

# Advances in Clinical and Medical Research

Genesis-ACMR-5(1)-70  
Volume 5 | Issue 1  
Open Access  
ISSN: 2583-2778

## Job Satisfaction among Staff of a New Private Medical University

Christie N. Mato<sup>1</sup>, Rex Friday Ogoronte A. Ijah<sup>2</sup>, Nkemsinachi M. Onodingene<sup>3</sup>, Michael I. Ogamba<sup>4</sup>, Friday E. Aaron<sup>2</sup>, Beniboba J. Eleki<sup>5</sup>, Boma Athanasius<sup>6</sup>, Mienye Bob-Manuel<sup>7</sup> and Emmanuel N. Aguwa<sup>1,8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departments of Anesthesia, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of Surgery, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup>Department of Hematology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

<sup>4</sup>Department of Chemical Pathology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

<sup>5</sup>Department of Medicine, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

<sup>6</sup>Department of Anatomic Pathology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

<sup>7</sup>Department of Medical Microbiology and Parasitology, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

<sup>8</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, River State, Nigeria

**\*Corresponding author:** Ijah RFO, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, PAMO University of Medical Sciences, Port Harcourt, River State, Nigeria

**Citation:** Mato CN, Ijah RFO, Onodingene NM, Ogamba MI, Aaron FE, et al. (2024) Job Satisfaction among Staff of a New Private Medical University. *Adv Clin Med Res.* 5(1):1-15.

**Received:** October 9, 2023 | **Published:** January 04, 2024

**Copyright** © 2024 genesis pub by Mato CN, et al. CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 DEED. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License., This allows others distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as they credit the authors for the original creation.

### Abstract

**Background:** A worker's acceptance to invest his or her time and energy in a workplace is a compromise of the

## Abstract

**Background:** A worker's acceptance to invest his or her time and energy in a workplace is a compromise of the balance between recognized potential opportunities and challenges of the work environment. The aim of this study is to highlight the opportunities and challenges associated with working in a new Medical University in the year 2020/2021, and relate it to staff job satisfaction.

**Materials and Methods:** A cross-sectional analytical study was carried out among staff of a new Private Medical University from November 2021 to January 2022. Self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data on opportunities, challenges, and job satisfaction, and data was formed into tables and analyzed using The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0

**Results:** There were 75 (58.6%) male and 53 (41.4%) female respondents, and their mean age was  $41.30 \pm 8.52$ . Respondents had varied opportunities, and a mean score of  $11.63 \pm 3.96$ . Forty-nine (38.3%) and 54 (42.2%) of the respondents had moderately positive impact and mildly positive impact respectively for available opportunities. However, only 48 (37.5%) were moderately/markedly/ and overwhelmingly positively impacted by the opportunities for improved financial earning. Mean score for challenges encountered was  $29.22 \pm 7.13$ , and few respondents were overwhelmingly positively impacted by the challenges encountered. Seventy-one (55.5%), fewer respondents strongly agreed with positive items of assessment (between 2 (1.6%) and 22 (18.0%) for job satisfaction. Only few respondents ( $n = 12$ , 9.4%) definitely dislike their work, although a sizable number of respondents ( $n = 1 - 71$ ; 14.8% -55.5%) were undecided, rather unwilling to state their position on job satisfaction.

**Conclusion:** Opportunities abound with moderate impact on university staff, and the opportunities available at work directly increases the chances of staff job satisfaction. There were also challenges in the range of moderate impact. Efforts at optimizing opportunities and minimizing challenges to enhance job satisfaction is recommended.

## Keywords

Challenges; Job Satisfaction; Opportunities; Private University; Port Harcourt; Nigeria.

## Introduction

A worker's acceptance to invest his or her time and energy in a workplace is a compromise of the balance between recognized potential opportunities and challenges of the work environment. Job satisfaction therefore comes as a reward from the interaction of the above influences and others (including workplace politics). The emphasis in this study is on personnel driving the organization. Another way to probably view the situation of staff in an organization is more properly expressed in the work titled "Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity and the Reconstruction of the Working Life", where the authors described ideal work as being "give workers influence over the selection of work routines such as working at home or flexible

