

JOB CONCERN FACTORS AND ACADEMIC STAFF ENGAGEMENT IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES, LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

**MARUFF AKINWALE OLADEJO
AZEEZAT TEMITOPE KAREEM
MULIKAT OMOLADE GHANNI**

University of Lagos, Akoka, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Job concern is a common element in any work organization. It is, no doubt, capable of determining the extent to which an employee is engaged with the job. This study therefore investigated job concern factors (namely workload, job hazard, and interpersonal discrimination) and academic staff engagement in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. The descriptive survey research design was used for the study. Five null-hypotheses, tested at .05 level of significance, guided the study. Participants were 250 randomly selected academic staff from two purposively selected public universities in Lagos State. A self-constructed questionnaire was used for data collection. Data were analyzed using inferential statistics, specifically One Sample t-test, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, Pearson Chi Square, and Independent t-test respectively. Findings showed that in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria, the level of academic staff engagement was low [$t(249) = 230.15, p > 0.05$]. No significant relationship was found between workload and employee engagement [$r(248) = -.611; p > 0.05$]. Further finding showed that employee engagement was significantly related to job hazard [$r(248) = .502, p < 0.05$]. There was also significant relationship between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement [$r(248) = .721; p < 0.05$]. Finally, there was no significant difference in employee engagement among academic staff in Federal and State Universities [$t(249) = 3.122, p > 0.05$]. It was recommended that Government and institutional administrators should ensure that the working environment is made more conducive for scholarly works, employ more qualified staff, and avoid interpersonal discrimination among academic staff.

INTRODUCTION

Job concern is a common element in any work organization. It is a source of tension and frustration which can arise through a number of interrelated influences on behavior, including individual, group, organizational, and environmental factors. According to Akpovi (as cited in Okoh & Ujuju, 2011), any situation that is seen as burdensome, threatening, ambiguous, or boring is likely to induce job concern for employees. This is the type of situation that would normally strike the individual as deserving immediate attention as it is viewed as unfortunate or annoying.

Berwick (2013) described job concern as employees' reactions to characteristics of the work environment that seem emotionally and physically threatening. It points to a poor fit between the individual's capabilities and his or her work environment, in which excessive demands are made of the individual or the individual is not fully prepared to handle a particular situation. In general, the higher the imbalance between demands and the individual's abilities, the higher will the employee experiences job concern. Job concern often shows high dissatisfaction among the employees, work mobility, burnout, poor job performance, and less employee engagement at work (Teniibiaje, 2013).

Job concern, no doubt, is likely to determine the extent to which an employee is engaged in work organization. How much one is engaged with one's job can be a product of the types of concerns

one experiences in one's work place. In other words, job concerns and employee engagement, especially as relate to academic staff is a study that should be continuously investigated.

Engagement generally is a positive attitude where an individual goes above and beyond the call of duty, so as to heighten the level of ownership, and to further the business interest of the organization as a whole (Erkutlu, 2014). By employee engagement, Lockwood (2014) conceptualized it as the individual's investment of his complete self into a job role. Employee engagement has been popularized by practitioners as well as the research/academic community, and it is regarded as the barometer that determines the association of the individual with the workplace.

Academic staff engagement (used interchangeably as employee engagement) is affected by workforce conditions such as a positive and safe work environment, supervision, work load and discrimination. Discrimination turns the employees emotionally brittle, an hitherto simple peace-loving employees now become paranoid and suspicious, fearful, and angry individuals. Thus, elimination of discrimination is crucial for the satisfaction, motivation, commitment, and enthusiasm, as well as less stress of the employees. In addition, interpersonal discrimination, work complexity, hazard exposure, and workload would directly lead to the possibility of forming job concern conditions among academic staff of university.

