



Influence of Demographic Factors and Pay Satisfaction on Career Satisfaction among Selected Employees in Redeemer's University

O. T. Arogundade^{1*} and O. Aremu¹

¹*Department of Behavioural Studies, Redeemer's University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/ARJASS/2017/33064

Editor(s):

(1) Hajime Eto, University of Tsukuba, Japan.

Reviewers:

(1) Ibiwani Alisa Hussain, Asia Pacific of University of Technology and Innovation, Bukit Jalil, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

(2) Borislav Kolaric, Belgrade, Serbia.

(3) Russell Davis, Columbia Southern University, USA.

(4) Mak Met, Malaysia.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/19005>

Original Research Article

Received 29th March 2017

Accepted 28th April 2017

Published 10th May 2017

ABSTRACT

This study explores the influence of demographic factors and pay satisfaction and on career satisfaction among selected employees of Redeemer's University, Osun State, Nigeria. The study adopted a cross sectional survey research design and simple random sampling technique were used to select two hundred and twelve (212) participants (M=97 males; F= 115 females) among both academic and non-academic staffs. The Biodata form, Pay Satisfaction Scale (PSS) and Career Satisfaction Scale (CSS) were used to collect data which were further analyzed through independent t-test. The results hence revealed that there were significant differences in career satisfaction of participants among the variables of marital status ($t = 1.96$ $p < 0.05$), designation ($t = 2.64$ $p < 0.05$) and pay satisfaction ($t = 6.41$ $p < 0.05$). While there were no significant differences in the variables of gender ($t = 0.78$ $p > 0.05$) and age ($t = 1.74$ $p > 0.05$). The implication of these findings substantiates the importance of creating a conducive working environment and an equity reward system in order to improve employees' career satisfaction.

Keywords: Demography; pay satisfaction; career satisfaction.

*Corresponding author: Email: arogundadeo@run.edu.ng

1. INTRODUCTION

Career satisfaction is a complex phenomenon. It describes a person's total affective reaction to the set of work and work-related factors [1,2]. And, this include feelings and attitudes that a person has towards his/her various aspects of work and career [3, 4]. Career satisfaction is an important concept in all areas of industry and workplace. According to [5] career satisfaction reflects employees' vitality, that is, the overall satisfied workers' tendency to be more productive than their dissatisfied counterparts with less proneness to shirking and inefficiency. Thus, businesses and corporations strive to enhance their employees' satisfaction.

Career satisfaction can also be described as an emotional state that can easily be evaluated by one's experiences on the job. In other words, it is a state where an employee feels perfection of value and worth in his or her work [6]. Answer [7] defines career satisfaction as a general perception of worker's sense of achievement and success that is directly linked to productivity and personal wellbeing. Social analysts have also reported that employees who exhibit joy and happiness in various aspects of their jobs tend to have better performance, productivity and effectiveness in that organization [8, 9].

Career satisfaction is therefore the sense of favourableness with which the employee disposes toward his or her work. It conveys the amount of agreement between one's expectation of the job and the rewards that the career provides; it is a part of life satisfaction. Thus, career satisfaction is the affective, behavioural and cognitive variable (as a professional attitude) that has a relationship with a wide and considerable range of individual and organizational variables [10].

Studies have shown that various factors in workplace can either strengthen or weaken career satisfaction. Some of the most important variables that have the capacity of reinforcing career satisfaction include: adequate salary, training and development opportunities, promotion, good human relations, healthy work and the likes [11, 12], while debilitating factors of career satisfaction include job stress, poor management and supervision, injustice, imprecise promotion and burnout [10].

The aim of this study therefore is to establish the contributory influence that demographic factors

and pay satisfaction have on career satisfaction among employees in Redeemer's University, Ede, Nigeria.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to [13], career satisfaction is a key indicator of the overall life satisfaction amongst employees because it climaxes when careers meet employees' expectations. Numerous studies have pointed to a gap in career satisfaction between men and women in academia, with men generally happier with working conditions than their female counterparts [10,14,15].

