



International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research (IJCER)

www.ijcer.net

Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in a Faculty of a Reputable Turkish University: Past and Present

Baris Barlas¹

¹ Istanbul Technical University

To cite this article:

Barlas, B. (2016). Job satisfaction among academic staff in a faculty of a reputable Turkish university: past and present. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 3(1), 1-11.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes.

Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their articles. The journal owns the copyright of the articles.

The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material.

Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in a Faculty of a Reputable Turkish University: Past and Present

Baris Barlas^{1*}

¹ Istanbul Technical University

Abstract

This paper examines the change of the determinants of job satisfaction and the commitment among the academic staff between the years 2002 and 2014, in a faculty of a distinguished Turkish university in different age, gender, and positional tenure groups. A questionnaire was filled in by 35 academic staff in 2002 and by 39 academic staff in 2014. The analyses of two different time survey data revealed that positional tenure, age, gender, compensation, and marital status have different effects during the 12 years period of time. Concerning the job characteristics, job level is important for increasing the continuation commitment of academic staff. The females are more committed than males.

Key words: Job satisfaction, Turkey, Academic staff, Job commitment

Introduction

This study is the first to examine the changes in job satisfaction and job commitment over a period of time in Turkish academia. The academia should be able to appeal successful people with academic curiosity. Furthermore, job commitment should be gained. Consequently, knowing the change of the determinants of job satisfaction and job commitment is essential. There are numerous factors that affect job satisfaction in academia. Money plays an important role, but it is not the only parameter. The level of fulfillment of employee's financial and social expectations both determine the level of job satisfaction. There were some studies about job satisfaction among the academic staff in the literature (Iacqua et al. 1995; Oshagbemi 2003; August & Waltman 2004; Horton 2006; Seifert & Umbach 2008; Love et al. 2010; Mamiseishvili & Rosser 2010; Bozeman & Gaughan 2011; Bentley et al. 2013a; Teichler 2014). Bos et.al. (2009) investigated differences in work characteristics and determinants of job satisfaction among employees in different age groups. Lacy & Sheenan (1997) examined the aspects of academic staff's job satisfaction across the eight nations. Results indicated that factors related to whole academics work environment being the dominant predictor of job satisfaction; morale, sense of community and relationship with the colleagues are the major parameters of job satisfaction. Enders & Teichler (1997) analyzed findings of an international survey on the various subgroups of academics in some of the European countries. The research was focused on the working conditions and how the academics handle their professional tasks. Several works on the subject are recently reviewed by Bentley et al. (2013b). Machado-Taylor et al. (2014 and 2016) reports the academic career satisfaction in Portugal and gender differences with respect to academic job satisfaction. Heijstra et al. (2015) examined whether age, work-related, and family-related predictors explain differences in the academic advancement of women and men in Iceland. Saner & Eyupoglu (2012 and 2013) examined the age, gender and marital status on job satisfaction relationship of academics in North Cyprus where the residents are mostly Turkish origin. Tiwari (2015) studied the job satisfaction of faculty members of selected private universities of Rajasthan state in India. Mirah et al. (2016) investigated the impact of talent management, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job performance on enhancing job performance at universities in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia universities located in Jeddah.

The factors that influence academic performance are relative. In developing countries knowledge is often held in higher respect and academics benefit from relatively more social status quo, but this is often stabilized by low salaries, poor research facilities, poor physical educational amenities, and lack of intellectual freedom (Altbach 2003). Smeenk et al. (2006) examines the factors of commitment among Dutch university employees in two

* Corresponding Author: *Baris Barlas, barlas@itu.edu.tr*

faculties with different academic identities. Their study reveals that social involvement has a significantly negative impact on commitment of academics.

For the academic staff, the university's reputation and standing in community is an important factor for academic job satisfaction. Beyond the economic satisfaction, social status quo is another key reason for motivation. Research and education environment, laboratories, and organizational setting play an important role. Also, collaboration with international researchers is very desirable. Every professor wants bright and talented students in their class. Working with bright students can be a joy and highly rewarding. A good salary is regarded as one of the most important factor to motivate employees, especially in developing countries. A higher level of pay satisfaction can motivate employees to work harder and increase their commitment. Not everything is depend on money in academia, however provided with a minimum required level of wage is essential. Benefits, such as on campus housing and pk-12 schools for the children are also very striking. The future possibilities and expectations are other important factors for academic job satisfaction, it suggests that the position has the potential to fulfill ones future plans. Someone do not need to worry about job satisfaction, if less-competitive criteria for academic promotions are utilized. According to Demerouti et al. (2001) when high job demands are experienced, emotional exhaustion increases and job satisfaction will decrease. Friendly organization motivates academics towards a great job satisfaction. The academic's authority to make decisions freely regarding the tasks is also an important aspect of job satisfaction. Nowadays, reducing expenditures and growing universities, academic employees have an increased teaching load which often delayed at the cost of valuable research time. Because new assistant professors, post-doc researchers, and research fellows with PhDs generally have considerable research time, it might be that they feel privileged to do their work, leading to stronger feelings of organizational commitment.

