

Workload and lecturers' job satisfaction in Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

Osifila, Gboyega Israel, Aladetan, Titilayo Abimbola

Department of Educational Management, Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria

Article Info

Article history:

Received Mar 25, 2020

Revised Jun 20, 2020

Accepted Jul 30, 2020

Keywords:

Job satisfaction

Lecturer

University lecturers

Workload

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the relationship between workload and lecturers' job satisfaction in Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Ondo State. The descriptive research design of the survey type was employed. The sample of the study was 105 lecturers selected using multi-stage sampling technique across three faculties. Two research questions and three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. A researcher-made questionnaire titled "Workload and Lecturers' Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (WLJSQ)" was used to elicit information from the respondents. The instrument was validated by experts in Test and Measurement and the test re-test method was used for test reliability which yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.72. The findings of this study revealed: lecturers found conducting research, processing of results, marking of examination scripts and supervision of undergraduate projects most demanding and that lecturers' job satisfaction was low in relations with the workload. Also, there is a significant relationship between marking of examination scripts and lecturers' job satisfaction, supervision of research work and lecturers' job satisfaction and there is a significant relationship between number of courses allocated and lecturers' job satisfaction. It is hereby recommended that more lecturers should be recruited particularly in faculties with high student population in order to reduce excessive workload, while the number of students to be allocated to lecturers for project supervision should be reduced and the services of assistant lecturers should be employed to assist in the area of marking of scripts and supervision of undergraduate projects.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Osifila, Gboyega Israel,
Department of Educational Management,
Adekunle Ajasin University,
PMB 001, Akungba Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria.
Email: osifilagboyee2002@yahoo.co.uk

1. INTRODUCTION

The centrality of education to issues of national development is incontrovertible, the world over. In line with this assertion, education in Nigeria is no longer regarded as a private enterprise, but a huge government undertaking. To this extent, the national policy document on education espoused by the Federal Government of Nigeria describes education as an instrument for effecting national development [1]. Education, therefore, is not only seen as a vehicle for promoting social reform, but as resources for building a robust and well developed nation. Now that education has been recognized as a sensitive issue and a factor for development of the nation, Nigeria cannot afford to toy with the education of her citizenry because the wealth of a nation is a function of the available human resources enabled by education and not the abundance of natural resources. Apart from the position of the national policy on education in Nigeria, the

quantitative and qualitative development of education in the country is largely due to the insatiable desires by parents, guardians, individuals and national group interest, who their intense ambition see education as a qualification to earn good income and contribute to societal drive towards egalitarianism. By all standard, these individuals and Nigerian shared in the idea that economically, socially, politically, scientifically and technologically, education holds the key [1].

In Nigeria, educational system is categorized into three; the primary, secondary and tertiary levels. The tertiary is the highest and the schooling given after secondary level in institution like the university. At the tertiary level of education, high level of manpower training takes place which contribute to national development. Therefore, skilled manpower such as academic staff and administrative staff perform different functions at this level of education especially in the university in order to make all students part of a general program of all round improvement and development.

However, due to the continuous upward trend on university enrolment, prompted by growing demand for education at this level by most citizens of school age, students' population has increased tremendously and this has impacted on the population of individual classrooms. Lecturers are presumably being stretched owing to the annual increase in the number of enrolment resulting in over bearing tasks and responsibilities for the academic staff in terms of numbers of courses to be taught per semester, numbers of periods per week, processing of results, setting of examination questions, examination invigilation, marking of examination scripts, result processing, teaching practice supervision, attendance at project, dissertation and thesis defense and supervision of undergraduate and postgraduate research work. All these may have increased their workload considerably and probably impacting negatively on their job satisfaction manifesting in seemingly poor attitude to teaching, aggression towards students and delay in processing of results.