Age has been found to have a direct relationship to level career satisfaction of employees [16]. According to [16], some employees experience career satisfaction with increasing age. Thus, the older they grow, the higher their career satisfaction increases. Marital status is another influential biographic variable that has bearing on career satisfaction of the employee. However, there are not enough studies to draw valid conclusion about the effect of marital status on career satisfaction. The few studies conducted in this area consistently indicates that married employees are more satisfied with their jobs than their unmarried co-workers [3,17]. The reason for this may be that marriage imposes increased responsibilities that may make a steady job more valuable and important.

Furthermore, [18,19] report another powerful determinant of career satisfaction as the nature of relationship that exists among colleagues and within the workplace. Thus, working together with people of same personality type, background and experience tend to promote career satisfaction [20].

Robbins [21] emphasizes that equitable rewards, which are the compensation systems that are perceived as fair and in line with employee expectations, act as a strong determinant in career satisfaction. [22] found that there is a significant positive relationship between career satisfaction and remuneration which demonstrates that when employees perceive that their remuneration is fair, they are most likely to experience a feeling of satisfaction. [23] in their study posit that reward is the centre piece of the employment contract - after all it is the main reason why people work. This include all types of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards that are received because of employment by the organization. [24] assert that pay is an important reward used in

motivating the behaviour of employees. Although, other behavioural factors or work conditions are important for enhancing satisfaction at a workplace, but the satisfaction derived from pay is most important and cannot be over-emphasized.

Pay satisfaction is a much narrower construct than career satisfaction, however, it is also an important variable that is linked to some rather significant organisational outcomes. For example, some evidence suggests that dissatisfaction with pay may lead to decreased career satisfaction, decreased motivation and performance, increased absenteeism and turnover intentions, and more pay related grievances and lawsuits. Pay satisfaction has been shown to influence overall career satisfaction, motivation and performance [25]. The impact of pay satisfaction on career satisfaction permeates every sphere of life; money not only helps people fulfil their basic needs but also is instrumental in providing upper-level needs satisfaction [3].

However, the present study seeks to establish the influence of demographic factors and pay satisfaction on career satisfaction taking Redeemer's University, Osun State, Nigeria as case study.

H₁: Demographic factors and pay satisfaction will significantly influence career satisfaction.

3. METHODS

3.1 Participants and Procedures

The study adopts a cross sectional survey research design and a simple random sampling technique which were used to select two hundred and twelve (212) participants (M=97; F= 115 females), both academic and non-academic staffs. The Bio-data form, Career Satisfaction Scale (CSS) and Pay Satisfaction Scale (PSS) were used to collect data. The demographic details of the participants are shown in Table 1.

All the ethical requirements for conducting research were observed: a permission was obtained from the Human Resource Department of the institution, participation in the study was voluntary and participants were neither compelled nor compensated for completing the psychological tests. The tests were completed in the familiar atmosphere of their offices after telling them the purpose of the study.

3.2 Measures

The Career Satisfaction Scale (CSS) was developed by [26] to measure satisfaction with career success and the extent to which an employee has made satisfactory progress towards goals for income level, advancement and development of skills. The reliability and validity of the scale were established by [26-28], with coefficient alphas ranging from .83 to .89 and confirmatory factor analyses showing that general perceptions of career satisfaction are empirically distinct from financial success and hierarchical success in an organization.

Pay Satisfaction Scale (PSS) uses four subscales to measure satisfaction with pay level, amount of last raise, benefits and pay structure/administration. The subscales can also be combined into a composite measure for overall pay satisfaction. The responses format is a Likert - type scale ranging from 1- 5. The psychometric properties were provided by [29] with a reliability coefficient alpha ranged from 0.77 to 0.88 and 0.73 to 0.96 respectively.

3.3 Data Analyses

Responses to the psychological tests were entered accordingly into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 on a personal computer. The Data were coded were analysed by percentages and independent t-test. The independent t-test was used in order to determine whether there is significant difference in the sample means of the two groups.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants

Variables		Frequency	Percentages
Gender	Male	97	46
	Female	115	54
Marital Status	Single	67	31
	Married	145	69
Designation	Academic	62	30
	Non-Academic	150	70
Age	Older 41 and above	73	34
	Younger 21-40	139	66