The target of this work is to investigate the job satisfaction changes in 12 years time among the academic staff of the same faculty in different age, gender, and positional tenure groups. A questionnaire was distributed and filled in by 35 academic staff of the same faculty in 2002. 12 years later, the same questionnaire was again distributed and filled in by 39 academic staff of the same faculty in 2014. The analyses of two different time survey data reveal that positional tenure, age, gender, compensation, and marital status, have different effects during the 12 years period of time.

Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction

The Council of Higher Education is responsible for the supervision of (both public and private foundation) universities in Turkey in accordance with the Turkish Constitution and the Higher Education Laws. Obviously the rector of a university and the dean of a faculty have certain effects on the academic identity of a university or a faculty, whilst, according to the findings of Smeenk et al. (2006), Turkey is grouped as a low-managerialism country for the public universities. In the low-managerial view, the academic identity is considered consistent and uncompetitive, almost no financial reward. The goals are the achievement of knowledge, freedom of thought, and working with colleagues in a proper environment. In Turkey, public university academics have a large number of competing roles such as teaching, research, scientific publication, seeking funding, and conference and seminar commitments. The system is forcing the academics to seek for external funds and other resources. Also a good cooperative research relations with the industry has some positive effects for the academic promotions. For the last decade, the academics who want to get promote on, he/she should publish numerous papers in per reviewed indexed journals, attend conferences, do research projects besides the teaching work, which is 3 to 5 courses per year average. Writing and publishing a manuscript whose language is English is a very meticulous process for the ones whose native language is not English. Generally the language part takes the half of the process, and almost every review the main objection from the reviewers are about the usage of the English language. Besides, every academic staff have some sort of administrative duties.

The academic profession is one of the desirable occupations among the highly educated intellectuals in Turkey, like almost same at the other parts of the world. Among the typical tensions of academics in Turkey are the teaching load, obligation of requirements of scientific and industrial research, mentoring the MSc and PhD students, having administrative duties, difficulties come from financial difficulties such as rents, mortgage payments, credit payments, children's private school tuitions, etc. and dealing with children's education issues related to planning their educational future path.

As an outsider perspective, the academia seems very attractive and easy going environment, on the contrary the academic work is very complex. It is the interaction of both teaching and scientific research with the aid of academic curiosity. One expects for a stable balance between teaching and research. There is also a possibility

of an administrative duty. Theoretically, academics are independent professionals. For the last decade, job security has risen, young academics have to wait for a very long time until they eventually gain secure employment after completing their PhDs. Furthermore, chances to get promoted the influential positions in well respected universities within the academia have seriously weakened. In Turkey, the full professors and associate professors have tenure, and assistant professors practically hold an unlimited contract (renew every 2 years) in public universities. Although, in private universities, all the academics have limited contracts. That is why, for the last five years, the young professors retired early when they completed their required work years (generally, the retirement age in public sector in Turkey is around 50-55 years of age, after completing a minimum 25 years of work), then they continue their university careers in private universities. Generally they double their wages in the private university plus their retirement pension salary. In Turkey's public university system, the employee's pay based on his/her job classification, academic title, and years of working. In this system, the pay is composed of a fixed amount based on job classification, academic title and years of working. There is no flexible part based on job performance as seen in some other countries (Zheng et al. 2014).

In Table 1 the average gross annual salaries in USD for the academic staff is given. The foreign exchange rates are taken from the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey (CBRT 2014). For a comparison, average annual salaries of full-time public university faculty members in US is given in Table 2. In Turkish public universities, the salary of a newly appointed professor is in between a professor and an assoc. professor for 3 years. In Table 3 the comparison of the ratio of academic staff annual salaries to country's GDP per capita is given. In US the professors have an average salary of 2.29 times the GDP per capita. In Turkey the professors have an average salary of 3.75 times the GDP per capita.

Table 1. Average salaries of the academic staff in public university faculty members in Turkey.

Position	2002 salary (USD/year)	2014 salary (USD/year)	Diff. %
Professor (3+ years)	14044	37920	170.0
Professor (0-3 years)	12267	33577	173.7
Assoc. Professor	10489	29143	177.8
Assist. Professor	8978	24286	170.5
Lecturer	6667	22971	244.6
Research Assistant (RA)	6222	18783	201.9

Table 2. Average salaries of full-time public university faculty members in US. The data are taken from The Chronicle of Higher Education (2001) and (2013).

