



EVALUATION OF ROLE CONFLICT AND ROLE OVERLOAD AS PREDICTORS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Aigbiremhon, Ikehide Joseph, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT)

Abstract: This study evaluated the role conflict and role overload as predictors of job satisfaction relations among academic staff of a University in South-east Nigeria. The objectives of the study were to determine whether role conflict will negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic) and to determine whether role overload will negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic). Two hundred and fifty-six academic staff of Enugu State University of Science and Technology participated in the study. The ages of the participants ranged from 28–69 years ($M=45.29$, $SD=8.98$). The participants were drawn using multi stage (cluster and purposive) sampling technique from Enugu state University of Science and Technology. The study was a cross-sectional survey study and self-rated measures were used to collect data from participants. These measures include Role Overload Index, Role Conflict Scale, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Moderated hierarchical regression was used for data analysis. The results indicated that role conflict was a significant predictor of intrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = .17$, $t = 3.21$, $p < .01$) and extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = .18$, $t = 2.69$, $p < .05$). Role overload was not a significant predictor of both extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction. These findings were discussed in the light of existing theories and empirical studies.

Keywords: Role conflict, Role overload, Job satisfaction, Predictor.

Introduction

Academic staff of higher educational institutions like Universities play vital roles in determining the success of the vision and mission of the institutions (Stankovska, Angelkoska, Osmani, & Grncarovska, 2017). They constitute the driving force of academic excellence of the University (Acikgoz, 2019). University lecturers are saddled with diverse roles ranging from teaching to supervision, mentorship, administration and research. As scientific workers, they carry out independent researches that are critical for their institutions to remain the stronghold of ideologies (Dai, Zhuang, & Huan, 2019); teach the students; supervise and mentor students and younger colleagues in their areas and in research; serve as administrators in the Universities (as Heads of

Departments, Deans of Faculties and Directors of Units), hence their work roles are in no dispute considered to be very stressful (Dai, et al., 2019).

Several studies have shown that role-based stress (role conflict and role overload) influence employee's job satisfaction (higher work stress experienced by the teachers, lower will be their satisfaction with their job) (Usman, Ahmed, Ahmed, & Akbar, 2011). This is because most of the organizations are demanding for better job outcome. This ever changing demands of the workplace can increase levels of stress and thus affect job dissatisfaction, especially for those who are consistently working under pressure such as university lecturers or academics (Firestone, 2014) due to increasing number of academic positions that are now untenured; increased

Academic Journal of Current Research

An official Publication of Center for International Research Development

Double Blind Peer and Editorial Review International Referred Journal; Globally index

Available www.cird.online/AJCR: E-mail: AJCR@CIRD.ONLINE



workload; and lecturers under increased pressure to attract external funds for their research and to either 'publish or perish' (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough, 2001).

These job roles could expose lecturers to such levels of job stress that could force them to deviate from normal functioning thus, reducing job satisfaction (Zainudin, Junaidah, & Nazmi, 2010). Since lecturers need to take on more roles in their schools to address the expectations of students, parents and the community, developing the needed self-belief, professional knowledge, skills and competencies by these teachers (Parker, Turner, & Griffin, 2003) which can be seen when one is taking on and mastering challenging tasks (self-efficacy) directed at educational success and lecturers job satisfaction (Filak & Sheldon, 2003) becomes a necessity.

Job satisfaction refers to the fulfillment acquired by experiencing various job activities and rewards (Peretomode, 1991). It has also been linked with enhanced job performance, positive work values, high levels of employee's increased output, lower rates of absenteeism, and turnovers (Ngo, 2009). Job satisfaction is the most significant factor in understanding worker motivation, effectiveness, retention and performance (Bashayreh, 2009). Employee job satisfaction ensures customer satisfaction, boost effective succession planning and subsequently improve management and investor's confidence (Mello, 2007). Therefore, a lecturer who has high job satisfaction is perceived to have a high level of commitment to his or her work and perform well (Judge, Thoresen, & Patton, 2001) but when under pressure especially from role conflict and role overload, productivity and motivation to perform job becomes low (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough (2001).

Research reports that highly satisfied employees tend to have better mental and physical health, learn new job-related tasks more quickly, are able to manage job stress, and file fewer grievances (Okonkwo, 1997). In

contrast, dissatisfied employees may cause undesirable job outcomes by lateness, drug use, sabotage, display of disruptive behaviours, as well as demonstrating high rates of absenteeism (Bashayreh, 2009). Kuria (2011) stated that employees are the most satisfied and highly productive when their job offers them intrinsic and extrinsic factors such as recognition of their effort, clarity of roles, autonomy, clean policy of grievances, opportunity to contribute ideas and suggestions, proper job schedules and managing the various job roles, etc. And Nwankwo (1982) concluded that the more intrinsic and extrinsic needs of workers are satisfied within an organization, the more they are motivated to different workloads because a satisfied worker operates at two levels of satisfaction, namely his own needs satisfaction and the satisfaction of the needs of the organization.

The relevance of job satisfaction to the long-term growth of any organization and by extension, educational system around the world is very crucial (Best, 2010). A study by Jafar, Kavousian, Beigy, Emami, and Hadavizadeh (2010) identified five major aspects of job satisfaction as: satisfaction from job, satisfaction from supervisor, satisfaction from colleagues, satisfaction from salary and satisfaction from promotion. Research has shown that teachers have both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction needs (Nyarko, Wiafe & Abdul-Nasiru, 2013). A teacher who is intrinsically motivated may undertake a task for its own sake, for the satisfaction it provides or for the feeling of accomplishment and self-actualization. On the other hand, an extrinsically motivated teacher may perform the activity or duty in order to obtain a reward such as salary. University lecturers derive intrinsic satisfaction from the nature of day-to-day classroom activities, such as developing warm and personal relationship with students, seeing students make progress, working with supportive colleagues, overall school climate (Cockburn & Haydn, 2004) as well as the intellectual challenge of teaching and autonomy (Amazt & Idris, 2011)



while dissatisfaction is traceable to extrinsic factors of workload (role conflict and role overload), poor pay and low recognition (Tsigilis, Zachopoulou & Grammatikopoulos, 2006).

Role-based stress can be defined as the pressure experienced by an individual as a result of organizational and job-specific factors in the form of demands and constraints that have been placed on them (Sager, 1991). It is the inability to cope with the pressures in a job, because of a poor fit between someone's abilities and his or her work requirements and conditions (Holmlund-Rytkönen & Strandvik, 2005). Role stress theory states that organizational factors generate role expectations among role senders, who then transmit these as role pressures to the person, hence role-based stress is very much an individual's reaction, and it is also organizational and job-related (Chen & Silverthorne, 2008). Thus, role-based stress refers to work-related psychological stress, as well as an individual's ability to handle a particular situation or work environment (Jamal, 1999) mainly because of fatigue that results from pressure to comply with the set of demands (Posig & Kickul, 2003). The dimensions of role-based stress, as classified by Kelloway and Barling, (1990); Peiro, Gonzalez-Roma, Tordera, and Manas, (2001) are four separate but related constructs: role overload, role underload, role ambiguity and role conflict.

Role overload is one dimension of role-based stress, which is a form of person–role conflict subsumed with other roles and it exists when role expectations are greater than the individual's abilities and motivation to perform a task (Conley & Woosley, 2000); when an individual must complete a wide variety of tasks in an insufficient amount of time (Thiagarajan, Chakrabarty, & Taylor, 2006) or when the role is too difficult (Gilbreath & Montesino, 2006). It may also occur in a strictly quantitative sense (too much work to accomplish) or in a more qualitative sense (work too difficult to accomplish) (Topper, 2007). Role overload describes situations in

which employees feel that there are too many responsibilities or activities expected of them in the light of the time available, their abilities, and other constraints (Cooper, Dewe, & O'Driscoll, 2001).

William and Alliger (1994) described role overload as individualized. Individuals differ in their ability to handle or cope with different stressors, such as role overload. For example, some university lecturers might be unable to cope with the demands of teaching and might experience role overload. A new lecturer might attribute the situation to the institution, whereas a more seasoned lecturer might attribute the situation to work within the institution/organization. Similarly, role attributes have various effects on different individuals (William & Alliger, 1994). Individuals are willing to accept roles because they provide important psychological benefits such as status, ego gratification, and increased self-esteem. However, there are also potential costs associated with the roles when individuals are not able to perform those roles as expected such as job dissatisfaction, fatigue, and tension (William & Alliger, 1994). Employees are concerned about their work roles because their satisfactions are based on the fulfillment of role expectations (Ashforth & Lee, 1990).

