

# Job Satisfaction in the first-year undergraduate programs during the Covid-19 pandemic

Dr. Nasser Saud Alrayes<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Yousry Mohammad Othman<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Associate Professor of Educational Administration, Department of Self-Development, Deanship of Preparatory Year and Supporting Studies, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, AD Dammam, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

*P.O. Box 13656, AD Dammam 31414, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5733-4162>

[nsalrayes@iau.edu.sa](mailto:nsalrayes@iau.edu.sa)

<sup>2</sup>*Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Teaching Methods, Department of Self-Development, Deanship of Preparatory Year and Supporting Studies, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, AD Dammam, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

*P.O. Box 13656, AD Dammam 31414, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0009-1876>

[yymothman@iau.edu.sa](mailto:yymothman@iau.edu.sa)

## Summary

The study aimed to identify the level of job satisfaction of faculty members in the first-year university programs at a Saudi university during the COVID-19, in the light of variables are the type of contract at the university, age, number of years of work at the university, education, academic rank, department, and experience. The study used the descriptive approach to measure the level of job satisfaction. The researchers used the survey of Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University to measure the level of job satisfaction. The survey includes 11 domains are Administrative Policies, Supervision, Interpersonal Relationships, Recognition and Reward, Working Conditions, Job Security, My Work Itself, Professional Responsibilities, Professional Achievements, Professional Advancement, and Salary. The number of faculty participants in this study (217) with a ratio (79.8 %) from the original community. The study results showed that the level of job satisfaction of faculty members was "high" in all domains, and the results showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of 0.05 on the total degree of the domains of job satisfaction among university faculty members compared to the teaching staff of education and training companies. The results showed that there are statistically significant differences at the level of 0.05 on the total degree of the domains of job satisfaction, where the level of job satisfaction is affected by the following variables: education, academic rank, age, experience, and department, on the other hand, the results showed that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of 0.05 in the total degree of the domains of job satisfaction depending on to the number of years of work at the university.

**Keywords:** job satisfaction, work environment, job security, job development, COVID-19

## I. Introduction:

The COVID-19 pandemic has imposed many unusual measures on the world, affecting the global economy, resulting in a major change in the working environment, and creating a new type of pressure on workers in various sectors.

This coincided with the increasing interest of institutions in the human element at a time when our modern world is witnessing a knowledge and technology revolution, which made enterprises more complex and diverse and presented them with very great challenges for achieving the competitive advantage that enables the institution to survive and develop by caring for the man who works as one of the most

important elements of production. The efficiency of collection for all production components depends on the competence of a qualified, trained, and skilled human element that enables it to perform its tasks efficiently and effectively (Apovir, 2018).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, universities must cope with various labor pressures, being one of the most important institutions whose academic leadership must pay attention to human resource development in the world's technological, communication and economic variables to ensure their safe functioning. This will ensure a sound and qualified output capable of contributing to development, development, and construction programs, especially if we know that the level and degree of social progress in all its economic, administrative, social, intellectual, and creative domains depends primarily on the efficiency of the output of higher education institutions. All of this must be addressed during distance learning and precautionary measures.

Job satisfaction is an important topic in the field of work in general, and in education in particular, since the faculty member's message aims to educate students about sound knowledge, skills, and behaviors; The difficulty of the teaching staff member's work; He works with students of different abilities and cannot delay in providing support and assistance to students so he must feel satisfied at work and meet his requirements, which will help him achieve the goals he needs (Kumar & Giri, 2009).

It is more important in educational institutions, so universities seek to improve the quality of performance of their employees (Abbadi, Tai'i, 2008). During the COVID-19 pandemic, staff support, and motivation must be strengthened to deal with distance-based short-distance education procedures and other various pressures resulting from the pandemic (Kulikowski, Przytuła, & Sułkowski, 2021)

During the COVID-19 cycle, university education was affected by the various surrounding conditions that were followed to deal with and reduce the risk of the pandemic; the shift to education was a new and unusual challenge for faculty members to carry out their practical tasks.

The universities must strengthen the support and motivation of faculty members to deal with distance-based education procedures and other various pressures resulting from the pandemic (Kulikowski, Przytuła, & Sułkowski, 2021)

Since the faculty member in the university is a key element in the educational sciences, and since the first-year university programs in Saudi universities are important in that they help students to join the various colleges in the university and give them the skills necessary to succeed in the university life, in addition to the diversity in the way these programs are operated, education and training companies are used to provide some faculty, and faculty members have a great diversity of academic background, gender, and gender.

### 1.1 Statement of the problem:

Because of the importance of job satisfaction, institutions of all kinds seek to achieve it among their employees, and educational institutions are well placed to provide a climate that contributes to job satisfaction. Trbsrra & Honoree, 2006, pointed out that many educational institutions are clearly interested in the levels of job satisfaction of their administrative and teaching staff, as job satisfaction is an important institutional variable, in connection with the levels of performance and employee support.

The basic concept of the first year's university programs in Saudi universities depends to a large extent on the introduction of this year independently for a period of one year, and the number of those implementing it varies, with several universities self-executing through faculty members from within the academic departments of the university. Others from universities rely mainly on education and training companies to operate these programs, and several universities combine self-employment and micro-employment in their programs.

The university in which this study was carried out, the first-year university programs rely on educational and training companies to provide a number of faculty members in specific disciplines, as a result of diversity in faculty members and the use of faculty members provided by educational training companies; The regulatory climate varies between the

management of education and training companies, as well as the different physical aspects between companies and the university, on the one hand, and the different disciplines and experiences on the other. He was the starting point for researchers to learn the degree of job satisfaction of faculty members during the COVID-19 pandemic, considering several variables, including the affiliation of faculty members or educational and training companies.

The current problem of the study was thus identified in the following main question:

What the level of job satisfaction do faculty members have for the first year of university programs during the COVID-19 pandemic in the light of some variables? The following questions arise from this main question:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of faculty members in the first year of university programs during the COVID-19 pandemic?
2. Are there statistically significant differences between the averages of study sample responses on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members at different levels of employment (university and companies)?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between the averages of the sample study responses on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members due to variables: Age, years of university work, experience, education, and academic grade?

### 1.2 The objectives of the study:

Current research aims at:

1. To identify the level of job satisfaction of faculty members in the first year of university programs during the COVID-19.
2. Detect differences between average study sample responses on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members at different levels of employment (university and companies).
3. Detect differences between average study sample responses on the level of job

satisfaction of faculty members considering study variables.

### 1.3 The importance of the study:

The importance of the current study is as follows:

1. The importance of the study stems from the importance of staff members' job satisfaction and its impact on performance quality and job security during the COVID-19 pandemic.
2. To study the level of job satisfaction of faculty members with different degrees of association with the university or with educational and training companies.
3. Provide decision makers with the results of the study to address problems and weaknesses and to work to increase and support strengths.
4. Provide recommendations and proposals to academic leaders in the light of the results of the study and the degree of job satisfaction of faculty members.

### Study limitation:

- Time limits: Applied in the second semester of the year 2020/2021.
- Spatial limits: First year university programs at a Saudi university.
- Objective limits: The level of practice of job satisfaction domains during the COVID-19 pandemic.

### 1.4 Definition of basic term:

***The first year of university programs:*** The first year that students are accepted and enrolled to study their academic program, and all the hours that the student recorded are counted as cumulative and include four courses: (Path of health colleges, path of engineering colleges, path of scientific colleges, course of human colleges).

***Job satisfaction:*** Zugby (2011) defines job satisfaction as a behavioral concept that measures an individual's desire to perform his or her job, his or her perceived acceptability during her performance, and the social and material satisfaction that this job has achieved.

***Functional satisfaction*** is defined as procedural in the current study as the overall satisfaction with the five key domains that faculty members are affected in the working environment: Administrative and financial policies, relationships within the work environment, work environment and professional responsibility, job security, professional development that the organization provides positively, and are reflected in job performance and productivity improvement. Job satisfaction is measured by the degree to which faculty members are provided in the Job satisfaction scale.

***Job satisfaction Domains:*** The degree of satisfaction of faculty members is called the first year's undergraduate programs during the COVID-19 Corpus pandemic from each domains of the job satisfaction scale: Administrative and financial policies, relationships within the working environment, work environment and professional responsibility, job security, and professional development, knowledge of these aspects is useful in identifying resources that can contribute to increasing or reducing job satisfaction.

***Education and Training Companies:*** A group of companies working in the field of education and training through the provision of human cadres from faculty and training, working in Saudi universities and other training and human resources development centers, especially in the first-year university programs, the first-year university programs are in cooperation with educational and training companies to provide training and training staff.

## 2. Literature Review

Job satisfaction is a source of success, strength and achievement of goals; Hoppock was the first to speak of job satisfaction in the 1940s; He identified three domains of job satisfaction for employees in different professions: The psychological domains, the physical domains, the environmental domains of work completion, and the more the work satisfied the needs of the employee in the three domains, the more satisfied he is with his job and the opposite is true (Kumar & Giri, 2009).

Schermerhorn, 2002 defined job satisfaction as the positive or negative feeling of the members of the Foundation toward their work and duties in the Foundation. Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state resulting from an individual's work or practical experience, and job satisfaction results from an individual's awareness of how much work provides those things that he considers important.

job satisfaction is an important managerial theme for increasing job productivity and quality assurance, and (Al-Sharadah, 2008) believes that job satisfaction for employees affects the quality of their performance, contributes to the desired positive results, and contributes to the achievement of the organization's goals. AbushaAira, 2014 indicates that reduced job satisfaction leads to minimal work tasks, conflicts and problems with colleagues and officials, and entails irregular or abandoned work. AbushaAira, 2012 noted that job satisfaction is a top priority for an organization to maintain its unique and unique components.