Several researchers had carried out studies on lots of issues that constitute job concerns in various work organisations. For instance, Rehman, Schabracq, and Cooper (2010) identified work schedule and heavy workload as the major factors that cause employee job concern. Finding from Kayastha and Kayastha (2012)'s study also established high occupational stress, heavy workload, strenuous working conditions, poor peer relations, unreasonable group, and political pressure as factors capable of causing job concerns for employees. In other words, any of those signs mentioned once experienced by the employees, is capable of causing feelings of concerns on the job. Kayastha and Kayastha then concluded that academic staff of university were most likely to experience serious concerns in educational setting. In the education sector, we contend that academic staff job concerns could be role ambiguity, working relationship, conflicting expectation, working condition, role overload, work mismatch, workload, work hazard, work discrimination, and work schedule.

On the relationship between job concerns and employee engagement, finding from the study of Igbal, Ghafoor, and Malik (2013) confirmed that the relationship between work overload and employee engagement was significant. Their results showed that the direction of the relationship is negative which implies that workers derive their engagement from minimal workload. In a recent related meta-analysis, Jones (2013) reported a meaningful correlation between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement. He argued that employees who frequently encounter incivilities from others in their organization, display greater feelings of psychological distress, including higher rates of depression and anxiety which in turn, affect their engagement with the job. The impact of discrimination on employee has implications for work outcomes and physical well-being. A robust body of research suggests that the experience of interpersonal discrimination can lead to substantial negative physical outcomes. For instance, Goldman (2013) observed that gender-based discrimination related to the onset of physical ailments in women. Supporting this, meta-analytic evidence has shown that interpersonal discrimination correlates with increased incidents of physical health issues, which results in less engagement with the job by the employees (Jones). In response to interpersonal discrimination, employees may decrease their engagement and increase deviant workplace behaviors (Kickul, 2013).

Within Nigerian context, there seems to be little work that has been done on these factors that give serious concerns to the employees, especially academic staff in relation to their engagement with the job. Filling this research lacuna is the purpose of this study. On the basis of the above background, this study is therefore poised to investigate the job concerns in terms of workload,

poor supervision, hazard exposure, interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement among academic staff in public universities, Lagos State, Nigeria.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The duties of academic staff are quite enormous. Working at the tertiary level of the education system is an inherently job concern profession with long working hours, heavy workloads, difficult students, and conflicting demands. The physical and psychology demands of academic staff at the tertiary level of education, particularly university make them more vulnerable to high levels of job concerns. One of the major problems that is therefore facing the Nigerian academic staff in public universities today seems to be lack of job engagement. It is widely believed that a worker who is well motivated and satisfied with his or her job is likely to be properly engaged and perform his or her duties efficiently and effectively. But despite the fact that several motivational measures have been implemented in a bid to ensure that academic staff are meaningfully engaged with their job, the reverse appears to have been the case. In other words, motivation may no longer guarantee effective employee engagement if there are other serious concerns on the job.

The effects of job concerns are evidenced in increased errors in memoranda, high medical bills, lateness to work, low job engagement, and low productivity. Despite the extremely negative effects of occupational concern on the human body and work performance, many institutional administrators seem not to have put in any concrete measures to address these job concern-related conditions that negatively affect academic staff engagement.

Furthermore, it appears there has not been a conscious establishment of a linkage between job concern factors and employee engagement among academic staff. It is in the light of these that this research investigated job concern factors namely workload, job hazard, and interpersonal discrimination, and employee engagement among academic staff in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate job concern factors namely workload, job hazard, and interpersonal discrimination, and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. In specific terms, the study was carried out in order:

- i. to investigate the level of employee engagement.
- ii. to determine how workload relates to employee engagement.
- iii. to establish the relationship between employee engagement and job hazard.
- iv. to examine the relationship between discrimination and employee engagement.
- v. to investigate the significant difference in employee engagement in Federal and State universities.

NULL HYPOTHESES

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance to guide the study:

1. The mean score of employee engagement is not significantly different from the hypothesized population mean.
2. There is no significant relationship between workload and employee engagement.

