection of data is justified by the fact that an interview
is the single best tool to use due to its flexibility and the ability to probe and obtain the opinions of the respondents (Gay, 1996). The interview was also considered necessary as it helped secure clear and detailed information that could have easily been left out of the questionnaires.

This study employed a semi-structured interview for two reasons. Firstly, it allowed flexibility in the coverage and depth of the information sought. Secondly, it enabled the researcher to collate the respondents’ responses and obtain the experience of academic staff with regard to job satisfaction and job performance in the universities.

The interview questions sought information relating to two domains of investigation, covering administrative-related and academic-related issues. The interviews lasted between 45 and 60 minutes. Near the end of each interview, the interviewees were asked to reflect on the interview session and give a summary of it. In order to get different perspectives, the researcher formulated three sets of interview guides based on the category of the respondents at the university.

Interview guide for university management officials, Deputy Vice Chancellor - Administration (Appendix II)

Interview guide for senior academic staff (Appendix III)

Interview guide for academic staff union leaders (Appendix IV)
3.7 Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments

3.7.1 Validity

A valid study is one that has properly collected and interpreted the data, so that the conclusions accurately reflect and represent the real world (Yin, 2011). Kothari (2004) also defined validity as the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Instrument validity and triangulation were used to ensure the overall quality of the study and the trustworthiness of the findings.

3.7.2 Reliability

Reliability means the ability of a measurement instrument to produce the same answer in the same circumstances, time after time (Johnson & Harris, 2002; De Vaus, 2002). It means that if respondents responded to a question in the same way on repeated occasions, the instrument is reliable. In this study, internal consistency was used. The rationale for using internal consistency is that the individual items should measure the same constructs, thereby correlating positively to one another (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). The measure most widely used to determine internal consistency is Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. Reliability was tested using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).
Table 3.3: Summary of Cronbach alpha coefficient for study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of items per variable</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Teaching undergraduates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Postgraduate academic supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Presentation at academic conferences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Publication in peer-referred journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 shows the reliability coefficient alpha of all the constructs in this study ranging from $\alpha = 0.810$ (remuneration satisfaction) to $\alpha = 0.897$ (responsibility). The closer the alpha is to 1 the higher the level of consistency. This falls within the range recommended by Gay (1992) that any coefficient more than (0.7) was quite acceptable.

**3.7.3 Piloting of data collection instruments**

After developing the data collection instruments, a pilot study was carried out in UDSM, THTU head office and Zanzibar University to ensure that the items in the questionnaire were stated clearly and had the same meaning for all the respondents, and it also gave the researcher an idea of approximately how long it took to complete the questionnaire. The academic staff were informed that the questionnaire was a
pilot for the larger study. They were asked to highlight questions that were ambiguous or which they were uncomfortable with and to make any other comments that would improve the questionnaire.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

3.8.1 Questionnaire Administration

After deciding on the appropriate sample size and identifying the respondents, the researcher distributed questionnaires to them. A letter of introduction accompanied the questionnaires explaining the purpose of the study and assuring the respondents of confidentiality and anonymity. To ensure anonymity, each academic staff member was given a questionnaire with an envelope addressed to the faculty/school dean’s office to which to return the completed questionnaire. The return rate for the questionnaires administered to academic staff was 411 (50%) of the 826 targeted sample.

3.8.2 Interview Schedule

The second phase of data collection involved face-to-face interviews with the Deputy Vice Chancellors – Administration, academic staff union leaders and senior academic staff of the selected universities to clarify issues on academic job satisfaction and job performance at the universities. Each interview was conducted in the workplace and lasted between 45 minutes and one hour. Prior to commencing the interviews, the interviewer sought the permission of each participant to record the
interview. The interviewees were assured of anonymity and confidentiality during the interviews and in reporting them.

3.9 Data Analysis

Data were analysed according to the objectives of the study.

i) Objective One, to examine the relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

This objective generated both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data were analysed thematically. Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS.

ii) Objective Two, to assess the relationship between responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

This objective generated both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data were analysed thematically guided by the research hypotheses. This objective also generated quantitative data which were analysed using SPSS.

iii) Objective Three, to determine the relationship between remuneration, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

This objective generated both qualitative and quantitative data. Whereas, qualitative data were analysed thematically, quantitative data were analysed using SPSS.
(iv). **Objective Four, to examine relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance in universities in Tanzania.**

The objective generated both qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative data were analysed thematically while quantitative data were analysed using SPSS.

### 3.10 Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to all ethical considerations that guide the conduct of research and protected the rights of the participants who voluntarily participated in this study. This suggests that protecting the participants in any research is important. In this study, ethical considerations began with the choice of the research topic (Bryman, 2015) and continued both during and after the research process (Jones, Pearlstone & Percival, 2006; Ritchie, Lewis, Nicholls & Ormston, 2013). Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) argued that ethics in research concerns the appropriateness of the researcher’s behaviour in relation to the rights of those who are the subject of their work or are affected by it. First, the proposal was defended at departmental level. Thereafter, in Tanzania, research clearance was granted by the UDSM Vice Chancellor (Appendix VII). Subsequently, the researcher received letters from the universities and academic staff union granting permission to conduct the study in their institutions (Appendices VIII - XIII).

The following are the ethical practices complied with by the researcher when conducting the study, as argued by Leedy and Omrod (2001), who put ethical issues
In research into four groups, namely, informed consent, right to privacy, honesty with professional colleagues and protection from harm.

**Informed Consent**

Informed consent implies providing as much relevant and as detailed information as possible to enable the participants to choose whether or not to participate in an investigation (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Subsequently, prior to distributing the questionnaire and each interview, the researcher provided the participant with an informed consent form in which the participant was formally requested to participate in the study. The informed consent form (Appendix VI) specified formal procedures, such as the overall purpose of the study, the advantages and disadvantages of participating in the study and how the data would be handled (Kvale, 1996; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The researcher also allowed enough time for each participant to read the informed consent form and to sign it. Moreover, the researcher explained to the participants that although they had signed the consent form, they would still have the right to withdraw from the study at any time should they wish to do so. All the participants agreed to participate in the study.

**Confidentiality and Anonymity**

The fundamental ethical consideration involves protecting participants’ right to privacy. The researcher assured participants that the information obtained would not be disclosed without their permission. This meant that the information a participant
provided for the research would not be reported or disclosed to unauthorized parties
without his or her consent (Kvale, 1996; Jones, Pearlstine & Percival, 2006).

Further, Jones, Pearlstine and Percival (2006) argued that the analysis and
interpretation of the data and the dissemination of the research findings carry with
them a significant ethical responsibility. Hence, the researcher did not disclose any
information regarding the personal lives of the participants. The researcher also
ensured confidentiality and anonymity by precisely processing and reporting the
information.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the study objectives. The study was guided by the following objectives.

1) To examine the relationship between recognition job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

2) To assess the relationship between responsibility job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

3) To determine the relationship between remuneration job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

4) To examine the relationship between promotion job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

In this regard, the discussion was based on the following hypotheses:

Ho$_1$ There is no significant relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

Ho$_2$ There is no significant relationship between responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.
There is no significant relationship between remuneration, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

There is no significant relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

4.2 The relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania

The first objective sought to examine the relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania. To address this objective the study used the following research hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Job performance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Receiving formal recognition for your achievement</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Being recognized by peers or co-workers</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feeling that your work is valued and appreciated</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed test)

Table 4.1 shows the correlations among recognition job satisfaction indicators and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania. The relationship between
receiving formal recognition for academic staff’s achievement and the job performance score was not statistically significant at $r = .989$, $p > 0.01$. The relationship between being recognized by the supervisor and academic staff’s job performance was not statistically significant at $r = .983$, $p > 0.01$. The relationship between recognition by peers or co-workers and academic staff’s job performance was not statistically significant at $r = .888$, $p > 0.01$.