Workload refers to the quantity and intensity of job assignments. Simply put, the core consideration in workload could be seen in the quantity of work being assigned and the degree of efforts to be exerted before completing the work. A manageable workload is likely to keep any hardworking lecturer motivated and satisfied. It could equally enable him/her to perform his/her duty to the best of his/her ability and become more productive. Many areas of workload have been observed to be more tasking to lecturers. These include marking of examination scripts, supervision of research work, processing of results and teaching of courses. Marking of examination scripts is a direct or indirect lecturers' involvement in marking undergraduates' and postgraduates' examination booklets. Lecturers are to ensure that every examination scripts have the correct mark so that all students will get the correct grade. Some exams are marked on paper and some are marked automatically by a computer. But for any exam, every students work is marked in the same way. Supervision of research work is the assistance and guidance that lecturers provide for undergraduates and postgraduates in the course of writing their project, dissertation and thesis. The need for high level devotion, in terms of obligation of time and energy on the lecturers' side during research supervision cannot be over-emphasized. In all, supervision of research work by lecturers is aimed at;

- a. Providing students with direction towards compliance with rules and procedures of research reporting.
- b. Helping students to adhere strictly with time schedules for research writing.
- c. Making students comply with time schedule for research defence.
- d. Ensuring that students are properly guided in using every resources needed for timely completion of research work.

One duty area expected of any lecturer is the compilation, computation and processing of students' results. What is obvious is that processing of results is statutorily done every semester. It should be noted, however, that this undertaking could be put lecturers under some form of stress and highly demanding. The registration of students and computation of examination results require some form of diligence from the lecturers usually referred to as Course Adviser. To ease this duty, some universities have employed the use of Information Technology (IT) techniques in resolving issues around compilation, computation and processing of result. This process, no doubt, would assist efficient and effective processing of results. Teaching of courses allocated by head of departments is another area of workload for lecturers. This involves preparing and delivering lectures to students by the lecturer. Many at times, lecturers are allocated courses to be taught across all levels of their department, and even other department including faculty courses allocated by the faculty head.

Lecturer's job satisfaction reflect the degree of lecturer's inner appreciation with regards to how they feel about the quality of treatment they are receiving on the job and the benefits that may accrue in future. In other words, job satisfaction entails the monetary and non-monetary paybacks that comes from work. It is not the money, benefits or vacations; it is doing the work itself. It signifies the amount of agreement between one's expectations of the job and the rewards the job provides.

Over the years, it has been observed that some of the output from the university system are referred to as *half-baked* product, that is, they do not have what it takes intellectually and skilfully to be employed in the labor market. Educational stakeholders, such as employers of labor, parents and the society as a whole have

linked this problem of poor output to lecturers' level of job satisfaction. It appears lecturers are not satisfied with their job due to excessive workload caused by number of periods per week, number of courses to be taught per semester, marking of examination scripts, teaching practice supervision, project, dissertation and thesis supervision, attendance at seminars, and processing of results, among others. Most times, lecturers complain of insufficient time to study and embark on educational researches to enrich their knowledge. It seems lecturers spend quality time performing administrative duties and attending to student problems. This may be negatively impacting their satisfaction on the job. This study is therefore carried out to investigate the relationship between workload and lecturers' job satisfaction in Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria.

The concept of workload have been defined in different ways as perceived by different scholars, but all pointing at the same direction. Summarily, workload could be seen as the totality of duties statutorily assigned to individual to perform. What constitute heavy, moderate or low workload may probably be based individuals' level of competence and energy in relations to the task at hand. "Workload can also be classified as quantitative (the amount of work to be done) or qualitative (the difficulty of the work)" [2] and also as "the amount of work that has to be done by a particular person or organization" [3].

Workload can also be described as the process through which energy is exerted on a given assignment in order to fulfil the expected end result. This application of energy cuts across all professions and fields. Every profession has its peculiar which has within it the application one form of efforts or the other. In these and related uses of the word, workload therefore relates to the quantity and quality work + load, that is, the quantity of work done with the level of energy required to do it [4]. Workload, according to Akob [5] as "all activities that involved lecturers' time either directly or indirectly with professional duties, responsibilities and interests". Relating to lecturing, workload refers to the entire duration a lecturer engages in classroom interactions with students and other schedules given to other official assignments which may be performed while in school environment or when outside the school. Lecturers' responsibilities could include teaching, students' advisor, file management, processing of students' results, attendance at academic and administrative meetings and any other responsibilities expected of a lecturer [6].