3. Employee engagement is not significantly related with job hazard.
4. Interpersonal discrimination has no significant relationship with employee engagement.
5. Employee engagement is not significantly different in Federal and State universities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section deals with the review of relevant literature to the study in order to have a better understanding of what had been done in this area. The review was done in turn as indicated:

Concepts of Job Concerns and Employee Engagement

Job concern is a critical concept with lots of importance in employee's life. It indicates a proper balance both in work and personal life which also ensures organizational productivity and employee's job satisfaction (Edwards & Easton, 2013). Job concern refers to the level of satisfaction, motivation, involvement, and commitment individuals experience with respect to their lives at work (Kalra & Ghosh, 2014). It is the degree to which individuals are able to satisfy their important personal needs while being employed by the work organization. It is very important for employees to have a sound mindset in their work field to utilize their full potentials, and to add value to the organization. An effectively engaged employee is an asset for the organization as he or she will ensure the full productivity. According to Dolan, Garcia, Cabezas, and Tzafirir (2012), job concern is a major concern for employees and how organizations compact with this issue is both of academic and practical consequence. Regarding employee engagement, Lockwood (2014) submitted that it is simply an individual's investment of his complete self into a job role. Employee engagement is the extent to which organizational employees are committed to the organization, subsequently feel passionate about their jobs, and put discretionary effort into their work.

Workload and Employee Engagement

Workload refers to the intensity of jobs assignment. With respect to academic staff, it simply means the number of hours the academic staff in a teaching-learning situation is made to bear (Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 2011). Oyebola and Ojuolape (2012) stated that one of the reasons why there is low employee engagement among academic staff in schools is because of the workload that members of the academic staff assume. Most studies have reported inverse relationships between work overload and employee engagement (Bemana, Moradi, Ghasemi, Taghari, & Ghayoor, 2013). Finding from Igbal, Ghafoor, and Malik (2013)'s study indicated that the relationship between employee overload and employee engagement is significant. Their results showed that the direction of the relationship is negative which implies that the workers derive their engagement from less workload.

Job Hazard and Employee Engagement

In today's work environment, safety and quality continue to remain critical priorities in the context of improving productivity and efficiency in the organization. The issue of safety at workplace and its environs is receiving serious attention worldwide. Okoye and Ezejiofor (2013) asserted that workplace hazards are organizational events which influence employee's behavior, engagement, and attitude to work especially in workplace that lack adequate compensation for victims. The impact of safety environment affects the engagement of employees either positively or negatively (Kadiri, 2011). Due to no adherence to safety rules and regulations, and ignorance of

the imminent dangers associated with many organizations, work related accidents and incidents are common, thereby negatively affecting the job engagement of workers (Nkogbu, 2015).

Interpersonal Discrimination and Employee Engagement

Onyeonoru (2011) predicted that perceiving interpersonal discrimination at work will damage employees' feeling about their work and employer. Studies have shown that perceived racial and interpersonal discrimination has a negative effect on job engagement, commitment, and integration at work and a positive effect on turnover intent (Foley, Kidder, & Powell, 2012; Raver & Nishii, 2010). Research has also revealed that perceived racial discrimination is related negatively to perceptions of fairness (Del Campo & Blancero, 2011) and positively to job concerns (de Castro, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2012) and absenteeism (Jones, Ni, & Wilson, 2013).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Social Exchange Theory (SET) is the most accepted and widely used theory in the recent research on employee engagement (Schaufeli, 2013). The essential principle of SET is that individuals make social decisions based on perceived costs and mutual benefits. It proposes that employees will be motivated to engage in their jobs when jobs are based on a fair and balanced system of exchange. This exchange relationship then evolves over time into trusting, loyalty, and mutual commitments.

There are key drivers that lead to employee engagement which are common in most business organizations. However, the components and the relative strength of each driver are likely to alter depending on the type of organization, sector, and demographic variations in the country or region. According to Social Exchange Theory, if employees perceive an organization as fair and just to them, they will reciprocate by putting in more efforts to work and by increasing their engagement, in accordance with the exchange ideology. The feeling of safety is influenced by the predictability and consistency of the fairness in assigning rewards, resources, or even inflicting punishment at work. In summary, SET theoretical foundation justifies the reasons why employees decide to engage more or less on their work, either positively or negatively, contingent upon the economic and socio-emotional resources received from their organization, or even decide to stay with their organization.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The design used for this study is the descriptive survey research design. This method was deemed the most appropriate design for this study because it involves chosen samples from a large population to discover the relative incidence distribution and interrelations of the study variables through questionnaire.