Position	2001 salary (USD/year)	2013 salary (USD/year)	Diff. %
Professor	84007	123393	46.9
Assoc. Professor	60571	84275	46.9
Assist. Professor	50635	73212	39.1
Lecturer	39928	54382	44.6
Instructor	35210	48359	36.2

As given in Table 3, in the US, the average ratio of annual salaries to GDP per capita is improved 5.1% from 1.55 to 1.63 in 2013, compared to 2002. But in Turkey, the average ratio of annual salaries to GDP per capita is reduced by 5% in 2014 compared to 2002. Also, the ratio of salaries of assist. professors, assoc. professors and professors to GDP per capita are reduced by 9% in 2014 compared to 2002. The GDP data are taken from World Bank (2014).

Table 3. The ratio of academic staff annual salaries to GDP per capita in US and in Turkey.

Position	US salary/GDP per capita 2002	US salary/GDP per capita 2013	TR salary/GDP per capita 2002	TR salary/GDP per capita 2014
Professor (3+ years)	2.20	2.38	3.93	3.56
Professor (0-3 years)	2.20	2.38	3.43	3.15
Assoc. Professor	1.59	1.63	2.93	2.73
Assist. Professor	1.33	1.41	2.51	2.28
Lecturer	1.05	1.05	1.86	2.15
Instructor/RA	0.92	0.93	1.74	1.76
Average	1.55	1.63	2.73	2.60

Method

The type of survey used is longitudinal survey. It is used to gather information over a period of time or from one point in time up to another. The aim of longitudinal surveys is to collect data and examine the changes in the data gathered. The participants were the academic staff from a well reputable faculty of a Turkish university in different age, gender, and positional tenure groups. In 2002, the number of participants were 35, and in 2014, the number of participants were 39. They all had the Turkish nationality and had been employed for at least 1 year. All of the respondents returned the questionnaire. All questions had been filled in by all the respondents. The questionnaire contained six questions.

Table 4. Personal characteristics for the academic staff.

	2002 Faculty	2002 respondents	2014 Faculty	2014 respondents
Gender (Male)	79.6%	82.9%	80.30%	76.9%
Gender (Female)	20.4%	17.1%	19.70%	23.1%
Age (Mean)		38.6		39.8
Age (Median)		38		40
Marital Status (Single)	27.8%	71.4%	39.39%	61.5%
Marital Status (Married)	70.4%	25.7%	57.58%	35.9%
Marital Status (Divorced)	1.9%	2.9%	3.03%	2.6%
Academic Degree (BSc)	11.1%	2.9%	21.21%	5.1%
Academic Degree (MSc)	20.4%	28.6%	22.73%	30.8%
Academic Degree (PhD)	68.5%	68.6%	56.06%	64.1%

In 2002 the average age of participants was 38.6 years, median age was 38 ($SD = 8.77$; range 25–65). Of the 35 participants, 17.1% ($n = 6$) were women. Regarding marital status, 71.4% of participants were married, 2.9% were divorced, and 25.7% were single. In terms of their education levels, 68.6% of participants had obtained doctoral degrees, 28.6% had master's degrees, and 2.9% had bachelor's degrees. In 2014 the average age of participants was 39.8 years, median age was 40 ($SD = 11.31$; range 25–62). Of the 39 participants, 23.1% ($n = 9$) were women. Regarding marital status, 61.5% of participants were married, 2.6% were divorced, and 35.9% were single. In terms of their education levels, 64.1% of participants had obtained doctoral degrees, 30.8% had master's degrees, and 5.1% had bachelor's degrees. The personal characteristics for the academic staff and the participants in 2002 and 2014 are given in Table 4.

The well reputable faculty considered here has a distinctive inbreeding history. Due to the fact that the faculty was the only institution in its particular field, inbreeding was inevitable. The author has every confidence in Medawar (1976), about inbreeding in reputable institutions as he mentioned in his famous work *Advice to A Young Scientist*. In 2002 academic staff list, 1 academics has a BSc degree and 16 academics have their PhD degrees from another University, 53 academics have their BSc degrees and 17 academics have their PhD degrees from their faculty. In 2014 academic staff list, 12 academics have BSc degrees and 13 academics have their PhD degrees from another University, 57 have their BSc degrees and 24 academics have their PhD degrees from their faculty. The reason for the rise in the BSc number is that, two other faculties established at the same field for the last decade and their graduates started their graduate level education in the considered faculty. Comparing the academics in 2002 and 2014; 34 people who were in the 2002 academic staff list are still in the academic staff list of 2014. Most have new academic titles and positions. The remaining 20 people; 4 were retired, 4 deceased, 6 are now in another faculty or university, 6 were working in the industry (left the academic career). In 2002 there were 54 people in the academic staff list in the faculty: 10 Full Professors, 15 Assoc. Professors, 8 Assist. Professors, 1 lecturer with Ph.D., and 20 Research Assistants (2 have Ph.D, 11 have MSc, and 7 have BSc degrees). 17 academics obtained their Ph.D's from the same faculty, and 16 academics obtained their Ph.D's from the leading universities in USA (5), Great Britain (9), Germany (2), and Turkey (1). In 2014 there were 68 people in the academic staff list in the faculty: 16 Professors, 6 Assoc. Professors, 9 Assist. Professors, 8 lecturer with Ph.D., and 27 Research Assistants (1 has Ph.D, 20 have MSc, and 6 have BSc degrees). 24 academics obtained their Ph.D's from the same faculty, and 13 academics obtained their Ph.D's from the leading universities in USA (4), Great Britain (6), Germany (2), and Turkey (1).