The definitions ascribes to the concept of job satisfaction is as many as the authors who attempted to define it. Job satisfaction as the realization of fulfilment of expectations being enjoyed by individuals performing job activities and the expected rewards [7]. Job satisfaction is an emotional state that is happy or positive emotions derived from the assessment of a person's job or work experience [8]. The perception of employees' perception of how good the job they do provide things that are considered important for them is seen as job satisfaction. Similarly, job satisfaction is a sentiment that can induce one's positive or negative attitude towards one's duties and assigned responsibilities when at work [9] and that it is imperative to understand that in the concept of job satisfaction, what can motivate are numerous and what lead to one's satisfaction may differ from others. More specifically, job satisfaction can be summarized as the employee's belief, perception and feelings emanating from the content and context of their job which in turn influence their job attitude.

According to Smith and Mistry [10] job satisfaction is a pleasant mood that emanates from an employee's opinion of accomplishing the anticipated essentials or satisfaction. Measuring job satisfaction reveals a hydra-headed dimension of attitude which is made up of the approach in terms of remuneration, promotions, and the content and context of work environment. Employee who shows high job satisfaction may have liked the job, whereas, employees who demonstrates low job satisfaction may have disliked the job. Therefore, it can be concluded that job satisfaction reveals employee's affirmative retort toward the innumerable areas of a job. Satisfaction on the job would improve job performance and can be used as basis to predict the difference between employee's anticipation about job consequences and what is offered on the job. Studies by Fredman and Doughney [11] revealed that factors within and outside the employee would influence job satisfaction. The peculiar nature of every higher institution of learning determines the levels of job satisfaction that may be experienced. According to Bentley, et al. [12], "Japanese academics, for example, feel highly satisfied with their job, but are highly stressed at the same time".

As contained in the National Policy on Education in Nigeria [1], lecturers in tertiary institutions of learning are expected to be engaged in quality teaching, research and community development. The core academic duties and responsibilities expected of lecturers in the university includes the following, among others: preparing and delivering lectures, designing examinations templates and managing students' results [13]. Other duties and responsibilities includes, tutoring, laboratory supervision, clinical work, exam invigilation, uploading of results, teaching practice supervision, supervision of both undergraduate and postgraduate project/dissertation/thesis respectively. In addition, lecturers are also expected to carry out researches and publish empirical and scholarly articles in local and international journals. In the aspect of conducting research, lecturers could determine where and what to carry out their studies bearing in mind the expectations of the institution and what would elevate their academic prowess. The institutions where they

work, in line with its general dictates on academic, will assist lecturers with such resources needed to help in the research endeavors.

Etor [14] concluded that school administrators should create an enabling environment for lecturers to work and alleviate work that are too strenuous, this will help to eliminate frustration and feeling of failure. It is believed that situation of minimal task, most employees will have the sense of fulfilment and job satisfaction. Any worker that is over loaded with work will not be happy, neither will the worker that is under-utilized be satisfied. It is the place of the head to assign duties to lecturers based on their specialization and their capacity. Nsa, and Isaac [15] pointed out that inadequacy in the number of staff would make those available will have heavy workload, which may result to poor productivity, Zwalchir [16] believes it leads to stress.

Lecturers' job satisfaction with professional status is the ladder to all achievement in the system. The lecturers has the uphill task of forming course outlines, teaching, marking examination scripts, researching and attending conferences. There are the duties that make them self-actualized. Mgbekem [17] maintained that these program improve productivity and enhance professional development. This is true especially when lecturers are upgraded and or promoted after such program. Winer, and Sarros [18] found that high job satisfaction is easily attainable when the responsibilities to be executed in a job situation are well demarcated. As Shin [19], Locke and Bennion [20] had concluded that when institution of learning pile up pressure on academics in furtherance to the notion of global competition and quality of teaching, lecturers experience stressful feelings and declined satisfaction on the job.