Johnson, 2010 emphasizes that job satisfaction is a general concept in business motivational theories and behaviors, which suggest that job satisfaction is the main reason for success in the field of working and maximizing the productivity of the work environment.

In his opinion (Salahuddin, 2002), job satisfaction is an important indicator of the effectiveness and success of the institution, as an individual with a high level of job satisfaction generates a great motivation for work and increases his enthusiasm and acceptance.

TRBSRRA & Honoree, 2006, has indicated that many educational institutions are clearly interested in the levels of job satisfaction of their administrative and teaching staff, as job satisfaction is an important institutional variable. It is a fact that the conviction and consent of the individual to the work he or she does is pushing him or her to do more, the more satisfaction he or she becomes, the more efficient and effective he or she will be able to do. This is why it is important to identify the factors that satisfy university faculty members to ensure a high degree of output that is consistent with labor-market requirements.

job satisfaction is concept based on determinants of factors that contribute to the formation and

extent of a person's job satisfaction, and these determinants and factors can be classified into three groups: (Abdul Aziz, 2014).

- Self-employed factors related to the workers themselves and the abilities and skills of individuals and their level of motivation, including those of scientific qualification, age groups, experience, level of ambition and others.
- Organizational factors relating to the Organization, working conditions and conditions, regulatory conditions and functional relationships associated with the employee, job function, relationship with colleagues, relationship with heads, level, content and responsibilities of the job.
- Environmental factors related to the work impact on the employee include services and facilities available in the workplace and surrounding areas, as well as community perceptions of the employee, their appreciation of their role and their integration with their work (Abdulaziz, 2014).

### Previous Studies

The researchers briefed several Arab and foreign studies related to the subject matter of the study, and a summary of several recent special studies related to the subject matter will be presented according to their chronology from newest to oldest:

**Study Kulikowski, K., Przytuła, S., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2021).** Entitled motivating academics to distance teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic at Polish Universities - the debate about a new equilibrium in e-learning opened. In this study, an appropriate sample of 202 academic teachers was used and found to support the hypothesis that academic teachers realized that their catalytic functional potential was lower during COVID-19 compulsory electronic learning than before. It also provided evidence that stimulating the potential for work during COVID-19's forced e-learning was linked to job participation and job satisfaction. Moreover, there is little evidence that the relationship between the potential for catalytic work and the functional satisfaction of academic teachers may be modified by teachers' assessment of university management procedures during the COVID-19 case, so that this link appears stronger among teachers who evaluate university management more positively. The findings provide preliminary

evidence of the potential unintended consequences of forced e-learning for academic teachers. It was, therefore, suggested that e-learning that was socially sustainable required not only focusing on students and organizations in the educational process but also improving teachers' catalytic potential for action.

**In the study of Szromek, A. R., & Wolniak, R. (2020),** the purpose of this article was to assess the level of satisfaction with the scientific work of researchers and to identify factors that affect their level. The article shows the results of a search conducted on a random sample of 763 academics from Poland. The following conclusions were reached: (1) the level of satisfaction of researchers for their scientific work depends on working conditions, as well as the social importance of research undertaken. (2) the level of job satisfaction is closely linked to the scientific opportunities of researchers (i.e., academic and educational work, communication with students and co-workers) and is negatively related to the need for administrative work. (3) most Polish researchers take pride in their scientific achievements and treat their profession as a passion or a profession.

**Chen, H., Liu, F., Pang, L., Liu, F., Fang, T. Win, Y., & Gu, X. (2020).** The main purpose of the study was to examine the impact of professional identity on job fatigue during the new Coronavirus period. At the same time, discuss the intermediate impact of job satisfaction on professional identity and job fatigue and its relationship between job satisfaction and functional exhaustion. During the peak period of the COVID-19 epidemic, an online survey was conducted - 483 Chinese university teachers with online teaching experience, the teacher's professional identity standard, job satisfaction gauge, and job fatigue scale completed. The results of this study found that the professional identity and job satisfaction of university teachers are highly negative factors in predicting job fatigue, where job satisfaction plays an intermediate role between professional identity and job fatigue. The study also confirmed that professional identity and job satisfaction are important factors affecting the job exhaustion of university professors. Therefore, the study suggested that schools adopt more effective strategies to improve the professional identity and job prospects of university teachers to reduce practical problems

of job fatigue, ensure the effectiveness of online teaching, and maintain sustainable development during the epidemic. Therefore, the study suggested that schools adopt more effective strategies to improve the professional identity and job prospects of university teachers to reduce practical problems of job fatigue, ensure the effectiveness of online teaching, and maintain sustainable development during the epidemic.

**Saad Al-Abdan study (2019)**, the study aimed at knowing the level of job satisfaction and its relationship with the scientific productivity of the faculty members in the technical faculty in Riyadh and Ha'il. The results of the study indicated that the level of functional satisfaction of the faculty members was high, and the results of the study showed that there are statistically significant differences between the productivity of the faculty members in the technical faculty in all domains of productivity except the number of conferences. The results also indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and scientific productivity in all areas of job satisfaction.

**Ahmed Al-Rahumi et al. Study (2019)**, the study aims at measuring the relationship between the application and development of quality standards and the improvement of the educational process and its impact on the satisfaction of faculty members at King Khaled University, and the results of the study showed a moral correlation between measuring the application of quality and development standards, improving the educational process, and satisfying faculty members. In addition, there is an indirect moral relationship between standards and the satisfaction of faculty members, and the study stated that the level of application of quality standards and development is not as well improved in the educational process as required, considering the results of the study that demonstrated the under satisfaction of faculty members.

**Orabeh, Mobaraki. (2018)**, the study aimed at learning the level of job satisfaction of university professors, and to achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher selected a sample of 110 professors of both sexes and with different degrees of education. The researcher used the Job Description Index. By Smith, Kendall, and Hulin; The results of the study showed that there were no differences in job

satisfaction due to different sex, and that there were differences according to the degree of science.

**The Bassam Abu Khodair study (2018)** aimed at learning the level of job satisfaction of faculty members in Jordanian universities located in the northern governorates, and the results of the study showed that the level of job satisfaction in the sample of the study was moderate. The study also showed that there are statistically significant differences that are attributable to the type of university for employees in government universities compared to those in private universities. The results also showed differences in statistical function attributable to the gender variable; Male faculty members are better off than females.

**The study of Wael Amin Al Ali (2018)** aimed at learning the degree of functional satisfaction of the faculty members in the special education departments in the southern region of Saudi Arabia and its relationship with some variables. The study results showed that the degree of functional satisfaction of the faculty members was moderate, as was the middle grade on the four domains of the tool. The study results showed no differences in the degree of job satisfaction depending on the sex variable and the change in the university. At the same time, there were differences in the degree of job satisfaction depending on the years of experience.

**Mohamed Aldays' study (2016)** aimed at learning the levels of job satisfaction of the University of Sana'a faculty members from their point of view, indicating the role of the changing specialization and academic rank on their job satisfaction, and the study showed that the level of job satisfaction of the faculty members came to a small degree. Differences of statistical significance by academic grade variable were also found, with the differences in favor of higher grades.

**Rafida Al-Sharman, and Safa Al-Jaafar study (2014)** aimed at identifying the degree of functional satisfaction of faculty members at a temporary university and its relation to their level of job performance. The study sample was made up of 256 faculty members at the university. The results of the study showed that the level of job satisfaction of the university faculty members was moderate, and the results

of the study showed that there were no statistically significant differences due to the variable of experience and academic grade, as well as to the gender variable and the male interest.

**Shahr Obaid Study (2014)** aimed at identifying the degree of functional satisfaction of the faculty members in the Arab American University and consists of a sample of 90 members, and the results of the study showed that the degree of functional satisfaction with the articles of the tool was moderate. The study showed that there were no statistical differences that were attributable to the changes of sex, college, experience, and experience, Academic rank and salary.

### 2.1 Comment on previous studies:

The previous studies showed the following:

- Most of the previous studies attempted to identify the level of job satisfaction of university faculty members, and their responses to some variables differed.
- Most previous studies used the descriptive approach.
- Most studies have indicated that the level of job

satisfaction of faculty members is at the intermediate level.

The current study is in line with previous studies of job satisfaction and agrees to use the survey as a study tool.

The current study differs with previous studies in that it dealt with the first year's university programs, as well as the comparison between the job satisfaction of the university's associate faculty members versus the faculty of the education and training company, and in the place of study.

### 3. Methodology and field procedures:

The descriptive analytical approach in this study adapted to the nature of its subject matter has been used to reveal the level of job satisfaction of the faculty with the first year of university programs in the light of certain variables.

**Research Community:** The study community is a member of the first university-year program at a Saudi university for 2020/2021, of which 272.

**Research sample:** The study tool was applied to the study community, and the number of faculty participants (217) was (79.8%) from the original community. The sample study was distributed as follows:

**Table (1):** Distribution of the sample of the study

| Department       | Community |        |       | Sample |        |       | % To community | % To Sample |
|------------------|-----------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|----------------|-------------|
|                  | Male      | Female | Total | Male   | Female | Total |                |             |
| Self-Development | 31        | 32     | 63    | 24     | 30     | 54    | 86%            | 25%         |
| Basic Science    | 36        | 35     | 71    | 24     | 31     | 55    | 77%            | 25.35%      |
| Computer         | 10        | 21     | 31    | 9      | 19     | 28    | 90%            | 12.50%      |
| English          | 45        | 45     | 90    | 31     | 42     | 73    | 81%            | 34%         |
| Islamic          | 6         | 11     | 17    | 3      | 4      | 7     | 41%            | 3%          |
| Total            | 128       | 144    | 272   | 91     | 126    | 217   | 80%            | 100%        |

### Search tools

The researchers used the survey of the university's job satisfaction, which included

eleven "11" domains under which 39 items are distributed as table (2).

