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This study is focused on job satisfaction of the senior staff of the University of Cape Coast. It is aimed at determining the extent of job satisfaction of senior staff, with Herzberg’s two-factor theory, Locke’s discrepancy theory, Maslow’s hierarchical theory and Adams’ equity theory of job satisfaction as theoretical references. The research design is a descriptive survey type and 135 senior staff completed the questionnaires. The findings of the study reveal that the level of job satisfaction of senior staff at the University is high. Majority of staff are quite satisfied with their job in the University with regard to the recognition of efforts by supervisors, relationship between staff and their superiors, opportunities for further education, safety at the workplace and comfortable working environment. However, staffs were dissatisfied with their salaries and non-availability of fringe benefits. One major recommendation was that Management should at least supplement the salaries of workers by paying end-of-year bonus. Best workers should also be recognised.
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INTRODUCTION

According to Karl (1844), the nature of man is work and it is through work that man realises his full potential. Work plays a prominent role in a man’s life. It occupies more time than any other single activity and it provides the economic basis for the lifestyles of human beings. Most adults spend more time at work than they do with their own families. Therefore, it is imperative that an individual's time spent working is both productive enjoyable, and beneficial to the employee as well as the employer. Job satisfaction is therefore one of the criteria for establishing a healthy organisational structure. One major reason for the continuing interest in job satisfaction, as Wilson and Rosenfield (1990) pointed out is that positive and negative attitudes towards work may exert powerful effects on many forms of organizational behaviour. Relevant research data have demonstrated the importance of job satisfaction in an organization, specially, in terms of its efficiency, productivity, employees’ relations, absenteeism and turnover (Baron, 1986; Oshagbemie, 1999).

The search for identifying the causes of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction in an organisation is an on-going area of interest for social scientist and managers. The premise is that satisfied workers will be more productive and remain within the organisation longer, whereas dissatisfied workers will be less productive and more inclined to quit (Sarker, 2003).

Research in human resource management (HRM) has established that it is in the interest of an organisation to retain employees and minimise turnover. However, many organisations have little understanding of how to satisfy their employees and the satisfaction level of these employees influence their intent to leave their positions. One way to address the issue of turnover is to understand the commitment employees have to their operation and to determine what affects these levels of commitment. Job satisfaction has been recognised as a component of organisation commitment (Kovach, 1972).

Job satisfaction has been an important part of human resource management ever since the Hawthorne studies at the plant of the Western Electric Company (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939) when it was thought that a firm correlation existed between satisfaction and performance. At that time, high satisfaction was thought to be a cause of high performance. It was assumed that management could improve performance simply by
satisfying workers through pleasant working conditions, adequate rewards and so on.

"Happy employees are productive employees." "Happy employees are not productive employees." We hear these conflicting statements made by Human Resource (HR) professionals and managers in organizations. There is confusion and debate among practitioners on the topic of job satisfaction, even at a time when employees are increasingly important for organizational success and competitiveness (Schermerhorn, 1991)

Although there have been several job satisfaction studies, very few of them have focused on the job satisfaction of the university's employees. Universities are the centers for imparting higher education which is an indispensable developmental cornerstone for any country. Universities in the world over are expected to seek and cultivate new knowledge, provide the right kind of leadership in all works of life and strive to promote equality and social justice. These objectives can be achieved when there is job satisfaction among the staff in the institutions (Chaugule, 2009).

Job satisfaction of the senior staff of the University of Cape Coast, who have an important place in the knowledge society, affects the quality of the service they render. This paper therefore seeks to examine the level of job satisfaction among senior staff of the University of Cape Coast. Specific issues examined included staff involvement in decision making, relationships, salary and other fringe benefits, working condition and the work itself.

The outcome of the study will help to address how to improve the job satisfaction among staffs at the University of Cape Coast. Thus, the University Management will be in a better position to address the problems that will come out as a result of the study and to take the necessary steps to improve the work situation in the University.