Analysis

The questionnaire is consisted of six questions. Questions 1 to 4 have four multiple choices in which the respondents were asked to select the best possible answer. In Table 5, the multiple choice questions are given. Questions 5 and 6 are rating and ranking questions. The respondents were asked to identify the most important

and the second important to them personally. The first given decision strongly favor the first choice over the others, and the second decision slightly favor the second choice over the rest. The purpose is to determine the levels of importance. Rating and ranking questions in 2014 questionnaire are given in Table 6.

Table 5. Multiple choice questions in the questionnaire.

	a	b	c	d
How satisfied are you with your current economic condition?	Perfectly satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Moderately dissatisfied	Totally disillusioned
How satisfied are you with your current social status quo?	Perfectly satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Moderately dissatisfied	Totally disillusioned
How satisfied are you with your current occupation?	Perfectly satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Moderately dissatisfied	Totally disillusioned
How did you choose your profession?	Personal decision	Influenced by family and friends	Influence from outsiders	By coincidence

Being economically satisfied is essential for one's job satisfaction and happiness. Higher job satisfaction grow up to earn higher levels of income. The first question is "In the existing economic situation, how satisfied are you with your current economic condition?" The results are given in Table 7.

Table 6. Decision making and rating and ranking questions in the 2014 questionnaire.

	a	b	c	d
If you win 1 million USD from lottery, what will you do?	I continue my current situation	my job	I quit my job and start a new life in Turkey	I quit and immigrate to another country
If you win 200,000 USD from lottery, what will you do?	I continue my current situation	my job	I quit my job and start a new life in Turkey	I quit and immigrate to another country
				Other (Please specify)
				Other (Please specify)

Table 7. Satisfaction with current economic condition.

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	11.4%	20.0%	57.1%	11.4%	12.8%	46.2%	38.5%	2.6%
Male	10.3%	17.2%	58.6%	13.8%	10.0%	46.7%	40.0%	3.3%
Female	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	0.0%	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	0.0%
PhD (24-25)	16.7%	16.7%	54.2%	12.5%	8.0%	44.0%	48.0%	0.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	0.0%	27.3%	63.6%	9.1%	21.4%	50.0%	21.4%	7.1%
Married (25-25)	16.0%	20.0%	52.0%	12.0%	8.0%	48.0%	44.0%	0.0%
Single (10-14)	0.0%	20.0%	70.0%	10.0%	21.4%	42.9%	28.6%	7.1%

In 2002, 57.1% of all the respondents are moderately dissatisfied with their economic condition, although in 2014 this choice chose by 38.5% of all the respondents. In 2002, 31.4% of all the respondents are perfectly and moderately satisfied; while in 2014 59% of all the respondents are perfectly and moderately satisfied. In 2002, one third of the PhD holders perfectly and moderately satisfied, in 2014 half of the PhD holders perfectly and moderately satisfied with their current economic condition. In 2002, three quarters of the MSc-BSc holders moderately dissatisfied and totally disillusioned with their current economic condition; in 2014 it is vice versa. In 2002, the married were happier with their current economic condition compared to singles; in 2014 it is nearly same. The MSc-BSc holders and singles are further pleased with their current economic condition in 2014, this is due to the fact that younger generation in academics could possibly have lesser financial problems; they have no responsibility for a family, no concerns about children's education, probably staying with the parents or on campus housing (on campus housing is possible for the research assistants since 2007). Also the increase in Lecturer and Research Assistant salaries are much more compared to the professor counterparts, 244.6% and 201.4% respectively.

The second question is "How satisfied are you with your current social status quo?" The results are given in Table 8. In 2002, almost half of all the respondents are perfectly and moderately satisfied with their social status quo, although in 2014 this choice chose by 61.5% of all the respondents. The social status quo condition is improved. While the PhD holders' choice both in 2002 and 2014 not changed so far (54.3% and 56% respectively), the MSc-BSc holders and singles are further pleased with their social status quo increased from 45.5% in 2002 to 71.4% in 2014, this is due to the fact that younger generation in academics dealing with the

social media much more compared to older ones. They express themselves boldly, and have much more self confidence compared to older academics.