**Table (2):** *Job satisfaction domains and number of items each domains*

| Domains                       | Items |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Administrative Polices        | 4     |
| Supervision                   | 5     |
| Interpersonal Relationships   | 4     |
| Recognition and Reward        | 2     |
| Working Conditions            | 4     |
| Job Security                  | 3     |
| My Work Itself                | 4     |
| Professional Responsibilities | 4     |
| Professional Achievements     | 4     |
| Professional Advancement      | 2     |
| Salary                        | 3     |

### Calculate the truth and stability of the search tool

#### - Stability

Stability has been calculated in three different ways: Alpha Cronbach, s, half-fragmentation by the "Spearman-Brown coefficient" equation, and internal consistency of all resolution phrases: Alpha has a stability factor of 0.95, and

half-segmentation stability of "0.93" which shows that the resolution has high stability.

#### - The validity of internal consistency

The validity of the internal consistency of the resolution is calculated by finding the correlation factor between each of the resolution and the overall degree of the domains to which it belongs, as shown in the following table:

**Table (3):**

| Domains                     | Correlation |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Administrative Polices      | 0.87**      |
| Supervision                 | 0.83**      |
| Interpersonal Relationships | 0.77**      |
| Recognition and Reward      | 0.87**      |
| Working Conditions          | 0.78**      |
| Job Security                | 0.81**      |
| My Work Itself              | 0.91**      |



|                               |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Professional Responsibilities | 0.93** |
| Professional Achievements     | 0.85** |
| Professional Advancement      | 0.88** |
| Salary                        | 0.87** |

From the previous table (3), all resolution paragraphs are statistically significant to the overall score of each axis at an indication level (0.01), indicating that the instrument is true.

Internal consistency has been verified by calculating the ratio of the overall score of the questionnaire to the sub-domains, and all stability indicators have been high, achieving a significant level at "0.01" as shown in the following table:

**Table (4): Internal consistency**

| Domains                       | Correlation |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Administrative Polices        | .869**      |
| Supervision                   | .843**      |
| Interpersonal Relationships   | .852**      |
| Recognition and Reward        | .744**      |
| Working Conditions            | .837**      |
| Job Security                  | .849**      |
| My Work Itself                | .806**      |
| Professional Responsibilities | .914**      |
| Professional Achievements     | .912**      |
| Professional Advancement      | .741**      |
| Salary                        | .891**      |

#### Statistical analysis and processing

The researchers used the statistical model with relative scale; With a view to judging the arithmetic averages of functional satisfaction, its domains and the paragraphs that follow it, as follows:

| Very High | High      | Medium    | Low       | Very Low  |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 4.21-5    | 3.41-4.20 | 2.61-3.40 | 1.81-2.60 | 1.01-1.80 |

The researchers used the Statistical Program (SPSS) to process study data and answer questions as follows:

**Question 1:** What level of job satisfaction do faculty members have for the first year of university programs during the COVID-19 pandemic?

To answer the first question the researchers, used averages, standard deviations to job satisfaction domains and their items and arranged domains by their averages.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

**Table (5):***Averages and standard variations of the study sample in the job satisfaction domains items*

| N                           | Items   | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Level of satisfaction | Stratifying in all | Stratifying in domain |
|-----------------------------|---|--------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Administrative Polices      |   | 3.9689 | 0.89747        | High                  | 27                 | 4                     |
| 1                           | There is flexibility in my work procedures.   | 3.7696 | 1.11903        | High                  | 35                 | 5                     |
| 2                           | There is a Job Description Manual at my university and I know my job position, scope, and responsibilities. | 4.1198 | 1.02036        | High                  | 13                 | 1                     |
| 3                           | I see that IAU policies are fair.   | 3.9770 | 1.14035        | High                  | 26                 | 3                     |
| 4                           | I am very aware of the Policy Handbook (manual) of the university and have complete access to it.           | 4.0092 | 1.09287        | High                  | 25                 | 2                     |
| Supervision                 |   | 4.1724 | 0.86686        | High                  | 10                 | 3                     |
| 5                           | My immediate supervisor uses positive feedback with faculty.  | 4.1429 | 1.11507        | High                  | 12                 | 4                     |
| 6                           | I can trust my immediate supervisor.  | 4.3456 | 1.01169        | High                  | 6                  | 2                     |
| 7                           | Delegation of responsibility are formally specified in signed documents                                     | 4.0691 | 1.23221        | High                  | 20                 | 5                     |
| 8                           | My supervisor involves me in the planning process.  | 4.3871 | 0.83190        | High                  | 5                  | 1                     |
| 9                           | My immediate supervisor treats faculty fairly   | 3.9171 | 1.08121        | High                  | 30                 | 6                     |
| Interpersonal Relationships |   | 4.1094 | 0.84496        | High                  | 15                 | 3                     |
| 10                          | I am satisfied with the work relation with my co-workers  | 4.2028 | 0.96003        | High                  | 9                  | 2                     |
| 11                          | There is co-ordination & integration among administrative   | 4.3917 | 0.79845        | High                  | 4                  | 1                     |

|                        |   |        |         |           |    |   |
|------------------------|---|--------|---------|-----------|----|---|
|                        | departments, regarding university activities  |        |         |           |    |   |
| 12                     | There is good communication and cooperation among the employees in my department.                           | 4.0829 | 1.15572 | High      | 19 | 4 |
| 13                     | I have a sense of friendship and team spirit with colleagues.   | 3.7604 | 1.25746 | High      | 36 | 5 |
| Recognition and Reward |   | 3.4908 | 1.04523 | High      | 43 | 3 |
| 14                     | IAU recognizes major professional accomplishment.   | 3.5899 | 1.18731 | High      | 41 | 2 |
| 15                     | IAU rewards excellent professional performance.   | 3.3917 | 1.23922 | Medium    | 46 | 1 |
| Working Conditions     |   | 4.0288 | 0.78213 | High      | 24 | 3 |
| 16                     | There are enough personnel to do all the work well  | 3.8710 | 1.08948 | High      | 33 | 4 |
| 17                     | The classroom equipment functions properly.   | 4.1613 | 1.02595 | High      | 11 | 2 |
| 18                     | Amenities (restrooms, etc.) in my college are clean.  | 3.4332 | 1.32162 | High      | 45 | 5 |
| 19                     | The office/area in my workplace is comfortable and safe   | 4.6498 | 0.75579 | Very High | 2  | 1 |
| Job Security           |   | 4.0922 | 0.92224 | High      | 16 | 2 |
| 20                     | There is no risk to lose my job even if I refuse an assignment not relevant to my skills or job description | 3.8894 | 1.19673 | High      | 31 | 4 |
| 21                     | I feel that I have a high degree of loyalty towards IAU.  | 4.3318 | 1.07176 | High      | 7  | 1 |
| 22                     | I feel IAU has a high degree of loyalty towards me.   | 4.0553 | 1.03936 | High      | 22 | 3 |
| My Work Itself         |   | 4.1106 | 0.77831 | High      | 14 | 3 |

|                               |  |        |         |           |    |   |
|-------------------------------|--|--------|---------|-----------|----|---|
| 23                            | My present job is compatible with my experience.                                   | 3.8848 | 1.16690 | High      | 32 | 4 |
| 24                            | I get the administrative support to accomplish my work.                            | 3.3226 | 1.25355 | Medium    | 49 | 5 |
| 25                            | My assigned workload does not affect the quality of performance                    | 4.6544 | 0.71711 | Very High | 1  | 1 |
| 26                            | My work does NOT make me stressed.   | 4.5806 | 0.71634 | Very High | 3  | 2 |
| Professional Responsibilities |  | 3.7569 | 1.03468 | High      | 37 | 3 |
| 27                            | I am ready to put in extra effort for the success of my department.                | 3.6682 | 1.17479 | High      | 40 | 4 |
| 28                            | I am aware of Quality concepts while performing my assigned duties.                | 3.4654 | 1.38442 | High      | 44 | 5 |
| 29                            | I am encouraged to participate, and I contribute to community services             | 3.8249 | 1.14128 | High      | 34 | 2 |
| 30                            | I have sufficient professional authority and autonomy at my work.                  | 4.0691 | 1.02280 | High      | 21 | 1 |
| Professional Achievements     |  | 3.7005 | 0.99223 | High      | 39 | 3 |
| 31                            | Promotion in my position is based on my professional performance and achievements. | 3.9447 | 1.12080 | High      | 28 | 2 |
| 32                            | My job encourages competitive spirit.  | 3.3871 | 1.32197 | Medium    | 47 | 4 |
| 33                            | I have clear, achievable goals and standards for my position.                      | 4.0922 | 1.10168 | High      | 17 | 1 |
| 34                            | I receive regular, timely feedback on how I am doing my work.                      | 3.3779 | 1.35915 | Medium    | 48 | 5 |

|                          |  |        |         |        |    |   |
|--------------------------|--|--------|---------|--------|----|---|
| PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT |  | 3.2005 | 1.18445 | Medium | 50 | 2 |
| 35                       | My present job gives me a good chance for professional promotion.                                | 2.8249 | 1.30054 | Medium | 51 | 3 |
| 36                       | IAU helps with my professional development.  | 3.5760 | 1.31056 | High   | 42 | 1 |
| Salary                   |  | 4.0432 | 0.89953 | High   | 23 | 3 |
| 37                       | My salary is sufficient, compared with my productivity and professional achievements.            | 4.2949 | 0.85289 | High   | 8  | 1 |
| 38                       | My salary is higher than the salary which is paid by other Universities with similar facilities. | 4.0876 | 1.07870 | High   | 18 | 2 |
| 39                       | I feel IAU has a clear policy related to salaries and allowances.                                | 3.7465 | 1.31772 | High   | 38 | 4 |
| All                      |  | 3.9322 | 0.77582 | High   | 29 |   |

Table (5) shows that the level of job satisfaction of the study sample in the overall total domains of the Job satisfaction survey was an average 3.93 and high satisfaction level. The table also shows that the item "My assigned Working does not affect the Quality of Performance" ranked first among all items of the domains with an average 4.66 and a very high level. And the item "The Office/Area in My Workplace is highly organized and safe" came second with an average of 4.65 and a very high level, while "My present job gives me a good chance for professional promotion" came last with an average of 2.82 with a medium satisfaction level, and the item "I get the Administrative Support to Accommodation My work. " Came pre-last with an average of 3.32 at a medium satisfaction level.