Lecturers' job satisfaction with academic publication is of great concern to lecturers in all tertiary institutions in Nigeria. Lecturers are expected to research, write and publish articles in journals in and outside the country before they are promoted from junior level to the zenith. Mgbekem [17] confirmed that if lecturers fail to comply with these directives from the management of their institution, they will stagnate on their first position of employment. This can be very frustrating to anyone. Akob [5] reported a significant relationship among workload, teacher work ethics and job satisfaction, and performance in the execution of work. Similarly, Imondi [21] found that job overload negatively influences satisfaction of teachers. Most of the teachers in the division admit that job excess workload has strong relationship with low performance. Similarly, [22] reported that lecturers experienced excess workload in academic activities and lecturers' satisfaction was negatively influenced by this excess workload. Sone, et al. [23] confirmed in their study that excess workload is the strongest reason responsible for decreasing job satisfaction. A study [24] on the level of workload and job satisfaction among Pharmacy academicians in private and public universities in India found that more than half of the respondents (57.9%) were satisfied with their workload, while overall, private sector academicians are more burdened by teaching load and also are less satisfied of their workload. Shin, and Jung [25] reported that academia jobs have become stressful and less satisfied when government have implemented managerial or university governance reforms.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The research employed a descriptive survey design. This research adopted the descriptive survey method because it has the advantage of applying the outcome of its investigation to a large section of the population at the same time. The sample of the study consisted of 113 lecturers. The sample is selected using multi-stage sampling technique. From the existing nine faculties, a simple random sampling technique was used to select three faculties. Proportionate stratified sampling technique was used to select 50% of the lecturers across all cadres in the sampled faculties. Table 1 shows how the samples are selected.

Table 1. Selection of sample

Faculty	No. of Lecturers	Prof./Reader	No. Sample	S/L	No. Sample	LI/LII	No. Sample	AL/GA	No. Sample
Education	75	11	06	25	12	23	12	15	07
Law	23	05	03	04	02	12	06	02	01
Science	128	25	12	17	09	48	24	38	19
Total	226	41	21	46	23	83	42	55	27

Key: Prof. = Professor, Reader = Associate Professor, S/L = Senior Lecturer, L II = Lecturer II, LI = Lecturer I, A/L = Assistant Lecturer, G/A = Graduate Assistant

A researcher-made questionnaire titled "Workload and Lecturers' Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (WLJSQ)" was designed to elicit information on the subject matter. The questionnaire consists of two sections. Section A deals with demographic information of the respondents, this include Gender, Cadre/Level, Faculty and Number of courses allocated. Section B contains 16 items formulated to examine aspects of work lecturers found demanding. Four Likert scale of Very Demanding, Demanding, Less Demanding and Not Demanding

are scaled to measure the opinion of the participants. Section C contains 11 items formulated to determine the level of lecturers' job satisfaction. A scale of Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Slightly Satisfied and Not Satisfied was used to measure the opinion of the respondents. Section D and E contains 10 items formulated to determine the level of lecturers' job satisfaction in relation with marking of examination scripts and supervision of research work. A scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, Strongly Disagree and Disagree are used to measure the opinion of the participants. The test-retest technique was used to ascertain the reliability of the instrument and a reliability index of 0.72 was obtained. This indicated that the research instrument is reliable. The researcher visited all the selected faculties in the university to administer the questionnaire. Out of a total of 113 copies of questionnaires administered, 105 copies were retrieved which gave 92.9% return rate. The research questions were answered with descriptive statistics of frequency counts, percentages and mean while the research hypotheses were tested with Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) at 0.05 level of significance.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research question one: What aspect of their workload do lecturers find most demanding? Table 2 depicts areas of workload lecturers found demanding. Conducting research with a mean of 3.6 is the area of workload that lecturers found most demanding while going to excursion or field trips is area of workload lecturers found least demanding. Other areas of workload lecturers found demanding include processing and uploading of students' results with mean of 3.5, marking of examination scripts (3.5), undergraduate project supervision (3.2) level advisory duty (3.1) among others. Finally, the grand mean of 3.1 is an indication that lecturers found these areas of workload identified in Table 2 demanding.