Again, the underlying causes of job dissatisfaction and unsatisfactory performance among staff will be uncovered. Human Resource Practitioners will also benefit from the outcome of this research by way of shaping future Human Resource policies to enhance job satisfaction among staff.

The subsequent sections of the paper focus on theoretical and conceptual issues, the methodology, and the results. The conclusion and policy implications are presented in the final section.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ISSUES
In reviewing the literature, it would be difficult to search for the universal definition of job satisfaction. Thus, job satisfaction is not an easy concept to understand and can mean a variety of things to different people. It is a complex notion that manifests itself in different ways in different people. Whether job satisfaction is high or low depends on a number of factors, including how well a person's needs and wants are met through work, working conditions, the extent to which an individual defines himself or herself through work, and individual personality traits (Hall and Nougain, 1968).

According to Noe, Hollenbeck, Wright and Garhart (1996) job satisfaction is a pleasurable feeling that results from the perception that one's job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one's own job values. They continue by saying that job satisfaction has to do with what a person consciously or unconsciously desires to obtain. Gunn and Holdaway (1986) agreed with this definition of job satisfaction when they wrote that job satisfaction may be viewed as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the perception of one's job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one's important values, providing these values are compatible with one's needs. Writing on the feature of the conceptualisation of career satisfaction and the role that need fulfilment plays in satisfaction, Dinham and Scott (1998), citing Maslow (1970) and Alderfer (1972) explain job satisfaction as an indicator of the degree of need fulfilment experienced by an individual.

Robbins, Water-Marsh, Cacioppo and Millet (1994) explain job satisfaction as the degree to which people like their jobs. They maintain that it is a general attitude towards their job, the difference between the amount of rewards employees receive and the amount they believe they should receive. According to them, a person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards the job, while a person who is not satisfied with his or her job holds negative attitudes about the job. On his part, Spector (1997) sees job satisfaction as one factor that is important for business effectiveness, good company reputation and low turnover. Begley and Czajka (1993) look at job satisfaction as an indicator of emotional well being or psychological health.

According to Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn (1994), job satisfaction is the degree to which individuals feel positively about their job. It is an emotional response to one's task as well as the physical and social conditions of the work place. In concept, job satisfaction indicates the degree to which the expectations in someone's psychological contract are fulfilled. Job satisfaction is likely to be higher for persons who perceive an inducement-contributions balance in their relationship with employing organisations.

To sum up, job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee towards his or her job. These attitudes may be related to job factors such as wages, job security, job environment, nature of work, opportunities for promotion, prompt removal of grievances, opportunities for participation in decision making and other enjoyment of fringe benefits.

A comprehensive theory of job satisfaction has not been developed to integrate the diverse findings of the satisfaction research. However, a few satisfaction theories of more limited scope have been proposed. Some of these theories are Herzberg's important
motivation theory, Maslow’s need hierarchy theory, Adam’s equity theory and Locke’s discrepancy theory.

The two-factor or hygiene theory of Herzberg (1959) tried to modify Maslow’s need hierarchy theory. The theory states that there are certain satisfiers and dissatisfiers for employees at work. Herzberg explained that intrinsic factors are factors related to job satisfaction, while extrinsic factors are associated with dissatisfaction.

To him, removing dissatisfying characteristics from a job does not necessarily make the job satisfying. He also stated that the presence of certain factors in the organisation is natural and the presence of those same factors does not always lead to motivation. However, their non-presence leads to de-motivation. In the same way, there are certain factors, their absence of which causes no dissatisfaction but their presence has motivational impact.

Herzberg (1959) categorised motivation into motivators and hygiene. The hygiene factors include security, status, relationship with subordinates personal life, salary, work conditions, relationship with supervisors, company policy and administration. On the other hand, the motivation factors also include growth, job advancement, responsibility, challenges, recognition and achievement.

Besides, Boachie-Mensah (2006) is of the view that the hygiene factors create a favourable environment for motivation and prevents job dissatisfaction. However, when any of these factors are lacking, there is bound to be job dissatisfaction. On the other hand, the positive ratings for these factors did not in themselves lead to job satisfaction. What this implies is that employees might leave an organisation because they are not satisfied with its condition of service or the relationship with the superior is poor.

