



Exploring Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Academic Members in Jordanian Higher Education Institutions

Mohammed Tawalbeh¹, Suhaib Mohammed Al-Khazaleh^{1*}, Muath Maqbool Albhirat¹,
Jawad Haitham Tawalbeh²

¹Amman Arab University, Jordan. ²Human Resources Department, Business School, Jadara University, Jordan.

*Email: s.alkhazaleh@aau.edu.jo

Received: 24 August 2024

Accepted: 20 November 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.17558>

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the determinants of job satisfaction among academic staff in Jordanian Higher Education Institutions and propose a model that these institutions can use to estimate overall job satisfaction. Understanding these determinants is critical for faculty retention, performance, and organizational effectiveness. This study employed a quantitative approach to examine job satisfaction and its determinants among academic members in Jordanian Higher Education Institutions. A total of 272 participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with multiple statements regarding job satisfaction determinants using a Likert scale. The data collected were analyzed to identify the key factors influencing job satisfaction among academic staff. The study found that the work environment, promotion and development opportunities, and job security are significant determinants of job satisfaction among academic staff in Jordan. These factors play a crucial role in shaping faculty members' perspectives on their jobs and their overall satisfaction levels. The findings of this study provide valuable insights for Higher Education Institutions that aim to enhance faculty satisfaction and organizational effectiveness. By focusing on improving the work environment, offering clear promotion and development paths, and ensuring job security, institutions can retain and motivate their academic staff better.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Academic Staff, Education, Jordan, Performance

JEL Classifications: J28; I2; A29; I21; M12

1. INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies and meta-analyses have confirmed the direct correlation between employee satisfaction and organizational outcomes in different industries, in which job satisfaction is conceived as a crucial indicator of organizational performance and commitment (Rafferty and Griffin, 2009). Job satisfaction not only affects organizations but is also linked to life satisfaction, as jobs become the central activity of life, especially in modern life (Rode, 2004). This has opened the door for scholars and investigators in different disciplines to explore job satisfaction and its relationships and interactions. This study focuses on academic members' satisfaction with Jordanian higher education institutions. The importance of academic staff satisfaction influences their

motivation, engagement, and commitment to the organization and, consequently, their educational outcomes. Understanding what affects academic members' satisfaction is essential for educational administrators and policymakers to ensure a supportive work environment and to encourage faculty retention and productivity. Therefore, the objective of this research was to identify the determinants of job satisfaction among academic staff in Higher Education Institutions in Jordan. Second, propose a model that Higher Education Institutions can use to estimate academic staff's overall job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is widely recognized as a pivotal factor that influences both individual well-being and organizational effectiveness. Numerous studies and meta-analyses have established a direct

correlation between employee satisfaction and organizational outcomes across various industries (Rafferty and Griffin, 2009; McCrae & Costa, 1987). When employees are content with their jobs, organizations tend to experience enhanced performance, increased commitment, and higher productivity. Moreover, job satisfaction not only affects organizational metrics but is also closely linked to life satisfaction, especially in modern society, where work plays a central role in people's lives (Rode, 2004). In the realm of higher education, the satisfaction of the academic staff is particularly important. Academic members are the cornerstone of educational institutions and are responsible for teaching, research, and contributing to the intellectual growth of the academic community (Sone et al., 2013). Their satisfaction influences their motivation, engagement, and commitment to their institutions, directly affecting educational outcomes, such as student learning, research quality, and institutional reputation. Understanding what affects academic members' satisfaction is essential for educational administrators and policymakers to create a supportive work environment that encourages faculty retention and productivity.