Academics have a psychological need to maintain stability in their lives, they are much more motivated if their social status quo condition is higher. In 2002, comparing the married and singles, the social status quo condition almost the same, whilst in 2014, married academics are perfectly and moderately satisfied by 52.1% and singles by 75% with their social status quo.

Table 8. Satisfaction with the social status quo.

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	11.4%	40.0%	40.0%	8.6%	12.8%	48.7%	30.8%	7.7%
Male	10.3%	41.4%	41.4%	6.9%	10.0%	50.0%	30.0%	10.0%
Female	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	22.2%	44.4%	33.3%	0.0%
PhD (24-25)	12.5%	41.7%	37.5%	8.3%	12.0%	44.0%	32.0%	12.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	9.1%	36.4%	45.5%	9.1%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	0.0%
Married (25-25)	12.0%	40.0%	40.0%	8.0%	13.0%	39.1%	34.8%	13.0%
Single (10-14)	10.0%	40.0%	40.0%	10.0%	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%	0.0%

The third question is “How satisfied from your occupation?” This is a very direct question, the results are given in Table 9. In 2002, almost three quarters of all the respondents are perfectly and moderately satisfied with the academic world, while in 2014 this choice chose by 92.3% of all the respondents, and no respondent is totally disillusioned. The job satisfaction of married ones is in general higher than single counter parts in 2002, but there is no difference in 2014. Married academics perfectly and moderately satisfied with their jobs 86% in 2002 and 91.6% in 2014. Although single academics completely and moderately satisfied with their jobs 70% in 2002 and 93.3% in 2014.

Table 9. Satisfaction with current occupation.

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	57.1%	17.1%	20.0%	5.7%	71.8%	20.5%	7.7%	0.0%
Male	58.6%	17.2%	20.7%	3.4%	70.0%	23.3%	6.7%	0.0%
Female	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	77.8%	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%
PhD (24-25)	54.2%	20.8%	16.7%	8.3%	68.0%	24.0%	8.0%	0.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	63.6%	9.1%	27.3%	0.0%	78.6%	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%
Married (25-25)	56.0%	20.0%	20.0%	4.0%	70.8%	20.8%	8.3%	0.0%
Single (10-14)	60.0%	10.0%	20.0%	10.0%	73.3%	20.0%	6.7%	0.0%

The fourth question is “How did you choose your profession?” The results are given in Table 10. In 2002 20%, and in 2014 10% of the respondents chose “by coincidence”. It is the belief that someone's kismet and fate is pre-determined and unchangeable, it should be accepted because it ultimately cannot be avoided (Burrus and Roesse, 2006). It is expected that the intellectual level is getting higher, the kismet and fate belief is getting lower. In this geography kismet and fate belief has a great effect on people. In 2002 and 2014, the MSc-BSc holders and singles are choosing “personal decision” 100% and 93% respectively. Singles are assumed to know what they want compared to married ones, both in 2002 and 2014.

Table 10. How did you choose your profession?

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	77.1%	2.9%	0.0%	20.0%	79.5%	7.7%	2.6%	10.3%
Male	72.4%	3.4%	0.0%	24.1%	80.0%	6.7%	3.3%	10.0%
Female	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	77.8%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%
PhD (24-25)	66.7%	4.2%	0.0%	29.2%	72.0%	12.0%	4.0%	12.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	92.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
Married (25-25)	68.0%	4.0%	0.0%	28.0%	70.8%	12.5%	4.2%	12.5%
Single (10-14)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	93.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%

Table 11. If you win 500 000 (2002)/1 Million (2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the first choice?

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	62.9%	22.9%	11.4%	2.9%	64.1%	15.4%	17.9%	2.6%
Male	65.5%	17.2%	13.8%	3.4%	66.7%	13.3%	20.0%	0.0%
Female	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.6%	22.2%	11.1%	11.1%
PhD (24-25)	58.3%	20.8%	16.7%	4.2%	76.0%	16.0%	8.0%	0.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	72.7%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	46.2%	15.4%	38.5%	0.0%
Married (25-25)	60.0%	20.0%	16.0%	4.0%	79.2%	12.5%	8.3%	0.0%
Single (10-14)	70.0%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	33.3%	6.7%