hours” and “have routine demands mixed with a liberal element of new learning challenges”. [1] In this work, there was cognition of a worker’s inherent desire (irrespective of profession) to exercise some degree of flexibility at work enough to ensure creativity, engagement, healthiness. Opportunities at workplace and challenges (perceived hindrances to guaranteeing the desired job satisfaction) are therefore important to workers in any organization. [2-5] A report from the United Kingdom (UK) highlighted how university staff (academic and non-academic) were considered as strategic assets, and treated with irresistibly unique opportunities different from their salaries. [6] The impact of such deliberate policy of rewards and compensation to staff of both private and public universities in the UK was a high job satisfaction. In a study carried out in Pakistan, academicians in private universities were more satisfied with their pay, supervision, and promotional opportunities compared with their public counterparts [7]. This study provided some insight to administrators on how to pay, promote, retain staff and maintain equity in their organizations. Another study in Uganda identified demographic, controllable and uncontrollable factors that determine staff turnover in public universities, and outstanding among these was the controllable factors for which economic incentives or poor motivation was key [8]. In Nigeria, brain-drain, gender gap, unattractive salary package and lack of adequate training and development were identified as factors that influence retention of staff [9]. Additionally, good learning and working climate, job flexibility, recognition, rewards and compensation, effective employee training and development were enhancers of job satisfaction and staff retention. [9]

The private tertiary educational institution has such uniqueness that is different from the long existing government-administered (public) universities in Nigeria for both the students and the staff the institutions, in terms of opportunities and challenges facing the authorities, staff, and the students. The justification for the establishment of private institutions is often linked to the demerits in the public institutions and the need to satisfy public expectations unmet by the former [10-13]. A private medical university is therefore one of such private tertiary institutions with unique interest in manpower development in the health sector. The aim of this study was to highlight the opportunities and challenges, in relation to staff job satisfaction in a new medical university in the year 2020/2021.

## Materials and Methods

**Study Area:** The Capital City of Rivers State-Port Harcourt, in South-South of the Federal Republic of Nigeria - was the study area. Two other university medical schools in Port Harcourt were the University of Port Harcourt (UPH) - Federal University; and the Rivers State University (RSU) – State University. As part of the economic life-wire of the cosmopolitan City of Port Harcourt were an international airport, a seaport, and many multinational petroleum oil-producing and oil-servicing companies.

**Study Setting:** The PAMO University of Medical Sciences (PUMS), a new private medical university, was the study setting. The university started admitting students after being licensed by the Federal Government of Nigeria in 2017.

**Research Design:** A cross-sectional analytical study was carried out in the year 2020/2021.

**Study Population:** Staff of the PUMS constituted the study population.

**Study Instrument:** Self-administered questionnaire was developed for collection of data. Job satisfaction was evaluated using the scale developed by Brayfield and Rothe [14] which unlike other evaluation measures, has been used in Nigeria and found to be overtly affective, minimally cognitive, and optimally brief [15-17]. The 18-item scale has five options of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree score 1 to 5. There were nine positive and 9 negative statements giving a minimum score of 18 and a maximum of 90, with higher score indicating higher job satisfaction and vice versa.

**Study Variables:** Contained in the questionnaire were data on socio-demographics, job opportunities, job challenges, and staff job satisfaction.

**Ethical Considerations:** The approval of the Research Ethics Committee of the PAMO University of Medical Sciences was obtained, and confidentiality of information was maintained in the process of data collection.

## Data Analysis

Data was formed into tables and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. The impact of available opportunities was scored using a scale of 1 to 5 based on how positively the parameter impacted on the staff in the course of duty in the University [Almost Negligible Effect (Negligibly Positive Impact) = 1; Mild Effect (Mildly Positive Impact) = 2; Moderate Effect (Moderately Positive Impact) = 3; Marked Effect (Markedly Positive Impact) = 4; Overwhelming Effect (Overwhelmingly Positive Impact) = 5]. Out of the items for opportunities (minimum of 5 and maximum of 25), a score of <6 = low impact; 6-12 = moderate impact; 13-19 = high impact;  $\geq 19$  = very high impact. In a similar manner, the impact of the challenges was scored using a scale of 1 to 5 based on how negatively the parameter impacted on the pioneer in the course of duty in the University [Almost Negligible Effect (Negligible Negative effect) = 1; Mild Effect (Mildly Negative Impact) = 2; Moderately Effect (Moderate Negative Impact) = 3; Severe Effect (Markedly Negatively Impact) = 4; Overwhelmingly Negative Impact = 5]. Out of the 25-item (minimum of Minimum of 13 and maximum of 59), a score of < 24.5 = low impact; 24.5 – 35.9 = moderate impact; 36 – 47.5 = high impact;  $\geq 47.5$  = very high impact.