Table 2. Aspects of work lecturers found demanding

S/N	Items	VS	F %	S	F %	SS	F %	NS	F %	X
1	Teaching/lecturing	37	35.2	56	53.3	11	10.5	1	1.0	3.2
2	Setting of examination questions	24	22.9	63	60.0	17	16.2	1	1.0	3.0
3	Conducting continuous assessment (test/assignment)	25	23.8	57	54.3	22	21.0	1	1.0	3.0
4	Marking examination scripts	56	53.3	46	43.8	2	1.9	1	1.0	3.5
5	Invigilation of examinations	27	25.7	70	66.7	8	7.6	-	-	3.2
6	Processing and uploading students' results	60	57.1	41	39.0	4	3.8	-	-	3.5
7	Teaching practice/SIWES Supervision	30	28.6	51	48.6	12	11.4	12	11.4	2.9
8	Attending postgraduate dissertation defense	14	13.3	65	61.9	21	20.0	5	4.8	2.8
9	Conducting research	70	66.7	29	27.6	5	4.8	1	1.0	3.6
10	Field trip/excursion	19	18.1	51	48.6	14	13.3	21	20.0	2.6
11	Level Advisory duty	38	36.2	45	42.9	20	19.0	2	1.9	3.1
12	Membership of Committees	33	31.4	44	41.9	25	23.8	3	2.9	3.0
13	Participation in Sandwich/ part-time programmes	17	16.2	47	44.8	36	34.3	5	4.8	2.7
14	Undergraduate Project Supervision	33	31.4	66	62.9	5	4.8	1	1.0	3.2
15	Postgraduate Dissertation/ Thesis Supervision	29	27.6	38	36.2	22	21.0	16	15.2	2.8
16	Conference attendance	23	21.9	66	62.9	14	13.3	2	1.9	3.0
	Grand Mean									3.1

Research question two: What is the level of lecturers' job satisfaction in relation to their workload? Table 3 describes the level of lecturers' job satisfaction in relation to their workload. With a mean of 1.5, it is revealed that the level of lecturers' job satisfaction is low with regards to their present salary in line with their workload, present fringe benefits, medical scheme/benefits available to them and transport allowance in their pay package. Also, a mean of 1.8 is an indication that lecturers are not satisfied with the condition of their as office spaces, their present salary and conditions of classroom (1.9). The grand mean of 1.7 indicates that lecturers are slightly satisfied on the job in relation to their workload.

Table 3. Level of lecturers' job satisfaction

S/N	Items	VS	F %	S	F %	SS	F %	NS	F %	X
1	Present salary	-	-	17	16.2	49	46.7	39	37.1	1.8
2	Present salary in line with my workload	1	1.0	3	2.9	39	37.1	62	59.0	1.5
3	Perception of my salary progression in the future	-	-	15	14.3	46	43.8	44	41.9	1.7
4	Present fringe benefits	-	-	6	5.7	45	42.9	54	51.4	1.5
5	Pension scheme	-	-	6	5.7	63	60.0	36	34.3	1.7
6	Medical scheme/benefits available	-	-	1	1.0	48	45.7	56	53.3	1.5
7	Transport allowance in pay package	1	1.0	3	2.9	47	44.8	54	51.4	1.5
8	Chance of regular Promotion	1	1.0	14	13.3	70	66.7	20	19.0	2.0
9	Condition of Office space	-	-	15	14.3	53	50.3	37	35.2	1.8
10	Condition of Classroom	1	1.0	9	8.6	62	59.0	33	31.4	1.9
11	Accessibility to library	1	1.0	21	20.0	64	61.0	19	18.1	2.0
	Grand Mean									1.7

Hypothesis one: There is a significant relationship between marking of examination scripts and lecturers' job satisfaction. Table 4 shows that there is a significant relationship between marking of examination scripts and lecturers' job satisfaction. This is because the r_{cal} of -0.329 is less than the r_{tab} of 0.195 at 0.05 level of significance. The tested hypothesis is hereby accepted.

Table 4. Marking of examination scripts and lecturers' job satisfaction

Variables	N	df	r_{cal}	r_{tab}	Decision
Marking of Examination Scripts Lecturers' Job Satisfaction	105	103	-0.329	0.195	rejected

Significant at 0.05

Hypothesis two: There is a significant relationship between supervision of research and lecturers' job satisfaction. Table 5 shows that there is a significant relationship between supervision of research work and lecturers' job satisfaction. This is because the r_{cal} value of -0.236 is less than the r_{tab} value of 0.195 at 0.05 level of significance. The tested hypothesis is hereby accepted.