The high level of satisfaction of faculty members in most domains and job satisfaction items is due to the university's provision of the appropriate environment and the continuous

electronic and logistical support to faculty members during the Corona Surge. Although teaching was mixed with distance teaching, the university provided all means to support the educational process, which was positively reflected in the satisfaction of faculty members and was shown in the results of the study.

The current study agrees with the study (Abidin, 2019), which concluded that the level of satisfaction was high, while the current study differs with the study of both (Rahami, 2019), (Daeis, 2016), which showed a low level of job satisfaction. It also agrees with a few jobs satisfaction studies that have shown that the level of job satisfaction was moderate, including the study (Abu Khudair, 2018) (Al Ali, 2018), (Al-Sharman, 2014), (Obaid, 2014), (Mansour, 2010).

At the level of satisfaction in all domains of job satisfaction, all domains were highly satisfied with the average of 3.93, and the level of

satisfaction in the sample study was diversified in the items on the domains of job satisfaction as they came between very high, high, and medium. The number of items was very high level are three (3) items with a ratio of 8% of the job-satisfaction domains, The number of items was high level are Thirteen "31" items with a ratio of 79% of the job-satisfaction domains, while the number of items was medium level satisfaction are five (5) items with a ratio of 13%.

At the level of job satisfaction for the first domains, all the items came with a high level of satisfaction, and the item "there is a job description manual at my university, and I know my job position, scope, and responsibilities." came in first level and high-level satisfaction with average 4.12, and the item "There is flexibility in my work processes" came in the last level with high level of satisfaction. The level of job satisfaction for the second domains was also high in all items and in the overall of total degree of the domain, and the item "My Supervisor involved me in the planning process" was first level in this domain with average 4.38 and high level of satisfaction. On the other hand, the item "My immediate supervisor treats factory fairly" came in the last level, with a high level and average satisfaction of 3.9. For the third domain, the level of job satisfaction was high in all items and in the overall of total degree of the domain, the results show the item "There is co-ordination & integration among administrative departments, regarding university activities" came in first rank on average of 4.39, while the item "I have a sense of friendship and team spirit with college" came in last rate on average of 3.76. The fourth domain varied the level of satisfaction between "high and medium, and the item "IAU recognizes major Professional Accommodation " came in first rate in high satisfaction with an average of 3.59, while the item "IAU Awards excellent professional performance" came in last rate in this domain with an average of 3.4. The fifth domain have varied the level of satisfaction between very high and high, and the item "The office/area in my workplace is highly and safe" came first rate with a very high level of satisfaction and an average of 4.65, and the item

"Amenities (restrooms, etc.) in my college are clean "came last rate in this domain on the average of 3.4. while the sixth domains and all items came with a high level of satisfaction, and the item "I feel that I have a high degree of loyalty towards IAU" came in the first rate with a high level of satisfaction and an average of 4.33. While the item "There is no risk to lose my job if I recuse an assignment not relevant to my skills or job description" came in the last rate in this domain on the average of 3.89. The seventh domain varied the level of satisfaction between "very high, high, and medium, and the item "My assigned workload does not affect the quality of performance" came first with a very high level of satisfaction and an average of 4.65, while the item "I get the administrative support to accommodation my work" came in the last rate in this domain with an average of 3.32. In the eighth domain all items came with a high level of satisfaction, and the item "I have enough Professional authority and authority at my work " came first rate with a high level of satisfaction and an average of 4.07. While the item "I am aware of quality concepts while performing my assigned duties "came in last rate in this domain with an average of 3.47. And the ninth domain has varied the level of satisfaction between high and medium, and the item "I have clear, and I have good goes and standards for my position. Came first-rate with a high level of satisfaction and an average of 4.09. While the item "I receive regular, timely feedback on how I am doing my work. Came in the last rate in this domain with an average of 3.38. While the tenth domain has varied the level of satisfaction between high and medium, and the item "IAU helps with my professional development" came first rate with a high level of satisfaction and an average of 3.58, in other hand the item "My present job gives me a good chance for professional promotion" came in the last rate in this domain with an average of 2.82. In the eleventh domain all the items came with a high level of satisfaction, and the item "My Salary is efficient, and I have found it with my productivity and professional achievements "came first rate with a high level of satisfaction and an average of 4.29 , while the item " I feel that there is a clear policy related to sales and Allowances" came in the last rate in this domain with an average of 3.75.

**Table (6):***Averages and standard variations of the study sample job satisfaction level to the Domains*

| Domains                       | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Level of satisfaction |    |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------------|-----------------------|----|
| Administrative Polices        | 3.9689 | 0.89747        | High                  | 7  |
| Supervision                   | 4.1724 | 0.86686        | High                  | 1  |
| Interpersonal Relationships   | 4.1094 | 0.84496        | High                  | 3  |
| Recognition and Reward        | 3.4908 | 1.04523        | High                  | 11 |
| Working Conditions            | 4.0288 | 0.78213        | High                  | 6  |
| Job Security                  | 4.0922 | 0.92224        | High                  | 4  |
| My Work Itself                | 4.1106 | 0.77831        | High                  | 2  |
| Professional Responsibilities | 3.7569 | 1.03468        | High                  | 9  |
| Professional Achievements     | 3.7005 | 0.99223        | High                  | 10 |
| Professional Advancement      | 3.2005 | 1.18445        | Medium                | 12 |
| Salary                        | 4.0432 | 0.89953        | High                  | 5  |
| All Domains                   | 3.9322 | 0.77582        | High                  | 8  |

Table (6) shows that the level of job satisfaction on all domains was high level, with an average 3.93 with standard deviation (0.78), while the domain "Supervision" came in first level with an average of (4.17) and the domain "My work Itself" came in second level with an average of (4.11), but the domain "Professional Advancer" came in last level with an average of (3.2).

The researchers attributed the high level of job satisfaction in this study to the fact that the first year's university programs are fully managed by the university administration and faculty members are affiliated with supporting

academic departments that follow the rules governing university work and have academic boards. The university also provides an enabling environment for academic and research development that is available to all faculty members, both university and educational and training companies.

**Question 2:** Are there statistically significant differences between the averages of study sample responses on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members at different levels of employment (university and companies)?

**Table (7):** T-Test results to examine the effect of the contract type variable for the study sample job satisfaction level.

| Domains                | Contract   | N   | Mean   | Std. Deviation | df  | t     | Sing. |
|------------------------|------------|-----|--------|----------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Administrative Polices | University | 173 | 4.0231 | 0.88481        | 215 | 1.774 | 0.650 |
|                        | Company    | 44  | 3.7557 | 0.92524        |     |       |       |

|                               |            |     |        |         |     |       |       |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----|--------|---------|-----|-------|-------|
| Supervision                   | University | 173 | 4.1815 | 0.87371 | 215 | 0.308 | 0.748 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 4.1364 | 0.84828 |     |       |       |
| Interpersonal Relationships   | University | 173 | 4.1633 | 0.80766 | 215 | 1.872 | 0.122 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.8977 | 0.95892 |     |       |       |
| Recognition and Reward        | University | 173 | 3.5867 | 1.00348 | 215 | 2.720 | 0.184 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.1136 | 1.13026 |     |       |       |
| Working Conditions            | University | 173 | 4.0824 | 0.75247 | 215 | 2.015 | 0.161 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.8182 | 0.86664 |     |       |       |
| Job Security                  | University | 173 | 4.1272 | 0.90034 | 215 | 1.109 | 0.331 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.9545 | 1.00281 |     |       |       |
| My Work Itself                | University | 173 | 4.1850 | 0.75562 | 215 | 2.836 | 0.336 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.8182 | 0.80580 |     |       |       |
| Professional Responsibilities | University | 173 | 3.8092 | 1.00458 | 215 | 1.482 | 0.186 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.5511 | 1.13427 |     |       |       |
| Professional Achievements     | University | 173 | 3.7486 | 0.97814 | 215 | 1.419 | 0.516 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.5114 | 1.03564 |     |       |       |
| Professional Advancement      | University | 173 | 3.2630 | 1.17948 | 215 | 1.547 | 0.993 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 2.9545 | 1.18527 |     |       |       |
| Salary                        | University | 173 | 4.1255 | 0.84929 | 215 | 2.712 | 0.090 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.7195 | 1.02223 |     |       |       |
| All Domains                   | University | 173 | 3.9851 | 0.75859 | 215 | 2.006 | 0.404 |
|                               | Company    | 44  | 3.7241 | 0.81616 |     |       |       |

**Table (7)** shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the "0.05" significance level in the overall total degree of all domains in job satisfaction. This means the level of job satisfaction is not affected by the type of contract (University or Education and Training Companies). The researchers attributed there are no statistically significant differences between the level of job satisfaction of the university faculty members compared to those belonging to the educational and training companies because of no differences in financial and administrative policies, relationships within the working environment, job security, and professional development. All practices within the university are equal and available to all, and the university

emphasizes during the contract with external institutions about all standards offered within the university shall be of the same quality in the educational and training companies. There is another factor about that, with academic departments directly supervising everyone in the first year's university programs.

