

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Winter 12-2019

Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction Among Library And Information Science Educators In South South, Nigeria

Violet Ikolo

violet.ikolo@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Ikolo, Violet, "Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction Among Library And Information Science Educators In South South, Nigeria" (2019). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 2694.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/2694>

Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction Among Library And Information Science Educators In South South, Nigeria

By

Violet Elohor Ikolo
violet.ikolo@gmail.com

Abstract

Significantly, job satisfaction is influenced by different factors. This study assessed the factors influencing job satisfaction among LIS educators in South South Nigeria. Specifically, this study sought to determine the extent of satisfaction amongst LIS educators as well as identify the motivator and hygiene factors that influenced job satisfaction among LIS educators. The study used the descriptive survey design with the population made up of LIS educators from six Library Schools in South South Nigeria. The sample of 79 LIS educators were conveniently selected for the study from Library Schools in South South Nigeria. A structured questionnaire adapted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to collect data for the study. The structured instrument sought to measure motivator factors of the Herzberg's Two-Factor theory such as, work itself, achievement, recognition and promotion. While the hygiene factors covered items on institutional policies, supervision, salaries and benefits, relationship with colleagues and work environment. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentages, mean and standard deviation. The survey results revealed that, LIS educators enjoy job satisfaction. Work ranked as the highest motivator factor that influenced job satisfaction, while, relationship with colleagues ranked as the highest hygiene factor that influenced job satisfaction. LIS educators expressed dissatisfaction with recognition as a motivator and work environment as a hygiene factor. The study concluded that not all the motivator factors brought about job satisfaction and not all the hygiene factors brought about job satisfaction, confirming Herzberg's assertion that employees can be satisfied with some aspects of their job and at the same time dissatisfied with other aspects.

Key Words: Job Satisfaction, Library and Information Science Educators, South South, Motivator Factors, Hygiene Factors

Introduction

An educator is a key facilitator of knowledge and plays a vital role in nation building. The job of educators in the field of librarianship borders on the training of skilled LIS professionals. This training translates into the evident success of libraries, archives and information centers in effectively meeting their obligation of information provision (Edegbo, 2011). In this respect, LIS educators plays a vital role as they contribute to equip LIS professionals who will become future gatekeepers and brokers of information which is essential for knowledge acquisition, decision-making and national development (Abdulrahman & Habila, 2017).

According to Lien (2017), lecturers and educators are among the biggest human capital resources in universities, so, understanding factors that contribute to their job satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) is essential to improving the information base needed to support a successful

educational system. Korb and Akintunde (2013) highlighted on some of the downsides of job dissatisfaction among teaching professionals by stating that there is usually lack of enthusiasm for the job, which in turn impacts on the teaching/learning process, absenteeism, stress, poor student performance and inefficiency on the part of lecturers and educators.

It is on this backdrop that this paper aims to explore job satisfaction among LIS educators using Herzberg's motivation-hygiene factor theory. Also known as the two-factor theory, the Herzberg's theory has received widespread attention in investigating factors that influence job satisfaction among employees. For instance authors such as Winer and Schiff (1980), Islam and Ali (2013), Ghanbahadur (2013), have all carried out such these studies but their focus have been on employees' in fields outside the academic environment. This paper endeavors to address this literature gap. Hence, the need to apply Herzberg's theory in the job satisfaction study of LIS educators.

Statement of the Problem

Among other pressing problems of our time is the falling standard of education in Nigeria. Dabo and Azi (2016) noted that, it is no longer news that the tertiary education system have been producing half-baked and unemployable graduates. Many studies have reported teachers' low level of satisfaction (e.g., Van den Berg, 2002; Scott, Stone & Dinham, 2001, Korb & Akintunde, 2013) as a key reason why teachers and educators are not putting in their best. There is lack of evidence and research regarding the job satisfaction of LIS educators. There is also scarcity of information on the application of Herzberg's theory in the job satisfaction study of LIS educators. Based on the foregoing, the aim of this paper, is to investigate the factors that influences job satisfaction among LIS Educators in South South, Nigeria, using the Herzberg theory.