Factors causing role-based stress can be divided into two categories: one is related to job tasks, simple or complex tasks, diversified or monotonous, or physical conditions of work environment; the other is related to role characteristics, such as role conflict, role ambiguity, role underload and role overload (Riggio, 2003). Other factors like role-related demands, lack of resources, lack of support and insufficient time to keep abreast with overall job demands (extrinsic factors) are frequently reported as the sources of role-based stress among university lecturers (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough, 2001) while Lease (1999) reported in particular that new academic members especially felt the pressure of role overload. Being new on the job, they tend to have a low level of



perceived ability to handle teaching and research (Taris, Schreur, Silfhout, & Van Iersel-Van, 2001). University management, on the other hand, emphasizes academic excellence, responsibility, accountability and competitiveness with its overbearing demands on the lecturers (Kinman & Jones, 2004) hence role overload occurs when the lecturer's role simply becomes too demanding or too big which could cause low job satisfaction (Ofoegbu & Nwadiani, 2006). In his meta-analysis, Winefield (2000) concluded that increased stress levels in academics were associated with increased workload and reduced satisfaction while Liu and Ramsey (2008) noted that inadequate time for planning and preparation and a heavy teaching workload reduces satisfaction from teaching.

On the other hand, role underload according to Cooper and Dewe (2004) is associated with underutilization of the role occupant and is stressful for the occupant. Workplace boredom can be even more stressful and damaging than overwork and become silent killer of team productivity. Ganster, Fusilier and Mayes (1986) reported that work underload is stressful and positively related to dissatisfaction and depression. While Spector, Dwyer and Jex (1988) reported work underload as a job stressor and measured work underload by measuring the quantum of work and amount of free time available, Kahn and Cooper (1993) reported that qualitative work underload results from routine and repetitive tasks and leads to lack of mental stimulation; conversely, quantitative work underload results from very few tasks to do, leaving excess time available after completing all the tasks. Both types of work underload are stressful and lead to lower job satisfaction of the employee.

Role ambiguity arises when individuals do not have clear authority or knowledge about how to perform the assigned jobs (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980) or a lack of necessary information for an organizational position, resulting in role dissatisfaction, anxiety, fear, hostility and

role conflict (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980). Employees also experience role-based stress as a result of role ambiguity (Usman, Ahmed, Ahmed, & Akbar, 2011) where there is conflicting demands placed on them, their role is not very clear as to what to do, what not to do, who to report and what targets are to be achieved and, also, they have to work longer hours and feel overloaded in their role. Similarly, there is also evidence that academics experience role ambiguity due to lack of regular feedback received by them about how well they were doing (Sharpley, Reynolds, Acosta, & Dua, 1996). Higher ambiguity may also arise due to lack of clarity regarding how to juggle different academic activities of teaching, research and professional services that are necessary for the successful accomplishment of academic role and job satisfaction (Bandura & Locke, 2003). When roles of the lecturers are ambiguous, it will lead towards the conflicting demand placed on them (Usman, Ahmed, Ahmed, & Akbar, 2011).

Role conflict refers to incompatibility of expectations and demands associated with the role (Ashforth & Lee, 1990). It occurs when a role occupant is required to perform two or more roles that present incongruent, contradictory, or even mutually exclusive activities (Rahim 2011) while Onyemah (2008) describes role conflict as a feeling of being torn in multiple directions, resulting in the inability of the role occupant to satisfy every role partner. According to Judeh (2011), role conflict may arise in a situation where two employees have different views about their work resulting in conflicting demands and expectations thereby leading to incompatible decisions and in the opinion of Quarat-ul-ain, Khattak, and Iqbal, (2013), role conflict is caused by incompatibility of demands with employee's goals, ability, value and belief. Differently put, a conflict is said to occur across two or more roles when a role occupant experiences contradictory or incompatible expectations on the role he/she occupies (inter-role conflict) (Rahim 2011). A conflict is also said to occur within a role when there are different expectations,



unclear demands of role or conflicting demand within a role (intra-role conflict) (Nir & Eyal, 2003). Either way, role conflict is detrimental to the success of any organization as the role occupants become confused by the conflicting expectations of them.

Myers (1990) highlighted three types of role conflicts: one type is the conflict between the person and the role. For example, a lecturer appointed to a supervisory position may not really believe in keeping close control over the students and it goes against the individual's personality to be "hard" or shout on others, but this is what the Dean of the Faculty expects. A second type is intra-role conflict created by contradictory expectations about how a given role should be played. Should a new supervisor be autocratic or democratic in dealing with the students or workers? Finally, inter-role conflict results from the differing requirements of two or more roles that must be played at the same time. Work roles and non work roles are often in such conflict. For example, a successful female Faculty Dean who works from 7a.m to 9p.m may lose her husband in the process, who gets fed up with her long hours outside home. Conflict may also occur when employees disagree about what the expectations are for a particular role, because of obligations to different groups, and role conflicts can also occur within a single organization ((Okonkwo, 2013). An example would be conflict between times spent at work leaving very little time to devote to other roles in the family by the female university lecturer that it brings disequilibrium into her home roles.

Statement of the problem

Many organizations nowadays are suffering because of low employee job satisfaction and output as a result of role-based related stress of role conflict and role overload (Khurshid, Butt & Malik, 2011) and given the ever increasing global nature of the service sector, the competitiveness of the knowledge era, key players such as university lecturers are constantly working under pressure (Sorcinelli & Gregory, 2006) due to heavy workload,

home-work interface, role ambiguity, conflicting job demands, striving for publication, insufficiency of funds, inappropriate curricula, industrial conflicts and administrative inefficiencies Ahsan, Abdullah, Fie & Alam, 2009). Several researchers (Archibong, Bassey & Effiom, 2010) have provided evidence that role conflict and role overload experienced by university lecturers particularly in Nigeria often lower their job satisfaction but their self-efficacy may help mitigate experiences of job related stressors among university lecturers. Consequently, (Torres, Padilla, & Montero-Simo, 2013; Elisabeth & Greenfeld, 2013) posited that the perceived ability of individual teacher (self-efficacy) that bring in social support, coping skills and individual difference will serve as a moderator in reducing the range of job stress thus decreasing stress levels. For example, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) stated that teachers' self-efficacy motivates school teachers to overcome various setbacks that arise in their job with great intrinsic satisfaction, hence the interest of this study in providing answers to the following problems:

1. Will role conflict negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic)?
2. Will role overload negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic)?

Objectives of the Study

1. To determine whether role conflict will negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic).
2. To determine whether role overload will negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic).

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be tested:

Ho: Role conflict will negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic).

Ho: Role overload will negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic).



LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

The following theories were reviewed in this section in order to explain the link between the study variables:

Work Adjustment Theory (Davis, England, & Lofquist, 1964)

The theory of work adjustment is based on the concept of correspondence between the individual and environment (Davis & Lofquist, 1984). This theory includes a basic assumption that the individual seeks to achieve and to maintain correspondence with the environment (Pandimeenal, 2014). There are many kinds of environments that may exist for an individual – home, school, work, church and according to Pandimeenal (2014), an individual must relate with these environment and the rate at which one achieves and maintains correspondence with one environment may affect the correspondence with other environments. Looking at the present study, work represents one of such environment in which one must relate (Pandimeenal, 2014). Satisfaction with one's work then indicates the correspondence between the individual and the work environment (Davis & Lofquist, 1984).

The theory was formulated based on the idea that the individual is a responding organism (Davis, England & Lofquist, 1964). As individuals respond to their environment, their responding becomes associated with reinforcements in the environment (Pandimeenal, 2014). Davis et al. (1964) summarized the theory of work adjustment in the following statements:

1. Work is conceptualized as an interaction between an individual and a work environment.
2. The work environment requires that certain tasks be performed, and the individual brings skills to perform the tasks.
3. In exchange, the individual requires compensation for work performance and certain preferred

conditions, such as a safe and comfortable place to work.

4. The environment and the individual must continue to meet each other's requirements for the interaction to be maintained. The degree to which the requirements of both are met may be called correspondence.
5. Work adjustment is the process of achieving and maintaining correspondence. Work adjustment is indicated by the satisfaction of the individual with the work environment and by the satisfaction of the work environment with the individual, by the individual's satisfaction.
6. Satisfaction and satisfactoriness result in tenure, the principal indicator of work adjustment.
7. Work personalities and work environments can be described in terms of structure and style of variables that are measured on the same dimensions (p.9-10).