Population

The population of the study comprised 1566 academic staff in the University of Lagos (1042 staff) and the Lagos State University (524 staff) in Lagos State. The University of Lagos is a Federal-Government owned university, while the Lagos State University is owned by the Lagos State Government.

Sample and Sampling Technique

The purposive sampling technique was used to select the two universities in Lagos. This is because they are the only public Universities in Lagos State. However, a sample frame of all the academic staff in the two Universities was drawn using a stratified random sampling technique. Random sampling technique was then used to select the sample size. A total number of 150 and 100 members of academic staff was sampled from University of Lagos and Lagos State University respectively. Hence, the sample size for the study comprised 250 academic staff from the two institutions.

Research Instrument

A self-constructed questionnaire titled “Job Concern Factors and Employee Engagement Questionnaire (JCFEEQ) is the instrument used for data collection. The questionnaire has two sections. Section A dealt with the demographic characteristics of the respondents such as name of the University, gender, age, department among others, while Section B was a close-ended question designed in line with the hypotheses postulated. This section addressed workload (5 items), job hazard (5 items), interpersonal discrimination (5 items) and job engagement (8 items). The direct scoring for positive statements was 4-1 where; 4 = Strongly Agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree. The reverse scoring for negative statements was 1 – 4; 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Strongly Disagree.

Validity of the Instrument

The contents, the constructs, and the face validity of the instrument was carried out by experts in the field of Educational Management as well as Measurement and Evaluation. All the corrections and constructive criticisms made by these experts formed the basis for the final version of the questionnaire.

Reliability of the Scale Score

For the reliability of the instrument, the instrument was pilot tested in a study that was carried out on 30 participants from Federal College of Education (Technical), Akoka, Lagos State. A total number of 50 copies of the questionnaire was administered on academic staff, while only 30 copies which were completed filled were used. Cronbach method of estimating reliability was used to estimate the internal consistence/reliability of the instrument. The overall obtained Alpha value of 0.89 made the scale to be found reliable.

Procedure for Data Collection

A letter of introduction was shown to the participants with a view to obtaining their permission to administer the questionnaires on them. Copies of the questionnaires for this study were administered personally by the researchers. The instrument was filled during administration, and collection was made immediately upon completion to ensure high return rate. The instrument was administered on 350 participants, out of which 250 completely filled copies were used for the study.

Method of Data Analysis

Data from completed questionnaires were analyzed using the inferential statistics. Null-hypothesis one was tested with One-Sample t-test, and Null-hypotheses two and four were tested with the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Null-hypothesis three was tested with Pearson Product-Moment while Independent t-test was used to test Null-hypothesis five. All the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Results from the analyzed data were presented in the following:

H0₁ The mean score of employee engagement is not significantly different from the hypothesized population mean

Table 1: Level of Employee Engagement

Variable	Mean	SD	N	df	t	P	Remark	Decision
Employee Engagement	18.25	2.44	250	249	230.15	.13	Not Sig	Accept H0 ₁

A one-sample t-test was run to determine whether the sample mean is not statistically different from hypothesized population mean. Table 1 showed that with an hypothesized population mean of 3, there was statistically difference between the sample and the hypothesized population mean scores. This indicates that the level of employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria was low [$t(249) = 230.15, p > .05$]. Thus, the null-hypothesis which stated that the sample mean is not statistically different from hypothesized population mean was retained.

H0₂ There is no significant relationship between workload and employee engagement.