**Question 3:** Are there statistically significant differences between the averages of the sample study responses on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members due to variables: Age, years of university work, experience, education, and academic grade?



To answer the question; One-way ANOVA was performed for each variable followed by the Last Significance Difference” LSD.

**Table (8): Results of a single contrast analysis (ANOVA) to examine the effect of a variable of education on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members**

| Domains                     | Education | N   | Mean   |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F       |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----|--------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|
| Administrative Polices      | BSC       | 15  | 4.0500 | Between Groups | 8.289          | 2   | 4.144       | 5.353** |
|                             | Master    | 99  | 3.7576 |                |                |     |             |         |
|                             | PHD       | 103 | 4.1602 | Within Groups  | 165.689        | 214 | 0.774       |         |
| Supervision                 | BSC       | 15  | 4.3200 | Between Groups | 3.386          | 2   | 1.693       | 2.280   |
|                             | Master    | 99  | 4.0364 |                |                |     |             |         |
|                             | PHD       | 103 | 4.2816 | Within Groups  | 158.928        | 214 | 0.743       |         |
| Interpersonal Relationships | BSC       | 15  | 4.2333 | Between Groups | 1.653          | 2   | 0.827       | 1.160   |
|                             | Master    | 99  | 4.0152 |                |                |     |             |         |
|                             | PHD       | 103 | 4.1820 | Within Groups  | 152.560        | 214 | 0.713       |         |
| Recognition and Reward      | BSC       | 15  | 3.6000 | Between Groups | 9.167          | 2   | 4.583       | 4.324*  |
|                             | Master    | 99  | 3.2677 |                |                |     |             |         |
|                             | PHD       | 103 | 3.6893 | Within Groups  | 226.815        | 214 | 1.060       |         |
| Working Conditions          | BSC       | 15  | 4.1667 | Between Groups | 7.151          | 2   | 3.575       | 6.122** |
|                             | Master    | 99  | 3.8308 |                |                |     |             |         |
|                             | PHD       | 103 | 4.1990 | Within Groups  | 124.982        | 214 | 0.584       |         |
| Job Security                | BSC       | 15  | 4.3556 | Between Groups | 3.452          | 2   | 1.726       | 2.049   |
|                             | Master    | 99  | 3.9630 |                |                |     |             |         |
|                             | PHD       | 103 | 4.1780 | Within Groups  | 180.260        | 214 | 0.842       |         |
| My Work Itself              | BSC       | 15  | 4.1833 | Between Groups | 5.261          | 2   | 2.631       | 4.483*  |
|                             | Master    | 99  | 3.9419 |                |                |     |             |         |
|                             | PHD       | 103 | 4.2621 | Within Groups  | 125.584        | 214 | 0.587       |         |
|                             | BSC       | 15  | 3.9667 |                | 11.090         | 2   | 5.545       | 5.390** |

|                               |        |     |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|-------------------------------|--------|-----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
| Professional Responsibilities | Master | 99  | 3.5101 | Between Groups |         |     |       |         |
|                               | PHD    | 103 | 3.9636 | Within Groups  | 220.149 | 214 | 1.029 |         |
| Professional Achievements     | BSC    | 15  | 4.0000 | Between Groups | 10.512  | 2   | 5.256 | 5.565** |
|                               | Master | 99  | 3.4621 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | PHD    | 103 | 3.8859 | Within Groups  | 202.143 | 214 | 0.945 |         |
| Professional Advancement      | BSC    | 15  | 3.2667 | Between Groups | 10.422  | 2   | 5.211 | 3.811*  |
|                               | Master | 99  | 2.9646 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | PHD    | 103 | 3.4175 | Within Groups  | 292.608 | 214 | 1.367 |         |
| Salary                        | BSC    | 15  | 4.2000 | Between Groups | 9.482   | 2   | 4.741 | 6.138** |
|                               | Master | 99  | 3.8153 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | PHD    | 103 | 4.2395 | Within Groups  | 165.296 | 214 | 0.772 |         |
| All Domains                   | BSC    | 15  | 4.0873 | Between Groups | 6.402   | 2   | 3.201 | 5.542** |
|                               | Master | 99  | 3.7446 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | PHD    | 103 | 4.0898 | Within Groups  | 123.609 | 214 | 0.578 |         |

**Table (8)** shows there are statistically significant differences at the "0.01" significance level in the total degree of all domains in job satisfaction, this means the level of job satisfaction is affected by the education variable in most domains of job satisfaction. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of the "0.05"

in Supervision and Interpersonal Relationships domains. Because of having more than one education level the researchers used "LSD" test to know the significance of differences between averages. The results showed in all domains of job satisfaction in favor of faculty members with a degree doctorate and bachelor's degree compared to masters.

**Table 9:** Results of the ANOVA analysis to examine the impact of a variable academic rank on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members

| Domains                | Rank       | N  | Mean   |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      |
|------------------------|------------|----|--------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|
| Administrative Polices | Instructor | 15 | 4.0500 | Between Groups | 8.879          | 4   | 2.220       | 2.851* |
|                        | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.7576 |                |                |     |             |        |
|                        | Assistant  | 80 | 4.1313 | Within Groups  | 165.098        | 212 | 0.779       |        |
|                        | Associate  | 21 | 4.2262 |                |                |     |             |        |
|                        | Professor  | 2  | 4.6250 |                |                |     |             |        |
| Supervision            | Instructor | 15 | 4.3200 |                | 4.393          | 4   | 1.098       | 1.475  |

|                               |            |    |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|-------------------------------|------------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
|                               | Lecturer   | 99 | 4.0364 | Between Groups |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Assistant  | 80 | 4.2450 | Within Groups  | 157.921 | 212 | 0.745 |         |
|                               | Associate  | 21 | 4.3619 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Professor  | 2  | 4.9000 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Interpersonal Relationships   | Instructor | 15 | 4.2333 | Between Groups | 2.165   | 4   | 0.541 | 0.755   |
|                               | Lecturer   | 99 | 4.0152 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Assistant  | 80 | 4.1563 | Within Groups  | 152.048 | 212 | 0.717 |         |
|                               | Associate  | 21 | 4.2381 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Professor  | 2  | 4.6250 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Recognition and Reward        | Instructor | 15 | 3.6000 | Between Groups | 12.015  | 4   | 3.004 | 2.843*  |
|                               | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.2677 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Assistant  | 80 | 3.7063 | Within Groups  | 223.967 | 212 | 1.056 |         |
|                               | Associate  | 21 | 3.5238 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Professor  | 2  | 4.7500 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Working Conditions            | Instructor | 15 | 4.1667 | Between Groups | 8.963   | 4   | 2.241 | 3.857** |
|                               | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.8308 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Assistant  | 80 | 4.1281 | Within Groups  | 123.170 | 212 | 0.581 |         |
|                               | Associate  | 21 | 4.4524 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Professor  | 2  | 4.3750 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Job Security                  | Instructor | 15 | 4.3556 | Between Groups | 5.927   | 4   | 1.482 | 1.767   |
|                               | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.9630 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Assistant  | 80 | 4.1083 | Within Groups  | 177.786 | 212 | 0.839 |         |
|                               | Associate  | 21 | 4.3651 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Professor  | 2  | 5.0000 |                |         |     |       |         |
| My Work Itself                | Instructor | 15 | 4.1833 | Between Groups | 6.663   | 4   | 1.666 | 2.843*  |
|                               | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.9419 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Assistant  | 80 | 4.2094 | Within Groups  | 124.183 | 212 | 0.586 |         |
|                               | Associate  | 21 | 4.4048 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Professor  | 2  | 4.8750 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Responsibilities | Instructor | 15 | 3.9667 | Between Groups | 13.127  | 4   | 3.282 | 3.190*  |
|                               | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.5101 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Assistant  | 80 | 3.9031 |                | 218.112 | 212 | 1.029 |         |

|                           |            |    |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|---------------------------|------------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
|                           | Associate  | 21 | 4.1190 | Within Groups  |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Professor  | 2  | 4.7500 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Achievements | Instructor | 15 | 4.0000 | Between Groups | 12.130  | 4   | 3.032 | 3.206*  |
|                           | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.4621 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Assistant  | 80 | 3.8531 | Within Groups  | 200.525 | 212 | 0.946 |         |
|                           | Associate  | 21 | 3.9286 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Professor  | 2  | 4.7500 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Advancement  | Instructor | 15 | 3.2667 | Between Groups | 12.405  | 4   | 3.101 | 2.262   |
|                           | Lecturer   | 99 | 2.9646 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Assistant  | 80 | 3.3625 | Within Groups  | 290.624 | 212 | 1.371 |         |
|                           | Associate  | 21 | 3.5476 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Professor  | 2  | 4.2500 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Salary                    | Instructor | 15 | 4.2000 | Between Groups | 11.077  | 4   | 2.769 | 3.586** |
|                           | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.8153 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Assistant  | 80 | 4.1916 | Within Groups  | 163.701 | 212 | 0.772 |         |
|                           | Associate  | 21 | 4.3495 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Professor  | 2  | 5.0000 |                |         |     |       |         |
| All Domains               | Instructor | 15 | 4.0873 | Between Groups | 7.605   | 4   | 1.901 | 3.293*  |
|                           | Lecturer   | 99 | 3.7446 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Assistant  | 80 | 4.0463 | Within Groups  | 122.406 | 212 | 0.577 |         |
|                           | Associate  | 21 | 4.1948 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                           | Professor  | 2  | 4.7300 |                |         |     |       |         |

**Table (9)** shows there are statistically significant differences at the "0.05" significance level in the total degree of all domains in job satisfaction; this means the level of job satisfaction is affected by the academic rank variable in most domains of job satisfaction. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of "0.05" in Supervision, Interpersonal Relationships, and

Job Security domains. Because of having more than one academic rank level, the researchers used the "LSD" test to know the significance of differences between averages. The results showed in all domains of job satisfaction in favor of faculty members with a rank professor, associate professor, and assistant professor comparative with lecturer then instructor respectively.