This study focused on academic members' satisfaction with Jordanian higher education institutions. Jordan's higher education sector has been expanding and evolving, making it imperative to understand the factors contributing to academic staff satisfaction within this context. By identifying these determinants, this study aims to provide insights into what matters most to academic staff in Jordan, helping institutions implement targeted strategies to enhance satisfaction and improve organizational outcomes. Therefore, the objectives of this research are twofold: First, to identify the determinants of job satisfaction among academic staff in higher education institutions in Jordan; and second, to propose a model that these institutions can use to estimate the overall job satisfaction of academic staff. By achieving these objectives, this study seeks to contribute to a broader understanding of job satisfaction within the academic sector and to offer practical tools for enhancing faculty satisfaction and performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior literature specifies many elements affecting satisfaction among academic staff in higher education institutions. Ahmad and Jameel (2018) reported that job security and financial rewards had the highest impact on academic staff satisfaction at two private universities. Similar outcomes were also noted in a Pakistani study by Ghaffar et al. (2013), where the influence of pay levels and job security outweighed the presence of promotion opportunities among academic staff. Similarly, academic staff dissatisfaction was linked to their disappointment regarding their pay packages, together with work overload (Al-Rubaish et al., 2009; Chimanikire et al., 2007). The literature has identified numerous elements that affect job satisfaction among academic staff in higher education institutions. Job satisfaction in academia is influenced by a complex interplay of factors including financial rewards, leadership styles, interpersonal relationships, and the overall work environment. Understanding these factors is crucial for educational institutions that aim to enhance faculty well-being and organizational performance. Financial rewards, particularly job security and salaries, have been highlighted as significant

determinants of job satisfaction in several studies. Ahmad and Jameel (2018) conducted research involving academic staff at two private universities in Iraq. They reported that job security and financial rewards had the highest impact on academic staff satisfaction, suggesting that when faculty members feel secure in their positions and adequately compensated, their satisfaction levels increase. Heightened satisfaction can lead to improved performance, commitment, and reduced turnover rates. Similar findings have been observed in Pakistan, emphasizing the universal importance of financial factors across different contexts. Ghaffar et al. (2013) explored the factors influencing job satisfaction among academic staff in Pakistani universities. Their study found that the influence of pay levels and job security outweighed the presence of promotion opportunities. This indicates that, while opportunities for advancement are important, immediate financial stability and security are more pressing concerns for faculty members, directly affecting their satisfaction levels and engagement with their roles.

However, financial rewards are not always the sole or predominant factor affecting job satisfaction; other elements such as leadership style also play a crucial role (Alzubi et al., 2023). Leadership and supervisory practices significantly influence academic satisfaction. In a Saudi Arabian study, Al-Rubaish et al. (2009) found that supervision that allows for professional growth and support development is linked to the highest job satisfaction rates among academic staff. This suggests that leadership styles that promote autonomy, recognize achievements, and facilitate professional development can enhance job satisfaction. Hee et al. (2020) established a significant link between leadership and job satisfaction, highlighting that effective leadership practices are essential for fostering a positive work environment. The roles of colleagues and the social environment within the institution also contribute to job satisfaction. Interpersonal relationships and support from colleagues can enhance the work experience of academic staff. Jawabri (2017) indicated that support from colleagues significantly affects overall satisfaction among academic staff in private universities in the United Arab Emirates. This finding underscores the importance of collaborative and supportive culture within academic institutions. Similar outcomes were found in studies by Al-Rubaish et al. (2009) and Kuwaiti et al. (2020) in Saudi Arabia, reinforcing the notion that positive collegial relationships are vital for faculty satisfaction and can impact their commitment to the institution. The general work environment, encompassing physical conditions, support facilities, working hours, university policies, and overall organizational culture, has been identified to have a considerable influence on job satisfaction. Several studies have highlighted the importance of these environmental factors. For example, Al-Hinai (2013) found that a conducive work environment with adequate facilities and resources contributes positively to job satisfaction. Additionally, Malik et al. (2010) and Masum et al. (2015) and Omar et al. (2020), and Schulze (2006) indicates that factors such as reasonable working hours, transparent policies, and a supportive organizational culture are essential for maintaining high levels of job satisfaction among faculty members. These elements help create a work environment in which academic staff can thrive both professionally and personally.

Finally, while financial rewards and job security are significant determinants of job satisfaction among academic staff, other factors, such as leadership style, support from colleagues, and the overall work environment, also play crucial roles. The multifaceted nature of job satisfaction in academia necessitates a holistic approach from higher-education institutions. By addressing these factors, institutions can create a more supportive and fulfilling work environment, leading to improved faculty retention, enhanced productivity, and overall organizational success. Understanding and implementing strategies that consider all of these determinants can help institutions foster a motivated and satisfied academic workforce. From another perspective, some studies have demonstrated that personal factors of academic staff affect their rate of job satisfaction. In an Ethiopian study by Ayalew et al. (2021), high levels of achievement were the most motivating factors affecting job satisfaction. In other words, individuals achieving more deliverables and contributing to their success are satisfied with their jobs, despite the conditions surrounding them. Kuwaiti et al. (2020) also detected a similar correlation between professional achievement and overall satisfaction. These outcomes recall the two-factor theory of Frederick Herzberg, which proposes that motivating factors such as professional achievement can independently affect job satisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). Therefore, these results highlight the influence of personal and psychological factors on satisfaction rates. Table 1 summarizes the

determinants of job satisfaction obtained from studies conducted in different countries.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Theoretical Framework

