

GENDER DISPARITY AND ITS IMPACT ON JOB SATISFACTION: A COMPARATIVE FIELD STUDY

Mesh'al Kh. Metle, College of Business Studies, PAAET, KUWAIT

Adnan A. Alali, College of Business Studies, PAAET, KUWAIT

This study examined the levels of Job Satisfaction of male and female faculty members in The Public Authority for Applied Education and Training (PAAET) in Kuwait. A modified questionnaire was developed, and the reliability of the data was calculated. Data were examined using SPSS version 17.0 software. A t-test, descriptive statistics and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) were implemented to reveal whether the correlation between job satisfaction and gender is statistically significant and to examine whether the two sexes are different. The target sample population participating in this study was composed of N=101 male and female faculty members consisting of 62.6% (n=58) males and 57.40 (n=43) females. Findings showed no difference between male and female faculty members in relation to overall job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction.

Keywords: Gender Comparison, Faculty Members, Job Satisfaction Level, Higher Public Education Institutes.

INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is the most frequently researched job attitude and among the most widely studied topics of occupational psychology (Judge & Church, 2000). Job satisfaction is an important concept that plays a crucial role in modern socio-economic development. It represents an essential and effective element of employees' lives and is an important part of success for any organization and economy (Laguador et al., 2014). The importance of studying job satisfaction derives from its influence on employee's performance, productivity, absenteeism and turnover (Hendon, 2013). Level of job satisfaction reflects an employee's individual appraisal of his or her job. Frey and Stutzer (2002) stated: "*Greater employee well-being is associated with better job performance, lower absenteeism, and reduced job turnover and therefore of particular interest to firms and other organizations*".

There are some logical justifications that would lead any organization to take care of its employees to foster higher levels of job satisfaction among them (e.g., job satisfaction is an indication of the psychological well-being of the employees, and satisfied employees have decreased absenteeism and turnover). In addition, higher levels of job satisfaction increase employees' morale and productivity. When employees' expectations are attained, they may turn out to be highly devoted to the organization and experience higher satisfaction. Furthermore, job satisfaction could encourage employees to remain with their organization for a long time (Vrinda et al., 2015).

Although the topic of job satisfaction is viewed to be one of the most widely investigated by human resources and organizational behaviour researchers in various organizations (Clark 1997; Durst & DeSantis, 1997; Ellickson & Logsdon, 2002; Jung & Moon, 2007; Ting, 1997 and Wright & Kim, 2004), limited studies have been conducted on the influence and relationship between gender disparities and job satisfaction among higher education faculty members in

Kuwait. This study is directed and concentrated on investigating the effect and association between gender differences and job satisfaction among faculty members in Kuwait, as the education sector has its own characteristics that are different from those of other sectors and organizations.

The primary purpose of this research is to practically verify whether gender disparities affect faculty members' job satisfaction in the PAAET. In addition, this investigation examines whether gender as a demographic variable is a dependable indicator of faculty members' satisfaction levels.

Job Satisfaction

There have been a substantial number of studies focused on job satisfaction. Based on a review of the literature, it is clear that an employee being satisfied with his or her job will lead to a successful work setting, and vice versa (Borooah, 2009). Clark and Oswald (1996) explain that an employee's level of job satisfaction may reflect, and used as a mean of assessment of, an employee's benefits gained from the job and, as such, it is an essential signal of an employee's feelings and conduct.

Because job satisfaction has been extensively investigated for the last forty years, there is an abundance of job satisfaction definitions and aspects (Currivan, 1999; Lund 2003). Job satisfaction could be defined as a pleasant status or a favourable feeling deriving from the assessment an employee's job (Locke, 1976; Pavelka et al., 2014). Job satisfaction, thus, is the outcome of an employee appraisal of his or her job and job expertise. Spector (1997) contends that job satisfaction is how employees perceive their jobs and various facets of their jobs. Ellickson & Logsdon (2002) support this perspective by describing job satisfaction as the extent to which individuals respect and admire their job.

Robbins & Judge (2011) clarify job satisfaction as an employee's overall feeling regarding his or her job. An employee with positive emotions towards his or her job experiences a higher level of job satisfaction; however, an employee with negative emotions towards his or her job shows a lower level of job satisfaction. Odom et al. (1990) clarified job satisfaction as: *"the extent to which a worker feels positively or negatively about his or her job"*, which means employees with positive emotions towards their job experience higher levels of job satisfaction; however, an employee with negative emotions about his or her job shows a lower level of job satisfaction. It is assumed that satisfied employees are more devoted to the job than their dissatisfied colleagues (Robbins & Judge, 2011).