The findings of this study on the relationship between academic staff’s formal recognition by their employer for their achievement and job performance indicated that there is no statistically significant relationship at $r = .989$, $p > 0.01$. The results of this relationship were necessary in order to establish whether being recognized by their employer for academic staff’s achievement would contribute to their overall job performance. This provides information about their satisfaction level in relation to being recognized for their achievement by their employer. These results are consistent with studies by Chireshe & Shumba (2011), Meke (2013) who noted that academic staff’s achievements are not adequately recognized by their respective employer. This also concurs with Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller & August (2012) that there was a feeling among employees that their work is not appreciated by their supervisors.

Furthermore, since the relationship between formal recognition for academic staff’s achievements and job performance indicates that it was not significant, it suggests that academic staff seek seemingly better opportunities outside universities where
they will be recognized. In this regard, Ubwani (2017) argued that the ongoing mass exodus of academic staff to government administrative posts or politics is the outcome of lack of recognition of academic staff’s achievements. Despite this brain drain, no plans have been made to replace academics who have departed in the near future. This has created a heavy teaching load for those who remain at universities, and so they do not have enough time for research, leading to low publication output.

Equally important, even the few who remain in universities and continue to engage in research are not adequately rewarded due to ongoing cost-cutting measures to reduce government spending as well as institutional bureaucracy. For instance, there are delays in postgraduate student supervision allowances, as well as long and cumbersome procedures for obtaining research clearance and permission to travel abroad to attend and present academic papers at academic conferences. Universities’ lack of financial base to facilitate academic staff’s research undertakings, such as for collecting data, doing analysis and writing the final research report for publication, also hampers academic staff from fully participating in research-related activities.

The THTU Chairperson observed with concern the mass exodus of senior and experienced academics to take up government administrative posts;

There is nothing wrong with appointing academic staff for government administrative positions. It is understood that universities are think-tanks and a place in which to develop the best brains for every sector of the economy and we cannot deny that. However, the blunder the government has made is that it took many experienced and seasoned academic staff from universities without commensurate efforts to replace them by recruiting new ones. Therefore, those left in universities have a heavy teaching workload.
The exodus of many academic staff to take up non-academic jobs has left universities with few academics to handle teaching as well as research functions, and so the heavy teaching load of academic staff, which includes preparing courses, actual teaching, preparing assignments and tests as well as setting and marking examinations, means they have little time or energy to do research.

It should be understood that success in scholarly research depends on a favourable environment and recognition of efforts that promotes outstanding research and attracts funds for research in the universities. Currently, Africa’s contribution to the world’s knowledge production is minimal amidst a booming population (Cloete & Maassen, 2015).

It is important to note that, in recent years, the issue of the global ranking of universities has dominated higher education debates worldwide, as Altbach (2016) states that ranking is an inevitable result of the widespread growth of higher education, increased competition and commercialization worldwide. In addition, Garcia (2011) argued that a university may be positioned in the global ranking through having dimension-specific prestige in a particular field when a particular bibliographic research performance indicator exceeds the threshold. University ranking is a widely used and much heralded practice to compare universities and establish benchmarks. However, critics have long argued that university ranking has not met the expectations of ranking organizations or bodies. For instance, popular university rankings bodies such as the Times Higher Education and the Institute of Higher Education Shanghai both use research output and citations as their main
ranking criteria, unlike Webometrics which ranks universities’ performance in terms of their commitment to providing research findings, international outreach and open access materials to all on the web. Webometrics has less to do with paper-based publications, which are not published online, but instead uses an intricate system of their own creation to quantify the extent to which global universities use the internet to spread, transfer and exchange knowledge. Altbach (2013) argued that most of these rankings have little validity, but nonetheless are taken seriously by the public.

The findings of the study that there is no significant relationship between academic staff's formal recognition by supervisors and job performance contradicts what Neckerman, Cueni & Frey (2014) and Mone & London (2018) found that monetary rewards by employers for employees' job performance is crucial for motivating employees. Moreover, recent studies indicated that there is a positive relationship between recognition of employees’ efforts and their subsequent job performance (Anitha, 2014). Providing sufficient recognition has a direct effect on employees' performance (Hoole & Bonnema, 2015). This positive relationship is an important indicator of the value of recognition to employees, thereby affecting job performance (Yerger, Crowe & Allen, 2015). In this regard, recognition was deemed necessary by employees for executing their duties as expected and improving their working relationships.

The findings of this study have also indicated that the relationship between academic staff being recognized by their peers and job performance was not statistically
significant at $r = .983$, $p>0.01$. This implies that university academic staff’s recognition by peers had little effect on their job performance. The findings further suggest that the lack of recognition by peers, as shown by universities in Tanzania, is likely to have a negative effect on their overall job performance. These findings can also be interpreted to mean that university academic staff were dissatisfied with the lack of recognition by co-workers (Mabaso, 2018).

Furthermore, the relationship between academic staff feeling that their work is valued and job performance suggests that it is not statistically significant at $r = .888$, $p>0.01$. A similar study by Wood, Froh and Gerathy (2010) argued that when employees’ efforts are not valued or appreciated by the supervisor this causes them to be dissatisfied. This concurs with a previous study done by Meyers, van Woerkom and Bakker (2013) who observed that lack of appreciation in the workplace impedes staff from being fully satisfied with their jobs.

The finding confirms what De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, De Witte, Niesen and Van Hootegem (2014) observed that lack of recognition of employees’ work damages organizations’ overall performance, as employees feel that their efforts are not appreciated. The finding is also in line with the findings of Talukder, Talukder and Alam (2014) that a major factor affecting academic staff’s job satisfaction is lack of recognition, which results in many academic staff leaving their university job.

The study also sought the views of THTU with regard to the recognition of academic staff by their employer. The THTU Chairperson indicated that despite the tireless
efforts made by academic staff in teaching and doing research, the university management does not seem to appreciate their efforts.

Specifically, it was observed in universities A, B and C had such a high number of students that classes exceeding 1000 students are divided into two streams, giving academic staff a greater workload without additional compensation. These universities do not recognize the efforts of such academic staff. The THTU Chairperson explained.

Most public universities in the country are congested due to the government’s over-ambitious enrolment expansion plans, contrary to the available teaching-learning facilities. Such high enrolment has negatively impacted academic staff’s teaching load by adding more classes to teach, demonstrate practicals or tutorials and conduct seminars. However, this additional load is not recognized nor are staff compensated.

Additionally, in an interview with a senior member of academic staff from university A it was observed that the university management does not appreciate the extra efforts made by academic staff who teach large classes. In fact, academic staff with large classes face greater challenges than their counterparts with small classes, who have adequate time to conduct research and consultancies and publish, and earn promotion and extra income, respectively. This finding corresponds to what Long and Shields (2010) found that the lack of recognition of employees’ efforts in most public institutions negatively impacted their performance, leading to poor quality service delivery.
Furthermore, the findings revealed that the limited development budget for rewarding academic staff was a major challenge facing most public universities. This meant that universities failed to renovate buildings and construct more offices for academic staff, lecture theatres and staff quarters. During the interview, the Deputy Vice Chancellor - Administration in university B said:

The ongoing government austerity measures complicate further the availability of necessary teaching-learning materials, like when you request money the answer is always either no or wait. In our case, some academic disciplines such as engineering, natural sciences and technology have been seriously affected as no money is available to buy laboratory equipment needed for science practicals.

Two of the three Deputy Vice Chancellors who were interviewed reported that the cut in funding was a major hindrance to implementing the university’s core functions of teaching, research and community service, which also variously impacted academic staff’s recognition. As a result, academic staff teach and conduct research in a difficult environment.

These challenges involving either lack of funds or delays in disbursement translate into universities’ inability to pay suppliers and academic staff dues. Therefore, the ensuing shortage of working tools directly threatens academic staff’s morale, who then perform well below their capacity, which may lead to poor quality university education (Mawoli & Babandako, 2011; Teferra, 2013; Ishengoma, 2013).