A well-defined theoretical framework was established from the beginning of the study to ensure the highest possible accuracy and eliminate bias. The research model is quantitative in nature, aims to identify job satisfaction determinants, and formulates a model that measures academic members' overall job satisfaction. Therefore, this study adopted a regression-based approach to examine the relationship between job satisfaction [dependent variable] and the main determinants of job satisfaction [independent variable(s)]. The conceptual model guiding this study is as follows.

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \dots + \beta_n X_{ni} + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

Where:

- Y_i represents the dependent variable, referring to the job satisfaction of academic staff.
- where β_0 is the intercept.
- X_{1i}, X_{2i}, X_{ni} represent the independent variables, which in

Table 1: Determinants of job satisfaction in previous literature

Author (s)	Country	Study variables	Study outcomes
Ahmad and Jameel (2018)	Iraq	Job security, financial rewards and empowerment	Job security and financial rewards found to have the highest effect on job satisfaction
AL-Hinai (2013)	Oman	Remuneration and development, management support, co-worker, workload and job status	Remuneration and development had an effect on job satisfaction
Al-Rubaish et al. (2009)	Saudi Arabia	Supervision, interpersonal Relationships, salary, working conditions and advancement	The highest Job satisfaction rates were linked to Supervision and interpersonal relationships and the lowest to salary, working conditions and advancement
Chimanikire et al. (2007)	Zimbabwe	Workload, salaries and allowances	Workload, inadequate salaries and allowances were linked to low levels of job satisfaction
GebrekirosHagos (2015)	Ethiopia	Achievement, Job advancement, recognition, salary, workload, University legislation and relationships	Achievement is a motivating factor in increasing satisfaction. While salary was the least motivating factor
Ghaffar et al. (2013)	Pakistan	Pay scale, job security, promotion opportunities and coworker relationship	pay level and followed by job security were the factor having with major effect on the satisfaction level
Hee et al. (2020)	Malaysia	Pay scale, work environment, top management leadership and workload	Leadership was most impactful on job satisfaction.
Jawabri (2017)	United Arab Emirate	Supervision, promotion, colleagues, recognition and rewards	Supervisor support, promotion and colleagues' relationship impacted on job satisfaction
Kuwaiti et al. (2020)	Saudi Arabia	Administrative policies, interpersonal relationships, supervision, recognition and reward professional achievements, salary	Administrative policies, salary level and interpersonal relationships affected job satisfaction
Malik et al. (2010)	Pakistan	Work environment, supervision and pay scale	Healthy work environment, positive supervision and high pay level had positive influence on satisfaction
Masum et al. (2015)	Bangladesh	Compensation, supervision, job security, training, co-workers relationship and working conditions.	Compensation, job security, and working conditions were found to contributors for satisfaction
Melek (2007)	Turkey	Work environment, workload, promotion and evaluation and research fund.	Work environment affected job satisfaction scores
Omar et al. (2020)	Malaysia	Job security, salary and working environment	Job security, salary and working environment had effect on job satisfaction.
Schulze (2006)	South Africa	Teaching and research, administration, promotions compensation, co-workers' relationship and physical conditions and support facilities	Significant association physical conditions and support facilities and satisfaction scores