Research Questions

1. To what extent are LIS educators satisfied with their job?
2. What are the motivator factors that influences job satisfaction among LIS educators?
3. What are the hygiene factors that influences job satisfaction among LIS educators?

Theoretical Background for the Study

The study is hinged on the Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory developed by Fredrick Herzberg in 1959. According to Herzberg (1968) job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are controlled by two different types of human needs: basic needs and the need for personal growth. Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory emphasized that when these two factors are met job satisfaction is achieved (Samad, 2011). Herzberg called these two types of factors motivating factors and hygiene factors (Meister, 2006). In his theory, Herzberg suggested that there are certain factors in the workplace that cause job satisfaction while a separate set of factors cause dissatisfaction, all of which act independently of each other. Prior to Herzberg's study, it was generally accepted that factors which did not lead to job satisfaction must lead to dissatisfaction. However, Herzberg's study and eventual theory disproved this belief. Herzberg, believed that employees can love and hate their jobs at the same time (Herzberg, 1968). In essence, Herzberg tried to disentangle factors that led to job satisfaction from ones that led to dissatisfaction.

The motivators, are related to the work that employees do. These factors are believed to have the ability to motivate people to higher performance. The presence of motivators causes employees to work harder and they are found within the actual job itself. Herzberg emphasized that motivators can create satisfaction by fulfilling individual's needs for meaning and personal

growth (Syptak, Marsland and Ulmer, 1999). Explaining the theory further, Chapman (2010) stated that motivators deal with factors that involve doing the job.

Hygiene factors on the other hand, are not present in the actual job itself. They are factors that are not directly related to the job but the conditions that surround doing the job. They operate primarily to dissatisfy employees when they are not present. Herzberg also noted that job dissatisfaction is a result of conditions that surround the doing of the job such as working conditions, salary, company policies, job security, quality of supervision and interpersonal relations. Herzberg called this set of factors hygiene (Manisera, Dusseldrop and Van der Kooij, 2005). In order to remove dissatisfaction in a work environment, these hygiene factors must be eliminated otherwise they can cause employees to work less hard. What Herzberg found was that workers enjoyed achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, promotion, and growth and disliked was company policy and administration, supervision, work conditions, salary and some relationships (with supervisors, peers, and subordinates) environmental factors (Meister, 2006).

Adapting Herzberg's theory for this study, it is important to distinguish between the hygiene and motivator factors in the study. Accordingly, there are four variables under motivator factors. These include, the work itself, achievements, responsibilities and promotion. While the study looked at five variables under hygiene factors. They are; institutional policies, supervision, salaries and benefits, relationship with colleagues and work environment. Job satisfaction has been associated with lots of benefits such as building up employee motivation, improved performance, efficiency, and workforce retention. On the contrary, job dissatisfaction has been found to cause poor productivity, employee absenteeism, workers burn out, job migration, and a poor feeling of wellbeing.

LIS educators' work like other academic staff in universities involves teaching, research and publication, and while looking at the responsibilities of training future information professionals, LIS Lecturer's job satisfaction becomes an important issue to be assessed using Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene theory. This is hoped will reveal the factors that influence job satisfaction as well as the factors that least influence job satisfaction among LIS educators.

Review of Related Literature

Job satisfaction has many definitions. Among one of the earliest definitions of the concept, is one offered by Locke (1976), that job satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state of feeling resulting from the perception of one's job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one's important job values. This is reported by people's perceptions of their work and working conditions. Weiss (2002) sees it as a concept that involves the attitude which shows the contentment displayed by employees about their work.

According to Heathfield (2016) job satisfaction is the terminology used to describe whether employees are happy, contented and fulfilling their desires and needs at work. Many measures purport that employee satisfaction is a factor in employee motivation, employee goal achievement, and positive employee morale in the workplace. While another perspective of the definition is given by Dabo and Azi (2016) that job satisfaction is the ability of employers to be able to provide workers with the conditions that will make them more efficient and active in their place of work with the view to improving their productivity level Instrument.