Gender and Job Satisfaction

Several studies have concluded that female employees experience extremely high levels of job satisfaction (Bender et al., 2005; Clark, 1997; Ishitani, 2010; Okpara et al., 2005; Roxburgh, 1999; Sousa-Pouza & Sousa-Pouz, 2000). However, there is an extensive, prolonged argument over whether gender disparities exist in job satisfaction. As a result, the factors causing these disparities in job satisfaction need to be explored (Bender et al., 2005; Kim, 2005; Sousa-Poza, & Sousa-Poza, 2003:2007). For instance, some studies contradictorily concluded that female employees experience higher levels of satisfaction at work than males, despite their lower payment and limited chances for advancement. In addition, they experience career failure, spend a longer time at lower career levels with lack training opportunities and have higher probabilities

of not getting social security. Further they suffer job segregation and feel more tension than males in the workplace (Bielby & Baron, 1986; Blau & Kahn, 1992; Clark, 1997; Hagedorn, 1996; Kim, 2005; Lynch, 1992; Loprest, 1992; Roxburgh, 1999; Sloan & Williams, 2000; Sousa-Pouza & Sousa-Pouza, 2000; and Westover, 2009:2012). Other studies found that males experience higher levels of satisfaction than females (Aydin et al., 2012; Chiu, 1998; Dalton & Marcis, 1987; Sousa-Pouza & Sousa-Pouza, 2000). An in-depth investigation conducted by Garcia-Bernal et al. (2005) indicated that social interrelationships influence male employees more than their female counterparts, except that working conditions were more important for female than males (Garcia-Bernal et al., 2005). However, Johnson et al. (1999) surveyed male and female directors' job satisfaction and found that both genders were satisfied with their jobs (Johnson et al., 1999).

In contrast, several studies ended without finding any important gender disparities in job satisfaction. Al-Ajmi (2006) investigated the consequences of gender disparities on job satisfaction in Kuwait, and concluded that there are no important disparities based on gender (Al-Ajmi, 2006). Garcia-Bernal et al. (2005) outline four aspects for delineating an employee's level of job satisfaction: financial facets, social interrelationships, working conditions, and individual achievement. Their results indicate no difference in overall job satisfaction on the basis of gender. Frye and Mount (2007) investigated the job satisfaction of top management directors and found no gender dissimilarities in overall satisfaction. Nevertheless, females showed slightly higher levels of job satisfaction than males (Frye and Mount, 2007). Another study conducted by Koyuncu et al. (2006) investigated men and women faculty members' work experience and job satisfaction in Turkey, and they also concluded that there was no meaningful gender-based discrepancy in job satisfaction (Koyuncu et al., 2006). In addition, Eskildsen et al. (2004), in their examination of Nordic countries' gender disparity and job satisfaction, concluded that no differences in job satisfaction exist. Bilgic (1998); Linz (2003); Oshagbemi (2003); and Tait et al. (1989), in their results, show that there is no gender disparity in job satisfaction. Chui (1998) explains the underlying causes of gender disparities in job satisfaction: first, female employees experience lower expectations than males yet feel satisfied anyway; second, due to social circumstances, there is a higher probability that females do not to show their disappointment; and third, men likely appraise their job features and attributes more positively than females.

As for the case of the PAAET in Kuwait, there is a lack of extensive, comprehensive and conclusive studies of gender disparity among male and female faculty members and its relationship with their job satisfaction. A study conducted by Al-Ajmi (2006) in Kuwait, which explored the influence of gender on employees' feelings of satisfaction and organizational commitment in five Kuwaiti government ministries, concluded that gender does not have a substantial influence on male and female employees' feelings of job satisfaction and organizational engagement; therefore, male and female faculties in Kuwait have equal levels of perceived satisfaction.

The only adequate justification for what has been stated in many studies regarding gender disparity in relation to job satisfaction level is that females have different expectations about their job than males (Campbell et al., 1976). The essential issue is that, despite the fact that females obtain less from their jobs than males, they perceive same level of satisfaction as males do because they have lower expectations. Job satisfaction, as a result, is considered to be the distinctive difference between what is anticipated and what is obtained by an employee. Job satisfaction as a whole depends on what an employee anticipates from his or her job and what he or she actually obtains from it. Specifically, higher expectations met with higher job outcomes

have strong effects on increasing job satisfaction, while lower expectations met with lower job outcomes have strong effects on decreasing job satisfaction. Nevertheless, higher expectations met with lower job outcomes have strong effects on increasing job dissatisfaction and lower expectations met with lower job outcomes have strong effects in decreasing job satisfaction (Kinman, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