A look at the seven summary statements of work adjustment shows the link between role stressors (conflict and overload) and job satisfaction. Role conflict and overload makes the work environment not to be a comfortable place of work for the employee. An academic staff that is experiencing either or the both of these stressors will show serious discomfort with the work environment. This will arouse a sense of in-correspondence between the individual and the work environment, thereby causing the employee not to be satisfied with the job he is doing in that environment.

Two-factor theory (Herzberg, 1959)

Herzberg (1959) theory lays emphasis on the motivator-hygiene factors in order to explain satisfaction in the organization. The theory focuses on outcomes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction and further found that certain aspects of a job caused satisfaction, but certain aspects caused job dissatisfaction (Dugguh & Ayaga, 2014). Herzberg explained that the factors that lead to



satisfaction or to dissatisfaction are different. Accordingly, he states that ‘the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction but, rather, no satisfaction; and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction but no dissatisfaction’ (Herzberg, 2003). This theory states that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is a product of different factors – motivation and hygiene respectively. Motivation is seen as an inner force that drives individuals to attain personal and organizational goals. Motivational factors are those aspects of the job that make people want to perform and provide people with satisfaction. Hygiene factors include aspects of the working environment like working conditions, interpersonal matters, organizational policies and so on (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Factors that relate to job satisfaction are therefore called satisfiers. According to Weir (1976) and Syptak, Marsland and Ulmer (1999), the following factors stood out as ‘strong determinants of job satisfaction’: achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, opportunity for advancement or promotion; and factors that relate to job dissatisfaction (dissatisfiers or hygiene factors) are: pay (salary), supervision, working conditions, company policies, administration and procedures, status and security.

An employee that suffers from job overload and/or conflict in their work responsibilities has impediments in meeting up with the job requirements and as such experiences under-achievement or lack of achievement. This will lead to no satisfaction in the job. Also when company policies are not well spelt out to show vividly the employees’ working conditions, the employees feel a sense of work conflict and running through responsibilities caves the employee into work overload, and they cause a state of dissatisfaction with the job.

This theory explains how lack of achievement due to role overload and role conflict can lead employees not to be satisfied with their jobs in the organization. Having a high job demand with little time and resources to overcome the demands will lead to no achievement. Also, when

working conditions (a hygiene factor) are not spelt out thereby leading to conflict of roles, the employee is also dissatisfied with work. Academic staffs of universities are exposed to work overload in terms of demand for teaching and research with little or no resources. The requirement of research experience for promotion is a placing a high demand on the academic to pursue different research undertaking even with the over demanding responsibility of administering classes. The work pay at some point does not make sense when the pursuit of “next level achievement” is blocked by loads of work untreated.

Organizational role theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, & Snoek, 1964)

Role theory posits that organizational factors generate role expectations among role senders, who then transmit these as role pressures to the person and that role attributes have various effects on different individuals (Idris, 2011). According to William and Alliger (1994), people are willing to accept roles because they provide important psychological benefits such as status, ego gratification, and increased self-esteem. However, there are also potential costs associated with the roles when individuals are not able to perform those roles as expected (Idris, 2011).

Central to the theory of organizations by Kahn et al. (1964) is the role concept. Accordingly, as social systems, organizations are defined and controlled by the patterned behaviours and socially constructed relationships of their members (Stevenson, 2014). The set of activities expected of an individual, located in a given position, constitutes the role required to be performed (Stevenson, 2014). Observing the role behaviour of the members of an organization therefore provides an opportunity to study the impact of an organization upon the individual (Kahn et al. 1964).

Acknowledging Linton’s (1936) emerging use of the role concept in the social sciences and the important work on structure and social action by Parsons (1951),



Kahn and colleagues drew directly from a number of other sources to systematically describe how role incumbents interact with other members of generic organizational systems (Stevenson, 2014). From Merton (1957), they borrowed the concept of role-set to indicate the complement of relationships that individuals have by virtue of occupying a particular social position. (For instance, one or more students, faculty directors/deans, the university senate and management team, or non-teaching staff could all form part of a lecturer's role-set.) Each member of the role-set develops beliefs and attitudes about what should or should not be done to fulfill that role and these expectations are communicated, or sent, to the focal person in an attempt to influence the role incumbent (Stevenson, 2014).

The key point, as argued by Kahn et al. (1964), is that activities that define a role are upheld through the expectations of role-set members, and these expectations are constantly communicated in the form of role pressures. From Gross, Mason, and McEachern, (1958), it was deduced that role pressures vary along a number of dimensions, such as magnitude, intensity or direction, and in Kahn et al.'s model, when perceived and cognitively processed by the focal person, they take the form of received role forces (Stevenson, 2014). The sent role represents the objective view of required role activities. The received role consists of the perceptions of what was sent and is thus the "immediate influence" for role behaviour (Katz and Kahn, 1966). This process by which the expectations of role set members are linked to role behaviours is described by Kahn and his colleagues as a role episode (Stevenson, 2014).

According to Kahn and his colleagues, in the ongoing life of a social group or organization, role incumbents will be involved in numerous role episodes, which may therefore impose pressures towards a variety of behaviours, which in turn may also be affected directly or indirectly according to the context of the situation

(Stevenson, 2014). There is another important factor that potentially influences the focal person of the role episodes (Stevenson, 2014). Each person has a personal set of values and beliefs about what behaviours are appropriate for their role and what abilities they possess. In other words, individuals are role-senders to themselves, thereby creating internal pressures and forces for role performance (Kahn et al., 1964). To the extent that these external and internal role pressures collectively or individually give rise to perceived role forces to fulfill expectation, the role incumbent may experience psychological stress (Stevenson, 2014).

Whenever individuals do not have clear guidelines regarding their role's authority and responsibility, they will experience stress, become dissatisfied, and perform less effectively (Lee & Schular, 1980). Employees are concerned about their work roles and goals because their rewards are based on the accomplishment of the work goals and fulfillment of role expectations (Ashforth & Lee, 1990).

According to Idris (2011), researchers agree that role stressors are made up of three main separate but related constructs: role overload, role ambiguity and role conflict (e.g. Peiro et al., 2001). Role overload exists when role expectations are greater than the individual's abilities and motivation to perform a task (Schaubroeck, et al., 1989; Spector & Jex, 1998; Conley & Woosley, 2000). Role ambiguity arises when individuals do not have clear authority or knowledge about how to perform the assigned jobs (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970). Role conflict refers to incompatibility of expectations and demands associated with the role (Ashforth & Lee, 1990).

Idris (2011) also pointed out that with regard to the experience of role stressors in academics, that literature provides clear evidence that academics are experiencing role overload (Gillespie et al., 2001). For example, academics were described as having difficulty in completing their assigned jobs properly due to task



overload (Gilliespie et al., 2001). The overload stems from different exercises that characterize their job- teaching, mentorship and research. All these match up with their after work roles in their families and personal lives.

A line of stress studies according to Idris (2011) has also detected the experience of role conflict among academics (Gillespie et al., 2001). Academics with role conflict can be characterized by those: without adequate resources; who have to bend a rule or policy; and who receive conflicting requests (Idris, 2011). For example, in order to accomplish the assigned task under inadequate resources, academics sometimes are forced to violate organizational policies and procedures (Idris, 2011). To certain extent, some academics were reported as having to reconcile the task of teaching and research (Rowley, 1996). For example, the pressures that were put on academics to focus simultaneously on quality of teaching and research under higher demands but tighter resource constraints have created strain (Rowley, 1996). As evidenced earlier, with the combination of higher teaching loads, tighter resources and higher demands from various stakeholders, there are potentials to lead to greater strain (Idris, 2011) thereby causing dissatisfaction in the workplace.

Role Conflict Theory (Merton, 1968)

Merton's role conflict theory posits that responsibilities from different domains compete for limited amount of time, physical energy and psychological resources (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). When employees (academic staff for example) swing between different roles (e.g., teaching, research, students supervision and mentoring), it leads to (the multiple/different roles) competing for the limited resources which leads to role conflict resulting to some negative consequences at work (Kopelman, Greenhaus, Connolly, & Thomas, 1983) including job dissatisfaction.

The role conflict theory posits that when the total demand on time and energy committed to work are too great for an employee to perform adequately and

comfortably, role overload occurs (Baruch & Barnett, 1986). However, Hammer, Kossek, Anger, Bodner and Zimmerman (2011) is of the opinion that personality attributes has been found to aid in the management of conflict across the different conflicting domains. In their position, individuals with high core self-evaluation (e.g., self-efficacy) will be able to manage and utilize time and the little available resources to overcome the demands of the different job roles which goes on to reduce the experiences of conflict.