Over time, job satisfaction has developed a reputation that relates it to work effectiveness. Several studies have been conducted about job satisfaction among lecturers. Zaman, Jahan and Mahmud (2014) was able to provide insight that the sources of job satisfaction not only arises from

the job, it also arises from other factors like work environment (both physical and social), relationship with supervisors and peers, corporate culture, managerial style. A study to determine the influence of promotion opportunity on job satisfaction among 320 lecturers in four public universities in Kelantan, Malaysia by Mustapha and Zakaria (2013), revealed that there was a positive significant relationship between promotion opportunity and job satisfaction. According to Shields and Ward (2001) the employees who are dissatisfied with the opportunity available for promotion show a greater intention to leave the institution. Apart from employee's satisfaction in job, promotion can be one of the factors that an employee can see as an aspect of job satisfaction. When employees perceive that there are golden chances for promotion they feel satisfied for the respective place in the organization (De Souza, 2002). In a similar study on higher educational institutes in Muscat, Sultanate of Oman, Khan and Mishra (2013) investigated the degree to which academic staff working in higher educational institutes experience job satisfaction from promotion. They found that academic teaching employees were satisfied with their level of promotion.

Muhammad, Rizwan and Yasin (2012) undertook a study to investigate the impact of two variables (pay and promotion) on the job satisfaction of lecturers in higher Education Institutes in Pakistan. They found that pay has significant influence on job satisfaction but promotion had less influence and partially significant to the job satisfaction of the lecturers. A similar study of Mehboob and Bhutto (2012) observed that faculty members were generally satisfied with their job. Specifically, their study, showed that "Work itself" was the most satisfying aspect that influenced job satisfaction, while "Policy" and "Working condition" were the least satisfying aspects of job.

Jawabri (2017) examined the job satisfaction of academic staff in higher education as well as private universities in UAE. The data obtained and analyzed revealed that only few factors have positively influenced job satisfaction, especially, supervisor support, promotion and support from colleagues. While, recognition and rewards for work done had a negative impact on job satisfaction of academic staff. Contracting evidences were presented by authors such as Akafo and Boateng (2015) who investigated the impact of rewards and recognition on job satisfaction in academic staff of seven private universities in Nigeria. The study revealed that, there was a positive relation between rewards and job satisfaction. For academic faculty members of state universities in Sri Lanka, recognition was a highly significant positive factor affecting the overall job satisfaction (Amarasena, Ajward & Ahasanul Haque, 2015).

Xuong-Kiet and Minh-Quang (2013) are of the opinion that job satisfaction is influenced by factors such as internal, external and personal factors, and according to these authors the internal, includes sub factors such as characteristics related to the basic nature of work. External factors, on the other hand, include sub factors such as the conditions of physical work, promotion conditions, relationships with superiors and co-workers, job security, organizational structure and culture. With an aim to examine the factors affecting faculty job satisfaction in institutions of higher education in Eritrea, Fessehatsion and Bahta (2016) collected data through a structured questionnaire from a randomly selected sample of 100 respondents from the IHE in Eritrea. Correlation and regression analysis revealed that research, co-workers relations, and training and development have strong positive and significant contributions to job satisfaction of the faculty in institutions of higher education in Eritrea.

Within the Nigerian academic environment, a study by Umaru and Ombugus (2017) revealed that regular salary payment, promotion opportunities, work environment, attainment of work goals, opportunity to growth and development among others are the determinants of job satisfaction of college of education lecturers. It was recommended that the college management

should fulfill their financial obligations and make provisions for adequate facilities as this will improve lecturers' commitment to work and job satisfaction for optimal performance. In a comparative study, Bello, Ogundipe and Eze (2017) provided findings that significant differences in the factors that influenced job satisfaction in public and private university lecturers in Nigeria. For working conditions, academic staff in private universities indicated that they had better working conditions, for pay package, academic staff in public universities stated that they had better payment package, while the academic staff in private universities are more satisfied with the recognition they got from their jobs. Again, Aderinto and Obadare (2009) questioned academic librarians on the effect their working environment had on their job satisfaction. Half of them (50%) indicated that the environmental conditions in the library gave them low job satisfaction towards their work.