The objective of this research is to explore the actual job satisfaction level and its relationship to gender disparities among faculty members. Both male and female faculty members in higher education contribute effectively to Kuwaiti social and economic development. Consequently, faculty members' job satisfaction is a very crucial variable and, thus, it is of substantial importance to investigate the relationship and influence of gender disparities among faculty member on their job satisfaction. The fundamental focus of this research is the relationship and influence of the gender differences of PAAET faculty members on their job satisfaction by examining job satisfaction with respect to gender disparities.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Despite the fact that there have been numerous studies about job satisfaction (Artz, 2010; Pallone et al., 1971), and large numbers of these examined gender disparities (Bender et al., 2005; Kaiser, 2007; Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2003), do we anticipate finding that gender dissimilarity among male and female employees affects their job satisfaction, especially in the PAAET?

In this study, gender disparity and its impact on Kuwaiti faculty members' job satisfaction is examined, with the intent to achieve and conform to the objectives of this research by trying to answer the following five basic research questions:

1. What is the overall level of job satisfaction of faculty members in the PAAET?
2. What is the relationship and influence of gender disparities on job satisfaction of faculty members in the PAAET?
3. What is the influence and association between gender disparities and the facets of job satisfaction (e.g., nature of work, payment, advancement policies, supervision style, and coworkers of faculty members) in the PAAET?
4. What is the relationship between the different facets of job satisfaction (e.g., nature of work, payment, advancement policies, supervision style, and coworkers, and Kuwaiti and American faculty members) in higher education institutions?
5. Which facet(s) of job satisfaction has/have a statistically significant impact on faculty members' job satisfaction in the PAAET?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the study is to explore the relationship and influence of gender disparities on male and female faculty members' job satisfaction in the Kuwaiti PAAET. Particularly, this study focuses on the following three objectives:

1. To determine and analyse faculty members' job satisfaction levels in the PAAET.

2. To determine and analyse the association and influence of gender disparities and faculty members' job satisfaction.
3. To determine and analyse the impact and relationship between gender disparities and faculty members' facets of job satisfaction.

Hypotheses

Our review of the related literature and studies revealed that much empirical research has concluded that females tend to experience higher job satisfaction levels than their male colleagues (Bender et al., 2005; Clark, 1997; Ishitani, 2010; Roxburgh, 1999; Sousa-Pouza & Sousa-Pouza, 2000). Nevertheless, There are various studies that have found that men enjoy higher levels of satisfaction than women (Aydin et al., 2012; Chiu, 1998; Dalton & Marcis, 1987; Sousa-Pouza & Sousa-Pouza, 2000), while some studies ended with no significant gender disparities (Al-Ajmi, 2006; Bilgic, 1998; Eskildsen et al., 2004; Garcia-Bernal et al., 2005; Frye and Mount, 2007; Koyuncu et al., 2006; Linz, 2003; Oshagbemi, 2003; Tait et al., 1989 and Ward & Sloane, 2000). In light of the literature review showing contradictory conclusions about gender disparity and job satisfaction, a perpetual investigation in the field of gender and job satisfaction would be needed. Hence, our review of the literature resulted in the formulation of six hypotheses, to be examined and verified, about relationship between gender disparity and Kuwaiti PAAET faculty members' levels of job satisfaction. The hypotheses were formulated as follows:

H₁: "A significant correlation, positive or negative, exists between gender disparity and PAAET faculty members' overall level of job satisfaction."

H₂: "A significant correlation, positive or negative, exists between gender disparity and faculty members' facets of job satisfaction (e.g., nature of payment, advancement opportunities, supervisory style and coworkers)."

H₃: "It is expected that Kuwaiti female faculty members perceive lower levels of overall job satisfaction because female faculty members experience lower expectations than their male counterparts."

H₄: "It is expected that Kuwaiti female faculty members perceive lower levels of job satisfaction because female faculty members experience lower expectations than their male counterparts."

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample and Data Collection

Survey data on job satisfaction were collected from the PAAET faculty members. For the purpose of this study, SPSS Version 17.0 software for Windows was adopted for the statistical analysis, in order to investigate the effect and the association between gender and faculty members' job satisfaction in PAAET. A t-test, descriptive statistics and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) were implemented to reveal whether the association between gender and faculty satisfaction is statistically significant and to examine whether the two sexes are different.