Boachie-Mensah (2006) further opined that motivating factors include sense of achievement, recognition responsibility, nature of the work and promote job satisfaction when they are present at satisfactory levels. According to him, all the factors are related to the job content and the rewards of work performance. It means that the absence of one would unlikely to cause an individual to leave the organisation however; if this factor is increased then the employee would be more motivated at the work. Herzberg (1959) realised that employees differ in relation to the importance they attach to motivators, that is to say, while others are interested in pay, and job advancement others are also interested in achievement and recognition.

According to Bateman and Snell (1999), even though Herzberg’s theory has come under criticism by many scholars, Herzberg (1959) has been the pioneer in the area of job design and he is still respected by American managers. They mentioned Herzberg’s contributions in the field of management as follows:
- His theory highlights the important distinction between extrinsic rewards and intrinsic rewards.
- His theory reminds managers not to count solely on extrinsic rewards to motivate workers but to focus on intrinsic rewards as well.
- He has set the stage for later theories, such as Hackman and Oldham model, which explain more precisely how managers can enrich people’s jobs.

Maslow (1954) cited in Mcshane and Glinow (2000) identifies five basic categories of human needs and placed them in a hierarchy. At the bottom of this hierarchy is a psychological need, which includes the need to satisfy biological requirements for food, air and shelter. Next is safety needs, the need for a secure and stable environment and the absence of pain, threat, or illness. Belongingness which includes the need for love, affection and interaction with other people follow. The fourth category is the need for esteem which includes self-esteem, through personal achievement as well as social esteem through recognition and respect from others. At the top of the hierarchy Maslow states, is self-actualisation which represents the need for self-fulfilment or a sense that the person’s potentials have been realised satisfaction has guided theories of job satisfaction.

An employee’s behaviour according to this theory is motivated simultaneously by several need levels but Maslow argues that behaviour is primarily motivated by the lowest unsatisfied need at a time. As the person satisfies a lower level need, the next higher need in the hierarchy becomes the primary motivator. This, according to Maslow, is called the satisfaction-progression process. Even if the person does not satisfy a higher need, he or she will be motivated by it until it is eventually satisfied.

Edwin (1979) develops the idea known as discrepancy or affect theory. This theory is considered the most famous job satisfaction model. According to this theory, satisfaction is determined by the discrepancy between what a person wants from the job and what that person has in the job. The theory further explains that when one values a given facet of work, it determines how satisfied or dissatisfied one becomes when one’s expectation is met or not met. For instance, if a person values a particular facet of a job, his satisfaction is greatly impacted positively when the expectations are met and negatively when the expectations are not met. This compares to someone who does not value that facet. However, the theory also states that too much of a particular facet will produce stronger feelings of dissatisfaction. This model lends support to the current study that seeks to examine job satisfaction of senior staff of the University of Cape Coast.

A descriptive survey approach was used for the study. One hundred and fifty (150) senior staffs were selected randomly among the University of Cape Coast senior staff as sampling size. Questionnaire was used in order to collect the accurate data. A total of 135 out of the 150
answered and returned the questionnaire. The sample was stratified by section/units/departments to cover the whole University. The main statistical tool that was used for analysing the data was simple percentages and frequencies. Thus, frequency and percentage tables were used to describe the data collected from respondents for easy presentation and analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis of data gathered from the field through questionnaires to provide information on biodata and background of the respondents and the job facets that caused satisfaction and dissatisfaction of senior staff of the University of Cape Coast. It will be realised that there are inconsistencies in the total of 135 responses because some of the respondents did not answer all the questions.

The gender distribution of the respondents is predominantly male, of which 65.9% were male and 34.1% female. The majority group of the respondents were in the age ranging from 30 to 40 years indicating that most of the staffs are predominantly in their youthful age. It was realised that almost 50 per cent of the respondents had been working in the University for 7 years or more (Table 1).