Ikhifa, Imide, Israel and Okokoyo (2006) studied the level of job satisfaction among 230 randomly selected Colleges of Education lecturers. Five variables, work load, present pay, promotion, supervision and coworkers of were adopted for the study. The results showed that lecturers were most satisfied with their work load followed by coworkers, supervision and promotion. Lecturer s expressed a high degree of dissatisfaction with their present pay. Generally, lecturers were not satisfied with their job. The correlation analysis showed that there was a significant negative correlation between age, education level and academic rank and the various facets that determined job satisfaction.

Methodology

The study used the descriptive survey design. The population of the study is made up of LIS educators from six Library Schools in South South Nigeria. The convenience sampling technique was used to select 79 LIS educators. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire adapted from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The instrument was adapted from the Herzberg's Two-Factor theory. Section A sought to elicit biographic information from the respondents. Section B consisted of two sub scales. The first sub scale sought to measure motivator factors of the Herzberg's Two-Factor theory and it consisted of items measuring work itself, achievement, recognition and promotion. The second sub scale focused on the hygiene factors of the Herzberg's Two-Factor theory. They covered items on institutional policies, supervision, salaries and benefits, relationship with colleagues and work environment. Responses were recorded on a five point Likert scale from '1' for neutral to '5' for strongly agree. High scores indicated that the respondents strongly agreed to the factors of job satisfaction that they received at their workplaces were closely related to their job satisfaction pertaining to Herzberg's Motivation factors, similarly low scores indicated their strong disagreement of factors influencing job satisfaction for them at their workplace as pertaining to Herzberg's hygiene factors. The instrument was distributed to 79 respondents with the help of research assistants. A total of 60 copies of the instrument were returned, giving a response rate of 76%. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentages, mean and standard deviation.

Results and Interpretation

Table 1: Institutions Response from Library School in South South Nigeria

S/NO	Name of Institutions	No of Educators
1.	Ambrose Ali University, Ekpoma	8
2.	Benson Idahosa University, Benin City	9

3	Delta State University, Abraka	13
4	University of Calabar, Calabar	9
5	University of Benin, Benin City	10
6	University of Uyo, Uyo	11
	Total	60

Source: Head of Department Offices from the Various Library Schools

Table 2: Biodata of LIS Educators

Educators Biodata	Number	%
Age		
20-30	7	11.7
31-40	18	30
41-50	21	35
51-60	12	20
Above 60	2	3.3
Gender		
Male	23	38.3
Female	37	61.7
Educational Qualification		
BLS/B.Sc or equivalent	9	15
MLS/M.Sc or equivalent	34	56.7
PhD	17	28.3

Table 2 shows the biodata of the respondents. Majority of the LIS educators are between the ages of 41-50 years 21 (35%), while the least respondents are those that are 60 years and above 2(3.3%). There are more female LIS educators 37(61.7%), than male educators 23(38.3%). As regards their educational qualifications, the lectures with MLS/M.Sc or equivalent are more, 34 (56.7%). This implies that there are more LIS educators with MLS/M.Sc or its equivalent degree.

Research Question 1: Are LIS educators satisfied with their job?

Data in Table 3 provide answer to this question.

Table 3: Job satisfaction LIS Educators

Items	Mean	Std. Dev.	Remark
My work as an LIS Lecturer is thrilling	4.40	0.49	Satisfied
As an LIS Lecturer I have variety in tasks that I do	4.60	0.49	Satisfied
My job as an LIS Lecturer makes good use of my skills and abilities	4.60	0.49	Satisfied
My job as an LIS Lecturer is very challenging	4.20	0.76	Satisfied
My job as an LIS Lecturer makes me feel productive	4.20	0.40	Satisfied