Furthermore, frequent power cuts and poor internet connectivity leave academic staff in difficult working conditions as they are unable to use working tools such as the computers, printers and photocopiers they need to prepare their lessons or do
research. One senior academic member of staff from university B commented on the issue.

Power cuts are common here, as the university is without power for hours on some days. This hinders teaching evening classes, whereby lecturers with large classes of 1000+ students are forced to arrange for mid-semester tests to take place during weekends, in order to secure large venues appropriate for examinations.

The observation of the senior academic staff was further supported by the Deputy Vice Chancellor – Administration of her university, who noted that due to frequent power cuts most lectures after 8:00pm have been frequently cancelled, causing students to lag behind in the 15–week semester timetable. Although there is a standby generator, she reported that it is very expensive to operate and so the working conditions of academic staff are seriously affected.

In line with these findings, studies by Aseanty (2016) and Taiwo (2010) indicated that recognition has the strongest influence on employees’ job performance. Therefore, universities need to provide a conducive working environment and recognize academic staff’s efforts as a prerequisite for the provision of quality university education.

4.3 To assess the relationship between responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania

The second objective of the study was to assess the relationship between responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania. To realize this objective, the study was guided by the following
hypothesis: there is no significant relationship between responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance in universities in Tanzania.

Table 4.2 Responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Job performance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Amount of responsibility you are given</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The opportunity to use your talents</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How satisfied you are with being involved in decisions that affect your work?</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed test)

Table 4.2 shows that Pearson Correlation Coefficient between responsibility, job satisfaction indicators and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania. The relationship between the amount of responsibility given to academic staff and their job performance was not statistically significant at $r = .413$, $p>0.01$. The relationship between the opportunity for academic staff to use their talents and job performance was not statistically significant at $r = .408$, $p>0.01$. The relationship between how satisfied academic staff were with being involved in decisions that affect their work and academic staff’s job performance was not statistically significant at $r = .414$, $p>0.01$.

The responsibilities of university academic staff involve teaching, research and community service (Rumble & Harry, 2018). Traditionally, universities defined
academic staff’s roles in line with their key functions and main focus on teaching and research. This hypothesis is anchored on the premise that academic staff’s duties and responsibilities are derived from the university’s core functions, which is related to the amount of responsibility, opportunity to use their talents and to what extent they are satisfied with their involvement in decisions that affect their work. Eventually, an appropriate amount of responsibility and the opportunity to demonstrate their talents while performing their duties will ensure the sustenance of quality education (Shin & Jung, 2014).

Specifically, universities’ day-to-day operations and performance mainly depend on their academic staff implementing university functions, and so giving responsibility to academic staff is key to ensuring a quality workforce and good results (Hanapi & Nordin, 2014). The literature suggests that academic staff’s responsibilities may include, but not exclusively, enhancing the learning environment through teaching, conducting research and community service that correspond to the university’s mission (Badmus & Enahoro, 2013).

Arguably, giving the academic staff responsibilities is viewed as crucial for any university, meaning that if a university is to fulfil its tasks, it needs to distribute key activities to its academic staff, which will ultimately contribute to the full functioning of the university.

The findings that the relationship between the amount of responsibilities given to academic staff and job performance is not statistically significant concur with Amatz
& Idris (2011) and Jawabri (2017) that employees’ job performance is mainly affected by both personal and organizational factors, for instance, if employees are not given the opportunity to demonstrate or use their abilities and are excluded from the university’s decision-making organs. In a typical university structure, academic staff are expected to be actively involved in decisions which affect their work. This participation will raise their morale, thereby helping the university to achieve its core functions.

This contradicts Berry and Cassidy’s (2013) argument that there is a significant relationship between staff not being involved in decisions and job dissatisfaction. It is further argued that participation in decision making in the recent past has sharply declined and so academics are highly dissatisfied (Amazt & Idris, 2011; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller & August, 2012). It can therefore be argued that in today’s world of transparency and competition, universities like other organizations need to involve their staff in university decisions and to share their thoughts on how to improve universities’ performance. Involvement in decision making makes them feel that they are contributing to the development of the respective university as well as building harmonious working relationships. This is supported by Ndunguru (2015) that it is an undeniable fact that academic staff are a key part in the provision of higher education, and so should effectively participate in making decisions on the university’s products and services. Specifically, academic staff through the existing university structure should be involved in preparing curriculum content to ensure that graduates are well prepared for the labour market and self-employment.
By participating in the achievement of the university’s core functions of teaching, research and community service, it gives academic staff the opportunity to influence the output of their work. Indeed, being given more responsibility increases employees’ skills and opens up more opportunities in the future. Muindi (2011) notes that when employees are involved in decisions they are empowered and save the organization time and money. Non-involvement in decisions generally widens the gap between the university management and academic members of staff. Consequently, Irawanto (2015) notes that the non-participation of academic staff in making decisions on issues relating to their job undermines their sense of belonging, which negatively affects their job performance. As a result, junior staff in most cases receive a double blow, as they are commonly least involved in major decision-making bodies in their respective university, while at the same time they are expected to implement decisions they were not involved in making. Kawemba (2017) argued that it is important to involve every employee in decision making as it lifts morale and ensures continuous improvement in their job.

Marzuki (2015), Mulinge and Arasa (2017) assert that the persistent problem of excluding academic staff from key university decision-making organs continues to prevail as decisions are made by a few mostly senior members of staff. This is the reason for this study to assess whether academic staff’s level of responsibility had a relationship with job performance in Tanzania’s universities. Underhill, Clarence-Fincham & Petersen (2014) observe that under-representation in university decision-making organs is a global concern. This is confirmed by several scholars (Greyling & Rhodes, 2006; Underhill & Mc Donald, 2010; Woodward, 2007) who argued that
junior employees are rarely included in decision-making organs of universities and so they work in a working environment that excludes them. The researcher established that this was true of universities in Tanzania where, despite the existence of management-employee consultation forums, minimal representation of employees.

Equally important, academic staff’s level of responsibility is an important yardstick for determining their job performance (Mwisaka, 2017). As argued in the McGregor theory X and theory Y of motivation, employee are ambitious, self-motivated and anxious to accept greater responsibility, which will ultimately give them the opportunity to perform better in their job (Hodson & Sullivan, 2012; Bockerman, Bryson & Ilmakunnas, 2012; Zoghi & Mohr, 2011). In this regard, allocating more responsibilities to academic staff guarantees their satisfaction, which is deemed important by university academic members of staff for executing the key tasks demanded of them.

4.4 To determine the relationship between remuneration, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in Tanzania

The third objective of the study sought to determine the relationship between remuneration, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania. Poor remuneration is a barrier found in universities, which prevents academic staff being satisfied with their job. The remuneration indicators were tested with job performance to determine whether there is a significant relationship. This was addressed by the research hypothesis: There is no significant relationship
between remuneration, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

**Table 4.3: Remuneration, Job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Job performance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  I am satisfied with my pay relative to other employees in this university</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort I put into my job</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  I need additional income to satisfy my needs</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  I get regular salary increments in my university</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Remuneration is very small</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed test)**

Table 4.3 shows the Pearson Correlation Coefficient among remuneration job satisfaction indicators and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania. The relationship between satisfaction and the pay academic staff receive compared to other employees in the university and job performance was not statistically significant at $r = -.308$, $p > 0.01$. The relationship between how the amount of effort academic staff put into their job and job performance was not statistically significant at $r = -.196$, $p > 0.01$. The relationship between the need for additional income to satisfy their needs and job performance was not statistically significant at $r = .032$,.
p > 0.01. The relationship between regular salary increments and job performance is not statistically significant at r = .002, p > 0.01 and the relationship between whether the remuneration provided is very small and job performance is not statistically significant at -.044, p > 0.01.