Table 2: Relationship Between Workload and Employee Engagement

Variables	Mean	SD	N	df	r	P	Remark	Decision
<i>Employee Engagement</i>	18.25	2.44	250	248	-.611	.10	Not Sig	Accept H0 ₂
<i>Workload</i>	10.03	2.13						

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was run to determine the relationship between workload and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State. Finding from Table 2 showed that there was negative, moderate, and insignificant relationship between the two variables [$r(248) = -.611; p > .05$]. Thus, the researchers failed to reject the null-hypothesis which stated that there is no significant relationship between workload and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State.

H0₃ Employee engagement is not significantly related with job hazard.

Table 3 Relationship Between Job Hazard and Employee Engagement

Variables	Mean	SD	N	df	r	P	Remark	Decision
Employee Engagement	18.25	2.44	250	248	.502	.03	Sig	Reject H0 ₃
Job Hazard	10.64	3.36						

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was run to determine the significant association between job hazard and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State. Table 3 showed that the test was significant [$r(248) = .502$; $p < 0.05$]. This indicated that there was significant relationship between job hazard and employee engagement. Thus, the null-hypothesis which stated that there is employee engagement is not significantly related with job hazard was rejected.

H0₄ There is no significant relationship between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement.

Table 4: Relationship Between Interpersonal Discrimination and Employee Engagement

Variables	Mean	SD	N	df	r	P	Remark	Decision
Employee Engagement	18.25	2.44	250	248	.721	.02	Sig	Reject H0 ₂
Interpersonal Discrimination	12.22	1.03						

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was run to determine the relationship between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State. Finding from Table 4 showed that there was positive, strong, and significant relationship between the two variables [$r(248) = .721$; $p < 0.05$]. Thus, the null-hypothesis which stated that there is no significant relationship between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State was rejected. It means that interpersonal discrimination has something to do with employee engagement.

H0₅ Employee engagement is not significantly different in Federal and State universities.

Table 5: Difference in Employee Engagement Between Federal and State Universities

Variable	Universities	Mean	SD	N	df	t	P	Remark	Decision
Employee Engagement	Federal	14.40	2.54	250	248	3.12	.13	Not Sig	Accept H0 ₅
	State	13.94	2.45						

Using an alpha level of .05, an independent-samples *t* test was conducted to determine whether academic staff in Federal and State universities in Lagos State differed significantly on engagement. The test was not significant, $t(249) = 3.122, p > .05$. An examination of the group means indicated that academic Staff in Federal university ($M = 14.40, SD = 2.54$) and academic Staff in State university ($M = 13.94, SD = 2.45$) are not much different. Thus, the null-hypothesis which stated that employee engagement is not significantly different in Federal and State universities was retained.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The first null-hypothesis which stated that the sample mean is not statistically different from hypothesized population in order to determine the level of employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State was accepted because finding showed that with an hypothesized population mean of 3, there was no statistically difference between the sample and the hypothesized population mean scores. This clearly indicated that the level of employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State was low [$t(249) = 230.15, p > .05$]. This finding further reaffirms Oyebola and Ojuolape (2012)'s finding that there was low employee engagement in schools, and that one of the reasons is because of the workload that members of the academic staff do. We also contend that another reason for this finding could be due to poor working conditions where academic staff carry out their work in the sampled universities.

The researchers failed to reject the second null-hypothesis which stated that there is no significant relationship between workload and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State because there was negative, moderate, and insignificant relationship between the two variables [$r(248) = -.611; p > .05$]. This finding contradicts that of Igbal et al., (2013) who reported that the relationship between employee overload and employee engagement was significant. Their results showed that the direction of the relationship is negative which implies that the workers derive their engagement from minimal workload. Shortage of academic staff could be responsible for their being over loaded with work, hence their low engagement.

Also, the third null-hypothesis which stated that there is employee engagement is not significantly related with job hazard was rejected because there was significant relationship between employee engagement and job hazard. Okoye and Ezejiofor (2013) asserted that workplace hazards are organizational events which influence employee's behavior, engagement, and attitude to work especially in workplace that lacks adequate compensation for victims.