**Table 10:** Results of the ANOVA analysis to examine the impact of a variable age on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members

| Domains | Age     | N  | Mean   |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       |
|---------|---------|----|--------|--|----------------|----|-------------|---------|
|         | Less 30 | 19 | 3.7895 |  | 9.918          | 3  | 3.306       | 4.292** |

|                             |         |    |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
| Administrative Polices      | 31-40   | 98 | 3.7679 | Between Groups |         |     |       |         |
|                             | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.1971 | Within Groups  | 164.059 | 213 | 0.770 |         |
|                             | More 50 | 15 | 4.2167 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Supervision                 | Less 30 | 19 | 4.3158 | Between Groups | 7.021   | 3   | 2.340 | 3.210*  |
|                             | 31-40   | 98 | 3.9796 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.3082 | Within Groups  | 155.293 | 213 | 0.729 |         |
|                             | More 50 | 15 | 4.4800 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Interpersonal Relationships | Less 30 | 19 | 4.1842 | Between Groups | 5.781   | 3   | 1.927 | 2.765*  |
|                             | 31-40   | 98 | 3.9515 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.2029 | Within Groups  | 148.433 | 213 | 0.697 |         |
|                             | More 50 | 15 | 4.5167 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Recognition and Reward      | Less 30 | 19 | 3.5526 | Between Groups | 2.768   | 3   | 0.923 | 0.843   |
|                             | 31-40   | 98 | 3.3980 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | 41 - 50 | 85 | 3.5235 | Within Groups  | 233.213 | 213 | 1.095 |         |
|                             | More 50 | 15 | 3.8333 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Working Conditions          | Less 30 | 19 | 4.1053 | Between Groups | 7.127   | 3   | 2.376 | 4.048** |
|                             | 31-40   | 98 | 3.8367 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.1765 | Within Groups  | 125.005 | 213 | 0.587 |         |
|                             | More 50 | 15 | 4.3500 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Job Security                | Less 30 | 19 | 4.1228 | Between Groups | 7.972   | 3   | 2.657 | 3.221*  |
|                             | 31-40   | 98 | 3.8912 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.2588 | Within Groups  | 175.740 | 213 | 0.825 |         |
|                             | More 50 | 15 | 4.4222 |                |         |     |       |         |
| My Work Itself              | Less 30 | 19 | 4.0921 | Between Groups | 6.034   | 3   | 2.011 | 3.432*  |
|                             | 31-40   | 98 | 3.9362 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.2882 | Within Groups  | 124.812 | 213 | 0.586 |         |
|                             | More 50 | 15 | 4.2667 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Less 30 | 19 | 3.9342 |                | 14.068  | 3   | 4.689 | 4.599** |

|                               |         |    |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|-------------------------------|---------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
| Professional Responsibilities | 31-40   | 98 | 3.4770 | Between Groups |         |     |       |         |
|                               | 41 - 50 | 85 | 3.9941 | Within Groups  | 217.171 | 213 | 1.020 |         |
|                               | More 50 | 15 | 4.0167 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Achievements     | Less 30 | 19 | 3.8684 | Between Groups | 10.381  | 3   | 3.460 | 3.644*  |
|                               | 31-40   | 98 | 3.4643 | Within Groups  | 202.274 | 213 | 0.950 |         |
|                               | 41 - 50 | 85 | 3.8735 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | More 50 | 15 | 4.0500 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Advancement      | Less 30 | 19 | 3.0526 | Between Groups | 7.776   | 3   | 2.592 | 1.870   |
|                               | 31-40   | 98 | 3.0204 | Within Groups  | 295.254 | 213 | 1.386 |         |
|                               | 41 - 50 | 85 | 3.4059 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | More 50 | 15 | 3.4000 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Salary                        | Less 30 | 19 | 4.0000 | Between Groups | 7.282   | 3   | 2.427 | 3.087*  |
|                               | 31-40   | 98 | 3.8578 | Within Groups  | 167.496 | 213 | 0.786 |         |
|                               | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.2115 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | More 50 | 15 | 4.3560 |                |         |     |       |         |
| All Domains                   | Less 30 | 19 | 3.9758 | Between Groups | 7.418   | 3   | 2.473 | 4.296** |
|                               | 31-40   | 98 | 3.7359 | Within Groups  | 122.593 | 213 | 0.576 |         |
|                               | 41 - 50 | 85 | 4.0965 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | More 50 | 15 | 4.2280 |                |         |     |       |         |

**Table (10)** shows there are statistically significant differences at the "0.01" significance level in the total degree of all domains in job satisfaction; this means the level of job satisfaction is affected by the age variable in most domains of job satisfaction. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of "0.05" in the Recognition and Reward and Professional Advancement domains. Because of having more than one age level, the researchers used the "LSD" test to know the significance of differences between averages. The results

showed in all domains of job satisfaction in favor of faculty members with age over 41 years compared to teaching staff with age less than 41 years.

**Table 11:** Results of the ANOVA analysis to examine the impact of the variable number of years of employment in first-year university programs on the level of job satisfaction of teaching staff

| Domains                     | Years in University | N  | Mean   |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|----|--------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|
| Administrative Polices      | Less 4              | 68 | 3.8346 | Between Groups | 5.790          | 3   | 1.930       | 2.444 |
|                             | 5-7                 | 79 | 3.8766 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | 8-10                | 57 | 4.1930 | Within Groups  | 168.188        | 213 | 0.790       |       |
|                             | more10              | 13 | 4.2500 |                |                |     |             |       |
| Supervision                 | Less 4              | 68 | 4.1324 | Between Groups | 0.342          | 3   | 0.114       | 0.150 |
|                             | 5-7                 | 79 | 4.1671 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | 8-10                | 57 | 4.2000 | Within Groups  | 161.972        | 213 | 0.760       |       |
|                             | more10              | 13 | 4.2923 |                |                |     |             |       |
| Interpersonal Relationships | Less 4              | 68 | 4.0221 | Between Groups | 1.227          | 3   | 0.409       | 0.569 |
|                             | 5-7                 | 79 | 4.0981 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | 8-10                | 57 | 4.1974 | Within Groups  | 152.986        | 213 | 0.718       |       |
|                             | more10              | 13 | 4.2500 |                |                |     |             |       |
| Recognition and Reward      | Less 4              | 68 | 3.4559 | Between Groups | 3.430          | 3   | 1.143       | 1.047 |
|                             | 5-7                 | 79 | 3.4051 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | 8-10                | 57 | 3.6930 | Within Groups  | 232.552        | 213 | 1.092       |       |
|                             | more10              | 13 | 3.3077 |                |                |     |             |       |
| Working Conditions          | Less 4              | 68 | 3.9449 | Between Groups | 3.690          | 3   | 1.230       | 2.040 |
|                             | 5-7                 | 79 | 3.9778 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | 8-10                | 57 | 4.2412 | Within Groups  | 128.442        | 213 | 0.603       |       |
|                             | more10              | 13 | 3.8462 |                |                |     |             |       |
| Job Security                | Less 4              | 68 | 4.1225 | Between Groups | 1.146          | 3   | 0.382       | 0.446 |
|                             | 5-7                 | 79 | 4.0000 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | 8-10                | 57 | 4.1754 | Within Groups  | 182.566        | 213 | 0.857       |       |
|                             | more10              | 13 | 4.1282 |                |                |     |             |       |
| My Work Itself              | Less 4              | 68 | 4.0625 | Between Groups | 0.436          | 3   | 0.145       | 0.237 |
|                             | 5-7                 | 79 | 4.1044 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | 8-10                | 57 | 4.1798 | Within Groups  | 130.409        | 213 | 0.612       |       |
|                             | more10              | 13 | 4.0962 |                |                |     |             |       |
|                             | Less 4              | 68 | 3.7647 |                | 2.464          | 3   | 0.821       | 0.765 |

|                               |        |    |        |                |         |     |       |       |
|-------------------------------|--------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|
| Professional Responsibilities | 5-7    | 79 | 3.6329 | Between Groups |         |     |       |       |
|                               | 8-10   | 57 | 3.8816 | Within Groups  | 228.776 | 213 | 1.074 |       |
|                               | more10 | 13 | 3.9231 |                |         |     |       |       |
| Professional Achievements     | Less 4 | 68 | 3.6324 | Between Groups | 4.776   | 3   | 1.592 | 1.631 |
|                               | 5-7    | 79 | 3.5728 |                |         |     |       |       |
|                               | 8-10   | 57 | 3.8947 | Within Groups  | 207.879 | 213 | 0.976 |       |
|                               | more10 | 13 | 3.9808 |                |         |     |       |       |
| Professional Advancement      | Less 4 | 68 | 3.0000 | Between Groups | 6.872   | 3   | 2.291 | 1.647 |
|                               | 5-7    | 79 | 3.1835 |                |         |     |       |       |
|                               | 8-10   | 57 | 3.3596 | Within Groups  | 296.158 | 213 | 1.390 |       |
|                               | more10 | 13 | 3.6538 |                |         |     |       |       |
| Salary                        | Less 4 | 68 | 3.9221 | Between Groups | 4.423   | 3   | 1.474 | 1.844 |
|                               | 5-7    | 79 | 3.9661 |                |         |     |       |       |
|                               | 8-10   | 57 | 4.2400 | Within Groups  | 170.355 | 213 | 0.800 |       |
|                               | more10 | 13 | 4.2831 |                |         |     |       |       |
| All Domains                   | Less 4 | 68 | 3.8654 | Between Groups | 1.864   | 3   | 0.621 | 1.033 |
|                               | 5-7    | 79 | 3.8708 |                |         |     |       |       |
|                               | 8-10   | 57 | 4.0698 | Within Groups  | 128.147 | 213 | 0.602 |       |
|                               | more10 | 13 | 4.0508 |                |         |     |       |       |

**Table (11)** shows no statistical differences at the "0.05" significance level in the total degree of all domains in job satisfaction. This means the level

of job satisfaction is not affected by the variable number of years of employment in the first-year university programs.