In the questionnaire, for the questions 5 and 6, the money win from lottery in 2002 was 500,000 USD and 100,000 USD respectively; and the money win from lottery in 2014 was 1 Million USD and 200,000 USD respectively. The fifth question is "If you win 500,000 (in 2002)/1 Million (in 2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the first choice?" This is a huge amount of money in Turkey. The results are given in Table 11. In 2002, 60% of the married respondents and 58% of the PhD holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice. Only 16% of the married respondents and 17% of the PhD holders wanted to quit and immigrate to a new country. Although in 2014, 79% of the married respondents and 76% of the PhD holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice. Only 8% of the married respondents and 8% of the PhD holders wanted to quit and immigrate to a new country. This change is interesting that the 20% gain in 12 years show confidence in their current situation and in Turkey. The fifth question's second part is "If you win 500,000 (in 2002)/1 Million (in 2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the second choice?" The results are given in Table 12. In 2002, 48% of the married respondents and 50% of the PhD holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice. Although in 2014, 41.7% of the married respondents and 44% of the PhD holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice. While comparing the young (MSc-BSc holders) and the singles, they lack of confidence around 30% in the first choice. In 2002, 70% of the single respondents and 72.7% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice, although, in 2014, 40% of the single respondents and 46.2% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice. This fact shows that, young ones are lost their confidence drastically, but the older ones gain confidence in 12 years of period. In 2002, 20% of the single respondents and 18.2% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice, although, in 2014, 46.7% of the single respondents and 42.9% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice. This is because if their first choice is not actualized, the young academics want to protect their current status in hand.

Table 12. If you win 500,000 (in 2002)/1 Million (in 2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the second choice?

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	40.0%	28.6%	11.4%	20.0%	43.6%	30.8%	17.9%	7.7%
Male	44.8%	20.7%	10.3%	24.1%	43.3%	30.0%	23.3%	3.3%
Female	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	0.0%	44.4%	33.3%	0.0%	22.0%
PhD (24-25)	50.0%	16.7%	12.5%	20.8%	44.0%	32.0%	20.0%	4.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	18.2%	55.0%	9.0%	18.0%	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%
Married (25-25)	48.0%	16.0%	16.0%	20.0%	41.7%	33.3%	20.8%	4.2%
Single (10-14)	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%	20.0%	46.7%	26.7%	13.3%	13.3%

Table 13. If you win 100,000 (in 2002)/200,000 (in 2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the first choice?

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	88.6%	8.6%	2.9%	0.0%	92.3%	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%
Male	86.2%	10.3%	3.4%	0.0%	93.3%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%
Female	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	88.9%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
PhD (24-25)	87.5%	8.3%	4.2%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	78.6%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%
Married (25-25)	84.0%	12.0%	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Single (10-14)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%

The sixth question is “If you win 100,000 (in 2002)/200,000 (in 2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the first choice?” The results are given in Table 13. In 2002, 84% and 87.5% of the married and of the PhD holders respectively wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice. Although in 2014, 100% of the married and of the PhD holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice. These results are expected, because someone can not buy a decent flat with 200 000 USD in Istanbul in 2014. The sixth question’s second part is “If you win 100,000 (in 2002)/200,000 (in 2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the second choice?” The results are given in Table 14. In 2002, 52% of the married respondents and 58.3% of the PhD holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice. Although in 2014, 58.3% of the married respondents and 60% of the PhD holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice. In 2002, 100% of the single respondents and 90.9% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice, although, in 2014, 80% of the single respondents and 78.6% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their first choice. This fact shows that, 100,000 USD in 2002 and 200,000 USD in 2014 are not enough money for a risk free living. In 2002, 30% of the single respondents and 18.2% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice, although, in 2014, 40% of the single respondents and 35.7% of the MSc-BSc holders wanted to continue their current jobs as their second choice.

Table 14. If you win 100,000 (in 2002)/200,000 (in 2014) USD from lottery, what will you do in the second choice?

	2002				2014			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
All respondents	45.7%	17.1%	8.6%	28.6%	51.3%	25.6%	10.3%	12.8%
Male	41.4%	20.7%	6.9%	31.0%	53.3%	26.7%	13.3%	6.7%
Female	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	44.4%	22.2%	0.0%	33.3%
PhD (24-25)	58.3%	8.3%	8.3%	25.0%	60.0%	24.0%	4.0%	12.0%
MSc-BSc (11-14)	18.2%	36.4%	9.1%	36.4%	35.7%	28.6%	21.4%	14.3%
Married (25-25)	52.0%	12.0%	12.0%	24.0%	58.3%	25.0%	4.2%	12.5%
Single (10-14)	30.0%	30.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	26.7%	20.0%	13.3%

Results and Conclusions

The relationship between income and job and life satisfaction is positively correlated. Increased income and wealth can lead to increased job and life satisfaction, because money is used to satisfy needs. Howell et al. (2013) indicated that in older adults as economic standing rises, so a safety need of financial security and minimum risk taking rises, which in turn increases overall job satisfaction. Increasing economic standing may also help academics satisfy their major academics related needs. One’s financial security is an important outcome of socio-economic status that influences well-being. Increased well-being and income may be positively correlated with social support (Biswas-Diener & Diener 2001). Also changes in financial status over time, either positive or negative, may influence financial security (Moghaddam 2008). A good salary is regarded as one of the most important factor to motivate employees. A higher level of pay satisfaction can motivate employees to work harder. For the academic staff, beyond the economic satisfaction, social status quo is another important factor for motivation, especially in Turkey. Academics experiencing various positions use different criteria when determining their overall job satisfaction, of which financial security is potentially one prominent factor, the other is social status quo. In general, financial security can be obtained by inheritance or by a good salary.