Regarding institution and administrative policies, it was observed that majority 98 (77.2%) of the sampled staff acknowledged that the university has a policy manual for its operations. Most of the respondents 94 (75.0%), who indicated the existence of the university policy manual, indicated that the policy was easy to understand. In response to a further question on whether their inputs are sought to make decisions, the majority 87(71.9%) did not contribute to the decision -making process in the University.

A hotmail document on the website (AAFP) on job satisfaction states that, although employees will never feel a great sense of motivation or satisfaction due to policies, management can decrease dissatisfaction in this area by making sure that their policies are fair and apply equally to all. This can be achieved by making printed copies of the policies and procedures manual easily accessible to all staff, especially, new employed staff.

There was a clear indication that senior staff of the University were left out in the decision-making process. However, when staffs participate in making decisions, they see those decisions as their own and will make sure that the implementation becomes successful. Furthermore, there is considerable evidence that the satisfaction of subordinates is positively associated with the degree to which they are given the opportunity to participate in decision making. The management of the University should therefore note that participation is one of the best ways of involving employees in their work and the problems of the organization. Thus, from behavioural position, it is difficult for a participant in the decision making process to be unresponsive to a plan he or she has been a party to (Table 2).

Six items were used to explore the extent to which supervisors carried out their job and the kind of relationships that exist between supervisors and subordinates and among staff. Details of the questionnaires and responses are shown in Table 3. Indeed, staff sampled indicated that their supervisors were doing well as far as their jobs were concerned. In addition, the supervisors possess the necessary supervisory skills in ensuring that work was done properly. With respect to interpersonal relationship, the respondents indicated that there existed cordial relationship among them and between staff and supervisors.

The results again showed that 69.9% indicated that

---

Table 1: Institution and administrative policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequently (yes)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequently (No)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Availability of policy manual</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>127(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Understanding of policy manual</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>126(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Taking part in decision making</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>121(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Supervision/Interpersonal Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequently (yes)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequently (No)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Supervisor possesses requisite skills</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>123(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Supervisor treats subordinate fairly</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>129(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supervisor provides feedback to help you achieve</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>131(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My supervisor is doing a good job.</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>125(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Co-workers are pleasant and cooperative to work with</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>124(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Opportunity to socialize with co-workers</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>132(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their supervisors possessed leadership skills and majority also acknowledged that they were fairly treated by their supervisors.

According to Locke, (1976) one of the most important influences on employee’s job satisfaction is the supervisor. Locke’s findings also revealed that supervisors who recognise and reward good performances and show basic respect for employees and employees’ welfare bring satisfaction to the employees. Also Rue and Byars (1981) contended that job satisfaction can be affected by workers’ attitude towards supervision.

The findings also lends support to Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory which states that the motivators relate to job content which includes achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement.

Another important factor of job satisfaction is how coworkers relate with each other. The findings indicates that majority of staffs had the opportunity to relate well with fellow workers for workers prefer that permit interaction. Thus, workers are more likely to quit jobs that prevent interaction and cite congenial peer relationship as among the major characteristics of good jobs (Kahn, 1972). The feeling of belonging to a caring group with the notion that in times of difficulties, there would be someone to assist is in itself a source of satisfaction. The finding is further in line with the view of Blum and Naylor (1968) who opined that job satisfaction is the general attitude of workers, constituted by their approach towards control and social relation in their work places. Thus, it is important for heads of the various units in the University to recognize this aspect so as to make employees satisfied.

Salaries and incentives

The majority of respondents (76.6%) were highly dissatisfied with the pay they were given. Similarly, when the respondents were asked if they were given incentives apart from their pay, 105 (80.2%) answered negatively as against 26 (19.8%) who answered in the affirmative. Apart from the salaries, staffs were not given any incentives. This is an indication that the majority of the respondents depended solely on their salaries. The findings go along with the position of Gibson et al (2000) that pay is one of the five crucial characteristics that can influence the individual’s attitude towards the job. It is also in line with the findings of Blum and Naylor (1986) who stated that job satisfaction is the general attitude of workers constituted by their approach towards wages.