I am proud to work in the university because it recognizes my work	2.80	1.48	Dissatisfied
I feel satisfied with my job because it gives me the feeling	3.80	0.99	Satisfied
I feel I contribute positively to LIS Education in Nigeria	4.20	0.40	Satisfied
My job as LIS Lecturer gives me good social standing	3.80	0.99	Satisfied
I am appreciated when I achieve or complete a task	2.80	1.48	Dissatisfied
I receive adequate recognition for doing my job well	2.60	1.21	Dissatisfied
My job as LIS Lecturer allows me to grow and develop as a lecturer	3.40	1.21	Satisfied
I get promoted when I am due for promotion	4.00	1.11	Satisfied
There is prospect for promotion in the Department of Library	4.00	0.64	Satisfied
There are opportunities for me to rise to the highest cadre in my career	4.20	0.40	Satisfied
Meeting my promotion requirements is easy in my institution	3.40	1.64	Satisfied
The institutional policies in my institution are favorable and	3.40	1.64	Satisfied
The institutional policies in my University motivates me to work	3.00	1.43	Satisfied
My boss is helpful and supportive	3.60	1.03	Satisfied
My boss gives me full support to carry out my duties	3.60	1.03	Satisfied
I feel my performance has improved because of the support from	3.60	1.03	Satisfied
The amount of pay I get for the job I do is adequate	2.80	1.61	Dissatisfied
My pay encourages me to put in my best in my job as LIS Lecturer	3.40	1.51	Satisfied
My income enables me to live in a manner I consider adequate	3.40	1.51	Satisfied
My colleagues are helpful and friendly	4.00	0.64	Satisfied
Colleagues are important to me	4.00	0.90	Satisfied
My Colleagues are interested in my professional welfare	3.40	1.21	Satisfied
My office environment is always neat	2.80	1.34	Dissatisfied
The lights fans air conditions in my office are adequate	2.00	1.11	Dissatisfied
The working tools are adequate	2.20	1.18	Dissatisfied
I am satisfied with pleasant working environment in my institution	2.00	1.11	Dissatisfied
Aggregate	3.04	0.9	Satisfied

A mean statistics of 3.04 and SD of 0.9 reveals that LIS educators enjoy job satisfaction. A cursory look shows that the mean statistics for each of the job satisfaction dimensions vary. LIS educators expressed the highest satisfaction (4.60 ± 0.49) for the variety of tasks they do and the

ability to use their skills. While the lowest mean range of (2.00 ± 1.11) was for items that had to do with satisfaction with the inadequacies of lights, fans, air conditions and unpleasant working environment in which the LIS educators work.

Research Question 2: What motivator factors influence job satisfaction among LIS educators? Data is presented in Table 4

Table 4: Mean Response for Influence of Motivator Factors on Job Satisfaction

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	
Motivation	Work Itself	60	4.40	0.44	Satisfied
	Achievement	60	3.65	0.49	Satisfied
	Recognition	60	2.70	1.26	Dissatisfied
	Promotion	60	3.80	0.57	Satisfied
	Motivation Factors		3.64	0.70	Satisfied

Listed in Table 4 are the motivator factors and their mean/ standard deviation scores showing how the factors that influence job satisfaction among the LIS educators. As can be seen, not all the motivator factors bring influence job satisfaction among the LIS educators. With a score of 4.40 ± 0.44 work ranks the highest. This implies that LIS educators work is a source of job satisfaction to them. The least area that the educators indicated dissatisfaction according to the data is in the aspect of recognition (2.70 ± 1.26).

Research Question 3: What hygiene factors influence job satisfaction among LIS educators?

Table 5: Mean Response for Influence of Hygiene Factors on Job Satisfaction

Hygiene	Institutional Policy	60	3.20	1.48	Satisfied
	Supervision	60	3.60	1.03	Satisfied
	Salaries and Benefit	60	3.20	1.50	Satisfied
	Relationship with Colleagues	60	3.80	0.87	Satisfied
	Work Environment	60	2.25	1.16	Dissatisfied
	Hygiene Factors		3.21	0.60	Satisfied

Table 5 presents the mean and standard deviation scores of hygiene factors. The highest hygiene factor as indicated by the educators is relationship with colleagues (3.80 ± 0.87). The least hygiene factor that they are dissatisfied with is the work environment (2.25 ± 1.16).