Table 5. Supervision of research work and lecturers' job satisfaction

Variables	N	df	r_{cal}	r_{tab}	Decision
Supervision of Research work Lecturers' Job Satisfaction	105	103	-0.236	0.195	rejected

Significant at 0.05

Hypothesis three: The number of courses allocated to lecturers is significantly related to lecturers' job satisfaction. Table 6 shows that there is a significant relationship between number of courses allocated and lecturers' job satisfaction. This is because the r_{cal} of -0.024 is less than the r_{tab} of 0.195 at 0.05 level of significance. The tested hypothesis is hereby accepted.

Table 6. Number of courses allocated and lecturers' job satisfaction

Variables	N	df	r_{cal}	r_{tab}	Decision
Number of courses allocated Lecturers' Job Satisfaction	105	103	-0.024	0.195	accepted

Significant at 0.05

Research question one sought to investigate the aspect of workload that lecturers found most demanding. As shown in Table 2, the aspect of work lecturers found most demanding include: conducting research ($x=3.6$), processing of results ($x=3.5$), marking of examination scripts ($x=3.5$) and supervision of undergraduate project ($x=3.2$). This is in tandem with the findings of [22] revealed that lecturers experienced excess workload in academic activities.

Research question two sought to examine the level of lecturers' job satisfaction in relation to their workload. The result in table 3 shows that lecturers' job satisfaction is low as revealed in the grand mean of 1.7. This result corroborate [21] who found in a study on the influence of workload on the performance of teachers in schools in Kombewa Division, Kisumu West District, Kenya that job overload negatively influences satisfaction of teachers. Also, lecturers' satisfaction was negatively influenced by excess workload as reported by Alabi et al. [22]

Research hypothesis one investigated the relationship between marking of scripts and lecturers' job satisfaction. It was found that there is a significant relationship between marking of script and lecturers' job satisfaction. This corroborates earlier findings by Akob [5] and Alabi et al. [22] that excess workload negatively influences job satisfaction of teachers and lecturers. However, in a relatively divergent view, Imondi [21] found that a low relationship exists between workload and teachers' satisfaction.

Research hypothesis two stated that there is a significant relationship between supervision of research work and lecturers' job satisfaction. This hypothesis was accepted as the r_{cal} value of -0.236 is less than the r_{tab} value of 0.195 at 0.05 significant level. This infers that a significant relationship exists between supervision of research work and lecturers' job satisfaction. Some factors responsible for this could include a lecturer having too many supervisees to supervise. The finding align with [23] who confirmed in their study that excess workload is the strongest reason responsible for decreasing job satisfaction. The third hypothesis tested established the relationship between number of courses allocated and lecturers' job satisfaction. This implies the more the number of courses allocated to a lecturer the likelihood of being prone to stress and likely

job dissatisfaction [5, 22]. Excess courses could be due to inadequate number of lecturers in a given educational program or course.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this research, it is concluded that excessive workload assigned to lecturers would reduce their job satisfaction which could consequently lead to their poor performance on the job. It is therefore important that more lecturers should be recruited particularly in faculties or departments with high student population, in order to reduce excessive workload relating to marking of scripts and supervision of research. Universities should also adopt more advanced technology to process processing of results and other academic activities.