**Validity/Reliability of Instrument:** The study instrument was developed, scrutinized by all the authors and pretested before usage. The Cronbach alpha test (in SPSS) was used for the validity of the study instrument, and yielded a score of 0.830.

## Results

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
	(n = 128)	(%)
Sex		
Male	75	58.6
Female	53	41.4

Age (Mean = 41.30±8.52; Min = 25, Max=67)		
Less than 25 years	1	0.8
25 - 40 years	76	59.4
41 - 60 years	47	36.7
More than 60 years	4	3.1
Experience in years (Mean = 9.42±7.55; Min = 1, Max=43)		
1 - 5 years	50	39.1
6 - 10 years	45	35.2
11 - 15 years	12	9.4
16 - 20 years	10	7.8
More than 20 years	11	8.6
Designation of Staff		
Professor	2	1.6
Associate Professor	2	1.6
Senior Lecturer	7	5.5
Lecturer I	19	14.8
Lecturer II	17	13.3
Assistant Lecturer	12	9.4
Graduate Assistant	4	3.1
Technologist	44	34.4
Clinical Instructor	8	6.3
Scientist	10	7.8
Administration	3	2.3

**Table 1:** Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents.

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. There were 75 (58.6%) male and 53 (41.4%) female respondents, and their mean age was 41.30±8.52. Their mean years of experience (in years) was 9.42±7.55.

Variables	perceived degree of impact on the departmental work					
	n = 128					
	NA	NPI	MIPI	MOPI	MAPI	OPI
	0	-1	-2	(3)	-4	-5
Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	
Opportunity for Administration	2(1.6)	47(36.7)	28(21.9)	24(18.8)	17(13.3)	10(7.8)

experience						
Opportunity for conference attendance	4 (3.1)	16 (12.5)	51(39.8)	39(30.5)	14(10.9)	4 (3.1)
Opportunity for career progression	4 (3.1)	34 (26.6)	40(31.3)	38(29.7)	9 (7.0)	3 (2.3)
Opportunity for improved financial earning	2 (1.6)	37 (28.9)	41(32.0)	21(16.4)	22(17.2)	5 (3.9)
Quality of equipment and environment	2 (1.6)	40 (31.3)	47 (36.7)	7 (5.5)	27(21.1)	5 (3.9)

**Table 2:** Opportunities and perceived degree of impact on the departmental work (n = 128).

Key: NA = Not Applicable; NPI = Negligible Positive Impact; MIPI = Minimal Positive Impact; MOPI = Moderately Positive Impact; MAPI = Markedly Positive Impact; OPI = Overwhelmingly Positive Impact)

Table 2 shows available opportunities and degree of impact on respondents. Respondents had varied opportunities, and a mean score of  $11.63 \pm 3.96$ . Fifty-one (39.9%) respondents were moderately / markedly / and overwhelmingly positively impacted by the opportunities available for administrative experience. Fifty (39%) were also moderately / markedly / and overwhelmingly positively impacted by the opportunities for career progression. However, only 48 (37.5%) were moderately / markedly / and overwhelmingly positively impacted by the opportunities for improved financial earning.

Variables	Impact on pioneering department					
	NA	NPI	MIPI	MOPI	MAPI	OPI
	0	-1	-2	(3)	-4	-5
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)
Location of the institution	2(1.6)	32(25.0)	54(42.2)	30(23.4)	5(3.9)	5(3.9)
Traffic and transportation to and from the institution	4 (3.1)	7 (5.5)	30(23.4)	62(48.4)	22(17.2)	3 (2.3)
Staff strength	2 (1.6)	16 (12.5)	45(35.2)	40(31.3)	20(15.6)	5 (3.9)
Allocation of lectures	3 (2.3)	31 (24.2)	61(47.7)	24(18.8)	6(4.7)	3 (2.3)
Development of Curriculum	3 (2.3)	57 (44.5)	34 (26.6)	19(14.8)	12(9.4)	3 (2.3)
Development of student's logbook	3 (2.3)	42(32.8)	49(38.3)	21(16.4)	9 (7.0)	4 (3.1)