Table 2. Independent t-test

Variables		Mean	SD	T	P
Gender	Male	16.43	4.97	0.78	>0.05
	Female	15.87	5.32		
Marital Status	Single	15.11	4.88	1.96	<0.05
	Married	16.60	5.22		
Designation	Academic	17.56	5.12	2.64	<0.05
	Non-Academic	15.54	5.06		
Age	Older 41 and above	15.97	5.14	1.73	>0.05
	Younger 21 -40	16.69	5.12		
Pay Satisfaction	High	18.17	4.55	6.41	<0.05
	Low	13.97	4.91		

Table 1 above shows the demographic attributes of the participants. In terms of gender, 46% were male participants while 54% were females. The marital status of participants shows that 31% of the participants were single while 69% were married. In terms of the designation of the participants, 30% of the participants were academic staffs while 70% were from a non-academic. Finally, the age range shows that 66% of the participants were within ages 21-40 while 34% were within the ages 40 and above.

Table 2 above shows that there are significant differences in career satisfaction of participants among the variables of marital status ($t = 1.96, p < 0.05$), designation ($t = 2.64, p < 0.05$) and pay satisfaction ($t = 6.41, p < 0.05$). However, there was no significant difference in the variables of the gender ($t = 0.78, p > 0.05$) and age ($t = 1.74, p > 0.05$). Thus, the hypothesis which states that demographic factors and pay satisfaction will significantly influence career satisfaction was not accepted at two tailed level of significant.

4. DISCUSSION

The aim of the study is to examine the influence of demographic variables and pay satisfaction on the career satisfaction among staffs at Redeemer's University, Ede, Nigeria (RUN).

Although the hypothesis was rejected, the findings of the study show among other things that married employees experience career satisfaction than their single counterparts. Despite a dearth in literature surrounding marital status and career satisfaction, [22] found that there is a robust correlation between marital status and career satisfaction. He reported that married people generally possess higher job-satisfaction than their single counterparts.

Furthermore, the study revealed that academic staff members experience higher career satisfaction than their non-academic colleagues. This finding can be alluded to the possible fact that the path to academic promotion is well laid out and can be easily understood and followed up, much more than the path for non-academic promotions. A few scholars [30,31] suggest that there is a direct and positive association between promotional opportunities and career satisfaction. When employees perceive that there are high chances for promotion, they feel motivated to work harder to achieve organizational goals with a view to attaining elevated career designations and higher ranks [31]. Academic staff tends to perceive higher chances of promotion, much more than non-academic staff and hence the higher career satisfaction averages.

Finally, the study shows employees classified as having higher pay satisfaction experience significantly higher career satisfaction compared to their counterpart classified as having lower pay satisfaction. This finding was supported by [21] who emphasized that equitable reward, in line with employee expectations is a strong determinant of career satisfaction. In this same vein [32] reported that public employees attributed the dissatisfaction with their careers to low benefits and salaries. Also, [22] found significant positive relationships between career satisfaction and remuneration amongst civil servants in the Republic of Maldives. This demonstrates that when employees perceive that their remuneration is fair, they are most likely to experience a feeling of satisfaction. This is because income helps individuals to meet certain universal needs and, therefore, income, at least at lower levels, is an antecedent to career satisfaction and subjective well-being. Salary is one important determinant of job satisfaction as identified by [17]. According to [17] salary is a forecaster of work satisfaction and workers who

were adequately rewarded show better career satisfaction. Thus, salary is a major priority of employees and they should not only be rewarded only with exceptional salaries but be recognized with rewards as per job done, such as cash bonuses and verbal rewards [11].

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study recommends that organizations and institutions should put into consideration variables such as pay satisfaction, marital status and job designation in promoting employees' career satisfaction. In other words, the place of adequate compensation system and marital satisfaction cannot be overemphasized in enhancing career satisfaction in the university system.

Although, this study has a major limitation in that the scope of coverage is limited to only one university, thus making it difficult to generalize the finding to other higher institutions of learning, the findings cannot be over looked.