Working for money is one major factor of extrinsic motivation, that is, the individual performs a task in order to get what is worth his effort. Ghanaians regard their jobs, per se, as instrumental activities to obtain money to satisfy their basic needs. Thus, the importance of pay or financial rewards should not be underestimated. Also, the significance of pay and other financial rewards emerging as the least satisfying or most dissatisfying factor to staff of the University requires serious consideration.

Most of the staffs sampled 78 (64.5%) indicated that they have the necessary equipment for their work but was quick to add their dissatisfaction with the delay of supply of equipment. When the opinion of the staff was sought with regard to their work environment, out of 123 respondents, 84 representing 68.3% described the environment as comfortable. This means that only a few, 39(31.7%), of the staff sampled described the work environment as uncomfortable. The environment in which people work has a tremendous effect on their level of pride for themselves and for the work they do. This supports Locke’s (1979) position that safe and attractive environment as comfortable. This means that only a few, 39(31.7%), of the staff sampled described the work environment as uncomfortable. The environment in which people work has a tremendous effect on their level of pride for themselves and for the work they do. This supports Locke’s (1979) position that safe and attractive physical surroundings, equipment and resources facilitate work accomplishment.

With regard to their satisfaction with the job itself, 96(72.7%) described their work as satisfactory. This is an indication that staff are happy with the work they perform. Perhaps, the most important things in employees’ motivation is assisting individuals to believe that the work they do is important and that their tasks are meaningful. Designing jobs so that they are stimulating can enhance both satisfaction commitments (Dorwin, 1971).

In response to the question on whether the staffs were given the opportunity to use their skills on the job, 97 (75.2%) answered in the affirmative. Thus, staffs were given the chance to use the skills they have acquired in the performance of their duties. This, in itself, is a plus on the part of management. As staffs are allowed the freedom to practice their skills on the job, they also learn from their mistakes and improve on their performances. Locke (1976) said employees tend to prefer jobs that give them opportunities to use their skills and abilities. This requires giving employees enough freedom and power to carry out their tasks so that they feel ownership of the result.

Table 4 shows that 87(70.7%) agreed that there were clear, achievable goals and standards for their positions whereas 36(29.3%) held contrary view. One premise inherent in Herzberg’s theory is that most individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequently (yes)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequently (No)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Availability of equipment</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Availability of a comfortable work</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Environment Satisfaction with job</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Opportunity to use skills on the job</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Working conditions/work itself
Individuals should also receive regular, timely feedback on how they are doing. The table also revealed that 89 (68.5%) affirmed that the University did not recognize their major accomplishment on the job while 41 respondents, representing 31.5% stated otherwise. Furthermore, majority of staff 71 (56.8%) were not given praise for a job well done while 54 (43.2%) received praise for a job well done. As to whether the University has a formal programme of appreciation and recognition for rewarding staff achievements on the job, 92 (70.8%) responded that there was no formal programme while a small number 38 (29.2%) indicated that there was a formal programme for appreciating and recognising major achievement of staff. One therefore realises that the University has no formal programme for rewarding staff. Thus, a kind note of praise can be written or even a bonus given to a staff, if need be. It should even be possible to establish a formal recognition programme, such as ‘employee of the month or year’ to serve as a motivator to other employees.

The paper revealed that the University supports continuing education for those who want to improve themselves academically. Out of the 132 staffs who answered this question, 96 representing 72.7% answered ‘yes’ to this question. This supports the finding by Gibson et al (2000) that, of the five crucial characteristics that influence job satisfaction, the third is the availability of opportunities for upgrading oneself on the job.