REFERENCES

- [1] Federal Republic of Nigeria, *National policy on education*, Lagos: NERDC Press, 2014.
- [2] S. M. Jex, *Teaching and research at University and Implication for managerial practices*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.
- [3] The Guardian U.K., "Teachers' workload," 2016. [Online] Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/mar/22/teachers-plan-leave-five-years-survey-workload-england>
- [4] D. C. Ganster, and C. C. Rosen, "Work stress and employee health: a multidisciplinary review," *Journal of management*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1085–1122, 2013.
- [5] M. Akob, "Influence of workload, work ethics and job satisfaction towards teachers' performance," *Global advanced research journal of management and business studies*, vol.5, no 7, pp.172–177, 2016.
- [6] A. R. Azita, "Secondary school teachers' workload in Batu Pahat, Johor Darul Takzim," (*Unpublished master's thesis*), Universiti Teknologi Skudai Johor, Malaysia, 2012.
- [7] F. N. Mbua, *Educational administration: theory and practices*, Limbe: Cameroon: Design House, 2003.
- [8] F. Luthans, *Organizational Behaviour*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006.
- [9] A. R., Baron and J. Greenberg, *Behaviour in organizations: understanding and managing the human side of work*, Canada: Prentice Hall, 2008.
- [10] K. T. Smith, and B. Mistry, "Predictive operational performance," In Philip D. Bust (Ed.) *Contemporary ergonomics. Proceeding of the international conference on contemporary ergonomics*, vol. 3, no.1, pp. 395-408, 2009.
- [11] N. Fredman and J. Doughney, "Academic dissatisfaction, managerial change and neo-liberalism," *Higher education*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 41–58, 2012.
- [12] P. J. Bentley, *et al*, "Academic job satisfaction from an international comparative perspective: factors associated with satisfaction across 12 countries," In P. J. Bentley, H. Coates, I. R. Dobson, L. Goedegebuure, & V. L. Meek (Eds.), *Job satisfaction around the academic world*, Berlin: Springer, pp. 239–262, 2013.
- [13] Williams Centre for Learning and Advancement, *Improving lecture design and delivery*. Workshop Lecture, Monday 19th March, 2018. [Online] Available: <http://fbe.unimelb.edu.au/wcla/workshop>
- [14] C. R. Etor, "Human resources management and lecturers' job satisfaction in tertiary institutions in Akwa Ibom and Cross River States," *Global journal of educational research*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 91–99, 2014
- [15] E. O. Nsa, and A. Isaac, "Quality control measures for sustainable higher education in Nigeria," In J. B. Babalola, G. A. Akpan, A. O. Ayeni and S. O. Adedeji (Eds.), *Access, equality and quality in higher geducation*, Lagos: Macmillan Publishers, pp. 21-30, 2007.
- [16] L. A. Zwalchir, "Workload management in the school system education," In J. B. Babalola and A. O. Ayeni (Eds.), *Educational management: Theories and tasks*, Lagos: Macmillan Publishers, pp. 833-838, 2009.
- [17] S. J. A. Mgbekem, *Management of university education in Nigeria*, Calabar: University of Calabar Press, 2004.
- [18] R. Winer, and J. Sarros, "The academic work environment in Australian Universities: A motivating place to work?" *Higher education research and development*, vol. 21, no.3, pp. 241–258, 2002
- [19] J. C. Shin, "Teaching and research nexuses across faculty career stage, ability and affiliated discipline in a South Korean Research University," *Studies in higher education*, vol. 36, no.4, pp. 485–503, 2011.
- [20] W. Locke, and A. Bennion, "Satisfaction in Stages: The Academic Profession in the United Kingdom and the British Commonwealth". In P. J. Bentley, H. Coates, I. R. Dobson, L. Goedegebuure, & V. L. Meek (Eds.), *Job satisfaction around the academic world*, pp. 223–238, Berlin: Springer, 2013.
- [21] P. J. N. Imondi, "The influence of workload on performance of teachers in public primary schools in Kombewa division, Kisumu West District, Kenya," Master dissertation, University of Nairobi, Kenya 2011.
- [22] A. T. Alabi, A. T., Murtala, and A. A., Lawal, "Lecturers' work stress and job performance in Kwara State College of Education, Nigeria," *Paper presented at the 3rd Annual International Conference of the Collaboration of Education Faculties in West Africa (CEFWA)*, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State, Nigeria, 2012.
- [23] M. Sone, *et al*, "Job satisfaction, income, workload, workplace, and demographics of Japanese radiologists in the 2008 Survey," *Japanese journal of radiologist*, vol. 31, no.5, pp. 364-370, 2013.
- [24] A. Akram, *et al*, "Evaluation of workload and its impact on satisfaction among pharmacy academicians in Southern India," *Journal of clinical & diagnostic research*, vol. 9, no 6, pp. 1-6, 2015.

- [25] J. C. Shin, and J. Jung, "Academics job satisfaction and job stress across countries in the changing academic environments," *Higher education*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 603–620, 2014.

BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS



Dr. Osifila, Gboyega Israel is a Lecturer I with specialization in Educational Administration and Personnel Management in the Department of Educational Management, Adekunle Ajasin University, Ondo State, Nigeria. He is a level adviser and supervises both undergraduates and postgraduate research projects.



Mrs. Aladetan Abimbola Titilayo is a graduate from the Department of Educational Management, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria. She has unquantifiable passion for research in education.