Table 2: Factors affecting job satisfaction

Determinants	Resources
Supervision and leadership style	AL-Hinai (2013); Al-Rubaish et al. (2009); Hee et al. (2020); Kuwaiti et al. (2020); Malik et al. (2010); Masum et al. (2015) Ahmad and Jameel (2018); GebrekirosHagos (2015); Jawabri (2017); Kuwaiti et al. (2020)
Job security	Ahmad and Jameel (2018); Ghaffar et al. (2013); Masum et al. (2015); Omar et al. (2020)
Salaries and benefits	Ahmad and Jameel (2018); AL-Hinai (2013); Al-Rubaish et al. (2009); Chimanikire et al. (2007); GebrekirosHagos (2015); Ghaffar et al. (2013); Hee et al. (2020); Jawabri (2017); Kuwaiti et al. (2020); Malik et al. (2010); Masum et al. (2015); Omar et al. (2020); Schulze (2006)
Promotion and development	AL-Hinai (2013); Al-Rubaish et al. (2009); GebrekirosHagos (2015); Ghaffar et al. (2013); Jawabri (2017); Masum et al. (2015); Melek (2007); Schulze (2006)
Coworker relationship	AL-Hinai (2013); Al-Rubaish et al. (2009); GebrekirosHagos (2015); Ghaffar et al. (2013) Jawabri (2017); Kuwaiti et al. (2020); Masum et al. (2015); Schulze (2006)
Workload	AL-Hinai (2013); Chimanikire et al. (2007); GebrekirosHagos (2015); Hee et al. (2020); Melek (2007)
Professional achievements	GebrekirosHagos (2015); Kuwaiti et al. (2020)
Work environment (physical and emotional)	AL-Hinai (2013); Al-Rubaish et al. (2009); Hee et al. (2020); Malik et al. (2010); Masum et al. (2015); Omar et al. (2020); Schulze (2006) GebrekirosHagos (2015); Kuwaiti et al. (2020); Melek (2007)

our research model are main determinants of job satisfaction

- $\beta_1, \beta_2 \dots, \beta_n$ represent the regression coefficients of the independent variables, ϵ_i represents the error.

The independent variables included in the regression model are theoretically justified based on existing literature and previous studies, as presented in Table 2. Consequently, the formulated hypothesis is that the effect of each determinant (independent variables) on overall job satisfaction (dependent variables) is statistically insignificant.

3.2. Data Collection

An online survey was developed and distributed via email to academic staff across multiple departments and units in different higher education institutions in Jordan. The survey asked participants to rate their level of agreement using a Likert scale on multiple statements regarding their perspectives/beliefs in two main areas; first, Job satisfaction determinants, including the eight identified determinants: supervision and leadership style, job security, salaries and benefits, promotion and development, coworker relationships, workload, professional achievements, and work environment (physical and emotional). Two to five survey items were used for each determinant. Second, the survey asked the participants to rate their overall job satisfaction. The survey also collected participants' demographics, including gender, age, university location (north, central, or south), university type (public or private university), and total years of experience in academia.

3.3. Sample Size

The total population of the current study was all academic members registered in the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research in Jordan, who accounted for 12108 academic staff members according to governmental infographics data for the academic year 2023/24 (MHEs, 2024). To ensure the generalizability of the current study, the sample size was estimated using the Cochran formula:

$$\text{Sample size} = \frac{Z^2 \cdot p \cdot (1-p)}{e^2} \quad (2)$$

Where Z denotes the standard distribution value that reflects the

selected confidence level. In our case, the Z -value was 1.645 at a confidence level of 90%. P is the proportion of an attribute present in a population, estimated to be 0.5. e is the error margin, which was estimated to be 0.05. Based on these estimations, the target sample size was set to 267. Therefore, 267 or more participants is the needed sample size in order to have a 90% confidence level within $\pm 5\%$ error margin.

3.3.1. Sampling technique

A simple random sampling technique was used in which participants were asked to fill out a survey sent via email. The survey was available to the participants, and the respondents' count was observed to reach the statistically optimum sample size. After 2 weeks, the number of respondents was 272, which exceeds the minimum targeted sample size.

3.4. Data Analysis

3.4.1. Demographics

Of the 272 participants involved in this study, 78.7% ($n = 214$) were male participants and 21.3% ($n = 58$) were female. More than half of the participants (61.4%, $n = 167$) were employed at public universities and 38.6% ($n = 105$) were employed at private universities. These distributions in gender and university type are comparable to the demographics of the total population of academic staff in Jordan. According to governmental infographics data for the academic year 2023/24, 80% of registered academic staff are male versus 20% female, and 64% of the total academic staff members are employees in public universities versus 36% in private universities (Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 2024). Indeed, it is significant for our study to have comparable demographics, as this assures the generalizability of the results. Furthermore, more than half of the answers were obtained from participants working in universities in the central region, followed by the north region, and then the south region. This pattern is explained by the fact that the geographic locations of universities in Jordan are concentrated in the central region, followed by the North and South. The other demographics are shown in Table 3.