Work condition/work Itself
The environment in which people work has a tremendous effect on their level of pride for themselves and for the work they do. As revealed in table 3, 68.3% of the respondents indicated that the work environment was comfortable. In respect to work itself, the response revealed that 72.7% of the respondents were satisfied with their work and 27.3% indicated dissatisfaction. This is an indication that staffs are happy with the work they perform. Perhaps, the most important thing in employees’ motivation is helping individuals believe that the work they do is important and that their tasks are meaningful. Designing jobs so that they are stimulating can enhance both satisfaction and commitment. (Dorwin, 1971).

Majority of them also accepted the fact that they were allowed to use their discretion on the job. This, in itself, is a plus on the part of management. Staff are allowed the freedom to practice their skills on the job, they also learn from their mistakes and improve on their performance. Locke (1976) said employees tend to prefer jobs that give them opportunities to use their skills and abilities. This requires giving employees enough freedom and power to carry out their tasks so that they feel ownership of the result. Management should therefore find ways to add challenging and meaningful work and perhaps the employees’ greater freedom and authority as well.

Commitment/responsibility
Employees will be more motivated to do their jobs well if they feel ownership of the work. The study revealed that 93.5% of staff were very committed and only 6.5% indicated otherwise. This is an indication that the staff recognized the importance of their jobs. Kreitner and Kinicki (2001) uncovered a significant and strong relationship between organizational commitment and satisfaction. They advised managers to increase job satisfaction in order to elicit higher levels of commitment since higher commitment can facilitate higher productivity.

Rahim and Psenicka (1996) agreed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are related to a person’s intention to quit a job. According to Firth, et al (2004), job satisfaction and organizational commitment are interrelated as the more satisfied one is, the more committed one becomes.

Mowday et al (1982) related that organizational commitment and job satisfaction have been found to be significantly related to one another with the basic proposition that job satisfaction is an antecedent of organizational commitment since commitment takes

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequently (yes)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequently (No)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Availability of clear achievable goals and standards.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>123(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Recognition of major achievement on the job</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>130(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Praise for job well done.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>125(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Formal programme of appreciation and recognition</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>130(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Employer support for continuing education</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>121(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
longer to form and only after people are satisfied with their job. Meshane and Glinow (2002) agreed on the relationship between job satisfaction and commitment by reporting that research has found that employees with higher levels of affective commitment to be less likely to quit their jobs and be absent from work.

CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The study was aimed at finding out the level of Job Satisfaction of the senior staffs of the University of Cape Coast. It was evident from the findings that senior staffs of the University were not satisfied with their salaries, incentives /other fringe benefits, and their non-involvement in decision-making processes. The paper however discovered that there was significant level of job satisfaction of senior staff in the University of Cape Coast.

On the basis of the research findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are offered for consideration.

Participation is important in encouraging people to accept decisions. This, in itself is helpful both in planning and instituting change. When employees understand the objectives and content of decisions, they are less suspicious of them. Participation also broadens the outlook of those involved and helps them feel that they have an active part in what is taking place. It also brings commitment as well as promotion of responsibility and satisfaction. It is therefore recommended that the management of the University should involve senior staff in the decision- making processes that affect their work and well-being at the place.

Supervisors should be mindful of the things that matter to their subordinates. Some of which are; giving staff prompt feedback on their performance, treating all staff fairly without favouritism and saying “thank you” for a job well done. Supervisors should not only be concerned with what goes into the job, but also be concerned about the well - being of subordinates. Since there exists a cordial relationship between supervisors and staff and among staff themselves, it is recommended that the Training and Development Section should organise periodic human relations courses for heads of sections and staff to maintain the level of the relationships.

Dissatisfaction of workers in most public institutions over pay, benefits and other incentives is not new. It is therefore recommended that the University should consider the prevailing economic situation such as cost of living and prices of goods and utilities and negotiate with governments for upward adjustment of salary. The study also recommended that the management of the University should explore other new and innovative ways of income generating ventures so as to raise enough funds which could be used to pay bonuses to staff as a salary supplement. Also, the University should institute a policy of recognising its hard working and deserving staff for their efforts by putting in place an annual award system to boost the level of satisfaction of staff.
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