Questionnaire

101 questionnaires, which focus on fields related to job satisfaction in a Kuwaiti work setting, were sent on-line using the "Survey Monkey" software. 100% of the data comes from Kuwaiti colleges and institutions of the PAAET, and respondents were 43 females (62.6%) and 58 males (57.40). A modified Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire version 1977 uses a 5-point

Likert scale, was delivered on line, and consisted of the following range: 1=Strongly Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Undecided (topically 3 symbolizes neutral), 4=Satisfied and 5 =Strongly Satisfied. Thus, higher the scores, greater the level of satisfaction. Similarly, lower the scores, the greater the level of dissatisfaction. On the basis of a Weighted Average (WA) scale, the categories of the scale are as follows: a weighted average greater than or equal to 4.5 is “*Strongly satisfied*”, a weighted average of 4.5 greater than or equal to a weighted average of 3.5 is “*Satisfied*”, a weighted average of 3.5 greater than or equal to a weighted average of 2.5 is “*Undecided*”, a weighted average of 2.5 greater than a weighted average of 1.5 is “*Dissatisfied*” and a weighted average smaller than 1.5 is “*Strongly dissatisfied*”.

DATA ANALYSIS

Reliability Analysis

Cronbach’s alpha reliability of measure instrument: The primary statistical analysis to be carried out was Cronbach's alpha to measure and to ensure that the questionnaire was reliable, clear and complete. Table 1 shows the reliability value of questionnaire.

Overall job satisfaction & job satisfaction facets	Item	Cronbach’s alpha Reliability Cronbach’s α (alpha)
Overall JS	1-65	$\alpha=0.983$
Payment	10, 13, 29, 63, 48	$\alpha=0.747$
Co-Worker	6, 23, 41, 25	$\alpha=0.854$
Supervision	3, 4, 14, 17, 19, 31, 33, 40, 43, 49, 53	$\alpha=0.942$
Promotion	20, 9, 32, 49, 54	$\alpha=0.844$
Work-itself	1, 7, 8, 16, 42, 24, 30, 55	$\alpha=0.883$

To obtain measures of job satisfaction, a questionnaire survey was adopted. The measures of job satisfaction are: overall job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction (e.g., payment, coworkers, supervision style, advancement policies and nature of work). Result indicate that the questions were reliable for measuring the scale of internal reliability and consistency of overall job satisfaction (alpha coefficient=0.983), and internal reliability and consistency of the scales of the facets of job satisfaction were also reliable; payment (alpha coefficient=0.747), co-worker (alpha coefficient=0.854), supervision (alpha coefficient=0.942), promotion (alpha coefficient=0.844) and work-itself (alpha coefficient=0.883). Therefore, the measuring instrument used was reliable.

RESULTS

Effects of Gender Disparities on Job Satisfaction

Descriptive statistics based on gender disparity: The statistical analysis shows the relationship and influence of gender disparities on overall satisfaction and five facets of satisfaction of Kuwaiti faculty members in the PAAET. Table 2 shows results of the descriptive statistics of samples vary based on gender disparity.

Gender	Job Satisfaction & Job Satisfaction Facets	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
FEMALE	Overall job satisfaction	43	1.28	4.68	3.1993	0.92872
	Pay & security	43	1.20	5.00	3.5709	0.94019
	Coworkers	43	1.00	5.00	3.3779	1.11453
	Supervision	43	1.00	4.91	3.1222	1.06232
	Promotion	43	1.00	4.80	2.9302	1.16773
	Work itself	43	1.13	4.75	3.3198	.95560
	Valid N (list wise)	43				
MALE	Overall job satisfaction	58	2.12	4.80	3.2745	0.59602
	Pay & security	58	1.00	4.80	3.4069	0.87617
	Coworkers	58	2.00	5.00	3.5948	0.65028
	Supervision	58	1.55	5.00	3.2075	0.75527
	Promotion	58	1.20	5.00	3.0034	0.87739
	Work itself	58	2.13	5.00	3.5850	0.65593
	Valid N (list wise)	58				

Note: Mean of females' feeling of satisfaction and facets of satisfaction is: neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
Mean of males' feeling satisfaction and facets of satisfaction is: neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Overall satisfaction and facets of satisfaction: The results show that the mean of female faculty members' overall feelings of job satisfaction was 3.199, which is in the neutral category (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied). In addition, the mean of Kuwaiti male faculty members' overall feelings of job satisfaction was 3.274, which is also in the neutral category. Male and female faculty members' categorization as neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their overall job satisfaction indicates that faculty members need to be positively motivated. Higher education leaders and policy makers must pay more attention and work to improve various facets of job satisfaction on the whole. Like overall job satisfaction, the mean of female and male satisfaction with payment and security policies was 3.5709 and 3.4069, respectively, which indicates that neither gender was satisfied nor dissatisfied with these policies. Payment and security policies have a weak influence on both male and female faculty members. Increasing salaries and establishing a new compensations and reward system would be more helpful in increasing levels of job satisfaction. The mean of satisfaction with co-workers was 3.3779 for females and 3.5948 for males, which is also in the category neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. This indicates a weak relationship between both male and female faculty members' job satisfaction and their coworkers. This shows that there is a lack of integration and teamwork between faculty members. It is very important for officials to create a pleasant, social working environment in order to enhance job satisfaction among faculty members.