For the singles and younger MSc-BSc group, there was a solid relationship between economic standing and job satisfaction in 2002. However, such dense bond could not occurred in 2014. The MSc-BSc holders responded that, they are perfectly or moderately satisfied (71.4%) with their current economic condition in 2014. The singles responded that, they are perfectly or moderately satisfied (64.3%) with their current economic condition in 2014. But when asked for if they win a big amount of money from lottery, what they will do in the first choice, they accept this an opportunity to leave the academic life. The MSc-BSc holders who are willing to leave the academic life are 53.8%, 35.7% and 21.4% for the amount of money win from the lottery in 2014 1 Million and 200,000 USD respectively. The singles who are willing to leave the academic life are 60% and 20% for the amount of money win from the lottery in 2014 1 Million and 200,000 USD respectively. This is due to the fact that younger generation in academics could possibly have lesser financial problems; they have no responsibility for a family, no education concerns about the children, probably staying with the parents or on campus housing. Moreover they explicitly see that their professor’s social and economic situation is not good

enough what they expected. Furthermore, one can conclude that almost half of the younger academics are lack of academic curiosity.

For the older PhD holder group provided support for the connection between economic standing and job satisfaction is mediated by both economic and social status quo satisfactions, although, social status quo satisfaction seems the stronger parameter. The PhD holders responded that they are perfectly or moderately satisfied with their current economic condition 33.3% in 2002 and 52% in 2014, and they are perfectly or moderately satisfied with their social status quo 54.2% in 2002 and 56% in 2014. On the other hand, the PhD holders who want to continue their current job situation in case of a lottery win 58.3% and 87.5% in 2002 and 76% and 100% for the amount of money winning from the lottery in 2014 1 Million and 200,000 USD respectively. This is due to the fact that the older PhD holders do not want to risk and change their current situation. In addition to more than half of the PhD holders are satisfied with their social status quo. One other reason is that, they do not rely on themselves or the country they live in, so they do not want to take risks to start a new life. It is documented that job satisfaction increases with age (Crooker and Near 1998; Bos et al. 2009). The findings indicate that academic positional tenure level and age are factors that are positively important in the job satisfaction in 2014, although, younger academic staff has lack of confidence for their future. They feel insecure with their current and future positions. Findings from the current study provide that money can buy satisfaction through increased economic status.

In one study, Cummins et al. (2003) found that future security in general was reduced among adults age 36 to 45; and while they assumed that they were taping into financial security, and Zumbo & Michalos (2000) examined financial security as a predictor of life satisfaction and found that financial security was a good predictor of satisfaction for a number of groups including students; this hypothesis is not verified. Vice versa between the adults age 36-45 is a specific age group that have PhDs, and have children of school ages, so the future security is increased among them. This diversity is assumed to exist due to the cultural differences between western and eastern parts of the world, where Turkey is located in between the two.

Concerning the job characteristics, job level is important for increasing the continuation commitment of academic staff. The females are more committed than males. According to Seifert & Umbach (2008) female academics are always less satisfied than their male counterparts. Nevertheless this assumption is not confirmed here, because there is no difference between the salaries of male and female academics in Turkish public universities. Besides, in Turkey men are typical breadwinners, so female academics less are worried about financial issues. This is true both married and single women. Generally, if married, the husband takes the financial responsibility, if single, she probably lives with her parents or family (with siblings, cousins, etc). In 2002 young academic staff are more committed than the professors, whereas in 2014 the older professors are more committed than their young counterparts. The young academic staff satisfaction with the social status quo increased in 2014. Overall satisfaction with current occupation is improved in 2014. Choosing the profession by personal decision are high in both young and older academic staff. Singles are assumed to know what they want compared to married counterparts, both in 2002 and 2014. The results reveal that age, compensation, and positional tenure have significant effects on the job satisfaction and the commitment. Similar findings are also reported in Filiz (2014).