The findings from the study indicated that the relationship between academic staff’s satisfaction with pay relative to other employees in the university is not statistically significant at r = -.308, p > 0.01. This suggests that the university academic staff were dissatisfied with the pay they are getting compared to other employees in the university. Comparatively, non-academic staff were getting remunerated better than their academics counterparts, as they were entitled to overtime and extra duty allowances, which was not the case for academic staff. Turk (2008) also found that staff in the corporate world receive bonuses based on their effectiveness and productivity in their job in fulfilling organizational goals. Furthermore, consistent with previous findings, employees in public parastatals and private corporations are more satisfied with their pay than those in universities (Rabossi, 2008; Volkwein & Parmey, 2004). However, Burgess and Ratto (2003) argued that pay alone is not the best incentive for public sector employees, because they are more motivated by other incentives than private sector workers. The possible explanation for this finding is that fringe benefits, such as high quality health insurance and life insurance, are provided by private universities in Tanzania, unlike public universities.

Apart from the pay received by academic staff compared to other employees, another vital element in being satisfied with their remuneration is whether it rewards them...
fairly for the amount of effort academic staff put into their job and its relationship
with job performance. In this regard, the findings indicated that there is no
significant relationship at \( r = -0.196, p > 0.01 \). The results further suggest that besides
the low salaries and insufficient allowances, the interviews indicated that academic
staff were allocated a heavy teaching load, to the extent that the majority of them are
unable to conduct meaningful research or engage in community service. For instance,
at UDSM, the workload policy defined teaching as an observable and controllable
activity, like lecturing, supervising seminars or tutorials, laboratory practicals or
clinical work (University of Dar es Salaam, 2005). It further stipulates that for
academic staff the minimum teaching load is 150 hours (per semester), and an
average of 10 hours (per week). On top of the 150 hours, each academic member of
staff is required to commit his or her time to conducting research and engaging in
community service. However, most of the interviewees noted that the teaching load
allocated to academic staff occupies most of their time, with the result that they
hardly participate in research and community service activities. A senior member of
academic staff in university C said,

We are really overworked, too much work here. Imagine you teach a
class of 1500 students, and also supposed to administer tests and
examinations even during the weekends, marking their papers and also
supervising a good number of postgraduate students. However, the bad
news about these activities is that such a workload is not compensated.

The findings of this study on remuneration and how it influenced academic staff’s
job satisfaction are consistent with those in the studies by Ssesanga and Garrett
(2005) and Awang, Ahmad and Zin (2010), who noted that lecturers were extremely
dissatisfied with their salary and allowances amidst the heavy workload allocated to them. This also agrees with what Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller and August (2012) discussed that low salaries are the major factor contributing to job dissatisfaction amongst academic staff. A similar study by Kiplangat, Momanyi and Kangethe (2017) found that academic staff are dissatisfied with their pay that ultimately affects their job satisfaction overall.

The findings have also indicated that the relationship between the need for additional income to satisfy academic staff needs and job performance was statistically significant at r=.032, p>0.01. Therefore the study further sought to find out what academic staff received by way of remuneration at the universities involved in the study. The results are presented in Tables 4.4 and 4.5.

Table 4.4: Salaries of academic staff at St. Augustine University of Tanzania (in Tanzanian Shillings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>5,875,000</td>
<td>6,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>5,350,000</td>
<td>5,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>3,825,000</td>
<td>4,805,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3,300,000</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>2,775,000</td>
<td>2,995,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Pay in Tanzania shillings (Tshs.); 1 USD = Tshs 2,247
Table 4.5: Salaries of academic staff in public universities (in Tanzania shillings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary scale</th>
<th>Minimum Basic</th>
<th>Maximum Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>PUTS 6</td>
<td>5,470,000</td>
<td>6,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PUTS 5</td>
<td>5,045,000</td>
<td>5,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>PUTS 4</td>
<td>4,235,000</td>
<td>4,794,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>PUTS 3</td>
<td>3,195,000</td>
<td>3,609,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>PUTS 2</td>
<td>2,310,000</td>
<td>2,545,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PUTS = Public Universities Teaching Staff Salary Scale

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 indicate the differences in salaries by university sector (both public and private universities) of the academic ranks of Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Full Professor. It was revealed that generally academic staff in a private university earn more than their public university counterparts. While a Full Professor in a private university earns between 5,875,000 (Tshs.) and 6,675,000 (Tshs.), a Full Professor in a public university earns between Tshs 5,470,000 and Tshs 6,220,000. The study further observed that these are gross salaries, which are later subjected to compulsory deductions such as Pay-As-You-Earn (PAYE) tax, pension scheme contribution, academic staff union, welfare union and health insurance scheme. This means that the net salary of academic staff is much lower, which may ultimately lead to their near mass exodus, especially from public universities, leaving them for better paid jobs. Additionally, since the deductions were compulsory, no-one (either academic staff or staff union) had control over this.
Further, the Chairperson of THTU argued that for years they have negotiated with the government (employer) to reduce the deductions, especially PAYE taxes, but the government responded by reducing PAYE deductions from 11% to only 9% in the 2016/2017 Financial Year, but only for those earning less than 700,000 TZS (312 USD), from which none of the academic staff benefited. As a result, their net salary continues to be unsatisfying due to the numerous deductions. This is consistent with the study by Odhiambo (2011), who found that the low salary of academic staff in public universities was due to huge deductions and higher inflation, resulting in the academic brain drain whereby academics look for other more seemingly promising jobs financially outside the universities. It was also observed that the housing allowance was discriminatory in nature as it is only given to senior members of staff, from Senior Lecturer upwards. However, even those entitled to a housing allowance still complain that the allowance is usually delayed, as it takes some years for them to receive it and others never get it at all. A senior member of academic staff in university B lamented that:

They promised to pay the money soon, which comprises salary arrears and allowances, but now the government has come up with new delaying tactics, by responding that it needed more time to validate the claims documents. The unfortunate thing is that the documents were submitted a long time ago……. I am telling you, the reality is, all these delaying strategies are done because the funds that were allocated to pay academic staff were either diverted to some other expenditure or mismanaged, or the government does not have the funds at all to pay us.

Expressing his dissatisfaction, the THTU Chairperson noted:

Without pressure from academic staff, the government or the universities won't act immediately to improve their remuneration. Therefore, academic staff through their union must act now, instead of
just waiting, expecting politicians to honour their pledges to ensure that academic staff arrears get paid, and so tough action is needed to make things happen.

The THTU Chairperson also suggested the following to the government;

Clearing the arrears the government owes academic staff and increasing their salaries at least to the level of other state corporations or parastatals is the best way to go. With the new government in power, it is high time to improve the working environment of academic staff. We don’t expect the last government’s blunders to continue. This administration under President Dr. Magufuli should be a phase of continuous improvement for the betterment of higher education.

Collectively, the THTU Chairperson, a leader of the academic staff union and senior members of staff in universities A, B and C maintained that there have been continuous delays in remunerating academic staff in public universities, including paying salary arrears. This has had an impact on the day-to-day working environment of academic staff and has lowered their morale, which may result in some of them starting to look for other work somewhere else to compensate for the deficit. This may jeopardize the quality of education provided at the parent university where these academic staff are employed full time.

Thus, according to the THTU Chairperson, peaceful negotiations with the government do not seem to be bearing fruit. Therefore, at this point, an industrial dispute with the government is needed to start pushing for academic staff rights. It was revealed that since the 2005/06 academic year the academic staff union has been negotiating with the government, but little has been achieved so far.
Furthermore, despite the establishment of the Presidential Pay Commission in 2006, which was tasked to harmonize salaries across the public sector as well as making salaries both internally and externally competitive, the problem of low salaries still persists, as the majority of academic staff in public universities receive lower salaries than other civil servants across the sectors. This confirms previous findings that lecturers may feel unfairly treated when they compare the compensation they receive from their current university with that of other universities that provide better compensation packages (Block, 2016; e, Pinagase & Mercy, 2014; Rahimi, Hashim, Tahsidari & Khodakarami, 2013; Zakaria, Jidi, Zani, Mislan & Eshak, 2014).