Moreover, the mean satisfaction with supervisors and their supervision style was in 3.1222 and 3.2075 for females and males, respectively, which is also in the category of neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. This is due to weak supervision and communications between superiors and subordinates at work. To improve the supervision style, which would increase levels of job satisfaction, it is of substantial importance to establish a participative and authoritative work setting between faculty members and their supervisors. Moreover, the mean of satisfaction with promotion policies was 2.9302 for females and 3.0034 for males, which also falls into the neutral

category. This is a result of promotion policies that are based on the equality of advancement opportunities between male and female faculty members that rely on, e.g., publishing academic research for advancement and seniority promotion systems, as they are the same for both genders. In addition, the mean of satisfaction with work itself neither was 3.3198 for females and 3.5850 for males and, thus, in the category of neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. It seems that the tasks or assignments of PAAET faculty members are not sufficiently challenging to be sources of satisfaction. This is consistent with the findings of Ciabattari (1986), who concluded that challenging and absorbing tasks can increase job satisfaction. In addition, higher education leaders need to enhance positive competition between male female faculty members in order to increase job satisfaction.

T-test of gender disparity: The t-test statistical output of gender disparities on satisfaction was not statistically significant. There are no differences between faculty members' sequence of satisfaction and facets of satisfaction. Males and females showed neutral results for satisfaction and facets of satisfaction. These results confirmed that no significant gender disparities prevail between gender and satisfaction. Our results are consistent with previous studies that concluded there are no important gender disparities in job satisfaction, e.g., Al-Ajmi (2006); Bilgic (1998); Eskildsen et al. (2004); Garcia-Bernal et al. (2005); Frye and Mount (2007); Koyuncu et al. (2006); Linz (2003); Oshagbemi (2003); Tait et al. (1989); and Ward and Sloane (2000) (Table 3).

Job satisfaction & job Satisfaction facets	Female	Male	t-value	Sig.
Overall Job Satisfaction	*3.1993 rank **(4)	*3.2745 rank **(4)	-0.465	0.643
Payment	*3.2745 rank **(3)	*3.4069 rank **(3)	0.902	0.369
Co-Worker	*3.3779 rank **(1)	*3.5948 rank **(1)	-1.140	0.258
Supervision	*3.1222 rank **(5)	*3.2075 rank **(5)	-0.449	0.655
Promotion	*2.9302 rank **(6)	*3.0034 rank **(6)	-0.345	0.731
Work-itself	*3.3198 rank **(2)	*3.5850 rank **(2)	-1.567	0.122

Note: *weighted average (wa) scale: $wa \geq 4.5$ is “*strongly satisfied*”, $wa 4.5 > wa \geq 3.5$ is “*satisfied*”, $wa 3.5 > wa \geq 2.5$ is “*undecided*”, $wa 2.5 > wa 1.5$ is “*dissatisfied*” and $wa < 1.5$ is “*strongly dissatisfied*”.

**Male and Female Respondents' Mean Value Order.

One-way (MANOVA) multivariate analysis of variance tests: For the purpose of comparing multivariate sample means, one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) between groups was employed to examine the effects of gender disparity on overall job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction. MANOVA helps to determine if any gender disparities have an important influence on job satisfaction and to identify the relationships among gender as an independent variable, and overall job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction as dependent variables.

MANOVA is valid under the assumption that the variance covariance matrices or the covariance matrices are equal for the two groups. The results show that value p is >0.05 or 0.001 , meaning p-value is not significant. This result provides evidence that the variance covariance matrices are equal for the two genders. Table 4 illustrates multivariate test, which indicates no statically significant difference between males and females on the joined influence of overall job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction as dependent variables ($F_{(6, 94)}=2.133$; $p=0.057$; Wilk's $\Lambda=0.880$; partial $\eta^2=0.120$).