Development of Laboratory manuals	6 (4.7)	43 (33.6)	44(34.4)	25(19.5)	9 (7.0)	1 (0.8)
Pre-accreditation (MDCN) Requirements and preparations	7 (5.5)	13 (10.2)	51(39.8)	36(28.1)	16(12.5)	5 (3.9)
Accreditation (MDCN) proper	8(6.3)	23 (18.0)	25(19.5)	37(28.9)	32(25.0)	3 (2.3)
Staff integration	26(20.3)	55 (43.0)	37(28.9)	4 (3.1)	5 (3.9)	1 (0.8)
Clinical allowances	26(20.3)	33 (25.8)	38(29.7)	15(11.7)	15(11.7)	1 (0.8)
Future and staff retention	28(21.9)	45 (35.2)	25(19.5)	19(14.8)	7 (5.5)	4 (3.1)
Students Hostels and proximity to the hospital	31(24.2)	33 (25.8)	42(32.8)	16(12.5)	3 (2.3)	3 (2.3)
Commencement of clinical postings and issues	13(10.2)	26 (20.3)	31(24.2)	37(28.9)	15(11.7)	6 (4.7)

**Table 3:** Challenges and impact on pioneering departmental work score.

Key: NA = Not Applicable; NPI = Negligibly Positive Impact; MIPI = Mildly Positive Impact; MOPI = Moderately Positive impact; MAPI = Markedly positive Impact  
OPI = Overwhelmingly Positive Impact

Challenges and impact on pioneering departmental work score is shown in Table 3. The Mean score for challenges encountered was  $29.22 \pm 7.13$ . Traffic and transportation to and from the institution. Few respondents were overwhelmingly positively impacted by the challenges encountered.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
	(n = 128)	(%)
Opportunity/degree of impact on pioneering departmental work		
Negligibly Positive Impact	2	1.6
Mildly Positive Impact	54	42.2
Moderately Positive impact	49	38.3
Markedly positive Impact	19	14.8
Overwhelmingly Positive Impact	4	3.1
Challenges/issues and impact on pioneering departmental work		

Negligibly Negative Impact	3	2.3
Mildly Negative Impact	65	50.8
Moderately Negative impact	54	42.2
Markedly Negative Impact	5	3.9
Overwhelmingly Negative Impact	1	0.8

**Table 4:** Respondents' score categories (Opportunities and Challenges).

In Table4 the respondents 'score categories opportunities and challenges are shown. Forty-nine (38.3%) and 54 (42.2%) of the respondents had moderately positive impact and mildly positive impact respectively for available opportunities. Fifty-four (42.2%) respondents had moderately negatively impact and 65 (50.8%) had mildly negative impact for challenges experienced at work.

Variables	Level of Job Satisfaction				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)
Job usually interesting enough to keep one from getting bored	22(18.0)	35(27.3)	32 (25.0)	30(23.4)	8(6.3)
Enthusiastic most days about work	13 (10.2)	38(29.7)	42 (32.8)	12 (9.4)	23 (18.0)
Job more interesting than others one could get	8 (6.3)	18(14.1)	35 (27.3)	33(25.8)	34 (26.6)
Find real enjoyment in the work	6 (4.7)	42(32.8)	24 (18.8)	25(19.5)	31 (24.2)
Feel happier at this work than other people	8 (6.3)	23(18.0)	37 (28.9)	26(20.3)	34 (26.6)
Feel fairly well satisfied with my present job	8 (6.3)	38(29.7)	19 (14.8)	25(19.5)	38 (29.7)
Satisfied with the current job	8 (6.3)	47(36.7)	24 (18.8)	20(15.6)	29 (22.7)