There was positive, strong, and significant relationship between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State [$r(248) = .721; p < 0.05$]. Thus, the null-hypothesis which stated that there is no significant relationship between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement in public universities in Lagos State was rejected. Studies have shown that perceived racial and interpersonal discrimination has a negative effect on employee engagement, commitment, and integration at work and a positive effect on turnover intent (Foley et al., 2012; Raver & Nishii, 2010). Also, Jones (2013) had earlier reported a meaningful correlation between interpersonal discrimination and employee engagement. He argued that employees who frequently encounter incivilities from others in their organization display greater feelings of psychological distress, including higher rates of depression and anxiety which in turn affect their employee engagement.

Finally, the independent t-test conducted to determine significant difference in employee engagement in Federal and State universities was not significant, [$t(249) = 3.122, p > .05$]. Thus, the null-hypothesis which stated that employee engagement is not significantly different in Federal and State universities was retained. We argue here that the possible reason for this non-significant difference could be due to the fact that academic staff in both the sampled Federal and the State universities are working within the same environment and working conditions.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The need for academic staff to be engaged with their job cannot be over-emphasized. A well engaged academic staff will be able to offer quality teaching, community service, and research to the humanity, which will translate into quality output in terms of qualified graduates. It is hereby recommended as follows:

- i. Interpersonal discrimination among academic staff should be discouraged. Rather, everyone should deal with fear without favor or any form of discrimination. This can go a long way at enhancing the level of employee engagement among academic staff once they feel secured and being treated fairly.
- ii. Also, all necessary safety measures which will prevent academic staff from being exposed to avoidable job hazards should be put in place, especially by the institutional administrators. Government should also increase the hazard allowance made available to staff in order to have a better engaged staff.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Findings from this study have certain implications towards effective planning that will ensure positive engagement of the academic staff. These implications include the followings:

- i. Government and institutional administrators need to plan the working environment such that it is made more conducive for scholarly works in terms of the provision of necessary equipment, facilities, and materials that can enhance the level of engagement of the academic staff with their job.
- ii. Government and institutional administrators need to plan for the recruitment of more qualified academic staff in line with staff-student ratio with a view to reducing the workload being currently experienced by the academic staff.

REFERENCES

- Bemana, V., Moradi, Y., Ghasemi, U., Taghari, M., & Ghayoor, W. (2013). *Effective behaviour in organizations: Cases, concepts, and employees experiences*. New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Berwick, R. (2013). Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(3), 9-22.
- de Castro, H., Gee, Y., & Takeuchi, V. (2012). Predicting the salary satisfaction of exempt employees. *Personnel Psychology*, 34(5), 579 - 589.
- Del Campo, K., & Blancero, G. (2011). *Sex differences in social behaviour: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dolan, H., Garcia, Y., Cabezas, I., & Tzafrir, E. (2012). What is the state of job engagement among academic staff at Malaysian universities? *Unitar E-Journal*, 7(1), 15-26.
- Edwards, S., & Easton, G. (2013). Reward systems and academic staff performance: Evidence from Ghana. *Canadian Social Science*, 9(5), 57-62.
- Erkutlu, J. (2014). *Strategic pay*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Foley, N., Kidder, W., & Powell, D. (2012). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Goldman, L. (2013). *Academic staff workplace: The social organization of tertiary institutions*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Igbal, E., Ghafoor, I., & Malik, E. (2013). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Jones, J. (2013). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *TQM Mag.* 18 (5), 484-500.
- Jones, J., Ni, Y., & Wilson, D. (2013). Employee satisfaction in higher education: The case of academic and administrative staff in Turkey. *Career Development International*, 8(7), 347-356.
- Kadiri, S A. (2011). *Safety handbook for professionals*. Lagos: Zub-chord Technical Ventures.
- Kalra, P. & Ghosh, E. (2014). Levels of job satisfaction amongst Malaysian academic staff. *Asian Social Science Journal*, 35(9), 122-126.
- Kayastha, L. & Kayastha, R. (2012). Gender differences and job engagement: A study of university teachers in the United States. *Women Manager Review* 20(3), 177-190.
- Kickul, J. (2013). Which work factors determine job engagement? *Work*, 30(4), 433-439.
- Lockwood, W. (2014). *Personnel: The management of people at work*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Nkogbu, G. O. (2015). Impact of human capital development on organizational productivity in the Nigerian public sector: A case study of Nigerian Ports Authority (Delta Ports, Warri). Unpublished M.Sc Dissertation. Lagos: National Open University of Nigeria.
- Okoh, L., & Ujuju, N. (2011). *Educational planning: Theory and methods*. Owerri: Izharsons Co Ltd.
- Okoye, P. V., & Ezejiofor, R.A. (2013). The effect of human resources development on organizational productivity. *International Journal of Applied Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(10), 250-268.
- Onyeonoru, I. P. (2011). *Industrial sociology in Africa context*. Ibadan: Samlad Press.
- Oyebola, B. & Ojuolape, O. (2012). *Studies in motivation*. Lagos. Macmillan Books.
- Raver, L., & Nishii, F. (2010). *Bureaucracy in education*. Baltimore: John Hopline Press.

