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Abstract

As institutions’ global environment becomes increasingly complex and inconsistent, the non-teaching staff agitations get intensified, thus, today’s institutions require dedicated focus. In the light of this, it is needful to identify and evaluate the issue of non-teaching staff agitations. Interestingly, studies are not forthcoming in Nigeria to address the above concern. Thus, this study examined job security strategy and job satisfaction of non-teaching staff in the public universities in Lagos State. The study used a mixed-method, and the population consisted of 4,800 non-teaching staff. The multi-stage sampling technique and a validated structured questionnaire were adapted for data collection. A 100% response rate was achieved. The job Security coefficient value was -0.283, an indication of negative effects on job satisfaction of
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the non-teaching staff in public universities in Lagos State. The result also revealed that Job Security was significant at 5% because the probability of its value was less than 0.05. Since the results revealed that Job Security had a significant effect on Job Satisfaction of non-teaching staff in the public universities in Lagos State, the study concluded that Job Security can strategically elicit job satisfaction of non-teaching staff in the public universities in Lagos State. Accordingly, this study recommends that the universities’ authorities need to reconfigure their employment policies, purposely, to eliminate unfair labor practices which may be facilitating threats, unfair dismissal, obscured career path, anti unions disposition, and unfair hearing on issues.

Keywords: Job Security, Strategy, Non-Teaching Staff, Job Satisfaction, Public Universities, Lagos State.

1.0 Introduction

Lots of problems are arising from the actions and inactions of the government as a stakeholder in the public universities in Nigeria. There are worries that government representatives do not feel the pains of internal stakeholders in the public universities in Nigeria. More so, there are allegations that children of government appointees in charge of Nigerian public universities are schooling abroad, consequently, they have little or no concern for the plight of those stakeholders who could not afford such luxuries. Consequently, the morale of non-teaching staff in the public universities appears dampened. Meanwhile, attempts to continue to fight back through recurrent industrial action might not necessarily be strategic and long-lasting. A search for a new approach is imperative, bearing in mind that non-teaching staff constitutes the front-line workers in any university. Sequence to the foregoing, this study is conceptualized.

Though there are studies that investigated the interactions between job security and some dependent variables, not several studies have been carried out on the interaction between job security and job satisfaction (Gallie et al., 2016; Kwabiah et al., 2016; Taduana, 2016; Daud, 2017; Jimenez & Didona, 2017; Abolade, 2018; Béduvé et al., 2018; De Cuyper et al., 2019; Imam & Javed, 2019; Mashi et al., 2019; Raeder et al., 2019; Adekiya et al., 2020; Kim & Kim, 2020; Nkedishu, 2020; Scicchitano et al., 2020; Hendarti et al., 2021; Konya et al., 2021; Stankevičiute et al., 2021).

None of those studies examined the effect of job security on job satisfaction with a focus on the non-teaching staff in the public Universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. Therefore, this is observed as a gap and serves as the focus of this study, thus, this study is centered on examining job security strategy and job satisfaction of non-teaching staff in public universities in Lagos State

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In this age, job security is closely tied to employees’ ability to demonstrate distinctive mastery and application of the latest technology in the discharge of daily responsibility, such mastery only comes through constant exposure and sponsorship to participate in the acquisition of emerging skills, in this regard the non-teaching staff members are victims of circumstance. Institutions toy with workers who lack the most current or up-to-date skills, workers in this category contribute less, and the chances of ending up with early exit, be it in form of deadwood, redundancy or rationalization is high. Based on the above exposition, non-teaching staff’s awareness of their job insecurity fuels their displeasure with the authorities in the institutions in focus. The null hypothesis for the study states that: Job security strategy has no
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significant effect on job satisfaction of the non-teaching staff in public universities in Lagos State.

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Job Security

According to Kwabiah et al. (2016), job security is a condition for employees’ job satisfaction. Kwabiah et al. (2016) argue that the performance of workers at their workplace, improves when employees derive satisfaction in their jobs, and in reciprocal improve their commitment to the realization of organizational objectives and goals.” The foregoing implies that job security is what a human resource manager can use to make workers feel satisfied working for an organization, motivate employees to improve performance, and exhibit commitment to the organization (Kwabiah et al., 2016). The cited researchers contend that employee performance and organizational commitment are not having any direct relationship with the job security of employees, but a direct positive relationship exists between job security and employees’ job satisfaction.

Kim and Kim (2020) posit that job security implies a process whereby an organization’s human resource manager (management) crafts and implements employees’ psychological safety policies, in such a way that employees get a sense of belonging and feel satisfied working in an organization. In addition, Kim and Kim (2020) conceptually argue that, in reaction to management gesture of implementing psychological safety policies, and job satisfaction that follows; employees are more susceptible to exhibit healthier performance in their organization assigned jobs. In the light of the above, job security works for both the employees and the employer. While well-implemented job security earns employees job satisfaction (employment stability), it similarly benefits employers, in terms of an increase in employees’ commitment, and performance, as a reflection of employees’ job satisfaction.