**Table 12:** Results of ANOVA analysis to examine the impact of variable experience on job satisfaction

| Domains                | Experience | N  | Mean   |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F             |
|------------------------|------------|----|--------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------------|
| Administrative Polices | 1-5        | 20 | 3.8125 | Between Groups | 8.700          | 4   | 2.175       | <b>2.790*</b> |
|                        | 6 - 9      | 30 | 3.8417 |                |                |     |             |               |
|                        | 10-14      | 60 | 3.8083 | Within Groups  | 165.278        | 212 | 0.780       |               |
|                        | 15-20      | 51 | 3.9314 |                |                |     |             |               |
|                        | more 20    | 56 | 4.2991 |                |                |     |             |               |
| Supervision            | 1-5        | 20 | 4.2700 | Between Groups | 2.155          | 4   | 0.539       | <b>.713</b>   |
|                        | 6 - 9      | 30 | 4.1800 |                |                |     |             |               |



|                               |         |    |        |                |         |     |       |                |
|-------------------------------|---------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|----------------|
|                               | 10-14   | 60 | 4.0867 | Within Groups  | 160.159 | 212 | 0.755 |                |
|                               | 15-20   | 51 | 4.0784 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | more 20 | 56 | 4.3107 |                |         |     |       |                |
| Interpersonal Relationships   | 1-5     | 20 | 4.2250 | Between Groups | 3.283   | 4   | 0.821 | <b>1.153</b>   |
|                               | 6 - 9   | 30 | 4.1333 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | 10-14   | 60 | 3.9625 | Within Groups  | 150.930 | 212 | 0.712 |                |
|                               | 15-20   | 51 | 4.0441 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | more 20 | 56 | 4.2723 |                |         |     |       |                |
| Recognition and Reward        | 1-5     | 20 | 3.4500 | Between Groups | 2.776   | 4   | 0.694 | <b>.631</b>    |
|                               | 6 - 9   | 30 | 3.5667 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | 10-14   | 60 | 3.3250 | Within Groups  | 233.205 | 212 | 1.100 |                |
|                               | 15-20   | 51 | 3.5196 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | more 20 | 56 | 3.6161 |                |         |     |       |                |
| Working Conditions            | 1-5     | 20 | 4.1000 | Between Groups | 5.399   | 4   | 1.350 | <b>2.258*</b>  |
|                               | 6 - 9   | 30 | 3.9833 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | 10-14   | 60 | 3.8167 | Within Groups  | 126.734 | 212 | 0.598 |                |
|                               | 15-20   | 51 | 4.0441 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | more 20 | 56 | 4.2411 |                |         |     |       |                |
| Job Security                  | 1-5     | 20 | 4.1333 | Between Groups | 5.224   | 4   | 1.306 | <b>1.551</b>   |
|                               | 6 - 9   | 30 | 4.1556 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | 10-14   | 60 | 3.8611 | Within Groups  | 178.489 | 212 | 0.842 |                |
|                               | 15-20   | 51 | 4.1111 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | more 20 | 56 | 4.2738 |                |         |     |       |                |
| My Work Itself                | 1-5     | 20 | 4.0500 | Between Groups | 6.477   | 4   | 1.619 | <b>2.760*</b>  |
|                               | 6 - 9   | 30 | 4.0750 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | 10-14   | 60 | 3.8750 | Within Groups  | 124.368 | 212 | 0.587 |                |
|                               | 15-20   | 51 | 4.1912 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | more 20 | 56 | 4.3304 |                |         |     |       |                |
| Professional Responsibilities | 1-5     | 20 | 3.9625 | Between Groups | 14.989  | 4   | 3.747 | <b>3.674**</b> |
|                               | 6 - 9   | 30 | 3.6083 |                |         |     |       |                |
|                               | 10-14   | 60 | 3.4750 | Within Groups  | 216.251 | 212 | 1.020 |                |
|                               | 15-20   | 51 | 3.6716 |                |         |     |       |                |

|                           |         |    |        |                |         |     |       |              |
|---------------------------|---------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|--------------|
|                           | more 20 | 56 | 4.1429 |                |         |     |       |              |
| Professional Achievements | 1-5     | 20 | 3.9000 | Between Groups | 7.739   | 4   | 1.935 | <b>2.002</b> |
|                           | 6 - 9   | 30 | 3.6750 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | 10-14   | 60 | 3.4292 | Within Groups  | 204.916 | 212 | 0.967 |              |
|                           | 15-20   | 51 | 3.7255 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | more 20 | 56 | 3.9107 |                |         |     |       |              |
| Professional Advancement  | 1-5     | 20 | 3.0500 | Between Groups | 2.327   | 4   | 0.582 | <b>.410</b>  |
|                           | 6 - 9   | 30 | 3.1833 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | 10-14   | 60 | 3.0833 | Within Groups  | 300.703 | 212 | 1.418 |              |
|                           | 15-20   | 51 | 3.2941 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | more 20 | 56 | 3.3036 |                |         |     |       |              |
| Salary                    | 1-5     | 20 | 4.0005 | Between Groups | 4.874   | 4   | 1.218 | <b>1.520</b> |
|                           | 6 - 9   | 30 | 3.9780 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | 10-14   | 60 | 3.8667 | Within Groups  | 169.905 | 212 | 0.801 |              |
|                           | 15-20   | 51 | 4.0594 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | more 20 | 56 | 4.2679 |                |         |     |       |              |
| All Domains               | 1-5     | 20 | 3.9725 | Between Groups | 4.918   | 4   | 1.229 | <b>2.084</b> |
|                           | 6 - 9   | 30 | 3.8993 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | 10-14   | 60 | 3.7405 | Within Groups  | 125.093 | 212 | 0.590 |              |
|                           | 15-20   | 51 | 3.9225 |                |         |     |       |              |
|                           | more 20 | 56 | 4.1495 |                |         |     |       |              |

**Table (12)** shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the "0.05" significance level in the total degree of all domains in job satisfaction, and there are no significant differences at the "0.05" significance level of the job satisfaction at the following domains; Interpersonal Relationships, Recognition and Reward , Job Security , and Professional Achievements, The results also showed that there are significant differences at the "0.05"

significance level of the job satisfaction at the following domains; Administrative Polices , Working Conditions ,and Professional Responsibilities. Because of having more than one Experience level, the researchers used the "LSD" test to know the significance of differences between averages. The results in favor of faculty members with more than 20 years of experience than faculty members with less experience.

**Table 13:** Results of the ANOVA analysis to examine the impact of the department variable on the level of job satisfaction of faculty members

| Domains | Department | N | Mean |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F |
|---------|------------|---|------|--|----------------|----|-------------|---|
|---------|------------|---|------|--|----------------|----|-------------|---|

|                             |                  |    |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
| Administrative Polices      | Self-development | 54 | 4.2407 | Between Groups | 10.743  | 4   | 2.686 | 3.488** |
|                             | Basic science    | 55 | 4.0955 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Computer         | 28 | 3.9107 | Within Groups  | 163.235 | 212 | .770  |         |
|                             | English          | 73 | 3.6884 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Islamic          | 7  | 4.0357 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Supervision                 | Self-development | 54 | 4.2741 | Between Groups | 4.298   | 4   | 1.075 | 1.442   |
|                             | Basic science    | 55 | 4.3091 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Computer         | 28 | 4.0714 | Within Groups  | 158.016 | 212 | .745  |         |
|                             | English          | 73 | 4.0082 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Islamic          | 7  | 4.4286 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Interpersonal Relationships | Self-development | 54 | 4.2778 | Between Groups | 3.956   | 4   | .989  | 1.395   |
|                             | Basic science    | 55 | 4.1227 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Computer         | 28 | 4.0179 | Within Groups  | 150.258 | 212 | .709  |         |
|                             | English          | 73 | 3.9760 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Islamic          | 7  | 4.4643 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Recognition and Reward      | Self-development | 54 | 3.9630 | Between Groups | 24.226  | 4   | 6.056 | 6.063** |
|                             | Basic science    | 55 | 3.4545 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Computer         | 28 | 3.5714 | Within Groups  | 211.756 | 212 | .999  |         |
|                             | English          | 73 | 3.1027 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Islamic          | 7  | 3.8571 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Working Conditions          | Self-development | 54 | 4.3148 | Between Groups | 10.882  | 4   | 2.721 | 4.757** |
|                             | Basic science    | 55 | 4.1409 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Computer         | 28 | 3.9732 | Within Groups  | 121.250 | 212 | .572  |         |
|                             | English          | 73 | 3.7500 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                             | Islamic          | 7  | 4.0714 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Job Security                | Self-development | 54 | 4.2654 | Between Groups | 5.630   | 4   | 1.407 | 1.676   |