3.4.2. Questionnaire validity and reliability

The questionnaire items were articulated to gather participants' responses regarding their job satisfaction rate and their views

on their actual status regarding the identified determinants: supervision and leadership style, job security, salaries and benefits, promotion and development, coworker relationships, workload, professional achievements, and the work environment (physical and emotional). For each determinant, two to five survey items were rated. Reliability was confirmed across these items by conducting a Cronbach’s alpha test for each identified item, as shown in Table 4. Values between 0.7 and 1.0 are considered to be accepted values for the reliability test. In our case, all Cronbach’s alpha values were above 0.7; therefore, internal consistency was confirmed in the questionnaire. The section where overall job satisfaction was evaluated consisted of one item; thus, the reliability test was not applicable.

Table 3: Demographic frequencies

Demographics items	Frequency	% of total
Age		
<35	118	43.38
>50	54	19.85
35-50	100	36.76
Gender		
Female	58	21.32
Male	214	78.68
University type		
Private University	105	38.60
Public University	167	61.40
University location		
Central region	148	54.41
North region	82	30.15
South region	42	15.44
Total years of experience in academia		
<5	119	43.75
>20	28	10.29
11-20	48	17.65
5-10	77	28.31

Table 4: Results of reliability test

Determinant	Cronbach’s coefficient alpha
Supervision and leadership style	0.84
Job security	0.90
Salaries and benefits	0.75
Promotion and development	0.89
Coworker relationship	0.84
Workload	0.71
Professional achievements	0.80
Work environment (physical and emotional)	0.83

Table 5: Correlation matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Overall satisfaction	1								
2. Supervision and leadership style	0.583121	1							
3. Job security	0.473858	0.574431	1						
4. Salaries and benefits	0.431055	0.395112	0.508331	1					
5. Promotion and development	0.631256	0.659954	0.67942	0.671337	1				
6. Coworker relationship	0.376903	0.549804	0.514652	0.504937	0.65175	1			
7. Workload	0.165572	0.243316	0.216901	0.407083	0.302881	0.455057	1		
8. Professional achievements	0.458348	0.538346	0.495657	0.572655	0.701363	0.681714	0.411772	1	
9. Work environment	0.640471	0.760007	0.762069	0.531894	0.706216	0.55001	0.154883	0.624528	1

3.4.3. Job Satisfaction

Among the 272 participants involved in this study, the average overall job satisfaction ± standard deviation was 3.4 ± 0.05, in which 68.9% of participants rated their overall job satisfaction as 4 or 5 (highest rate). And only 1.94% of the participants rated their overall job satisfaction as 1 (lowest rate). All participants who rated their overall job satisfaction with the highest rate (5) were younger (<35 years old), while those who rated their overall job satisfaction with the lowest rate (1) were in the Middle Ages (35-50 years old). The differences between the distribution of job satisfaction rates in different groups of years of experience or university types were statistically insignificant.

3.4.3.1. Job satisfaction determinants

We used a regression model to explore the determinants of job satisfaction. Before we started, multicollinearity was tested to exclude multicollinearity between dependent variables. Correlations between explanatory variables in regression models cause overlap and an increase in the percentage of errors (Evans, 1996). A correlation test was performed for all variables, as shown in Table 5. According to Vatcheva (2016), the most typical correlation coefficient cut-off for multicollinearity in a regression model is 0.80. In our case, all correlation coefficients were <0.8, which indicated that no multicollinearity between the explanatory variables and the regression model could be employed.

A regression test was used to explore which of the identified 8 independent factors affected job satisfaction. We applied a stepwise multiple regression analysis and demonstrated that three factors significantly affect overall job satisfaction: Work environment, promotion and development, and job security. Table 6 summarizes the stepwise regression model with the corresponding R-squared values. The work environment factor explains 41% of the variability when applied alone in the equation. However, the R-square increased to 47% when applying the work environment and promotion and development factors and reached the highest value (49%) when applying the work environment, promotion and development, and job security in the equation.