Stankevičiute et al. (2021) postulate that job security is a conscious attempt by human resource managers to mitigate job loss which has become an inevitable reality. Stankevičiute et al. (2021) argue that “intensive robotization persistently creates mass job loss.” Furthermore, Stankevičiute et al. (2021) contend that job insecurity, associated with robotic migration of jobs has continued to lessen the happiness of employees at the workplace, in other words, lack of job security, minimizes employees’ job satisfaction. The researcher worries about the possibility of performance maximization and sustaining organizational competitiveness, in a circumstance where employees are not happy. From the foregoing, the unmistakable position of the authors is that job security has a positive relationship with happiness (job satisfaction); while job insecurity has an inverse relationship with happiness (job satisfaction).

Hendarti et al. (2021) posit that job security is a conscious managerial decision, whereby, more employees of an organization are made up of permanent staff, whose stability of tenure is assured, and, on whom due process has to be applied if they must be relieved of their jobs; as against casual and temporary staff who could be disengaged abruptly. Job insecurity could increase employees’ absenteeism at the workplace, job insecurity could eliminate job satisfaction, and also, job insecurity could erode employees’ commitment to the organization (Hendarti et al., 2021). In the event that, the employer fails, in the issues relating to employees’ job security. The quoted researchers prefer that organization management should do the needful (develop and implement employee supporting policies). In addition, the authors sell ideas that the actualization of labor, temporary, and contract employment run contrary to the concept of job security.
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Some of the characteristics of job security were found in the literature reviewed by the researcher. It is observed that lack of job security triggers conflict, most especially as relating to labor turnover (Abolade, 2018). According to Daud (2017), employee well-being mirrors or reflects job security in an organization. Job security has been a recurrent issue, it has consistently been an unresolved issue in the workplace since 28 years ago (Daud, 2017). Job security is sensitive to the environment and as well sensitive to policy somersault (Daud, 2017; Abolade 2018). Job insecurity is responsible for absenteeism and a drop in organizational performance (Hendarti et al. 2021).

Advantages located in the reviewed literature on job security come with topical issues which include job satisfaction, job commitment, and employee productivity (Taduvana, 2016; Kwabiah et al., 2016). According to Jimenez and Didona (2017), job security is perceived when employees willingly improve job performance because the threat of dismissal does not exist. Disadvantages found in the reviewed literature with respect to job insecurity are weighty. However, the most prominent disadvantages observed came from Hendarti, et al. (2021), who argue that job insecurity would lead to absenteeism, low job satisfaction, and poor organizational commitment. The cited scholars (Hendarti et al. 2021) contend that “the use of contract workers or specific time work agreements and freelance workers is one of the alternatives used by which organization exploit labor to minimize organization costs and expenses. But on the other side of workers, this policy will lead to anxiety about the certainty of the status employment contract.”

In view of the foregoing illuminations offered by various articles reviewed, the researcher interprets job security as a situation where the temporal and casualization of labor is not being unduly exploited by the employer on one hand, and on the other hand, every category of worker enjoys the stability of tenure (more importantly, as a result of the possession of very relevant skills, which make employee not easily dispensable)

2.1.2 Job Satisfaction

According to Ineme et al. (2016), job satisfaction starts when employees are rightfully posted to where they are psychologically capable to explore and exploit organizational resources at their disposal to a positive impact on the organization. The authors investigated the influence of self-efficacy, personality, and demographic factors on job satisfaction among non-teaching staff at the University of Uyo, and argue that employees’ demographic variables might considerably predict employees’ job satisfaction. Kalamawei et al. (2016) postulate that job satisfaction is an aftermath of enhancement in remuneration. They argue that “physicians tend to be more satisfied with the benefits, while nurses tend to be more satisfied with pay and benefits.” According to them, determinants of job satisfaction include job security, promotion, hours of work, pay, benefits, the delegation of work by supervisors, and degree of autonomy.

Thiagaraj and Thangaswamy (2017) postulate that “job satisfaction is a weighty determinant of organizational commitment.” The cited authors opine that a dissatisfied employee could exit an organization that failed to embrace employees’ contributions’ since globalization makes it possible for employers to compete and hire hands across the universe. Employers should bear in mind that when an employee exits an organization, there is a loss to the organization in terms of accumulated experience and trade secrets, which employees could transfer to another organization (Thiagaraj & Thangaswamy, 2017). Thiagaraj and Thangaswamy (2017) argue that “job satisfaction would lead to better performance and the employees will be more committed towards their organization.” Consequently, employees’ job satisfaction, might be in the best interest of an employer.
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Adigun et al. (2017) define job satisfaction as a product of deliberate management commitment to the implantation of employee-favoring strategies. For instance, employees might derive job satisfaction from the organization’s strategically administered welfare packages, and financial and non-financial rewards. Adigun et al. (2017) contend that “any organization that does not put the welfare of its employee-first such organization is endangering its performance and productivity.” Furthermore, Adigun et al. (2017) argue that “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization that can be characterized by three elements; a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and; a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization”