|                               |                  |    |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
|                               | Basic science    | 55 | 4.1939 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Computer         | 28 | 3.9167 | Within Groups  | 178.082 | 212 | .840  |         |
|                               | English          | 73 | 3.9269 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Islamic          | 7  | 4.3810 |                |         |     |       |         |
| My Work Itself                | Self-development | 54 | 4.3935 | Between Groups | 13.137  | 4   | 3.284 | 5.915** |
|                               | Basic science    | 55 | 4.2091 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Computer         | 28 | 4.1964 | Within Groups  | 117.708 | 212 | .555  |         |
|                               | English          | 73 | 3.7808 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Islamic          | 7  | 4.2500 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Responsibilities | Self-development | 54 | 4.0741 | Between Groups | 19.146  | 4   | 4.787 | 4.784** |
|                               | Basic science    | 55 | 3.9045 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Computer         | 28 | 3.5714 | Within Groups  | 212.093 | 212 | 1.000 |         |
|                               | English          | 73 | 3.4178 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Islamic          | 7  | 4.4286 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Achievements     | Self-development | 54 | 4.0787 | Between Groups | 17.247  | 4   | 4.312 | 4.678** |
|                               | Basic science    | 55 | 3.7909 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Computer         | 28 | 3.4018 | Within Groups  | 195.408 | 212 | .922  |         |
|                               | English          | 73 | 3.4281 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Islamic          | 7  | 4.1071 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Professional Advancement      | Self-development | 54 | 3.6204 | Between Groups | 22.806  | 4   | 5.701 | 4.313** |
|                               | Basic science    | 55 | 3.4000 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Computer         | 28 | 2.9286 | Within Groups  | 280.224 | 212 | 1.322 |         |
|                               | English          | 73 | 2.8493 |                |         |     |       |         |
|                               | Islamic          | 7  | 3.1429 |                |         |     |       |         |
| Salary                        | Self-development | 54 | 4.2778 | Between Groups | 14.563  | 4   | 3.641 | 4.817** |
|                               | Basic science    | 55 | 4.2729 |                |         |     |       |         |

|             |                  |    |        |                |         |     |       |         |
|-------------|------------------|----|--------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|---------|
|             | Computer         | 28 | 3.9057 | Within Groups  | 160.215 | 212 | .756  |         |
|             | English          | 73 | 3.7214 |                |         |     |       |         |
|             | Islamic          | 7  | 4.3357 |                |         |     |       |         |
| All Domains | Self-development | 54 | 4.0432 | Between Groups | 10.399  | 4   | 2.600 | 4.608** |
|             | Basic science    | 55 | 4.1970 |                |         |     |       |         |
|             | Computer         | 28 | 4.0444 | Within Groups  | 119.612 | 212 | .564  |         |
|             | English          | 73 | 3.8236 |                |         |     |       |         |
|             | Islamic          | 7  | 3.6679 |                |         |     |       |         |

Table (13) shows statistically significant differences at an indication level "0.01" In the total number of domains of job satisfaction; this means the level of job satisfaction is affected by the type of department variable in most domains of job satisfaction. The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences at the level of "0.05" in three domains are Supervision, Interpersonal Relationships, and job security. Because of having more than one age level, the researchers used the "LSD" test to know the significance of differences between averages. The results showed in all domains of job satisfaction in favor of faculty members in the departments self - development, basic science and Islamic studies compared to both the English and computer department.

Through the results of the study in terms of the degree, academic grade, age, years of work, experience and department, the researchers consider that this result makes sense to the members of the faculty at the higher academic level and the higher level. "Professor-Associate" and those with higher experience finished many of the requirements for promotion, incentives, promotions and rewards, and their tenure at the university made them build an expanded social relations network, thus having a higher degree of satisfaction compared to other academic and scientific ranks. The current study is consistent with the result of a study (Abu Khodava, 2018) which showed that the most experienced and most scientific faculty member is more satisfied than the rest of the teaching staff.

### Recommendations

In the light of the results of the research, the researchers recommend that:

- Reliance on universities for the full self-operation of their first-year university programmes.

- Promote an attractive and stimulating learning environment, considering periodic follow-up and the ongoing maintenance of classrooms.

### References

- [1] Abu Khudair, Bassam. (2018). Level of Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members in Jordanian Universities Located in the Northern Governorates: A Field Study. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, University of Bahrain, 2 (19), 569-605.
- [2] Al-Balawi, Muhammad. (2008). *Administrative Empowerment and its Relationship to Job Performance among Public School Teachers in Al-Wajh Province, Saudi Arabia from their Perspective*, Unpublished Master Thesis, Mu'tah University, Jordan.
- [3] Al-Da'is, Muhammad. (2016). The degree of job satisfaction among the faculty members of Sana'a University from their point of view. *Arab Journal for Quality Assurance of University Education*, 23 (9), 143-166.
- [4] Al-Rahmi, Ahmed, et al. (2019). Measuring the relationship between the application and development of quality standards and improving the educational process and its impact on the satisfaction

- of faculty members at King Khalid University. *American Arab Academy for Science and Technology*, 32 (10), 180-163.
- [5] Zoghbi, Marwan. (2011). *Job satisfaction concept, ways to measure the interpretation of degrees, and methods of increasing work*. Amman: Dar Al Massira.
- [6] Shraideh, Salem. (2008). *Job satisfaction: Theoretical frameworks and practical applications* (i 1). Amman: Dar Al Safa Publishing & Distribution.
- [7] Sharaman, Rafidah; (2014). The degree of job satisfaction of faculty members at Mu'tah University and its relation to their level of job performance. *Al-Manara Journal for Research and Studies*, No. 1.
- [8] Abadi, Hashim; Taie, Youssef; and Asadi, Afnan. (2008). *Department of University Education: A Modern Concept in Contemporary Administrative Thought*, Amman: Dar Al Warraq for Publishing and Distribution.
- [9] Abdan, Saad. (2019). Job satisfaction and its relationship to scientific productivity among the faculty members of the Technical College in Riyadh and Hail. *Arab Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, Arab Foundation for Education, Science and Arts, 9, 46-82.
- [10] Assaf, fit. 1427H. *Introduction to Research in Behavioral Sciences* (I 4). Riyadh: Obeikan.
- [11] Ali, Wael. (2018). Degree of Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members in Special Education Departments in Southern Region of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, National Research Center Gaza, 5 (2), 149-162.
- [12] Orabeh, Mobaraki. (2018). Work Satisfaction with University Professors: A Comparative Study at Mouloud Mamari Tiziouzou University as a Model. *Journal of the Human and Social Sciences Generation*, Scientific Research Generation Center, 44, 9-19.
- [13] Serious Lord, master. (2010). *Modern Trends in Business Administration*, Cairo: Shatat Publishing and Distribution House.
- [14] Hakim, Abdul Hamid. (2009). *Job satisfaction of teachers of general education and teachers of special groups of both sexes*. Unpublished comparative study. Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.
- [15] Abdul Baqi, Salahuddin Mohammed (2002). *Effective Behavior in Organizations*, Alexandria: The New University House.
- [16] Abdulaziz, Bushra (2014). The role of the work environment in promoting job satisfaction. *Journal of Baghdad College of Economic Sciences University*, 36.
- [17] Abdel Fattah, Mohamed. (2014). The degree of job satisfaction among the teaching staff working in the education and training companies operating for the preparatory year in Saudi universities: the preparatory year of the University of Tabuk as a model. *Journal of the World of Education*, Egypt, 45 (15) 89-141.
- [18] Abboud, Isaac. (2014). *The effect of job satisfaction on the performance of the teaching staff at the University of Nyala*, unpublished doctoral thesis, Omdurman Islamic University, Sudan.
- [19] Obeid, Shaher. (2014). The degree of job satisfaction among the faculty members of the Arab American University. *Ramah Journal for Research and Studies*, 13, 50-76.
- [20] Obeidat, Dhuqat; Abdul Haq, Kayed; and Adass, Abdul Rahman. (2001). *Scientific research concept and tools and methods*. Amman: Dar Al Fikr for Publishing and Distribution.
- [21] Maher, Ahmed. (2002). *Organizational Behavior: The Skills Building Approach*, Egypt: University Publishing House.
- [22] Mansour, Majeed. (2010). Degree of job satisfaction among faculty members at An-Najah National University in Palestine. *Journal of AlAzhar University in Gaza*, Humanities Series, 1 (12), 795-838.
- [23] Abushaira, M. (2012). Job Satisfaction among Special Education Teachers in Jordon, International interdisciplinary. *Journal of Education*, 1(3), 48-53.
- [24] Kumar, B. & Giri, V. (2009). Effect of age and experience on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 8 (1), 28 - 36.
- [25] Johnson, B. W. (2010). *Job satisfaction, self-efficacy, burnout and path of teacher certification: predictors of attrition in*

- special education teachers*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation; Capella University.
- [26] Terpstra, D & Honoree, A. (2006). *Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline and by geographic region*. Retrieved on January 18, 2018, from [www.search.ebscohost.com](http://www.search.ebscohost.com).
- [27] Kulikowski, K., Przytuła, S., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2021). The motivation of academics in remote teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic in polish universities—Opening the debate on a new equilibrium in e-learning. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2752; <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052752>
- [28] Szromek, A. R., & Wolniak, R. (2020). Job satisfaction and problems among academic staff in higher education. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 4865; <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12124865>
- [29] Chen, H., Liu, F., Pang, L., Liu, F., Fang, T., Wen, Y., ... & Gu, X. (2020). Are you tired of working amid the pandemic? The role of professional identity and job satisfaction against job burnout. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(24), 9188; <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17249188>