Looking at the job of an academic staff from the standpoint of this theory will expose the fact that the several job demands of an academic staff of a university (teaching, research, administration, supervision and mentoring) will definitely pull them in various ways even with little or sometimes no resources which will enable them navigate through as they try to respond to the many statuses they hold such as teacher (in the classroom), researcher, administrator, research supervisor for students and mentor for younger academics and students. When this is more than what the available time, energy and other resources at the disposal of the academic staff can comfortably handle to bring about tangible result, the employee may feel dissatisfied with the work/job roles.

Even as this theory presents a reasonable explanation to the concept of role conflict and role overload, it did not successfully consider the advantages employees might draw from engaging in multiple job roles and job statuses in the organization. It did not also consider the place of years of experience, modern technology, training, expertise and support from colleagues and others which may reduce the effect role stressors on the employee.

Empirical Review

Oduwaiye (2006) in her study of role conflict and administrative effectiveness of Vice Principals of public secondary schools in Kwara state, Nigeria, reported a significant relationship between role conflict and



administrative effectiveness. She found also that role conflict and vague definition of roles affected the effectiveness of Vice Principals leading to low performance and job satisfaction.

Mossholder, Bedeian, and Armenakis (1981), using analysis of variance and multiple regression technique, investigated the influence of role conflict on job satisfaction and performance among 161 hospital professional personnel. The result showed that the role conflict affected the satisfaction of employees adversely. Individuals who were classified as being lowly satisfied experienced more conflict in their jobs than their counterpart who were more fairly satisfied. In the case of on-the-job performance, role conflict did not have any significant effect on the individual performance of the employees. However, there was a significant interaction between role conflict and job satisfaction in determining the performance of employees.

Urien and Osca (2012) in a study of role conflict and role overload with a sample gathered in a manufacturing setting at two different times, analyzed the role of task-oriented norm (job resource) and role stressors (job demands) to predict job satisfaction over time. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the principal and the interaction effects of role stressors (role conflict and role overload) and task-oriented norm to predict job satisfaction. Results confirm the negative effect of role conflict at Time 1 on job satisfaction at Time 2 showing the relevance of setting priorities to neutralize the negative effect of this stressor. Moreover, these results showed the interaction between task overload (Time 1) and task-oriented norm (Time 1) on job satisfaction (Time 2) after working together for more than one year as a permanent group.

Venkataraman and Ganapathi (2013) examined the impact of job stress on job satisfaction among 300 employees of small scale industries in Madurai. Using the correlation analysis, the result shows that the employee job

satisfaction is negatively and significantly associated with work load and role conflict, while the employee job satisfaction is positively and significantly correlated with physical environment in small scale industries. The regression analysis shows that the job stress factors of workload and role conflict have negative impact on employee job satisfaction while, the job stress factor of physical environment have the positive impact on employee job satisfaction at one percent level of significance. The study employed questionnaires to collect data for the study.

Beena (1999) in her study examined role conflict; role ambiguity and role overload of women executives in organizations. The results of the study revealed that role conflict significantly affected the job satisfaction, commitment and performance of women executives to their organization negatively. While Adidu (1998) using the same data, reported in her study that majority of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction in their job which is attributed to role ambiguity and role conflict.

Szilagyi, (1977) in a research examined the relationship of role conflict to job satisfaction and employee performance with 2,995 employees of a hospital as sample which employed correlation analysis. The results of the study revealed: (1) that role conflict was negatively related to job satisfaction ($r = -.54$), (2) that role conflict was negatively related to on-the-job performance ($-.43$), (3) that based on these results, it could be said that organizational role conflict affects the job satisfaction and performance of employee adversely.

Malik and Waheed (2010) investigated the mediating effects of job satisfaction on role stressors and affective commitment of branch managers of private sector commercial banks in Pakistan. The study result demonstrated that role conflict and role overload reduced job satisfaction and commitment of the bank managers.

Karadal, Ay, and Cuhadar (2008) examined the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on job satisfaction



and organizational commitment using the multiple regression technique in a sample of 219 executives from the public and private sector in Turkey. Results provided evidence of a negative relationship between role conflict and ambiguity on the job satisfaction of ($r=-0.34$; $p<0.001$) and ($r=-0.37$; $p<0.001$), respectively, and a strong and positive relationship between the organizational commitment variable and job satisfaction of ($r=0.67$; $p<0.001$). According to the researchers, these results show the bad management in establishing positions, delegating authority, and defining responsibilities and duties, which consequently create tensions among executives.

Ofori, Elikem, Kekleli, and Dapaah (2015) in a study of 210 respondents collected from university staff found that job satisfaction is influenced by role overload, role ambiguity, physical environment, supervisors support and coworkers support. The result of the study revealed that there is a small positive contribution of role overload and physical environment on job satisfaction, further finding reveals insignificant relationship between job satisfaction and coworker support. Finally the result indicate only 8% of variance of job satisfaction is been predicted by job stressor which is practically small.

Ali and Farooqi (2014) in a study of 207 teaching and non-teaching staff of Public Sector University of Gujranwala Division examined among other things, the effect of work overload on job satisfaction. The results of the study revealed a positive effect of work overload on job satisfaction. The researcher found in this study that stress in job due to different issues like work overload, coworkers behavior, etc. become harmful not for himself but for the organization which negatively affected the job satisfaction.

Chhabra (2016) investigated the direct effects of work role stressors and subjective fit perceptions on some employee outcomes including job satisfaction. The study involved 317 professionals from five sectors. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data and it showed among others that the work role stressors

(role conflict, role overload and role ambiguity) were negatively related to job satisfaction and OCB and positively related to turnover intentions.

Hashemi, Jamil, Kiumarsi, and Shno (2015) explored the concept of role stress in terms of role ambiguity and overload, and its relationship with job satisfaction. An evidence base for the impact of role stress/job satisfaction relationship on organizational commitment was provided. The results of the studies reviewed indicate (1) that stress has important effects on personnel and organizational outcomes (2) role overload at the work place may result in unfavorable outcomes such as low level of performance and low job satisfaction and possible resignation from work (3) therefore, identifying the job stress's factors in an organization will significantly improve job satisfaction.

Al-Ghamdi (2017) investigated role overload as a predictor of job stress among 100 university female teachers from two campuses of King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah. The differences among the married and single females with respect to role overload and job stress were analyzed. The results of study indicated that role overload is a significant predictor of job stress and job satisfaction. The impact of role overload and job stress was found to be insignificant between the married and unmarried female university teachers.

Khuong and Hai (2016) with a sample of 378 respondents identified six factors affecting job stress and job performance wherein he included work overload, role ambiguity & role conflict, working relationship, career development, and working environment. The results of the study identified that all the factors have positive and significant influence on job stress but negative influence on job satisfaction and performance. The result also revealed that job stress mediate the impact of career development on employee's job performance.

Remsburg, Armaccost and Bennett (1999) in a qualitative study of 15 nursing assistants on the workload



influences on job satisfaction reported that heavy workload was one of the major reasons for job dissatisfaction. Schaefer and Moos (1996) in a research also found that employees who reported more workload and scheduling problems were less satisfied with their job, more depressed, and had more physical symptoms.

Yaacob and Long (2015) studied role of occupational stress on job satisfaction. The research was conducted with 386 teachers from Malacca who completed the questionnaire survey. The participants were made of 282 female (73.1%) and 104 males (26.9%) majority of which were married (318 respondent, 82.4%) and 68 respondents (17.6%) were single. The participants indicated their length of services in teaching as more than 16 years (167 respondents, 43.4%), between period 6 to 10 years (82 respondents, 21.2%), teaching between 11 to 15 years (69 respondents, 17.9%), and teaching less than 5 years (68 respondents, 17.6%). The determinants of occupational stress that have been investigated under this study include role ambiguity, role overload, and work-family conflict. A cross sectional study was used to examine the relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction. Descriptive analysis, Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis were employed to analyze the data. The results showed (1) the level of role ambiguity and role overload was high (2) however, there was a moderate level of work-family conflict (3) that there is a significant relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction (4) that role ambiguity and role overload were predictors of job satisfaction.

In Chou's (2007) dissertation on the effects of job satisfaction on different sources of job support, 984 direct care workers in assisted living facilities were surveyed in Wisconsin. Chou found that job satisfaction was negatively correlated with role overload. These results mirrored those of a study by Pearson (2008) in which the psychological health, leisure satisfaction, job satisfaction and role overload of 155 employed women was assessed.