In view of this limitation, the researchers suggest that future indigenous studies in this area should take into consideration more higher institutions of learning.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Alansari HA. Career choice, satisfaction, and perceptions about their professional image: A study of Kuwaiti librarians. *Professional image: A study of Kuwaiti librarians. Library Review*. 2011;60(7): 575-587.
2. Cranny CJ, Smith PC, Stone EF. *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington Books; 1992.
3. Judge TA, Heller D, Klinger R. The dispositional sources of job satisfaction: A comparative test. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 2008;57:361-372.
4. Bagtasos MR. Quality of work life: A review of literature. *Business & Economics Review*. 2011;20(2):1-8.
5. Abele E, Spurk D, Volmer J. The construct of career success: Measurement issues and an empirical example. *Journal for Labour Market Research*. 2011;43(3):195-206.
6. Badreya Al Jenaibi. *Management Science and Engineering*. 2010;4(2):27-39.
7. Answer.com (2008) [Online]. Available:<http://www.answers.com/topic/job-satisfaction>
8. Judge TA, Church AH. Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. 2000;166-174.
9. Nelson DW, Knigh AE. The power of positive recollections: Reducing test anxiety and enhancing college student efficacy and performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 2010;40(3): 732-745.
10. Warr PB, Inceoglu I. Job engagement, job satisfaction, and contrasting associations with person-job fit. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 2012;17:129-138.
11. Rode JC. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction revisited: A longitudinal test of an integrated model. *Human Relations*. 2004;57(9):1205-1230
12. De Kok, CA. Happiness at work: Are job satisfaction, job self- efficacy and trait emotional intelligence related? Unpublished Master of Art Thesis in Psychology, University of South Africa; 2013.
13. Zhang J, Howell RT. Do time perspectives predict unique variance in life satisfaction beyond personality traits? *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2011;50:1261-1266.
14. Thompson ER, Phua FT. A brief index of affective job satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management*. 2012;37(3): 275-307. ISSN 1059-6011.
15. Umbach PD, Seifert TA. The effects of diverse faculty characteristics on dimensions of job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*. 2008;49(4):357-381.
16. Mueller CW, Kim SW. The contented female worker: Still a paradox? In K. A. Hegtvedt & J. Clay-Warner (Eds.), *Justice: Advances in group processes*. 2008;25:117-150. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Available:<http://books.google.com/books?id=rynLSn6zYRkC>

17. Souza-Poza A, Souza-Poza AA. Taking another look at the gender/job satisfaction paradox. *Kyklos*. 2000;53:135–152.
18. DeVaney S, Zhan SC. Job satisfaction of recent graduates in financial services. U.S. Department of Labour, Bureau of Labour Statistics; 2003.
19. Elizabeth S. Find your satisfaction in your current job; 2007.
Available:<http://stress.about.com/od/workplacestress/a/jobsatisfaction.html>
20. Elizabeth George, Zakkariya KA. Job related stress and job satisfaction: A comparative study among bank employees. *Journal of Management Development*. 2015;34(3):316 – 329.
21. Robbins SP. Organizational behaviour concepts, controversies, application. 8th ed., Publisher: Prentice-hall International. New Jersey, USA; 2003.
22. Knerr M. An empirical analysis of the relationship between marital status and job satisfaction. Under Graduate Journal for the Human Science (online version); 2006.
Available:<http://www.kon.org/urc/r4/knwrr.htm>
23. Harrison DA, Liska Z. Promoting regular exercise occupational fitness programme. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*. 2008; 5(5):27–45.
24. Taylor GS, Vest MJ. Pay comparisons and satisfaction among public sector employees, *Public Personnel Management*. 1992;21:445-54. Ubom, I.U.
25. Cable DM, Judge TA. Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology*. 1994;47:317-350.
26. Greenhaus JH, Parasuraman S, Wormley, WM. Effects of race on organizational experiences, job–performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1990;33(1):64–86.
27. Aryee S, Chay YW, Tan HH. An examination of the antecedents of subjective career success among a managerial sample in Singapore. *Human Relations*. 1994;47:487–509.
28. Seibert SE, Crant JM, Kraimer ML. Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1999;84: 416–427.
29. Judge TA. Validity of the dimensions of the pay satisfaction questionnaire: Evidence of differential prediction. *Personnel Psychology*. 1993;46:331-355.
30. McCausland W, Pouliakas K, Theodossiou I. Some are punished and some are rewarded: A study of the impact of performance pay on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*. 2005;26:636–659.
31. Saari LM, Judge TA. Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*. 2004;43(4):295-407.
32. Dessler G. *Human Resource Management* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Prentice Hall; 2008.

© 2017 Arogundade and Aremu; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/19005>