At a significant level of P < 0.005 (F = 33.2), the model was developed with the three independent factors cited earlier, and the theoretical model fit into the following equation:

$$Y = 0.83 + 0.14X_1 + 0.43X_2 + 0.52X_3 \tag{3}$$

Where Y is job satisfaction, X1 is Job security, X2 is promotion

Table 6: Multiple regression stepwise model summary

Model	Multiple R	R square	Adjusted R square	Standard error
1 (Work environment, promotion and development, job security)	0.70	0.49	0.48	0.71
2 (Work environment, promotion and development)	0.69	0.47	0.47	0.72
3 (Work environment)	0.64	0.41	0.41	0.76

Table 7: Responses for job satisfaction

Respondent no.	Responses				Job satisfaction using Equation (3)
	Job security	Promotion and development	Work Environment	Overall satisfaction	
i	3.1	3.6	3.2	4	4.48
ii	4.1	3.8	3.4	4	4.81
iii	2.8	2.9	2.4	3	3.72

and development, and X3 is work environment. The equation highlights that the work environment has the highest impact among all the factors tested, as it corresponds to a beta value of 0.52. followed by promotion, development, and job security, with beta values of 0.43 and 0.83.

Finally, in the process of confirming the validity of the proposed equation, we interviewed three academic staff members from different universities in Jordan and asked them to (i) rate their satisfaction with the three significant factors (work environment, promotion and development, and job security) and (ii) overall job satisfaction. Comparably, the results obtained by actual academic staff's responses to overall job satisfaction (Table 7) were consistent when applying Equation (3); therefore, higher education institutions can use Equation (3) to estimate the academic staff's overall job satisfaction, namely work environment, promotion and development, and job security (Table 8).

4. DISCUSSION

Work environment has the highest impact on academic members' job satisfaction in Jordan. This includes supporting universities' policies and legislation regarding convenient working hours, positive ergonomics (safer and more efficient workplaces), and a positive work culture that prioritizes the well-being of employees and encourages respect, trust, support, and empathy. Our results endorse other researchers who have outlined the importance of the work environment in achieving academic staff satisfaction (Kuwaiti et al. [2020], Melek [2007] and Malik et al. [2010]). The second-highest impact on academic staff satisfaction was promotion and development. This is achieved when academic staff feel open to opportunities for promotions, are offered a platform to learn new skills, and are encouraged to develop their talents in their workplaces. As found in other research, promotion significantly contributes to academic staff's overall job satisfaction, and their access to learning and development is highly important in achieving contentment regarding their jobs (Al-Hinai [2013]; Al-Rubaish et al. [2009]). Job security is the last determinant affecting job satisfaction among academic staff members. Giving the confidence that their jobs are not at risk of sudden termination allows the academic staff to focus on their work responsibilities

Table 8: Factors and survey items assessing academic staff job satisfaction and work environment

Factor	Survey items
Job security	I am confident that my position at this university is not at risk of sudden termination I have peace of mind regarding my job security, allowing me to focus on my work responsibilities.
Promotion and development	I have enough opportunity for promotion I have opportunity to utilize my skills and talents I have opportunity to learn new skills.
Professional achievements	I have considerable professional achievements I have considerable research records I contribute to university's success.
Work environment (physical and emotional)	I am satisfied with my working hour per week. My working environment is safe and stable. My working environment is pleasant and convenient for me. The university policies and legislations facilitate my research work The university policies and legislations provide me a healthy work environment.
Overall satisfaction	I am satisfied with my current job.

and ultimately be satisfied. Ahmad and Jameel (2018) also highlighted the significant effect on satisfaction and ultimate performance when offering academic staff a sense of job security. Other studies have also concluded that job security enhances academic members' satisfaction (Ghaffar et al. [2013], Masum et al. [2015] and Omar et al. [2020]).

4.1. Conclusions and Recommendations

The work environment, promotion and development, and job security are the main determinants of academic member satisfaction in Jordan. Based on our research, we created a model that incorporates these determinants to evaluate and predict the overall job satisfaction of academic staff members. Our recommendation for higher education institutions in Jordan is to focus on the most important determinants—work environment, promotion and development, and job security—when building up their human capital strategy, as this determinant has a significant impact on academic satisfaction. They can also use the generated model of job satisfaction as a key performance indicator to evaluate the impact of the initiatives and implementations incorporated into their human capital strategy.