The study further found that, despite filling in the claim forms for salary arrears and housing allowances several times, academic staff still experienced delays. This confirms what Mkude, Cooksey and Levey (2003) argued that many delays in public institutions remain a major challenge to executing numerous undertakings. In Tanzania, delays in attending to civil servants’ grievances, for instance, over salary arrears and allowances, have also been associated with poor record keeping by various government agencies, and corruption by clerical staff who use delaying tactics to obtain a bribe (Sikoi, 2013).

It is clear that, while several studies have indicated that salaries are very important for ensuring employees’ commitment to an organization (Shoaib, Noor & Tirmiz, 2009; Singh, 2006), the situation in many African universities is different as most academics tend to devote less time to their university job than other income-generating activities outside the university to support their meagre salaries.
(Grossman, 2016; Cilliers, 2017). Engaging in other income-generating activities means that university academics do not spend much time researching and preparing the content of a serious academic course, which results in poor teaching and disengaged students.

Due to the relatively low salary level in Tanzania’s universities, some academics have chosen to work for lucrative engagements or consultancies outside the university while still holding on to their present university position (Luhanga, 2009). Interestingly, some lecturers have even taken on a third job to boost their salaries. Therefore, because of the inadequate remuneration and relatively unsatisfactory working conditions compared with private universities, public universities are unable to attract potential scholars from the private, corporate world, either locally or abroad, to work for them on a full-time basis as used to be the case. Generally speaking, Tanzanian public university academic staff salaries are lower than those with similar qualifications in private universities. It is unfortunate that the academic profession has lost its financial attractiveness or appeal, causing younger scholars to shun an academic career due to the low salaries that are paid. Parsons and Slabbert (2001) found that the lack of adequate financial resources with which to compensate staff was one of the impediments to the successful implementation of a monetary rewards strategy for improving performance in higher education institutions. This study found that the academic staff in public universities perceive that their remuneration is inadequate compared with that of their private university counterparts and so they expressed dissatisfaction with their insignificant remuneration. Pienaar and Bester (2009) also stated that, due to the perceived
inconsequential monetary rewards, universities are at risk of failing to attract and retain highly competent and experienced academics. This is of concern in the light of Tanzanian universities’ vision to become world-class universities that are responsive to both local and global needs. Several studies also question the view that academics have less regard for monetary rewards (Forest, 2008), particularly in view of Ishengoma’s (2007) finding that one of the primary reasons for the internal brain drain of academics from Tanzania’s public universities - as in other African countries - is the low remuneration and to some extent poor working conditions, manifested in inadequate teaching/learning facilities, large classes and inadequate office space, and so academics experience job dissatisfaction and leave public universities.

A further observation in universities is that the academic staff union has had frequent confrontations with the government over issues relating to salaries and working conditions, which has led to an ongoing crisis in most of the country’s public universities as a way to push the government to attend to their demands. As a result, this has adversely affected academic performance. Strikes have lately been common in Tanzania’s public universities, the issue of salaries and poor working conditions being the major area of concern. However, strikes have long-term effects, such as a disrupted academic calendar, a poor relationship between the staff and university management and the exodus of many highly qualified academic staff who turn to non-academic university jobs.

More importantly, Zeleza (2016) further argued that the poor remuneration of university academic staff has became salient, as those in non-universities public
parastatals enjoy much higher salaries and better working conditions than their counterparts in universities. This to a great extent explains why there is a high rate of job turnover in most universities in Africa. As observed by Figueroa (2015), the high rate of turnover not only causes institutions financial loss as they need to find a replacement, but remaining employees also experience a sense of shared loss and decreased work productivity.

4.5 The relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities

The fourth objective was to examine the relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania. To address this objective the study used the following research hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

Table 4.6: Promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion depends on how well you do your job in this university</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being here for a long time will get you promoted sooner than having good skills and performing well</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a better chance of getting promoted in this university</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 (two-tailed test)
Table 4.6 shows the relationship between promotion, job satisfaction indicators and job performance among university academic staff. The results indicate that there is no significant relationship between promotion based on how well academic staff do their job at universities and job performance at $r = -0.013$, $p>0.01$. This finding suggests that the criteria currently used to promote academic staff do not consider how well academic staff do their job, which ultimately affects their job performance. This means that the current unclear promotion criteria has an impact on job performance. As suggested later, these promotion criteria could be revised by including how well academic staff do their jobs in line with university core functions of teaching, research and community service. Revised, clear academic staff promotion criteria will, therefore, motivate them and improve their job performance.

Consistent with the findings of Bello, Ogundipe & Eze (2017), promotion did not influence academic staff’s job performance. Equally important, there has been much debate in recent times on whether universities should use teaching or research as criteria for promoting their academic staff (Prince, Felder & Brent, 2007).

There was a non-significant relationship between the time it took to promote academic staff and overall job performance. This finding was also supported by sentiments expressed by the majority of senior academic members of staff that it took a long time before being promoted despite the promotion criteria or possessing the required qualifications. One of the senior academic members of staff in university A stated that political interference in academic staff’s promotion significantly reduced job satisfaction and subsequently affected job performance.
Most of us are deeply disappointed and demotivated by the long time it takes for someone to get promoted. We are tired of political interference by the government in the academic staff’s promotion. Imagine, it is now three years since the government stopped promoting all deserving university lecturers, without giving an explanation for this decision. In fact, we have started looking for better paid jobs outside the university.

The fact that the majority of the academic staff indicated that they were extremely dissatisfied with promotional procedures involving delays confirmed the study conducted by Anassi (2004) that indicated that delays and political interference with university lecturers’ promotion was a major stumbling block to academic staff being satisfied with their job. This agrees with what Gudo, Olel and Oanda (2011) observed that the promotion of academic staff is held up by long and tiresome procedures, which ultimately lowers academic staff’s morale. This was reiterated by Rehman, Rehman, Saif and Khan (2013) that academic staff were dissatisfied with the promotion procedures.

The researcher sought to find out the promotion criteria used in the selected universities and found that in the three selected public universities promotion of academic staff is guided by the universities’ appointment and promotion policy, which outlines the criteria to be used for promoting from one academic rank to another. Analysis of the universities’ promotion policy indicates that besides educational qualifications, teaching experience and publications, an academic staff member had to wait three years to qualify for promotion to the next academic rank. It is important to note that teaching effectiveness was also included in the promotion criteria, which was confirmed in an interview with the Deputy Vice Chancellor – Administration of university B, who said that;
We have added teaching effectiveness as a promotion criterion in the revised appointment and promotion policy, that is, every academic staff member will be evaluated and rewarded for his or her teaching effectiveness and research performance, unlike in previous years when only research output and publications were considered for academic staff’s promotion.

Despite the fact that the leaders of the academic staff union agreed with the inclusion of teaching effectiveness in the academic staff’s promotion criteria, they disagreed with the points allocated to teaching effectiveness compared to the points allocated to research achievement and the three years’ waiting time for an academic staff member to qualify for promotion to the next academic rank.

Generally, the criteria for promoting academic staff are evaluated in line with the universities’ core functions of teaching and research, as indicated in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Criteria for Promoting academic staff to various academic ranks in universities A, B and C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion criteria</th>
<th>Weight (Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>0 – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0 – 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents</td>
<td>0 – 6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 indicates the allocation of points for the promotion of academic staff. However, teaching was awarded fewer points, 0 to 2.0 points, than publications and patents. Further, the appointment and promotion policy does not explain what the guiding parameters are when it comes to teaching effectiveness. Therefore, the concern was not only about less points being allocated to teaching effectiveness, but also about how the appointment and promotion policy evaluates and rewards teaching effectiveness.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the research findings, presents the conclusions and makes policy recommendations. Lastly, the chapter presents suggestions where further research could be conducted that emerged from the study.

5.2 Summary of the Study Findings

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship of academic staff’s job satisfaction and job performance in universities with a view to informing higher education practices in Tanzania. The respondents of the study were academic staff, Deputy Vice Chancellors – Administration and leaders of the academic staff trade union. To achieve the objectives of the study, data were collected from four hundred and eleven (411) respondents through the use of questionnaires. A total of nineteen interviews were conducted. The data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics in order to adequately test the research hypotheses.