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Non cent. Parameter	Observed Powerb
Gender	Pillai's Trace	0.120	2.133 ^a	6.000	94.000	0.057 ^b	0.120	12.799	0.737
	► Wilks' Lambda	0.880	2.133^a	6.000	94.000	0.057^b	0.120	12.799	0.737
	Hotelling's Trace	0.136	2.133 ^a	6.000	94.000	0.057 ^b	0.120	12.799	0.737
	Roy's Largest Root	0.136	2.133 ^a	6.000	94.000	0.057 ^b	0.120	12.799	0.737

Note: a=Exact statistic; b=Computed using alpha=0.05; c=Design: Intercept+Gender.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests of JS & JS facets: An independent MANOVA was carried out for each dependent variable at the $\alpha=0.025$ level of significance. Table 5 shows no significant difference between males and females in overall job satisfaction, $F_{(1, 99)}=0.25$; $p=.622$; partial $\eta^2=0.002$), with males ($M=3.27$) recording higher levels than females ($M=3.20$). No significant difference exists between either gender in work itself, $F_{(1, 99)}=2.73$; $p=0.101$; partial $\eta^2=0.037$), with males ($M=3.58$) recording higher levels than females ($M=3.32$). There was no significant difference between male and female faculty members in pay and security, $F_{(1, 99)}=0.81$; $p=0.369$; partial $\eta^2=0.01$), with females ($M=3.60$) recording higher levels than males ($M=3.42$). In addition, there was no significant difference between either gender of faculty members with regard to coworkers, $F_{(1, 99)}=1.51$; $p=0.222$; partial $\eta^2=0.01$), with males ($M=3.60$) recording higher levels than females ($M=3.38$). No significant difference was found between males and females in satisfaction with supervision, $F_{(1, 99)}=0.22$; $p=0.64$; partial $\eta^2=0.002$), with males ($M=3.21$) recording higher levels than females ($M=3.12$). Further, no significant difference between the two sexes male and female faculty members was found in promotion, $F_{(1, 99)}=0.13$; $p=0.72$; partial $\eta^2=0.001$), with males ($M=3.0$) recording higher levels than females ($M=2.94$).

Table 5
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA) TESTS OF JS & JS FACETS

Effect	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df/Error	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Gender	Overall Job Satisfaction	0.140	1/99	0.140	0.245	0.622	0.002 ^a
	Work-itself	1.737	1/99	1.737	2.735	0.101	0.027 ^b
	Pay & Security	0.664	1/99	0.664	0.813	0.369	0.008 ^c
	Co-workers	1.162	1/99	1.162	1.508	0.222	0.015 ^d
	Supervision	0.180	1/99	0.180	0.223	0.638	0.002 ^e
	Promotion	0.132	1/99	0.132	0.130	0.720	0.001 ^f

Note: a. R Squared=0.002 (Adjusted R Squared= -0.008).
 b. R Squared=0.027 (Adjusted R Squared= 0.017).
 c. R Squared=0.008 (Adjusted R Squared= -0.002).
 d. R Squared=0.015 (Adjusted R Squared= 0.005).
 e. R Squared=0.002 (Adjusted R Squared= -0.008).
 f. R Squared=0.001 (Adjusted R Squared= -0.009).

CONCLUSIONS

The primary objective of this investigation is to examine the actual level of satisfaction and its association to gender disparities among faculty members of the PAAET in Kuwait. Faculty members in higher education play very crucial roles in Kuwaiti economic and social development.

The independent t-test shows no statistically significant difference between faculty members in relation to their overall satisfaction and facets of satisfaction. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was also conducted, and its results were in agreement with the t-test findings. There is no significant difference between genders in overall satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction. Thus, all hypotheses are unsupported.

In the light of above results, the findings are inconsistent with this study's hypotheses. Faculty members experience the same neutral level of job satisfaction. Both genders seem to have the same expectations.

This study revealed that satisfaction among faculty members is not satisfactory. Decision-makers should pay more attention to developing more suitable educational systems and motivating administrative policies that would positively affect faculty members' job satisfaction. Supervision styles, payment policies, and coworker relationships are inadequate and need to be improved. Because faculty members of both genders in the PAAET are full time employees, security policies including career, health and social security need to be revised. Higher education management should provide more opportunities for promotion, higher payment and more reward systems. In addition, efforts should be taken to enhance and strengthen the morale of the faculty members and meet their individual needs in order to enhance their satisfaction and help them achieve their goals.

Male and female faculty members' status of being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their jobs indicates that faculty members need to be positively motivated. Higher education leaders and policy makers must take numerous steps to ensure higher levels of job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction. Further, as payment and security policies have a weak influence on

the job satisfaction of both male and female, increasing salaries and establishing new compensation and reward systems would be helpful for improving faculty job satisfaction. In addition, there is weak relationship between both genders and satisfaction with coworkers. This suggests the need to establish a new system to strengthen participation, teamwork and the social climate between faculty members. It is very important that the officials create a pleasant social environment in order to enhance job satisfaction among faculty members.