for the time being					
Like my job better than the average worker does	10 (7.8)	31(24.2)	71 (55.5)	11 (8.6)	5 (3.9)
Job like hobby	13 (10.2)	20(15.6)	52 (40.6)	19(14.8)	24 (18.8)
Appears friends are more interested in their jobs	5 (3.9)	14(10.9)	63 (49.2)	20(15.6)	26 (20.3)
Job has fair (impartial) promotion policy	7 (5.5)	33(25.8)	67 (52.3)	16(12.5)	5 (3.9)
Enjoy work more than leisure time	9 (7.0)	8 (6.3)	43 (33.6)	61(47.7)	7 (5.5)
Force self to go to work most time	3 (2.3)	6 (4.7)	46 (35.9)	50(39.1)	23 (18.0)
Consider current job to be unpleasant	2 (1.6)	14(10.9)	58 (45.3)	40(31.3)	14 (10.9)
Disappointed to have taken the job	5 (3.9)	10 (7.8)	55 (43.0)	37(28.9)	21 (16.4)
Job is pretty interesting	17 (13.3)	53(41.4)	41 (32.0)	17(13.3)	0 (0.0)
Each day of work seems like it will never end	4 (3.1)	28(21.9)	56 (43.8)	32(25.0)	8 (6.3)
Adequately paid for the job done	8 (6.3)	20(15.6)	35 (27.3)	29(22.7)	36 (28.1)
Often bored with the job	6 (4.7)	9(7.0)	34 (26.6)	59(46.1)	20 (15.6)
Definitely dislike the work	5 (3.9)	7 (5.5)	20 (15.6)	55(43.0)	41 (32.0)

**Table 5:** Staff Job Satisfaction (n = 128).

Table 5 shows respondents' opinion (assessment) for Job Satisfaction. Fewer respondents strongly agreed with positive items of assessment (between 2 (1.6%) and 22(18.0%). Only few respondents (n=12, 9.4%) definitely dislike their work. A sizable number of respondents (n = 1 – 71; 14.8%-55.5%) were undecided, rather unwilling to state their position on job satisfaction.

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	r- Value	p- Value
Level of Job Satisfaction	Impact on departmental work	-0.042	0.64
	Opportunity for staff	0.355	0

**Table 6:** Relationship between Challenges, Opportunity, and Level of Job Satisfaction.

Table 6 shows the relationship between Challenges, Opportunity, and Level of Job Satisfaction.

A positive correlation ( $r=0.355$ ) was observed between respondents' level of job satisfaction and opportunity for staff. In other words, as the opportunity/degree of impact increases, the job satisfaction level of the respondents (staff) increases and this was statistically significant ( $P=0.000$ ). However, a negative correlation ( $-0.042$ ) was observed between impact (challenges) and level of job satisfaction. So, as the challenges increases, respondents' level of job satisfaction decreases, although the association was not statistically significant ( $P=0.640$ ).

## Discussion

Opportunities, challenges and job satisfaction are indices that directly or indirectly affect both personnel and performance of organizations, including universities. [18-19] The demographics of university staff to some extent affect job satisfaction. [20-21] The respondents had a mean age of  $41.30 \pm 8.52$  (years), implying that most of the university staff were in their middle age – the active age among medical professionals in Nigeria [22]. The mean years of experience of the respondents was  $9.42 \pm 7.55$  years, and were males dominated the profile of the staff.

Most respondents were positively impacted to a negligible, minimal, and moderate degree by the available opportunities whose mean score was  $11.63 \pm 3.96$ , for improved financial, earning, career progression, administrative experience, conference attendance, etc. While this mean score of 11.63 had a moderate impact on the university staff, the negative impact of workplace environment on staff retention in Southern Nigeria was earlier reported, with highlight on increasing pauperization, varying promotion criteria, erratic power supply, over-congested classrooms, etc. [23] Another Nigerian study that described workplace opportunities as motivation for staff - training opportunities, frequency of development, work environment, promotion prospects, sabbatical leave, communication and management style – reported general dissatisfaction with most of the variables [24]. A study among 220 faculty members stressed the positive impact that opportunities such as employee compensation and

promotional opportunities had on employee retention in public higher education institutions in Pakistan [25]. Another researcher explains that when these positive opportunities are available, workers become more obligated to repay through positive attitudes, loyalty and devotion. [26] The mean score for challenges encountered was  $29.22 \pm 7.13$ , implying moderate impact (either negatively or positively). Life challenges could push individuals to discover themselves and achieve greater heights (positive), and it could also break individuals (negative) in the process and make them to perform poorly in their endeavors. However, most of the respondents were mildly and moderately negatively impacted by the challenges, thereby tilting the cumulative balance to the negative. This finding is in consonance with published report on problems facing academic staff of Nigerian Universities, [9,27] and also generally universities in Africa [28]. Our study is a little different in that it has attempted to relatively quantify the impact of the challenges into different degrees. Another Nigerian study focused on the challenges faced by newly employed lecturers at the University of Calabar, and how lack of orientation greatly contributed to it [29]. Numerous challenges are also faced by academic staff of United Kingdom universities, [30] however, in this clime there was deliberate policy of rewards and compensation to staff of both private and public universities different from their salaries [6].