2.2 Theoretical Review

Achievement Motivation Theory, also known as Learned Needs Theory, was propounded in 1961 by an American Psychologist named David Clarence McClelland. According to this theory, motivation is driven by intentions or motives. Intentions or motives are regularly classified into fundamental intentions or motives and learned intentions or motives. Fundamental or main intentions or motives are unlearned, more so, they are familiar equally to animals and humans. In this case, one can refer to pain, thirst, hunger, and fear as examples. The learned intentions or motives otherwise referred to as derived intentions or motives comprised of such things as recognition, achievement, and power, just to mention a few. Such motives emanated from an individual’s life experiences and environmental exposures (Lunenburg, 2011).

The assumptions of David McClelland learned needs theory are captioned as the need for achievement, need for power, and need for affiliation respectively. The theory assumed that each individual fits into one of the three categorized motivators. Those categorized motivators are not meant to be inherent. However, such is usually built up through one’s culture and life experiences. Achievement-inclined persons derive pleasure in solving problems and realizing objectives and goals. Any individual with an ardent need for affiliation would usually not like to be a lone ranger. Such individuals treasure relationships. The theory also assumed that individuals with a passionate drive for power as a motivator usually derive pleasure in securing control and bear rule over others.

The foregoing assumptions notwithstanding, the theory has attracted criticism. The most constructive criticism came from Braden, 2000. The criticism of the assumptions of the theory was on the ground that, unlike Maslow, McClelland failed to differentiate or point out the possibility of transition among the needs. It was buttressed that individuals with a towering need for power are not necessarily power-mongers. Such individuals simply appreciate the application of power. More so, power is instrumental to laudable positive implementations, and not just for domineering purposes as upheld in the assumption. The assumptions of McClelland had been validated by different studies carried out at different times. The studies that supported McClelland learned theory assumptions came from authors such as (Lunenburg, 2011; Roberts-Lombard, 2010; Royle & Hall, 2012; Uduji & Ankeli, 2013).

In all, this theory is relevant to the study at hand, the reason being that non-teaching staff in the public Universities in Lagos State, Nigeria would love to have the assumptions of learned theory actualized to their benefit in their respective offices. More so, to satisfy and retain a talented workforce, the University authorities would require knowledge of the needs of the respective worker and accordingly motivate each in that direction. The authorities in charge of the Universities in Lagos State, Nigeria could make use of understanding of learned theory to
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guide, admire, and inspire the stakeholders more effectively, and to improve structure. To this end, the assumptions of the Learned Needs Theory (Achievement Motivation Theory) are relevant to both the independent variable and the dependent variable of this study, that is, job security strategy and job satisfaction of non-teaching staff in the public universities in Lagos State.

2.3 Empirical Review

2.3.1 Job Security

Kim and Kim (2020) quantitatively analyzed the importance of job insecurity, psychological safety, and job satisfaction on the corporate social responsibility-performance link. Survey data of 301 workers in South Korean firms were used. The results proved that psychological safety and job satisfaction function as sequential internal mediators in the link (Kim & Kim, 2020). In addition, job insecurity negatively moderated the influence of CSR on psychological safety. The results showed that an employee’s perceptions and attitudes, such as job insecurity, psychological safety, and job satisfaction, significantly influence the relationship between CSR and performance. Stankevičiute et al. (2021) examined the impact of job insecurity on employee happiness at work. Quantitative data were collected in a survey of robotized production line operators working in the furniture sector in Lithuania (Lithuania is a member of the European Union). The results revealed that job insecurity had a negative impact on happiness at work as a higher-order construct and all of its dimensions (Stankevičiute et al., 2021). The study concluded that job insecurity is real, and it was recommended that the findings should be taken seriously by organizations.

Adekiya et al. (2020) analyzed the relationship between perceived job insecurity and task performance of bank employees. Primary data were collected through copies of questionnaire administered to randomly selected participants. The data collected were analyzed with regression software contained in SPSS. The findings indicated that job insecurity had a negative impact on the task performance of bank employees in Nigeria. Policy decision-makers and managers in the banking industry in Nigeria were advised to overhaul their unfair labor policies to pave way for the improvement in task performance of bank employees in Nigeria.

Nkedishu (2020) empirically studied workers’ job security and productivity in missionary
education centers in Delta State, Nigeria. This study adopted an ex-post-facto research design. Copies of the structured questionnaire were administered to randomly determined respondents. Data analysis was done using descriptive statistics and t-test statistics at a 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that ways to provide job security for workers include; constant training of workers, providing adequate physical and instructional facilities, allow workers to play a role when making a decision.