Discussion of Findings

The LIS educators indicated a high level of job satisfaction. This is reflected in the expressed satisfaction with the variety of tasks they do, the ability for them to use their skills, as well as a feeling of positive contribution to LIS education in Nigeria. It is also important to observe the expressed satisfaction about the opportunities to rise to the highest cadre available in their

career and the prospect for promotion in the Department of Library and Information Science. This findings supports the earlier explanation proffered by Schroder (2008) that, employees derive satisfaction from any work that is interesting and challenging, and a job that provides them with promotion opportunities. The result from the study supports that of Mustapha and Zakaria (2013) of academics in Malaysia being satisfied with the promotion aspect of their work. Similar finding by Khan and Mishra (2013) that academic staffs working in higher educational institutes in the Sultanate of Oman where satisfied with the promotion.

The results of the second research question regarding motivator factors showed that the most influencing motivator factor is work. The LIS educators expressed that their work is thrilling, has variety, is challenging, makes good use of their skills and abilities as well as brings about feeling of productivity. Motivator factors are believed push and encourage employees to higher performance. With a high level of satisfaction with Herzberg's motivation factors, there is a high chance that the LIS educators can be motivated to improved performance. This finding is not in agreement with an earlier study on professors by Bozeman and Gaughan (2011), that teaching undergraduates does not bring about job satisfaction for them. This result corresponded with that of Ghanbahadur (2013), whose result indicated that 73% of motivator variables were successful in predicting intrinsic job satisfaction and the strongest motivator variable was work itself. Similarly, this result supports the finding mentioned by Islam and Ali (2013) which showed achievement to be the predictor along with work itself of job satisfaction. On the other hand, the study's finding is not in agreement with an earlier finding by Winer and Schiff (1980) where they conducted studies using Herzberg's dual factor theory. They found that the achievement variable was the highest rated motivator among employees. This result further implied that although the educators feel satisfied with their work, promotion and achievement, they are dissatisfied with the level of recognition that their work attracts. Recognition is an important motivator factor that cannot be overlooked because it has to do with the extent to which an employer appreciates work done by the employee. Where recognition is lacking, this is an implication that LIS educators do not feel appreciated for their work and contribution. This situation if allowed to persist can eventually discourage the educators from putting in their best. This finding supported the result by Jawabri (2017) who observed that recognition had a negative impact on job satisfaction of academic staff. However the result is not in agreement with Amarasena, Ajward and Ahasanul Haque (2015).that recognition was a highly significant positive factor affecting the overall job satisfaction

The result for the third research question revealed that the LIS educators are satisfied with the all the hygiene factors except one (work environment). The hygiene factor with the highest score influencing job satisfaction among the LIS educators is relationship with colleagues. This is followed by supervision. Institutional policies and salaries ranked third. From the results, it can be implied that there is cordial and friendly relationship among the LIS educators, as has been reflected in their assessment of the relationship with colleagues. This is good, as such relationship with colleagues can foster and encourage collaborations beyond the immediate work environment which can further improve satisfaction. However expressed lack of satisfaction with work environment by the educators clearly suggests that the work environment for LIS educators in the universities is not very comfortable for them to work. This result is in supports the earlier finding of Aderinto and Obadare (2009) that half of their respondents indicated that the environmental condition in the library gave them low job satisfaction towards their work. The result also portrays the point made by Luthans (1998) that work groups characterized by co-operation and understanding amongst their members tend to bring about high level of job satisfaction. However, the findings of this study is not in line with the research carried out by Leea, Jay and Brandb,

(2005) that the workers were satisfied with their work environment. Abram (2010) reported that majority of academic librarians were satisfied with the quality of office furnishings and general office environment. As noted earlier, hygiene are not present in the actual job itself, instead, they are factors that are not directly related to the job but the conditions that surround doing the job. They operate primarily to dissatisfy employees when they are not present. Their presence remove job dissatisfaction from the job.