The following is a summary of the major findings for each objective.

5.2.1. The relationship between recognition job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania

The first objective of the study was to examine the relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.
The aspect of academic staff receiving formal recognition for their achievements was not statistically significant in relation to job performance. The study summarizes that receiving formal recognition for achievements was not significantly related to the job performance of university academic staff.

With regard to being recognized by supervisors, the study established that there is no significant relationship between being recognized by supervisors and academic staff’s job performance. As to whether recognition by peers or co-workers was significantly related to academic staff’s job performance, the study established that there is no significant relationship between being recognized by peers or co-workers and job performance. Lastly, on whether academic staff feel that their work is valued and appreciated, the study established that this is not significantly related to their job performance.

5.2.2 The relationship between responsibility job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania

The second objective of this study was to assess the relationship between responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

On the relationship between the amount of responsibility academic staff are given and job performance, the study established that this relationship was not statistically significant, neither was the relationship between the opportunity of academic staff to use their abilities and job performance statistically significant, nor
was the relationship between academic staff’s satisfaction with being involved in decision making and their job performance statistically significant.

5.2.3 To determine the relationship between remuneration job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania

The third objective of this study was to determine the relationship between remuneration, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania.

With regard to the relationship between satisfaction with pay relative to other employees and job performance the study established that there was no significant relationship.

On the relationship between whether academic staff are rewarded fairly for the amount of effort they put into their job and job performance, the study established that there was no significant relationship.

5.2.4 The relationship between promotion job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania

The fourth objective of the study was to examine the relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of academic staff in universities in Tanzania. The findings of the study revealed that there was no significant relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance. For instance, it was established that promotion based on how well academic staff do their job was not statistically significantly related to job performance.
The study has shown that the relationship between the time it takes for academic staff to get promoted after meeting the required promotion criteria and job performance was not statistically significant at $r = .214$, $p > 0.01$. Academic staff having a better chance of being promoted in their respective university had no statistical relationship with job performance.

Despite the fact that the leader of the academic staff union agreed with the inclusion of teaching effectiveness in the criteria for promoting academic staff, they disagreed with the points allocated to teaching effectiveness compared to the points allocated to research achievement and the three years’ waiting time for an academic staff member to qualify for promotion to the next academic rank.

5.3 Conclusions

This section focuses on conclusions based on the findings on the objectives that guided the study. These are:

5.3.1 On the relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff

In general, the relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff was not statistically significant. For example, the relationship between academic staff’s formal recognition for their achievements was not statistically significantly related to job performance. This is probably causing the
mass exodus of many academic staff to non-teaching jobs outside universities where they will seemingly be recognized. This has had a dire impact as it has left the universities with few academics to handle the teaching and research functions, but then again the remaining academics have little time to conduct scholarly research.

5.3.2 On the relationship between responsibility job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

The relationship between responsibility, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff was not statistically significant. The study found that the amount of responsibility given to academic staff is not statistically significantly related to job performance. From the perspective of the Herzberg two-factor theory, this non-statistically significant relationship between academic staff’s amount of responsibility and job performance may be attributed to the tendency to exclude academic staff from universities' key decision-making organs.

5.3.3 On the relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.

The relationship between promotion, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff was not statistically significant, because of the time it takes for academic staff to get promoted despite fulfilling the promotion criteria. Indeed, the majority of the academic staff indicated that they were extremely dissatisfied with promotional procedures involving delays.
5.3.4 On the relationship between remuneration job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff.

The relationship between remuneration, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff was not statistically significant. The findings of the study revealed that inadequate financial resources to compensate academic staff led to their dissatisfaction, which ultimately affects job performance. The findings further revealed that, due to the low salary and the delay in remunerating academic staff, including paying salary arrears, some academic staff looked for and obtained better paid jobs somewhere else to make ends meet. This again jeopardizes the quality of education provided at universities where academics are expected to work on a full-time basis.

5.4 Recommendations

This section makes recommendations in the light of the study findings that were guided by the objectives. They relate to policy, practices and suggestions for further research.

5.4.1 Policy Recommendations

The study came up with the following policy recommendations on basis of the objectives. Objective 1: To examine the relationship between recognition, job satisfaction and job performance of university academic staff in Tanzania.
On the **relationship between recognition** **job satisfaction and job performance**, the study established the challenges that affected academic staff’s job satisfaction. The study, therefore, recommended the following:

Academic staff with outstanding job performance should be formally and continuously recognized. There is a need for universities to ensure that they establish a strategy for motivating their academic staff, which will influence their career growth.

This study therefore recommends that:

i) Because academic staff do not feel that their work is either valued or appreciated, they should be given recognition for their work which they deserve to improve their job performance.

ii) Outstanding academic staff should be recognized and rewarded accordingly. This will not only disseminate knowledge to the wider society but also encourage other academic staff in the universities to emulate the efforts made by the recognized academic staff in performing their job.

iii) Universities should allocate more funds to research-based activities. Academic staff should be encouraged to apply for available research grants both within universities and outside, and this information should be shared on university websites, staff intranet portals and notice boards.
iv) Academic staff’s remuneration and allowances should be increased in line with
the current inflation rate. This will motivate them to concentrate on their key
responsibilities of teaching and research at their respective university. Universities should also timely recruit academic staff once a position falls vacant. This will ensure the availability of an adequate number of academic staff in various academic specializations, which is vital for the provision of quality university education.

v) Performance-based research funding should be provided in universities to boost the research performance of Tanzanian universities. Senior academics are expected to play a mentorship role in assisting juniors with research undertakings and to learn from other countries or institutions about best research practice. Because of the pressure to be more efficient and relevant, universities like other institutions have to become more focused on their research agenda.

vi) The Tanzania Commission for Universities should prepare national guidelines on where academic staff can publish academic work to avoid falling prey to predatory or bogus publication outlets, which might consequently affect the promotion process when applying for promotion to the next academic rank.

vii) To encourage and reward the dissemination of research findings, the university management should develop open research policies and mandate that all university-funded research be made open. An evaluation of academic staff’s job performance should be based on what they have deposited in the university repository. In-house journals should be available on open access platforms, such
as open access journals. In addition, all academic staff should create a personal profile on the university website so that they can easily track their published work by seeing who has been interested in and cited their publications.

viii) The Tanzania Commission for Universities, as the statutory body that oversees university education in Tanzania, should link academic promotions and recruitment to its academic job performance indicators, which will recognize academic papers published on the approved list. This list should be prepared by subject experts and reviewed from time to time.

5.4.2 Suggestions for further research

This study suggests further research in the following areas.

This study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and the job performance of academic staff in six selected universities in Tanzania. There is a need for further research in all Tanzanian universities due to the fact that universities differ in terms of ownership, mission or the philosophy behind their establishment, location and academic specialization. As job satisfaction and job performance depend on the type of university investigated, there is a need for further research on job satisfaction and job performance in all Tanzanian universities.
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University Academic Staff Job Satisfaction and Job performance Questionnaire

PART A

SECTION A: Personal Information
This questionnaire seeks information on the job satisfaction and job performance among university academic staff in Tanzania. You are kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire by filling in the gaps, by giving answers and putting a tick against the number with the relevant answers. Be free to work to the best of your knowledge. But please do not write your name. Your contribution is highly valued and will remain confidential.

Please complete the following section which asks about you and your job

Name of your university .................................

Public university (  ) Private university (  )

Specialization: ....................................................

Academic rank and/or title: ........................................