- Rehman, V., Schabracq, W., & Cooper, A. (2010). Worker sorting and job engagement: The case of union and government jobs. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 65(8), 595- 609.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement? In C. Truss, K. Alfes, R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane (Eds.), *Employee Engagement in theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Teniibiaje, O. (2013). *Value orientation, needs satisfaction and job performance of public servants in Akwa Ibom State*. A Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria.
- Tett, V., Jackson, Z., & Rothstein, P. (2011). Innovative behavior and job involvement at the price of conflict and less satisfactory relations with co-workers. *Occupational & Organizational*

APPENDIX

Job Concern Factors and Employee Engagement Questionnaire (JCFEEQ)

Dear Participant,

We are researchers in the above-mentioned Department in the University of Lagos. We are currently carrying out a research on job concerns and employee engagement. This questionnaire is mainly for research purpose. We hereby humbly request your cooperation by providing us with the required information. All information given be handled with strict confidentiality.

Please carefully read through the items and tick [] the appropriate information related to you in Section A and answer all questions in Section B. Your anticipated cooperation will be highly appreciated. Thank you.

Researchers

Section A: Demographic Data

1. **Gender:** (a) Male [] (b) Female []
2. **Age:** (a) 31 – 35 yrs [] (b) 36 – 40 yrs [] (c) Above 40 yrs []
3. **Teaching Experience:** (a) 01 – 05 yrs [] (b) 06 – 10 yrs [] (c) 11 – 15 yrs []
(d) 16 – 20 yrs [] (e) Above 20 yrs []

SECTION B: Put a tick (✓) to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement to the options presented in the column below.

KEYS: Strongly Agree (SA); Agree (A); Disagree (D); and Strongly Disagree (SD)

S/N	Workload	SA	A	D	SD
1.	I have too much work to do.				
2.	The job is taking too much out of me.				
3.	I deal with several emotional difficult situations.				
4.	Combining administrative work with academic work is tasking.				

5	I hardly have time to rest in my place of work				
Job Hazard		SA	A	D	SD
1	I am being exposed to illness.				
2	I am being exposed to injury.				
3	The physical conditions on my job (noise crowding, temperature) are too much.				
4	My job is physically strenuous.				
5	My workplace environment is not maintained with adequate safety measures.				
Interpersonal Discrimination		SA	A	D	SD
1	I have been treated with less courtesy than other people are in this institution.				
2	I am facing discrimination or harassment because of my race/ethnic background.				
3	I face discrimination because of my gender.				
4	I do not feel comfortable working with other colleagues.				
5	I am always being harassment				
Employee Engagement		SA	A	D	SD
1.	I am more committed to performing to be the best of my ability.				
2.	I am committed to the mission statement of this institution.				
3.	I am not dedicated to the success of what I am doing.				
4.	I voluntarily do more than the job requires so that I contribute to the efficient operation of the institution.				
5.	I do not think of my job every time.				
6.	I hate the job I am doing.				
7.	As an academic staff, I feel happy each time I am going to work.				
8.	If I get better option, I am willing to leave this institution immediately.				