Again, role overload was found to negatively correlate with job satisfaction.

A study by Cartwright and Cooper (1997) on the effects of psychological strain and role overload on an organization's employees and job satisfaction revealed that psychological strain led to lower rates of productivity, job satisfaction and higher rates of absenteeism and turnover.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants in this study comprised two hundred and fifty-six (256) male and female academic staff of the Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) drawn from the 592 academic staff population (440 males and 152 females) of the university (Records and Statistics Units in the Registrar's Office, ESUT January 16, 2019).

Instruments

A questionnaire comprising demographic information and four scales categorized into sections (A, B, C, D) for easy administration and scoring was administered. The scales includes Johnson and Stinson (1975) Role Conflict Scale, Higgins and Duxbury (1991) Role Overload Index, Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, MSQ, and Sherer, Maddux, Mercadante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs.

Role Conflict Scale

Role conflict was measured by 10-item role conflict scale developed by Johnson and Stinson (1975) (section B). The role conflict scale contains ten items. The response categories to the items ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A score of 5 was given to strongly agree and a score of 1 to strongly disagree. Thus a high score on these scales denotes high role conflict. Examples of items are: "I am uncertain about how much authority I have; I have to do things that should be done differently; I work under incompatible policies and guide lines; and I receive conflicting requests from two or more people". Johnson



and Stinson (1975) reported a reliability ranging from 0.58 to 0.80. For the purpose of this study, the researcher obtained through a pilot study, a reliability coefficient of .69 (Cronbach's alpha) using a sample of academic staff from University of Nigeria, Enugu campus and Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu.

Role Overload Index.

Section B comprised role overload index developed by Higgins and Duxdury (1991). This instrument is a 9-item scale rated on a 5-point Likert format scale (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree) and it measures job stress in form of role overload in the workplace. Sample items include: "I have a good balance between my job and my family time; I wish, I had more time to do things for the family; Family life interferes with work; and My time of work does not match other family members' schedule well". Higgins and Duxdury (1991) reported reliability ranging from 0.40 to 0.72. However, the researcher obtained a Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of .76 using a sample of academic staff from University of Nigeria, Enugu campus and Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, MSQ

The 20-item MSQ was developed by Weiss et al. (1967) (section C) to measure job satisfaction. The 20-item inventory is the short version of the MSQ 100-item inventory. The inventory is rated using a 5-point Likert format ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5). Examples of the items are "Being able to keep busy all the time"; "The working conditions" and "The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job". The scale proposed three components of fulfillment in the work environment namely, intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction. All the items are directly scored. Score for intrinsic satisfaction is obtained by adding together the values for the responses on items 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 20 while, for extrinsic satisfaction, add values for responses on items 5,

6, 12, 13, 14, 19 and for the general satisfaction, sum up the value for the responses on all the items.

Weiss et al. (1967) reported a one-week interval test-retest reliability coefficient of .089 and a one-year interval coefficient of .70 for an American sample. However, using a Nigerian sample, Mogaji (1997) reported a 72-day interval test-retest reliability coefficient of .69, .82 and .94 for the intrinsic, extrinsic and general components of the scale. Obodo, Okonkwo and Aboh (2019) reported Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.79 while a pilot study conducted for the purpose of this study using a sample of academic staff from University of Nigeria, Enugu campus and Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu, yielded a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .84.

Procedure

The first step in the data collection process was the procurement of necessary approvals. Next, the Faculty Deans provided permission to use the full-time academic staff for the study.

The next step was to meet the Head of Departments (HODs) at each Faculty to present the research project and to obtain dates of scheduled departmental meetings. Building a rapport with the HODs was a key component to facilitate scheduling time for the Lecturers to complete the survey at the departmental meetings. At the meeting, each HOD received the research packet that included a letter of introduction, a cover letter, an informed consent, and survey tools and the survey questionnaire distributed to the lecturers. Lecturers, who did not attend the mandatory unit meeting along with others in some departments where meetings were not held but volunteered to participate, received a copy of the survey packet through the box at the HOD's office. Both the completed consent forms and the surveys were returned to the HODs and placed in sealed envelopes for the researcher's collection and data processing. All



respondents who returned completed surveys out of the 500 copies distributed comprised the study sample.

Participation was an important factor in this research. Strategies to increase awareness such as pre-notifying participants, meeting face-to-face with participants, and conducting follow-up procedures (meeting lecturers individually those found in their offices, phone call, In-faculty whatsapp platform and text messages) encouraged high response rates (Creswell, 2007; Salkind, 2005). Creswell (2007) stressed the importance of high response rates from participants in a study because of higher response rates create greater

confidence in generalizing the results to the population under study.

Design and Statistics

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design as data were collected to make inference about the population of interest at one point in time (Hall, 2008). Moderated hierarchical regression using the SPSS version 23 software was used for the data analysis in order to determine the relationships, moderation as well as the direction or strength of the relation between the study variables.



DATA AND RESULTS PRESENTATION

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Zero Order Correlations among Job Satisfaction and Role-based Stress Variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Sex	1.25	.43	-										
2. Age	45.29	8.98	-.185**	-									
3. Marital Status	2.78	.45	-.178**	.579**	-								
4. Qualification	2.30	.67	-.103	.411**	.361**	-							
5. Years in the University	2.64	1.35	-.177**	.625**	.447**	.373**	-						
6. Religion	1.01	.19	-.037	-.088	-.109	-.029	-.030	-					
7. Rank	3.70	1.68	-.162*	.678**	.505**	.611**	.661**	-.064	-				
8. Role Conflict	30.02	6.85	-.052	.398**	.379**	.181**	.302**	-.009	.335**	-			
9. Role Overload	30.64	7.02	.003	.091	.069	.006	-.044	-.105	.026	.494**	-		
10. Self-Efficacy	63.54	10.08	-.032	-.022	.119	.027	-.017	.098	.072	.175**	.183**	-	
11. Intrinsic Satisfaction	22.68	4.93	-.070	.066	.215**	.016	.103	-.021	.164**	.329**	.237**	.280**	-
12. Extrinsic Satisfaction	45.67	7.83	-.084	.147*	.170**	-.039	.059	.044	.226**	.234**	.170**	.554**	.542**

Note: ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; Sex (1= male, 2= female); Marital Status (1= not supposed to marry, 2= single, 3= married, 4= divorced, 5= separated); Qualification =(1= Bachelor's degree, 2 = Masters, 3=Doctorate); Years spent in the University (1= less than 5, 2= 5-9, 3= 10-14, 4= 15-19, 5= 20 & above); Religion (1= Christian, 2= Muslim, 3= Traditionalist, 4= Others); Rank (1= graduate assistant, 2= assistant lecturer, 3= lecturer 2, 4= lecturer 1, 5= senior lecturer, 6= reader, 7= professor).



The correlations in table 1 showed that age positively correlated with extrinsic job satisfaction ($r = .15$, $p < .05$). Marital status had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions) ($r = .22$, $p < .01$; $r = .17$, $p < .01$) respectively. Rank had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions) ($r = .16$, $p < .01$; $r = .23$, $p < .01$) respectively. Role conflict had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions) ($r = .33$, $p < .01$; $r = .23$, $p < .01$) respectively. Role overload had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions) ($r = .24$, $p < .01$; $r = .17$, $p < .01$) respectively. Self-efficacy had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions) ($r = .28$, $p < .01$; $r = .55$, $p < .01$) respectively. Also, there is a positive relationship between the two job satisfaction dimensions (intrinsic and extrinsic) ($r = .54$, $p < .01$).

However, sex of participants, age, qualification, years in the University and religion had no significant relationship with intrinsic job satisfaction. Sex and religion showed negative but insignificant correlation with intrinsic job satisfaction ($r = -.07$, $p > .05$; $r = -.02$, $p > .05$) respectively. Age, qualification and years in the University showed positive but insignificant correlation with intrinsic job satisfaction ($r = .07$, $p > .05$; $r = .02$, $p > .05$; $r = .10$, $p > .05$) respectively. Sex of participants, qualification, years in the University and religion had no significant relationship with extrinsic job satisfaction. Sex and qualification showed negative but insignificant correlation with intrinsic job satisfaction ($r = -.08$, $p > .05$; $r = -.04$, $p > .05$) respectively. Years spent in the University and religion showed positive but insignificant correlation with intrinsic job satisfaction ($r = .06$, $p > .05$; $r = .04$, $p > .05$) respectively.