Conclusion

This study, using the Herzberg theory, has established that there are factors that influences job satisfaction among LIS educators in South South, Nigeria. The LIS educators in South South Nigeria expressed high job satisfaction. They placed more emphasis on the variety of tasks that they do and their ability to make use of their skills. The motivator factors influencing job satisfaction among LIS educators were identified as, work, achievement and promotion. While the identified hygiene factors are relationship with colleagues, supervision, institutional policies and salaries and benefits. The study concluded that not all the motivator factors brought about job satisfaction and not all the hygiene factors brought about job satisfaction, confirming Herzberg's assertion that employees can be satisfied with some aspects of their job and at the same time dissatisfied with other aspects.

Furthermore, recognition as a motivator factor was found to be lacking among the LIS educators. The implication of this is that LIS educators with time may become discouraged from putting in their best in their job. On the other hand, if recognition is present, it can motivate LIS educators to put in more effort in their work. Also, the absence of a comfortable work environment can bring about dissatisfaction among LIS educators. As a hygiene factor, the absence of a comfortable work environment can bring about job dissatisfaction. They might not necessarily want to quit the job because of the absence of this factor, but it can continue to make the unhappy with work. The findings of the present study can be adopted by the universities in Nigeria to increase job satisfaction, not only among LIS educators but also among other academic staff, thus ensuring that the educators put in their best to training the future generation of employees.

References

- Abdulrahman, A.B., & Habila, L. (2017). Library and information science education and the challenges of ICT in a depressed society. *Research Journal of Library and Information Science*, 1(1), 25-30.
- Aderinto, C.O., & Obadare, S.O. (2009). Working environment of cataloguers: An investigative research of academic libraries in South Western Nigeria. *Ozean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2(3), 137-146.
- Akafo, V., & Boateng, P. A. (2015). Impact of Reward and Recognition on Job Satisfaction and Motivation. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(24), 112-124. Retrieved from <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/viewFile/25095/25961>
- Amarasena, T. S. M. Ajward, A.R., & Ahasanul Haque, A.K.M. (2015). Does social recognition impact job satisfaction of academic faculty members of state universities in Sri Lanka? *International Journal of Recent Advances in Organizational Behaviour and Decision Sciences (IJRAOB)* 1(4). 540-553. Retrieved from www.globalbizresearch.org.

- Bello, A.O., Ogundipe, O.M., & Eze, S.C. (2017). Employee job satisfaction in Nigerian tertiary institution: a Comparative study of academic staff in public and private Universities. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(4), 33-46. Retrieved from www.eajournals.org.
- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154-186. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29789513>.
- Chapman, A. (2010). Motivation: Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Retrieved from www.businessballs.com.
- Dabo, S.A., Azi, S.A. (2016). Enhancing job satisfaction for teachers: A strategy for achieving transformation of secondary education in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(13), 37-41. Retrieved from www.iiste.org.
- De Souza, G. (2002). A study of the influence of promotions on promotion satisfaction and expectations of future promotions among managers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 13(2), 325-40.
- Edegbo, W.I. (2011). Curriculum development in library and information science education in Nigerian universities: Issues and prospects. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 560. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/560>.
- Fessehatsion, P.W., & Bahta, D.T. (2016). Factors affecting academic job satisfaction in the public institutions of higher education, Eritrea. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(11), 1-6. Retrieved from www.iiste.org.
- Ghanbahadur, R.R. (2014). To test the effectiveness of Hygiene-Motivation factors on Irish Accountants and American Engineers in predicting Intrinsic-Extrinsic job satisfaction. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment for M.A in Human Resource Management.
- Heathfield, S. (2016). How (and Why) to foster employee satisfaction. Retrieved from http://humanresources.about.com/od/employeesurvey1/g/employee_satisfy.htm.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*. 86-96.
- Ikhifa, R.A., Imide, O.G, Israel, O. & Okokoyo, I.E. (2006). Job satisfaction among educators in Colleges of Education in Southern Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences, Volume 6(5)*, 1094-1098 DOI: 10.3923/jas.2006.1094.1098.
- Islam, R., & Ismail, A. (2008). Employee motivation: A Malaysian perspective. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 18, 344-362.
- Jawabri, A. (2017). Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff in the Higher Education: Evidence from Private Universities in UAE. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 7(4), 193-211.
- Khan, T., & Mishra, G.P (2013).Promotion as job satisfaction, A study on Colleges of Muscat, Sultanate of Oman. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(5), 56-62. Retrieved from www.iiste.org.