Employment tenure: Permanent (  ) On Contract (  )

Gender (Please tick): Male (  ) Female (  )

Age (Years) :( i). Below 30 (  ), (ii). 31 – 39 (  ), (iii). 41 – 49 (  )

(iv).50 & above (  )
Marital status: Single [ ] Married [ ] Other (Please specify):

How many years of university service do you have? 0 – 4 [ ] 10 [ ] 11 [ ]

– 15 [ ] 16 and above [ ]

How many years have you held your current position? Below 1 year [ ]

1 - 4 [ ] 5 – 10 [ ] 11 and above [ ]

Please select from the following the highest educational qualification you hold from below:

Bachelor’s degree or equivalent [ ]
Masters [ ]
Doctorate [ ]
Doctorate (Ongoing studies) [ ]
Others (Please specify) …………………………………………

Please specify if you are involved in any income-generating activities such as:

Part–time lecturing (e.g. other institutions or parallel programmes) [ ]

Consultancies [ ] Privately run business [ ]

Other (Please specify): ………………………………………
### Section B: Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction indicator</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Likert Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the following aspect of your job by putting a (V) in the appropriate box. The scale is 1=Extremely dissatisfied; 2=Dissatisfied; 3=Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4=Satisfied; 5=Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1. Receiving formal recognition for your achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Being recognized by supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Being recognized by peers or co-workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Feeling that your work is valued and appreciated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>1. I am satisfied with my pay relative to other employees in this university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I am rewarded fairly for the amount of effort I put into my job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I need additional income to satisfy my needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I get a regular salary increment in my university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Remuneration is quite small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1. Amount of responsibility you are given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The opportunity to use your abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How satisfied you are with your involvement in decisions that affect your work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>1. Promotions are based on how well you do your work in this university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Being employed in this university for a long time will get you promoted sooner than having good skills and performing well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I have a good chance of getting ahead in this university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B

SECTION C: ACADEMIC STAFF JOB PERFORMANCE

Please indicate the extent to which you were involved in teaching and academic supervision of students in your university.

1. Are you teaching more than one course at this university?

   I. YES [  ] II. NO [  ] If NO proceed to Question number 2

If YES, how many

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>Course Units</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Contact hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. (i) How do you devote your time to teaching and supervising each of the following types of students per semester?

   (a) Undergraduate teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Units</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Mode of Contact</th>
<th>Time spent (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutorials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) **Postgraduate teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Programme</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Students’ Progress (2014/15 Academic year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. (ii) **Postgraduate Academic Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Programme</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Students’ Progress (2014/15 Academic year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: Research-based activities

Indicate the number of research-based activities you as a researcher participated in the following research-based publications below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Research based activities</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of referred academic publications published in national journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of referred academic publications published in international journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of national conference presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of international conference presentations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Technical notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Book reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Manuscripts sent for publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Government reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Research reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Consultancy reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the space below if you have any comments or recommendations about issues raised in this questionnaire or any other issues that were not addressed here. All comments made will be valuable and useful in the final outcomes of this study (*Please use additional paper if you wish*)

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX II: Interview guide for Deputy Vice Chancellor - Administration

Introduction

The following instrument seeks the views of the university management on the influence that Job satisfaction has had on the job performance of academic staff in public and private universities. The purpose of the information sought is for a study that seeks to document the level of job satisfaction and job performance as well as how job satisfaction influences job performance. Please be assured that your responses and identity will be kept confidential and anonymous. Any person will be free to withdraw from the research any time he/she wishes to do so.

Part A: Administrative related issues

1) What key developments have taken place regarding academic staff welfare in this university?

2) Comment on how academic staff job-related issues are handled in this university.

3) Please explain the university role in improving academic staff;
   i) Recognition
   ii) Remuneration
   iii) Promotion
   iv) Responsibility

4) In your opinion, what are the drawbacks of the academic staff performance evaluation mechanism of this university?
Part B: Academic-related issues

1) How has the university’s terms and conditions of service affected academic staff’s job performance (probe the following)
   i) Recognition
   ii) Remuneration
   iii) Responsibility
   iv) Promotion
   v) Teaching workload
   vi) Research and publications

2) What mechanisms/policies has the university put in place to ensure that academic staff are motivated?

3) In your view, does addressing academic staff grievances in this university help to address also the national development priorities and challenges?

Part C: University source of income

1) What are the main sources of income in the last five (5) years? How much money is allocated to research?

Part D: General reflection and summary

In your assessment of the experience of academic staff job issues in your university would you say that the university’s attempt has been useful and worth continuing? What would you say are the main factors for its success or failure?

Thank you for your response
APPENDIX III: Interview guide for senior academic staff

Introduction

The following instrument seeks the views of academic staff on job satisfaction and job performance both in public and private universities. The purpose of the information sought is for a study that seeks to document how job satisfaction influences job performance among academic staff in public and private universities. Please be assured that your responses and identity will be treated confidentially and anonymously. Any person will be free to withdraw from the research any time he or she wishes to do so.

University……………………… Faculty/School…………………

1) What key developments have happened regarding academic staff welfare in this university?

2) Comment on how inclusive and consultative are academic staff’s job-related issues addressed in this university.

3) In what ways has the current academic staff evaluation system affected the terms and conditions of services for academic staff (probe the following)?

   i) Recognition
   ii) Remuneration
   iii) Responsibility
   iv) Teaching workload
   v) Research and publications

4) What mechanisms has the university put in place to enhance academic staff’s job satisfaction?

5) In your opinion, what are the shortcomings of the current reward strategies and promotion procedures applied by the administration of this university?

6) In your assessment and experience of academic staff in this university, would you say that the university’s attempt has been useful and worth continuing? What would you say are the main factors for its success or failure?

7) Is there anything you would like to say that I have not asked about?

Thank you for your responses
APPENDIX IV: Interview guide for academic staff union leaders

Introduction

The following instrument seeks the views of academic staff union leaders on job satisfaction and job performance in public and private universities. The purpose of the information sought is for a study that seeks to document the level of job satisfaction and job performance and how job satisfaction influences job performance. Please be assured that your responses to this research will be kept confidential and anonymous.

Name of the organization/union…………………………………..

Part A: Administrative-related issues

1) What key developments regarding academic staff job welfare are you dealing within your university?
2) Comment on how consultative the academic staff job-related issues are handled by your organization.
3) Comment on any other areas of academic staff welfare in which your organization plays a role.
4) In your opinion, what are the drawbacks of the academic staff’s working environment and performance evaluation mechanism applied by universities?

Part B: Academic-related issues

In what ways has the introduction of the Open Performance Appraisal System (OPRAS) changed the job performance of academic staff (probe on the following).

i) Recognition
ii) Remuneration
iii) Responsibility
iv) Promotion
v) Teaching workload
vi) Research and publications
Part C: General reflection and summary

In your assessment and experience of academic staff welfare, would you say that the universities’ attempt on matters regarding job satisfaction and job performance of its academic staff has been useful and worth continuing? What would you say are the reasons for its success or failure?

Is there anything you would like to say that I have not asked about?

Thank you for your response
### APPENDIX V: Table for determining sample size from a given population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI: Letter of Informed Consent to Participants

DATE……………………………..

INTRODUCTION

I am a PhD student at the Kenyatta University, Department of Educational Management, Policy and Curriculum Studies. I am working on a study titled ‘The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance among University Academic Staff in Tanzania’. The purpose of the study is to examine the job satisfaction of academic staff in public and private universities and assess the extent to which job satisfaction influences job performance in terms of teaching and research in public and private universities in Tanzania.

For the purpose of this study, I kindly request you to participate in the interview. Your participation will facilitate the collection of relevant information on academic staff job satisfaction and job performance in your university. Kindly read the information provided below to guide you to make an informed decision regarding your participation in this study.

RESEARCH PROCEDURE

THE STUDY

Title: Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of University Academic Staff in Tanzania: The Relationship.

Purpose of the study: The purpose of the study is to examine the job satisfaction of academic staff in and assess the extent to which job satisfaction influences job performance in terms of teaching and research in universities in Tanzania.