Table 2: Summary of moderated Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Job satisfaction (Extrinsic dimension) (N=256)

	STEP 1		STEP 2		STEP 3		STEP 4		STEP 5	
	β	T	B	T	B	T	β	T	β	T
Sex	-.05	-.81	-.06	-.95	-.06	-.92	-.04	-.85	-.01	-.12
Age	-.003	-.03	-.04	-.45	-.04	-.49	.07	.85	.02	.22
Marital Status	.13	1.77	.09	1.24	.10	1.35	.02	.27	.05	.72
		-								
Qualification	-.30	3.95***	-.29	-3.88	-.29	-3.89	-.27	-4.25	-.25	-4.22
Years Spent	-.21	-2.47*	-.21	-2.57	-.19	-2.33	-.15	-2.13	-.17	-2.52
Religion	.07	1.19	.06	1.08	.07	1.25	.01	.272	.003	.068
Rank	.47	4.71***	.45	4.59	.46	4.63	.36	4.31	.38	4.74
C_RoleConflict			.18	2.69*	.12	1.57	.07	1.09	.06	.91
C_RoleOverload					.10	1.36	.02	.33	.07	1.19
C_SelfEfficacy							.51	9.80***	.48	9.13



C_Conf X					-
C_Effic					3.37**
C_Over X					-.19 *
C_Effic					-.09 -1.40
R	.365	.398	.405	.632	.674
R²	.133	.158	.164	.400	.455
R²Δ	.133	.025	.006	.235	.055
F Change	5.455***	7.216*	1.853	95.976***	12.333***

Note: *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; Sex (1= male, 2= female); Marital Status (1= not supposed to marry, 2= single, 3= married, 4= divorced, 5= separated); Qualification =(1= Bachelor's degree, 2 = Masters, 3=Doctorate); Years spent in the University (1= less than 5, 2= 5-9, 3= 10-14, 4= 15-19, 5= 20 & above); Religion (1= Christian, 2= Muslin, 3= Traditionalist, 4= Others); Rank (1= graduate assistant, 2= assistant lecturer, 3= lecturer 2, 4= lecturer 1, 5= senior lecturer, 6= reader, 7= professor).

Results of the hierarchical multiple regression for the test of the first factor of job satisfaction (extrinsic dimension) is shown in table 2. The variables were entered in stepwise models. The demographic variables (sex, age, marital status, qualification, years spent in the University, religion and rank) were entered in the Step 1 of the regression analysis and the variables jointly contributed 13.3% variance in predicting the extrinsic job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .133$, $p < .001$). Qualification and years spent in the University were negative and significant predictors of extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = -.30$, $t = -3.95$, $p < .001$; $\beta = -.21$, $t = -2.47$, $p < .05$) respectively while, rank made significant positive contribution as a predictor of extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = .47$, $t = 4.71$, $p < .001$). Sex, age, marital status, and religion did not make significant contribution in explaining the variance in extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = -.05$, $t = -.81$, $p > .05$; $\beta = -.003$, $t = -.03$, $p > .05$; $\beta = .13$, $t = 1.77$, $p > .05$; $\beta = .07$, $t = 1.19$, $p > .05$) respectively.

In step 2, role conflict was entered and the inclusion accounted for 2.5% significant variance in explaining extrinsic job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .025$; $\beta = .18$, t

= 2.69, $p < .05$) which imply that role conflict is a significant predictor of extrinsic job satisfaction.

In step 3, role overload was entered and the inclusion made 0.6% contribution in explaining the variance in extrinsic job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .006$, $\beta = .10$, $t = 1.36$, $p > .05$). So role overload did not predict extrinsic job satisfaction.

In step 4, self-efficacy was entered and the inclusion made a 23.5% significant contribution in explaining the variance in extrinsic job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .235$; $\beta = .51$, $t = 9.80$, $p < .001$) which implies that self-efficacy predicted extrinsic job satisfaction.

In step 5, the interaction term of the role-based stressors and self-efficacy were entered, of which self-efficacy significantly moderated the relationship between role conflict and extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = -.19$, $t = -3.37$, $p < .001$), whereas self-efficacy did not moderate the relationship between role overload and extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = -.09$, $t = -1.40$, $p > .05$). The contribution of the interaction terms in explaining the variance in extrinsic job satisfaction was 5.5% ($\Delta R^2 = .055$).



Discussion of Findings

Looking at the results, the first hypothesis which stated that role conflict will negatively predict job satisfaction (extrinsic and intrinsic) was partly supported. The result of the study showed that role conflict was a significant positive predictor of extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction but was not a significant predictor of extrinsic job satisfaction. According to this result, role conflict positively predicted extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction which suggests that the higher the experience of role conflict, the more the workers are satisfied extrinsically and intrinsically. This is in contrast to previous findings (e.g. Oduwaiye, 2006; Mossholder, et al., 1981; Urien & Osca, 2012; Venkataraman & Ganapathi, 2013; Beena, 1999; Adidu, 1998; Szilagyi, 1977; Malik & Waheed, 2010; Karadal & Cuhadar, 2008) who found that role conflict has negative relationship with job satisfaction. The difference in the result in terms of the direction of the prediction of job satisfaction dimensions by role conflict might be due to the participants. None of the previous studies reviewed involved lecturers. This just as stated before might be a factor their positive appraisal of their jobs that played a significant role in this finding. However, none of the studies reviewed considered job satisfaction in dimensions (extrinsic or intrinsic) rather, they looked at it in whole as one variable.

The second hypothesis which stated role overload will negatively predict job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic) was fully refuted because role overload did not predict any of the dimensions of job satisfaction. According to this result, role overload did not significantly predict job satisfaction (extrinsic and intrinsic dimensions). This infers that neither increase nor decrease in role overload among these academic staff (lecturers) was found to be significantly associated with either increase or decrease in job satisfaction (extrinsic and intrinsic). This finding contradicted the findings of previous studies (e.g. Mittal & Bhakar, 2018; Chhabra,

2016; Hashemi, et al., 2015; Al-Ghamdi, 2017; Khuong & Hai, 2016; Remsburg, et al., 1999; Yaacob & Long, 2015; Cartwright & Cooper, 1997; Chou, 2007) which demonstrated that role overload had a significant negative relationship with job satisfaction.

The direction of the insignificant contribution of role overload in predicting job satisfaction, according to the outcome of the present study was positive against the hypothesized negative prediction. This direction was supported by some previous studies (e.g. Ofori, et al., 2015; Ali & Farooqi, 2014) though their results were significant contrary to the result of the present study which is not significant. However, it is not clear why role overload could not negatively predict job satisfaction (extrinsic and intrinsic) in this study. Perhaps the nature of the participants (being just lecturers) and their appraisal of their jobs could have played a significant role in this finding. More work for lecturers could mean more money, more promotions and all that are tantamount to accolades. A look at the things that constitute more works to an academic staff in a university tending to overload such as research and academic authorship, students' mentorship and research supervision, teaching in other universities and other programs of the university are all what determine how much he/she earns, how far he/she rises in the ranks and his/her social contours, which are all elements of job satisfaction. Therefore, a lecturer may have a positive appraisal of what constitutes overload for others and this will affect the measure of impact of overload on job satisfaction to him.

Summary of Findings

1. Role conflict was a significant predictor of extrinsic job satisfaction
2. Role overload was not a significant predictor of extrinsic job satisfaction.
3. Role conflict was a significant predictor of intrinsic job satisfaction.
4. Role overload was not a significant predictor of



intrinsic job satisfaction.

Implications of the findings

There are some implications emanating from the findings of the present study and inferences can be made that can benefit researchers and organizational psychologists.

The study exposed the two dimensions of the job satisfaction variable and how role conflict and role overload assisted in defining the outcome in the various dimensions, which was not considered in previous studies reviewed.

By establishing that role conflict positively predicted job satisfaction (intrinsic), the findings of this study have given a different perspective to ongoing researches on the role of role-based stressors on some employees' outcome. Employees who are intrinsically satisfied draw their strength from within and they seek to perform well because they either enjoy performing the actual tasks or enjoy the challenge of successfully completing the task even when the tasks are conflicting or seemingly much.

Conclusion

This present study provided a new perspective in the relationship between role-based stress (role conflict and role overload) and job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic). From the findings of the study, role conflict was a significant positive predictor of intrinsic job satisfaction implying that higher role conflict will lead to higher extrinsic job satisfaction outcome.