- Korb, K. A., & Akintunde, O. O. (2013). Exploring factors influencing teacher job satisfaction in Nigerian schools. *Nigerian Journal of Teacher Education and Training*, 11, 211-223.
- Lien, P.T. (2017). Factors Affecting Lecturer Job Satisfaction: Case of Vietnam Universities. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 6(2), 138. DOI: 10.6007/IJAREMS/v6-i2/2809 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/v6-i2/2809>.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp1297-1349). Chicago: IL Rand McWally.
- Luthans, F. (1998). *Organizational Behaviour*. 8th ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Manisera, M., Dusseldrop, E., & Van der Kooij, K. (2005). Component structure of job satisfaction based on Herzberg's theory. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/16843703.2010.11673222>
- Mehboob, F., & Bhutto, N.A. (2012). Job satisfaction as a predictor of organizational citizenship behavior: A study of faculty members at business institutes. *International Conference on Business, Economics, Management and Behavioral Sciences Papers presented at Dubai*, 7-8 January (pp. 552-556).
- Meister, J.J. (2006). To work or not to work: Frederick Herzberg's Two Factor Theory regarding job satisfaction. Retrieved from <http://www.thebluz.net>.
- Mustapha, N., & Zakaria, Z.C., (2013). The effect of promotion opportunity in influencing job satisfaction among academics in higher public institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 6990.
- Muhammad, E.H., Rizwan, Q.D., & Yasin, M. (2012). The Impact of Pay and Promotion on Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Higher Education Institutes of Pakistan, *American Journal of Economics*, 6-9. DOI: 10.5923/j.economics.20120001.02.
- Rehman, M.Z.U., Muhammed, R. & Lashari, Z.J.A (2010). Effect of job rewards on job satisfaction, moderating role of age difference: An empirical evidence from Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*. 4(6), 1131-1139. Retrieved from www.academicjournal.org/AJBM.
- Samad, S. (2011). The effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitment and job performance relationship: a case of managers in Malaysia's manufacturing companies. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 18(4), 602.
- Schroeder, R. (2008). Job satisfaction of employees at a Christian university. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 17, 225-246. Retrieved from www.ebscohost.com.
- Scott, C., Stone, B. & Dinham, S. (2001). I love teaching but... *International Patterns of Discontent, Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(28). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n28.html>.
- Shields, M., & Ward, M. (2001). Improving nurse retention in the National Health Service in England: The impact of job satisfaction on intentions to quit. *Journal of Health Economics*, 20, 677-701.

- Syptak, M.J., Marsland, D.W. & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. *Family Practice Management*, 6(9), 26-30. Retrieved from <http://www.aafp.org/fpm/1999/1000/p26.html>.
- Umaru, R.I., & Ombugus, D.A. (2017). Determinants of job satisfaction of colleges of education lecturers: A study Of Nasarawa State College of Education, Akwanga. *Integrity Journal of Education and Training*, 1(4). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.31248/IJET2017.016>.
- Van den Berg, R. (2002) Teachers' meanings regarding educational practice, *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 577–625.
- Weiss, H.M. (2002) Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 173-194. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00045-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00045-1).
- Winer, L., & Schiff, J. S. (1980). Industrial salespeople's views on motivation, *Industrial Marketing Management*. 9(4), 319– 323.
- Xuong–Kiet, V., & Minh–Quang, D. (2013). A comparison of job satisfaction level between male and female faculty at the Vietnam National University of Ho Chi Minh City. *Asian journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(3), 10-19. Retrieved from <https://ajhss.org/pdfs/>
- Zaman, S., Jahan, A., & Mahmud, M. (2014). Job Satisfaction of university teacher's: A study on private university in Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(31), 138-147.