Moreover, as the findings indicate weak supervision and communications among managers and subordinates in the workplace, it is supposed that improving supervision would increase levels of job satisfaction. Therefore it is important to establish a participative and authoritative work setting between faculty members and their supervisors. In addition, it is vitally important to formulate policies that are based on equally encouraging promotion opportunities between male and female faculty members in order to maintain higher levels of satisfaction. It seems that when faculty members lack sufficiently challenging tasks at work, they experience lower job satisfaction. Higher education leaders need to enhance positive competition among faculty members in order to increase job satisfaction.

This study concludes that faculty members' overall levels of satisfaction and facets of satisfaction in the PAAET are "Indifferent". In addition, it shows no statistical significance between gender and satisfaction. These results are consistent with other studies (e.g., Al-Ajmi, 2006; Bilgic, 1998; Eskildsen et al., 2004; Garcia-Bernal et al., 2005; Frye and Mount, 2007; Koyuncu et al., 2006; Linz, 2003; Oshagbemi, 2003; Tait et al., 1989; and Ward and Sloane, 2000). On the other hand, these results are inconsistent with the findings of some other studies (e.g., Aydin et al., 2012; Bender et al., 2005; Chiu, 1998; Clark, 1997; Dalton & Marcis, 1987; Ishitani, 2010; Roxburgh, 1999; and Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000).

This study was conducted on a specific group in the particular work setting of educational institutions employing both male and female faculty members. Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to other organizations or sectors. Care must be taken to avoid generalizations, since the findings of this study were derived from specific organizations and population.

Another study could be carried out with a larger population, and future research needs to integrate more demographic variables, such as age, culture, tenure and education, to determine the influence and association between gender and satisfaction, when one or more of these variables are controlled.

REFERENCES

- Al-Ajmi, K., & Rashed, A. (2006). The effect of gender on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Management*, 23(4), 838-844.
- Artz, B. (2010). Fringe benefits and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 31(6), 626-644.
- Aydin, A., Uysal, S., & Sarier, Y. (2012). The effect of gender on job satisfaction of teachers: A meta-analysis study. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 356-362.
- Bender, K., Donohue, S., & Heywood, J. (2005). Job satisfaction and gender segregation. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57(3), 479-496.
- Bielby, W.T., & Baron, J.N. (1986). Men and women at work: Sex segregation and statistical discrimination. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91(4), 759-99.
- Bilgic, R. (1998). The Relationship between job satisfaction and personal characteristics of Turkish workers. *Journal of Psychology*, 132(5), 139-155.
- Blau, F.D., & Kahn, L.M. (1992). The gender earnings gap: Learning from international comparisons. *The American Economic Review*, 82(2), 533-538.