A good number of respondents were unwilling to state their position on job satisfaction (undecided), in a manner of keeping their cards to their chest, while a few strongly agreed with positive items of assessment for job satisfaction. This guarded position of staff is laden with unspoken meanings. It could be that they might have reasoned that the full expression of their opinion may attract some punitive measures hence the abstinence or they may have wondered if their responses would bring a change of their situation. This finding is different from the high job satisfaction reported in the UK following a deliberate policy of rewards and compensation in private and public universities [6]. Our study rather find similarity with the observations in Uganda and Nigeria where only few were satisfied with their work. [8-9] This could partly explain why professionals decide to look for greener pastures, a situation often described as brain drain, in search of relatively better opportunities, less challenging work environment, and “satisfactory working conditions”.

This study shows that job satisfaction directly increases with opportunities at work, implying that opportunities available at work increases staff job satisfaction. Our finding is similar to the observations of other researchers who also found a direct positive relationship between job opportunities and job satisfaction in other climes [3,5,31]. Similar correlation was also reported among Nigerian university staff – some of the opportunities were given different names such as motivation and work intrinsic factors [32-33]. This study also revealed that although job satisfaction decreases as the challenges increase, the relationship was not statistically significant. Amplifying the various sheds of opportunities available to university staff will to a large extent enable the institution to increase job satisfaction to achieve the much need work output in the university. This is critical as the commonest reason for emigration, in a study conducted among 913 of physician across all states of the Nigerian federation, was reported as poor remuneration, being one of the variables under opportunities at work [18].

**Study Limitation:** Although total population of staff was targeted, some members of staff who were either not available during the period or did not give consent were not captured in the study.

## Conclusion

There were opportunities available to staff in the institution, and the mean score was in the range of moderate impact. There were also challenges encountered that had a mean score in the range of moderate impact, and the cumulative opinions tilted in favor of mostly negative impact for the challenges. There was a remarkable unwillingness by a large number of staff to express their opinion on issue of job satisfaction, while a few strongly agreed with positive items of assessment for job satisfaction. The opportunity available at work directly increases the chances of staff job satisfaction. The challenges encountered at work have an inverse relationship with job satisfaction, although the relationship was not statistically significant.

## Recommendations

Measures targeted at optimizing opportunities and minimizing challenges to enhance job satisfaction are recommended.

## Other Information

**Acknowledgement:** Data analyst – Mr. Zacchaeus O. Adeyanju contributed immensely to the success of this work for which we are very grateful.

**Conflict of Interest:** None declared.

## References

1. Quick TL. (1990) Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life. *Natl Prod Rev.* 9(4):475-9.
2. Singh JK, Jain M. (2013) A study of employees' job satisfaction and its impact on their performance. *Journal of Indian research.* 1(4): 1-7.
3. Lehtonen EE, Nokelainen P, Rintala H, Puhakka I. (2022) Thriving or surviving at work: how workplace learning opportunities and subjective career success are connected with job satisfaction and turnover intention? *J Workplace Learn.* 34(1):88-109.
4. Olsen E, Bjaalid G, Mikkelsen A. (2017) Work climate and the mediating role of workplace bullying related to job performance, job satisfaction, and work ability: A study among hospital nurses. *J Adv Nurs.* 73(11):2709-19.
5. Raziq A, Maulabakhsh R. (2015) Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Econ .* 23:717-25.
6. Nazir T, Khan SU, Shah SF, Zaman K. (2013) Impact of rewards and compensation on job satisfaction: Public and private universities of UK. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research.* 14(3):394-403.
7. Khalid S, Irshad MZ, Mahmood B. (2012) Job satisfaction among academic staff: A comparative analysis between public and private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *Int j Bus Manag.* 7(1):126.
8. Kyaligonza R, Kamagara E. (2017) Staff turnover in public universities in Uganda. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education.* 9(2):59-72.