4.2. Limitations and Future Studies

This study has some limitations. First, the study scope was academic staff; other university staff, such as administrative and secretarial staff, were not included. Second, quantitative data were collected to test the determinants of job satisfaction. However, we suggest recommendations for future studies. First, we investigated job satisfaction among all university employees (both academic and administrative). Second, qualitative tools can be incorporated using case studies and direct interviews to dig deeply into respondents' viewpoints on the topic.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, M.A.A., Jameel, A.S. (2018), Factors affecting on job satisfaction among academic staff. *Polytechnic Journal*, 8(2), 119-128.
- AL-Hinai, Z.A. (2013), Factors Influencing Academic Staff Job Satisfaction of Higher Education in the Sultanate of Oman. (Doctoral dissertation, The British University in Dubai (BUiD)).
- Al-Rubaish, A.M., Rahim, S.I.A., Abumadini, M.S., Wosornu, L. (2009), Job satisfaction among the academic staff of a Saudi university: An evaluative study. *Journal of Family and Community Medicine*, 16(3), 97-103.
- Alzubi, K.M., Alkhateeb, A.M., Hiyassat, M.A. (2023), Factors affecting the job satisfaction of construction engineers: Evidence from Jordan. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 23(2), 319-328. Available from: <https://fetzer.org/sites/default/files/images/stories/pdf/selfmeasures/personality-bigfiveinventory.pdf>
- Available from: https://www.mohe.gov.jo/ebv4.0/root_storage/ar/eb_info_page/infograph-2023.jpg
- Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/figure/personality-factors-hierarchical-types-descriptions-of-characteristic_tbl1_320560830
- Chimanikire, P., Mutandwa, E., Gadzirayi, C.T., Muzondo, N., Mutandwa, B. (2007), Factors affecting job satisfaction among academic professionals in tertiary institutions in Zimbabwe. *African Journal of Business Management*, 1(6), 166-175.
- Evans, J.D. (1996), *Straightforward Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. Pacific Grove, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- GebrekirosHagos, K. A. (2015), Study on factors affecting job satisfaction in Mekelle University Academic staff at Adi-Haqi campus. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 5(1), 1-6.
- Ghaffar, A., Ameer, B., Arshad, N., Urooj, F. (2013), Factors affecting job satisfaction level of academic staff in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and practice*, 4(6), 181-203.
- Hee, O.C., Shi, C.H., Kowang, T.O., Fei, G.C., Ping, L.L. (2020), Factors influencing job satisfaction among academic staffs. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(2), 285-291.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Snyderman, B.B. (1959), *The Motivation to Work*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Jawabri, A. (2017), Job satisfaction of academic staff in the higher education: Evidence from private universities in UAE. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 7(4), 193-211.
- Kuwaiti, A.A., Bicak, H.A., Wahass, S. (2020), Factors predicting job satisfaction among faculty members of a Saudi higher education institution. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 12(2), 296-310.
- Malik, M.E., Nawab, S., Naeem, B., Danish, R.Q. (2010), Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of university teachers in public sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(6), 17-26.
- Masum, A.K.M., Azad, M.A.K., Beh, L.S. (2015), Determinants of academics' job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from private universities in Bangladesh. *PLoS One*, 10(2), e0117834.
- McCrae, R.R., Costa, P.T. (1987), Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90.
- Melek, E., Anbar, A., Karabiyik, L. (2007), Job satisfaction of academicians in Turkey and the factors affecting job satisfaction. *ISGUC The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, 9(4), 66-90.
- Omar, M.S., Aziz, S.F.A., Salleh, N.M. (2020), Factors affecting job satisfaction among academic employees in polytechnic. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(11), 209-216.
- Rafferty, A.E., Griffin, M.A. (2009), Job satisfaction in organizational research. In: *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods*. United States: Sage Publications Ltd. p196-212.
- Rode, J.C. (2004), Job satisfaction and life satisfaction revisited: A longitudinal test of an integrated model. *Human Relations*, 57(9), 1205-1230.
- Schulze, S. (2006), Factors influencing the job satisfaction of academics in higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 20(2), 318-335.
- Sone, M., Mizunuma, K., Nakajima, Y., Yasunaga, H., Ohtomo, K. (2013), Job satisfaction, income, workload, workplace, and demographics of Japanese radiologists in the 2008 survey. *Japanese Journal of Radiology*, 31, 364-370.
- Vatcheva, K.P., Lee, M., McCormick, J.B., Rahbar, M.H. (2016), Multicollinearity in regression analyses conducted in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology (Sunnyvale)*, 6(2), 227.