- Borooah, V. (2009). Comparing levels of job satisfaction in the countries of Western and Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Manpower*, 30(4), 304-325.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P., & Rogers, W. (1976). *The quality of American life*. Russell Sage, New York.
- Chiu, C. (1998). Do professional women have lower job satisfaction than professional men? Lawyers as a case study. *Sex Roles*, 38(7-8), 521-537.
- Ciabattari, J. (1986). *The biggest mistake the top managers make*. Working Women, No. 48.
- Clark, A.E., Oswald, A.J., & Warr, P. (1996). Is job satisfaction U-Shaped in age? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69, 57-81.
- Clark, A. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, 57(4), 341-372.
- Currihan, D.B. (1999). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4), 495-524.
- Dalton, A., & Marcis, J. (1987). Gender differences in job satisfaction among young adults. *Journal of Behavioral Economics*, 51(1-2), 21-32.
- Durst, S.L., & DeSantis, V.S. (1997). The determinants of job satisfaction among federal, state, and local government employees. *State and Local Government Review*, 29(1), 7-16.
- Ellickson, M., & Logsdon, K. (2002). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *State and Local Government Review*, 33(3), 173-184.
- Eskildsen, J., Kristensen, K., & Westlund, A. (2004). Work motivation and job satisfaction in the Nordic countries. *Employee Relations*, 26(1/2), 122-136.
- Frey, B.S., & Stutzer, A. (2002). *Happiness and economics: How the economy and institutions affect human well-being*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Frye, W., & Mount, D. (2007). An examination of job satisfaction of general managers based on hotel size and service type. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 6(2), 109-34.
- Hagedorn, L.S. (1996). Wage equity and female job satisfaction: The role of wage differentials in a job satisfaction casual model. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 569-99.
- Hendon, J.R. (2013). *Human resource management: Functions, applications, skill development*. Sage, L. A.
- Ishitani, T.T. (2010). Exploring the effects of congruence and Holland's personality codes on job satisfaction: An application of hierarchical linear modeling techniques. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(1), 16-24.
- Johnson, J., McClure, D., & Schneider, K. (1999). Job satisfaction of logistics managers: female versus male perspectives. *Transportation Journal*, 39(1), 5-19.
- Judge, T.A., & Church, A.H. (2000). Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper & E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp.166-198). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Jung, K., & Moon, M.J. (2007). Do age, gender, and sector affect job satisfaction? Results from the Korean labor and income data panel data. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(2), 125-146.
- Kaiser, L. (2007). Gender-job satisfaction differences across Europe. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(1), 75-94.
- Kim, S. (2005). Gender differences in the job satisfaction of public employees: A study of Seoul Metropolitan Government, Korea. *Sex Roles*, 52(9/10), 667-683.
- Kinman, G. (1998). *Pressure points: A survey into the causes and consequences of occupational stress in UK academic and related staff*. Association of University Teachers, London.
- Koyuncu, M., Burke, R., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work experience and satisfaction of Male and female professors in Turkey: signs of progress? *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(1), 38-47.
- Laguador, J.M., De Castro, E.A., & Portugal, L.M. (2014). Employees' organizational satisfaction and its relationship with customer satisfaction measurement of an Asian academic institution. *Quarterly Journal of Business Studies*, 1(3), 83-93.
- Linz, S. (2003). Job satisfaction among Russian workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(6), 626-52.
- Locke E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. (In M. D. Dunnette Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, (pp.1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Loprest, P.J. (1992). Gender differences in wage growth and job mobility. *The American Economic Review*, 82(2), 526-32.
- Lund, D.B. (2003). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18(3), 219-36.
- Lynch, L. (1992). Private-sector training and the earnings of young workers. *American Economic Review*, 82, 299-312.

- Vrinda N.N., & Jacob, N.A. (2015). The impact of job satisfaction on job performance. *International Journal in Commerce, IT & Social Sciences*, 2(2), 27-37.
- Odom, R.Y., Boxx, W.R., & Dunn, M.G. (1990). Organizational culture, commitment, satisfaction and cohesion. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 14, 157-168
- Okpara, J., Squillace, M., & Erondy, E. (2005). Gender differences and job satisfaction: A study of university teachers in the United States. *Women in Management Review*, 20(3), 177-190.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from UK universities. *Economics*, 30(11/12), 1210-32.
- Pallone, N., Hurley, R., & Rickard, F. (1971). Emphases in job satisfaction research: 1968-1969. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1(1), 11-28.
- Pavelka, T., Skála, M., & Ůadil, J. (2014). Selected issues of the minimum wage in the Czech Republic. *Ekonomie a Management*, 17(4), 30-45.
- Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2011). *Organizational behavior*, (14th ed.) Essex: Pearson
- Roxburgh, S. (1999). Exploring the work and family relationship. *Journal of Family Issues*, 20(6), 771-88.
- Sloan, P.J., & Williams, H. (2000). Job satisfaction, comparison earnings and gender. *Labour*, 14(3), 473-502.
- Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2003). Gender differences in job satisfaction in Great Britain, 1991-2000: permanent or transitory? *Applied Economics Letters*, 10(11), 691-694.
- Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2007). The effect of job satisfaction on labor turnover by gender: An analysis of Switzerland. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(6), 895-913.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. California: Sage.
- Tait, M., Padgett, M.Y., & Baldwin, T. (1989). Job and life satisfaction: A re-examination of the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of the date of the study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(3), 502-507.
- Ting, Y. (1997). Determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 26, 313-334.
- Ward, M., & Sloane, P. (2000). Non-pecuniary advantages versus pecuniary disadvantages; Job satisfaction among male and female academics in Scottish universities. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 47(3), 273-303.
- Westover, J.H. (2009). A cross-national look at the changing nature of gender differences in perceived job satisfaction. *International Journal of Global Business and Economics*, 2(1), 62-67.
- Westover, J.H. (2012). The job satisfaction-gender paradox revisited: A cross-national look at gender differences in job satisfaction, 1989-2005. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 3(2), 263-277.
- Wright, B.E., & Kim, S. (2004). Participation's influence on job satisfaction: The importance of job characteristics. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24, 18-40.
- Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1977). *Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press of Industrial Relations Center.