Looking at the findings of the present study, academic staff (lecturers) should be encouraged to develop capacity to believe in their capabilities in the workplace. These capabilities can be developed through capacity building and human capital enhancement trainings. These training programmes should be designed to equip the lecturers with skills to enhance job satisfaction even in the presence of role-based stress.

References

- Acikgoz, Y. (2019). Employee recruitment and job search: Towards a multi-level integration. *Human Resource Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.02.009>.
- Adidu, F. A. (1998). Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Job Satisfaction among Managers in selected Organizations in Nigeria. Doctoral Dissertation, The Postgraduate School, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria
- Ahsan, N., Abdullah, Z., Fie, D. Y. G., & Alam, S. S. (2009). A study of job stress on job satisfaction among university staff in Malaysia: Empirical Study. *European Journal of Social Science*, 8 (1), 121-131.
- Al-Ghamdi, N. G. (2017). Role Overload and Job Stress among the Female University Teachers-Saudi Context, *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences* 6(2), 288-295
- Ali, S. & Farooqi, Y. A. (2014). Effect of Work Overload on Job Satisfaction, Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance and Employee Engagement (A Case of Public Sector University of Gujranwala Division), *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Engineering*, 5(8), 32-41.
- Amazt, I. H., & Idris, A. R. (2011). Lecturers' satisfaction towards university management & decision-making styles in Some Malaysian public universities. *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 3957–3970. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.400>.
- Archibong, I. A., Bassey, A. O. G. & Effiom, D. O. (2010). Occupational stress sources among university academic staff. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 2, 217-225.



- Ashforth, B. E. & Lee, R. T. (1990). Defensive behavior in organizations: a preliminary model. *Human Relations*. 43, 621-48.
- Bandura, A. & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 87-99.
- Baruch, G. K. & Barnett, R. C. (1986). Role quality, multiple role involvement and psychological well-being in midlife women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51(3), 578-85. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.3.578.
- Bashayreh, A. M. K. (2009). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. Available from: [http://ep3.uum.edu.my/1632/1/Anas Mahmoud Khaled Bashayreh.pdf](http://ep3.uum.edu.my/1632/1/Anas_Mahmoud_Khaled_Bashayreh.pdf). [Date Accessed 14/10/2018]
- Beena, C. (1999). Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Role Overload of Women Executives in Organisations. *Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Social Sciences, Cochin University of Science and Technology, Kerala*.
- Best, E. E (2010). Job satisfaction of teachers in Krishna primary and secondary schools. <http://eproxy.lib.nku.hk/login?url=http:pqdd.sinica.edu.tw/twdaoapp/servlet/advanced?query=3212536>
- Cartwright, S., & Cooper, C. L. (1997). *Managing workplace stress*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chen, G., Gully, S.M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a New General Self-Efficacy Scale *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 62-83. doi:10.1177/109442810141004
- Chhabra, B. (2016). "Work role stressors and employee outcomes: Investigating the moderating role of subjective person-organization and person-job fit perceptions in Indian organizations", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 24(3), 390-414. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2013-0722>
- Chou, R. (2007). Facility proprietary status, role overload, workplace support, and job satisfaction of direct care workers in assisted living. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 67.
- Cockburn, A. D., & Haydn, T. (2004). *Recruiting and retaining teachers: Understanding why teachers teach*. London, England: Routledge Falmer.
- Conley, S. & Woosley, S. A. (2000). Teacher role stress, higher needs and work outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 38(2), 179-201.
- Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P.J. & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). *Organizational Stress*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dai, Y. De, Zhuang, W. L., & Huan, T. C. (2019). Engage or quit? The moderating role of abusive supervision between resilience, intention to leave and work
- Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1964). A Theory of work adjustment. *Minnesota studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, XV.
- Dugguh, S. & Ayaga, D. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and*



- management*. 16, 11-18. DOI: 10.9790/487X-16511118.
- Elisabeth, K. R., & Greenfeld, S. (2013). An investigation of gender differences in occupational stress and general wellbeing. *Applied Business Research*, 6 (4), 35-40.
- Filak, V. F. & Sheldon, K. M. (2003). Student Psychological Need Satisfaction and College Teacher-Course Evaluations. *Educational Psychology*, 23(3), 235-247.
- Firestone, W. A. (2014). Teacher evaluation policy and conflicting theories of motivation. *Educational Researcher*, 0013189X14521864.
- Ganster, D. C., Fusilier, M. R., & Mayes, B. T. (1986). Role of social support in the experience
- Gilbreath, B. & Montesino, M. U. (2006). Expanding the HRD role: Improving employee well-being and organizational performance. *Human Resource Development International*, 9, 563-571. Retrieved December 30, 2018, from ProQuest database.
- Gillespie, N. A., Walsh, M., Winefield, A. H., Dua, J. & Stough, C. (2001). Occupational stress in universities: staff perceptions of the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work and Stress*, 15, 53-72.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 76-88.
- Gross, N., Mason, W. S. & McEachern, A. W. (1958). *Explorations in Role Analysis*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 16 (2): 250-279.
- Hall, J. (2008). *Cross sectional survey design*. In encyclopedia of survey research methods. Paul J. Lavrakas, ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 173-174
- Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Anger, W. K., Bodner, T., & Zi Katz mmerman, K. L. (2011). Clarifying work–family intervention processes: The roles of work–family conflict and family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 134-150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020927>
- Hashemi, S. M., Jamil, J., Kiumarsi, S. & Shno, M. (2015). Exploring the Role of Stress on Organizational Commitment among Employees in Hospitality Industry: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Information Research and Review*, 2, 23-34.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: how do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 81, 56-96
- Higgins, C. A. & Duxbury, L. E. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 60-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.1.60>
- Holmlund-Ryttonen, M. & Strandvik, T. (2005). Stress in the business relationship. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 20(1), 12-22.
- Ida, P. W., Gede, I. D., Saraswati, E., & Hariadi, B. (2017). Role Stress, Job Satisfaction and Role of Workplace Spirituality of Auditor. *International Journal of Social Relevance & Concern*, 5(3), 13-22.
- Idris, M. K. (2011). Over Time Effects of Role Stress on Psychological Strain among Malaysian Public University Academics. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(9), 154-161.



- Iroegbu, M. N. (2013). Effect of Organizational Role Conflict and Job Satisfaction on Performance in the Nigerian Customs Service: An Empirical Examination. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3(6), 174-181
- Jafar, R., Kavousian, J., Beigy, A., Emami, M., & Hadavizadeh, A. (2010). The study of job satisfaction among Bandar Abbas Islamic Azad university staff. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5(2), 258–261. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.084>
- Johnson, T. & Stinson, J. (1975). Role ambiguity, role conflict and satisfaction: moderating the effect of individual differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 329-333.
- Judeh, M. (2011). Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict as Mediators of the Relationship between Orientation and Organizational Commitment. *International Business Research* 4(3), 171-181.
- Judge, T. A. Thoresen, C. J., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship. A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127,376-407.
- Kahn, H. & Cooper, C. L.(1993).Stress in the dealing room. London: Routledge, p. 33.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D. & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964) *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Khuong, M. N. & Hai, Y. V. (2016). Investigate the Effects of Job Stress on Employee Job Performance- A Case Study at Dong Xuyen Industrial Zone, Vietnam. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 7(2), 12-22.
- Khurshid, F., Butt, Z., & Malik, S. (2011). Occupational Role Stress of the Public and Private Sector Universities Teachers. *Language India Journal* [Internet]; 11(8): 354, 353-366. Available from: <http://www.languageinindia.com>.
- Kinman, G. & Jones, F. (2004). Working to the limit: Stress and work-life balance in academic and academic related employees in the UK. *Association of University Teachers*.
- Kopelman, R., Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. (1983). A model of work, family, and inter role conflict: A construct validation study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 32(2). 198-215.
- Lease, S. H. (1999). Occupational role stressors, coping, support, and hardiness as predictors of strain in academic faculty: an emphasis on new and female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(3), 285-307.
- Lee, C. & Schular, R. S. (1980). Goal specificity and difficulty and leader initiating structure as strategies for managing role stress. *Journal of Management*. 6 (2), 177-187.
- Linton, R. (1936). The study of man: an introduction. Oxford, England: Appleton-Century.
- Liu, X. S., & Ramsey, J. (2008). Teachers' job satisfaction: Analyses of the Teacher Follow-Up Survey in the United States for 2000–2001. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1173–1184.
- Malik, O. F. & Waheed, A. (2010) The Mediating Effects of Job Satisfaction on Role Stressors and Affective Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management* 5(11), 223-235
- Mello, J. A. (2007). *Strategic Human Resource Management*. (2nd ed.), India: Cengage South Western.



- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Mittal, M. & Bhakar, S. (2018). Examining the Impact of Role Overload on Job Stress, Job Satisfaction and Job Performance-A study among Married Working Women in Banking Sector. *International Journal of Management Studies*. V. 01. 10.18843/ijms/v5i2(7)/01.
- Mossholder, K. W. Bedeian, A. G. & Armenakis, A. A. (1981). Role of perceptions, satisfaction and performance Organizational Behaviour and Human performance, 28, 224-234.
- Myers, D. G. (1990). *Social Psychology*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, pp. 178-179
- Ngo, D. (2009). Importance of employee satisfaction. [Online]. Available from: <http://www.humanresources.hrvinet.com/importance-o-employee-satisfaction/> [Date Accessed: 15/10/2018]
- Nir, A.E. & Eyal, O. (2003). School-Based Management and the Role Conflict of the School Superintendent. *Journal of Educational Administration* 41(5), 547-564.
- Nwankwo, J. (1982). *Educational Administration: Theory and practice*. New Delhi: Vikas publishing House PVT Ltd.
- Nyarko, K., Akenten, W., & Abdul-Nasiru, I. (2013). Teachers' Promotion of Creativity in Basic Schools. *American Journal of Social and Management Science*, 4(2), 63-70.
- Obodo, P. A., Okonkwo, E. A., & Aboh, U. J. (2019). Job characteristics and job satisfaction among police officers in Enugu Urban. *Practicum Psychologia*, 9(1), 139-157.
- Oduwaiye, R. O. (2006). Role Conflict and Administrative Effectiveness of Vice Principals of Public Secondary Schools in Kwara State, Nigeria: Implications for Their Morale. *African Journal of Educational Studies* 4(2), 95-105
- Ofoegbu, F. & Nwadiani, M. (2006). which reveals significant factors influencing stress among academic lecturers
- Ofori, E.J., Elikem, M. M., Kekleli, K. L., & Dapaah, G. (2015). Influence of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction among University Staff: Analytical Evidence from A Public University In Ghana, *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management United Kingdom* Vol. III, Issue 2
- Okonkwo, E. A. (2013). *Psychology of Work*. Enugu: Ofiaco production.
- Okonkwo, S. N. (1997). Job satisfaction and the work behaviour of Nigerian Teachers: The Nigerian Perspective. Anambra: Meks publishers Ltd.
- Onyemah, V. (2008). Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, and Performance: Empirical Evidence of an Inverted-U Relationship, *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management* 28(3), 299–313.
- Pandimeenal, R. (2014). *A study on job satisfaction of teachers working in the arts and science colleges of Sivagangai district*. Doctoral Thesis submitted to ManonmaniamSundaranar University. Retrived March 6, 2019 from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/72694>
- Parker, S. K., Turner, N., & Griffin, M. A. (2003). Designing healthy work. In D. A. Hofmann & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Health and Safety in*



- Organizations: A Multilevel Perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Peiro, J. M.; Gonzalez-Roma, V., Tordera, N., & Manas, M. A. (2001). Does role stress predict burnout over time among health care professionals? *Psychology & Health*, 16(5), 511-525.
- Peretomode, V. F. (1991). *Educational Administration: Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspective*. Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers.
- Posig, M., & Kickul, J. (2003). Extending our understanding of burnout: test of an integrated model in non-service occupations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 8(1), 3-19.
- Quarat-ul-ain, Khattak, M. A. & Iqbal, N. (2013). Impact of Role Conflict on Job Satisfaction, Mediating Role of Job Stress in Private Banking Sector. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(12), 711-722.
- Rahim, M. A. (2011). *Managing Conflict in Organisations*. (4th edn.) New Jersey, U.S.A.: Transaction Publishers.
- Remsburg, R. D., Armacost, K. A., Radu, C., & Bennett, R. G. (1999). Two models of restorative care in the nursing home: Designated versus integrated restorative nursing home assistants. *Geriatric Nursing*, 20 (6), 321–326.
- Riaz, M., Ahmad, N., Riaz, M., Murtaza, G., Khan, T., & Firdous, H. (2016). Impact of Job Stress on Employee Job Satisfaction, *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 5(4), 41–56
- Riggio, R. E. (2003). *Job Stress in Organizations*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Rivera-Torres, P., Araque-Padilla, R. A., & Montero-Simó, M. J. (2013). Job stress across gender: the importance of emotional and intellectual demands and social support in women. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 10, 375–389. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph10010375
- Rowley, J. (1996). Developing constructive tension between teaching and research. *International Journal of Educational Management*. 10(2), 6-10.
- Sager, J. K. (1991). Type A Behavior Pattern (TABP) Among Salespeople And Its Relationship to Job Stress. *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 11(2), 1-14.
- Salkind, N. J. (2005). *Exploring research* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Schwarzer, R. & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived Teacher Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Job Stress and Burnout: Mediation Analyses. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57, 152-171.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- Sorcinelli, K. & Gregory, I.C. (2006). Sex differences in the relationship between work and health: The Minnesota Heart Survey. *Journal of Health and Social behavior*. 26, 379-394.
- Spector, P. E. & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 3(4), 356-367.



- Spector, P. E., Dwyer, D. J., & Jex, S. M. (1988). Relation of job stressors to affective, health, and performance outcomes: A comparison of multiple data sources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 73(1), Feb 1988, 11-19
- Stankovska, G., Angelkoska, S., Osmani, F., & Grncarovska, S. P. (2017). Job motivation and job satisfaction among academic staff in higher education. In *Current business and economics driven discourse and education: Perspectives from around the world*, 15, 159–167.
- Stevenson, M. (2014). *Role Overload Appraisal and Coping: A Case Study of Female Health Care Workers*. Doctoral thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, Carleton University Ottawa, Ontario. Available Online at <http://curve.carleton.ca/system/files>.
- Sypatak, M.J., Marsland, D.W. & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job Satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. *Fam Practice Management*. 6(9) 63–75.
- Szilagyi, A. D. (1977). An Empirical test of causal inference between role perceptions, satisfaction with work, performance and organizational level. *Personnel Psychology*, 30, 375 – 388.
- Thiagarajan, P., Chakrabarty, S., & Taylor, R. D. (2006). A confirmatory factor analysis of Reilly's role overload scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 657-666. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from ProQuest database.
- Topper, E. F. (2007). Stress in the library. *Journal of New Library*, 108(11/12), 561-564.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783–805.
- Tsigilis, N., Zachopoulou, E., & Grammatikopoulos, V. (2006). Job satisfaction and burnout among Greek early educators: A comparison between public and private sector employees. *Educational Research and Review*, 1(8), 256-261.
- Urien A. B., & Osca, A. (2012). Role stressors, task-oriented norm, and job satisfaction: A longitudinal study. *Revista De Psicología Del Trabajo y De Las Organizaciones*, 28, 171–181.
- Usman, A., Ahmed, Z., Ahmed, I. & Akbar, Z. (2011). Work stress experienced by the teaching staff of University of the Punjab, Pakistan: Antecedents and consequences. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(8), 202-210.
- Venkataraman, P. S., & Ganapathi, D. R. (2013, sep). A study of job stress on job satisfaction among the Employee of small scale industries. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 13 (3), 18-22.
- Weir, M. (1976). *Job Satisfaction Challenge and Response in modern Britain*. Glasgow: William Collins.
- Weiss, H.M., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center. Yaacob, M. & Long, C. S. (2015). Role of Occupational Stress on Job Satisfaction. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), S1. Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2s1p81.
- Whitehead, A.N. (2011). Teacher burnout: a study of occupational stress and burnout in New Zealand school teachers. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10179/2083> on 16th September, 2018.
- William, K. J. & Alliger, G. M. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37(4), 837-868.



Winefield, A. H. (2000). Stress in academe. Some recent research finding. In D. T. Kenny, J. G. Carlson, F.J. McGuigan, & J. L Sheppard (Eds.), *Stress and Health: Research and Clinical Application* (pp. 437-446). Sydney: Harwood

Yaacob, M. & Long, C. S. (2015). Role of Occupational Stress on Job Satisfaction. *Mediterranean Journal*

of Social Sciences. MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy. Vol 6 No 2 S1

Zainudin, A., Junaidah, H. A., & Nazmi, M. Z. (2010). Modeling Job Satisfaction and Work Commitment Among Lecturers: A Case of UITM Kelantan. *Journal of Statistical Modeling and Analytics*, 1(2), 45-59.