For the future research, the same questionnaire can be done ten years later to observe the change of the determinants of job satisfaction and the commitment among the academic staff. The author is aware that the research has some limitations that must be considered in evaluating the study's findings. The respondents were all employed at the same faculty in Turkey. Although there is no reason to believe that the relations observed are unique to the faculty or university, generalizations to other faculties and universities should be made wisely, although the author biased to think that the relations can be generalized to Turkish public universities.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2003). *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(2), 177-192.
- Bentley, P.J., Coates, H., Dobson, I.R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L.V. (Eds.). (2013a). *Job Satisfaction around the Academic World*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bentley, P.J., Coates, H., Dobson, I.R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L.V. (2013b). Academic Job Satisfaction from an International Comparative Perspective: Factors Associated with Satisfaction Across 12

- Countries. In Bentley, P.J., Coates, H., Dobson, I.R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L.V. (Eds.), *Job Satisfaction around the Academic World* (pp 239-262), Dordrecht: Springer.
- Biswas-Diener, R., & Diener, E. (2001). Making the best of a bad situation: Satisfaction in the slums of Calcutta. *Social Indicators Research*, 55, 329-352.
- Bos, J.T., Donders, N.C.G.M., Bouwman-Brouwer, K.M., & Van der Gulden, J.W.J. (2009). Work characteristics and determinants of job satisfaction in four age groups: university employees' point of view. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*, 82, 1249-1259.
- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job Satisfaction among University Faculty: Individual, Work, and Institutional Determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-186.
- Burrus, J., & Roese, N.J. (2006). Long ago it was meant to be: the interplay between time, construal, and fate beliefs. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 32(8), 1050-1058.
- CBRT (2014, July 5). Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey foreign exchange rates. Retrieved from <http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/wps/wcm/connect/TCMB+TR/TCMB+TR/Main+Menu/Istatistikler/Doviz+Kurlari/Gosterge+Niteligindeki+Merkez+Bankasi+Kurlarii>
- Crooker K.J., & Near, J.P. (1998). Happiness and satisfaction: Measures of affect and cognition? *Social Indicators Research*, 44, 195-224.
- Cummins, R. A., Eckersley, R., Pallant, J., Van Vugt, J., & Misajon, R. (2003). Developing a national index of subjective wellbeing: The Australian unity wellbeing index. *Social Indicators Research*, 64, 159-190.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499-512.
- Enders, J.; & Teichler, U. (1997). A victim of their own success? Employment and working conditions of academic staff in comparative perspective. *Higher Education*, 34(3), 347-372.
- Filiz, Z. (2014). An Analysis of the Levels of Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction of the Academic Staff. *Social Indicators Research*, 116, 793-808.
- Heijstra, T., Bjarnason, T., & Rafnsdóttir, G.L. (2015). Predictors of Gender Inequalities in the Rank of Full Professor. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 59(2), 214-230.
- Horton, S. (2006). High aspirations: differences in employee satisfaction between university faculty and staff. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 1(3), 315-322.
- Howell, R.T., Kurai, M., & Tam, L. (2013). Money Buys Financial Security and Psychological Need Satisfaction: Testing Need Theory in Affluence. *Social Indicators Research*, 110, 17-29.
- Iiacqua, J. A., Schumacher, P., & Li, H. C. (1995). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education*, 116(1), 51-61.
- Lacy, F.J., & Sheehan, B.A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher Education*, 34(3), 305-322.
- Love, K.M., Tatman, A.W., & Chapman, B.P. (2010). Role stress, interrole conflict, and job satisfaction among university employees: the creation and test of a model. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 47, 30-37.
- Machado-Taylor, M.L., White, K., & Gouveia, O. (2014). Job Satisfaction of Academics: Does Gender Matter? *Higher Education Policy*, 27, 363-384.
- Machado-Taylor, M.L., Soares, V.M., Brites, R., Ferreira, J.B., Farhangmehr, M., Gouveia, O., & Peterson, M. (2016). Academic job satisfaction and motivation: findings from a nationwide study in Portuguese higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(3), 541-559.
- Mamiseishvili, K., & Rosser, V. J. (2010). Examining the relationship between faculty productivity and job satisfaction. *Journal of the Professorate*, 5(2), 100-132.
- Medawar, P.D. (1979). *Advice to A Young Scientist*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Mirah, D., Rowe, A., Atkinson, C., & Sutton, A. (2016). The impact of job performance enablers on job performance capability: an empirical study on Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) Universities located in Jeddah, *Journal of Business & Management (COES&RJ-JBM)*, 4(2), 72-92.
- Moghaddam, M. (2008). Happiness, faith, friends, and fortune-Empirical evidence from the 1998 US survey data. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 577-587.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. *Int J Soc Econ*, 30(12), 1210-1232.
- Saner, T., & Eyupoglu, S.Z. (2012). The Age and Job Satisfaction Relationship in Higher Education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 1020-1026.
- Saner, T., & Eyupoglu, S.Z. (2013). The Gender-marital Status Job Satisfaction Relationship of Academics. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 2817-2821.
- Seifert, T.A., & Umbach, P.D. (2008). The Effects of Faculty Demographic Characteristics and Disciplinary Context on Dimensions of Job Satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 357-381.