Procedures: Semi-structured interviews will be conducted within 30 – 60 minutes. During the interview, you are allowed to withdraw either yourself and/or your contribution any time you wish to do so. You will not be forced to provide
information that is not relevant to this study. All the information you supply will remain confidential and your identity will not be revealed to other participants or in the draft of this report. Furthermore, with your consent I would record our conversation during the interview to be used later on to cross-check the authenticity of the information recorded. A written draft of our interview will be sent to you to amend or confirm before I use it as data in my study.

**Benefits:** The findings of the study will be useful to scholars, university administrators, policy makers and other stakeholders to inform on academic staff motivation that will foster job performance for the achievement of the university’s core functions of teaching and research.

**DECLARATION**

I ……………………………………………………………………..(Name) of ………………………………..(Address) declare to participate in the study mentioned above. I understand that I have the right to withdraw from participating in the study, if I am not comfortable during the interview process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I understand that the information will be kept confidential as it will not be released without my authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I understand that there are no risks associated with this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Respondent’s name ………………….. Signature ………………..

Date ……………………..

Faculty/School …………………………………………………
APPENDIX VII: Research Clearance: University of Dar es Salaam

Deputy Vice Chancellor – Administration
University of Dar es Salaam
Dar es Salaam

RE: REQUEST FOR RESEARCH CLEARANCE

The purpose of this letter is to introduce to you Mr. Simon Peter is a bonafide staff of the University of Dar es Salaam and who is at the moment required to conduct research. Our staff members undertake research activities as part of their core functions.

In accordance with government circular letter Ref. No. MPEC/R/10/1 dated 4th July 1980, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dar es Salaam is empowered to issue research clearances to staff members and students of the University of Dar es Salaam on behalf of the government and the Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH). I am pleased to inform you that I have granted research clearance to Mr. Peter.

I therefore request you to grant him any help that may enable him achieve his research objectives. Specifically we request your permission for him to meet and talk to the leaders and other relevant stakeholders in your region in connection with his research.

The title of his research is “A Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among University Academic Staff in Tanzania”.

The period of his research is from July to September 2015 and the research will cover the University of Dar es Salaam.

Should there be any restriction, you are kindly requested to advise us accordingly. In case you may require further information, please do not hesitate to contact us through the Directorate of Research, Tel. 2410500-8 Ext. 2084 or 2410727 and E-mail: research@udsm.ac.tz.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Prof. Rwakata S. Mwakanda
VICE-CHANCELLOR
UNIVERSITY OF DARES-SALAM
P.O. BOX 35091
DAR-ES-SALAM
APPENDIX VIII: Research Clearance: St. Augustine University of Tanzania

ST. AUGUSTINE UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA
The Office of Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
P.O. Box 307 - Mwanza

Ref. No. SAUT/AC/02/21
23rd September, 2015

The Vice Chancellor
University of Dar es Salaam
P.O. Box 35091
DAR ES SALAAM

Re: RESEARCH CLEARANCE FOR MR. SIMON PETER

The reference is made to the above heading.

May I acknowledge with thanks receipt of your letter dated 10th July 2015 with reference number AB3/12(B).

Mr. Simon Peter is welcome to report to the SAUT Director of Postgraduate Studies, Research and Consultancy for more directives as to which departments would be relevant to his study (scope) and later on to the Public Relations Officer who shall introduce him to the respondents.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Negussie Andre. D
Acting Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

cc: VC
Corporate Counsel
Director of Postgraduate Studies, Research and Consultancy
HRO
PRO
Mr. Simon Peter
OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR

P. O BOX 2440 ZANZIBAR, TANZANIA

Ref. No: ZU4/4(C) Date: 19th October, 2015

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RESEARCH CLEARANCE

The purpose of this letter is to introduce to you Mr. Simon Peter, who is a bonafide student at Kenyatta University.

Mr. Peter has been permitted to conduct research titled “A Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among University Academic Staff in Tanzania”

The period for which this permission has been granted is from October, 2015 to December 2015.

It will be appreciated if you will grant the researcher any help that may facilitate him to achieve research objectives.

Prof. Mustafa A. A. Roshash

VICE CHANCELLOR
APPENDIX X: Research Clearance: Sokoine University of Agriculture

CLEARANCE PERMIT FOR CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN TANZANIA

SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR
P.O. Box 3080, MOROGORO, TANZANIA
Phone 023-204252, 206031; Fax 023-206061

Our Ref. SUA/ADM/R.1/8/ Date: 21st December 2015

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN
SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE
MOROGORO

Re: REQUEST FOR RESEARCH LEARANCE

The heading above refers.

May I introduce to you Mr. Simon Peter, who is a boniside staff from University of Dar es Salaam.

At the moment Mr. Simon is conducting research on "A Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among University Academic Staff in Tanzania" from November to December 2015.

Please assist him accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Prof. Gerald C. Monela
VICE-CHANCELLOR

Copy to: The Vice Chancellor
University of Dar es Salaam
P.O. Box 35091
DAR ES SALAAM

"": Mr. Simon Peter
P.O. Box 54255
DAR ES SALAAM
simonipetro@gmail.com
APPENDIX XI: Research Clearance: Open University of Tanzania

THE OPEN UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA
DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH, PUBLICATIONS AND POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
P.O. Box 23409
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
http://www.openuniversity.ac.tz

Our Ref. No. OUT/DRPS/RC/I

Date: 5th January, 2016

Dean,
Faculty of Education/
Faculty of Business Management/
Faculty of Science and Environmental Studies and
Director of Research,
DAR ES SALAAM

RE: RESEARCH CLEARANCE

This is to introduce to you Mr. Simon Peter who is a bonafide student of University of Dar es Salaam. By this letter he has been granted permission to conduct research study at our university (OUT). His research title is: 'A Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among University Academic Staff in Tanzania'.

This permission allows him to talk to Academic staff of the Open University of Tanzania under your Faculty or Directorate in connection with his study. This is in accordance with the Government circular letter Ref. No. MPEC/R/10/1 dated 4th July, 1980; the Vice Chancellor was empowered to issue research clearance to the staff and students of OUT and other universities who wish to conduct their studies at the Open University of Tanzania on behalf of the Government and the Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology, a successor organization to UTAFTI.

This permission is granted from January, 2016 to March, 2016.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation and facilitation of this research activity.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Jacob Lisakafu
For: VICE CHANCELLOR
THE OPEN UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA
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APPENDIX XII: Research Clearance: University of Iringa

UNIVERSITY OF IRINGA
CHUO KIKUU CHA IRINGA

The Office of Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
(Formerly, Tumaini University, Iringa University College)
P. O Box 200 Iringa, Tanzania

Ref. No. UOIVC/03/32 4th February, 2016

The Vice Chancellor
University of Dar es Salaam
P.O Box 35091
DAR ES SALAAM

RE: RESEARCH CLEARANCE FOR MR. SIMON PETER

The above caption matters.

May I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 10th July 2015 with reference number ABJ/12(B).

By this letter Mr. Simon Peter has been granted permission to conduct research study titled "A Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among University Academic Staff".

This permission is granted from February, 2016 to May, 2016.

Yours Sincerely

Ms. Nelly Sanga

For Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
APPENDIX XIII

Research Clearance: Tanzania Higher Learning Institutions Trade Union

TANZANIA HIGHER LEARNING INSTITUTIONS TRADE UNION (THTU)
CHAMA CHA WAFANYAKAZI WA TAASISI ZA ELIMU YA JUU TANZANIA

P.O. Box 35091, Dar es Salaam
Tel: +255 22 240500/9 Ext. 2434

Our Reference: THTU/WAN/HQ/109

18 January, 2016

The Vice Chancellor
University of Dar es Salaam
P. O Box 35091
DAR ES SALAAM

RE: RESEARCH CLEARANCE FOR MR. SIMON PETER

The above caption matters.

Mr. Peter has been granted permission to conduct research titled “A Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among University Academic Staff in Tanzania”.

The period for which this permission has been granted is from January, 2016 to February 2016.

“NIA NA MWELEKEO WETU DAIMA NI KUJENGA, TAIFA KWANZA”

Salfius G. Mligo
Chairperson

cc: Mr. Simon Peter