9. Onah FO, Anikwe OS. (2016) The task of attraction and retention of academic staff in Nigeria universities. *Journal of Management and Strategy*. 7(2):9-20.
10. Okoro NP, Okoro EO. (2014) Time and change: Development of private universities in Nigeria. *Time and Change: Development of Private Universities in Nigeria*. *Int J Bus Soc Sci*. 5(9):1-7.
11. Olawore OP, Ajayi TB. (2016) The emergence of private universities in Nigeria and their various challenges. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*. 9(1):31-8.
12. Akindele I. (2013) Evolution of private universities in Nigeria: Matters arising and the way forward. *Educational Research and Reviews*. 8(2):41.
13. Olaleye S, Ukpadi D, Mogaji E. (2020) Public vs private universities in Nigeria: Market dynamics perspective. In: *Understanding the Higher Education Market in Africa*. London Routledge.
14. Gautam M, Mandal K, Dalal RS. (2006) Job satisfaction of faculty members of veterinary sciences: an analysis. *Age*. 36(5.91):0-92.
15. Thompson ER, Phua FT. (2012) A brief index of affective job satisfaction. *Group OrganManag*. 37(3):275-307.
16. Okwaraji FE, Aguwa EN. (2015) Burnout, Psychological Distress and Job Satisfaction among Secondary School Teachers in Enugu, South East Nigeria. *J Psychiatr*. 18:198.
17. Elechi OO, Lambert EG, Otu S. (2018) Exploring the effects of work environment variables on the job satisfaction of Nigerian correctional staff. *Criminal Justice Studies*. 31(2):160-77.
18. Davidescu AA, Apostu SA, Paul A, Casuneanu I. (2020) Work flexibility, job satisfaction, and job performance among Romanian employees—Implications for sustainable human resource management. *Sustainability*. 12(15):6086.
19. Rane DB. (2011) Employee job satisfaction: An essence of organization. *Iš: HRM Review*. 11(7):10-6.
20. Islam MF, Akter TA. (2019) Impact of Demographic Factors on the Job Satisfaction: A Study of Private University Teachers in Bangladesh. *SAMSMRITI–SAMS J*. 12:62-80.
21. Sakiru OK, Ismail IA, Samah BA, Busayo AT. (2017) Influence of demographic variable on job satisfaction among academicians in public universities. *International Journal of Innovative Business Strategies*. 3(1):127-35.
22. Onah CK, Azuogu BN, Ochie CN, Akpa CO, Okeke KC, et al. (2022) Physician emigration from Nigeria and the associated factors: the implications to safeguarding the Nigeria health system. *Hum Resour Health*. 20:85.
23. Salau O, Worlu R, Osibanjo A, Adeniji A, Falola H, et al. (2020) The impact of workplace environments on retention outcomes of public Universities in Southern Nigeria. *Sage Open*. 10(2).
24. Abifarin A. (1997) Motivating staff in Nigerian university libraries. *Library Management*. 18(3):124-8.
25. Bibi P, Pangil F, Johari J, Ahmad A. (2017) The impact of compensation and promotional opportunities on employee retention in academic institutions: The moderating role of work environment. *Journal of Economic & Management Perspectives*. 11(1):378-91.
26. Mossholder KW, Settoon RP, Henagan SC. (2005) A relational perspective on turnover: Examining structural, attitudinal, and behavioral predictors. *Acad Manage J*. 48(4):607-18.
27. Jacob ON, Jegede D, Musa A. (2021) Problems Facing Academic Staff of Nigerian Universities and the Way Forward. *International Journal on Integrated Education*. 4(1):230-41.

28. Mushemeza ED. (2016) Opportunities and Challenges of Academic Staff in Higher Education in Africa. *International Journal on Integrated Education*. 5(3):236-46.
29. Anijaobi-Idem F, Archibong IA. (2012) Adjustment challenges of new academic staff in Nigerian universities: A case study of university of Calabar. *J Educ Prac*. 3(9):69-75.
30. Marten S. The challenges facing academic staff in UK Universities. *Jobs. ac. uk*. 2009.<https://career-advice.jobs.ac.uk/academic/the-challenges-facing-academic-staff-in-uk-universities/>
31. Akafo V, Boateng PA. (2015) Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 7(24):112-24.
32. Adeoye AO, Fields Z. (2014) Compensation management and employee job satisfaction: A case of Nigeria. *J Soc Sci*. 41(3):345-52.
33. Hassan AI, Romle AR. (2015) Intrinsic factors of job satisfaction among lecturers of Bauchi State University Gadau, Nigeria. *International Journal of Administration and Governance*. 1(4):87-91.