From the foregoing reviews, there were divergent reports as far as the studies relating to the workforce job security and job satisfaction of organization workforce is concerned. Apparently, some scholars found a positive relationship between job security and job productivity, job performance, organizational performance, or job satisfaction. While others found a negative and insignificant relationship between strategic management of job satisfaction and job satisfaction of the workforce. The work of authors who found a positive or negative effect, influence, or impact of the independent variable on the dependent variable was also presented in the literature.

2.3.2 Job Satisfaction

Meyerding (2017) analyzes the job satisfaction and preferences of employees. The data for the study were obtained through copies of questionnaire administered to respondents in a German organization. The data collected were subjected to quantitative analysis. The findings indicated that insights into job attributes’ attractiveness, as well as their impact on job satisfaction, led to a more transparent environment in which employers and employees can make better-informed decisions and redesign the professional environment, resulting in increased job satisfaction, performance, and career sustainability.

Abuhashesh et al. (2019) examined factors that affect employees’ job satisfaction and performance. The study population was comprised of selected employees in Jordan’s industrial sector, with a random sample of industrial employees representing the population. The study found a positive relationship between wages and employee satisfaction. Based on the study result, it is evident that the two major factors that lead to employees leaving their jobs are low salaries and a negative organizational culture. Dziuba et al. (2020) assessed the influence of employees’ job satisfaction and work performance on work safety. The data obtained were analyzed, and findings of the study showed that both job satisfaction and work performance had an impact on job safety. Also, satisfied employees devoted themselves to work, performed better, and cared for others. The study concluded that job satisfaction resulted in employees’ work safety. More so, happy and satisfied employees perform better, become more responsible, and feel a sense of belonging.

3.0 Methodology

The study used both questionnaire and interview for the collection of data for. The population for the study is comprised of non-teaching staff in the public universities in Lagos State. Accordingly, the University of Lagos’ Human Resources Development Board put the population of non-teaching staff at 3,060; while Lagos State University’s Non-Academic Staff Establishment put the institution’s non-teaching staff population at 1,740. The sample size of 357 corresponding to the 4,800 study population was traced on the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample determination table. However, in order to compensate for non-response and wrong filling of the questionnaire, this study increased the copies of the questionnaire to be administered by 30%, so we had 357+107 = 464. The study applied a multi-stage sampling technique. In the first stage, participating institutions were picked through purposeful sampling. https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t4042
In the second stage, proportionate sampling was applied to get the sample size per institution. In the final stage, random sampling was used to select respondents. While SPSS was used to analyze quantitative data, the qualitative data were subjected to thematic analysis.

**Proportionate sampling**

The population of Non-Teaching Staff \( \times 100 \)

Total population

University of Lagos = \( \frac{3,060}{4,800} \times 100 = 63.75\% \)

Lagos State University = \( \frac{1,740}{4,800} \times 100 = 36.25\% \)

**Table 1: Proportionate Distribution of Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
<th>Sample Size (Proportionate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Lagos</td>
<td>63.75%</td>
<td>63.75% of 464= 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lagos State University</td>
<td>36.25%</td>
<td>36.25% of 464= 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Computation (2022)

**4.0 Results and Discussion of Findings**

**4.1 Questionnaire Response**

The study distributed 464 copies of the questionnaire, 400 were retrieved, but 357 were usable.

**4.2 Descriptive Analysis & Interpretations**

The objective of the study was to determine the effect of job security strategy on job satisfaction of non-teaching staff in public universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. The study used a Likert scale in which 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 represented continuum scores for: 1.0–2.49 (very low) or (strongly disagree); 1.5 – 2.49 (low) or (disagree); 2.5 – 3.49 (fairly low) or (partially disagree); 3.5 - 4.49 (fairly high) or (partially agree); 4.5 - 5.49 (high) or (agree); and 5.5 - 6.0 (very high) or (strongly agree). These enabled the tabulation and interpretation of the responses from the research instrument.

**4.3 Responses to Job Security**

The respondents’ responses on their perception of job security were collated and the results are presented in Table 2 followed by analysis and interpretation.
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Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Responses to Job Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Partially agree</th>
<th>Partially disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfair dismissal</td>
<td>94 (26.3%)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain future</td>
<td>33 (9.2%)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union intervention</td>
<td>28 (7.8%)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>34 (9.5%)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair hearing</td>
<td>59 (16.5%)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.610</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Table 2 presents the descriptive analysis of responses to the job security of the non-teaching staff of selected universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. Results from Table 4.7 revealed that 94 (26.3%) of the respondents strongly agree that ‘unfair dismissal’ occurs, 96 (26.9%) agree, 89 (24.9%) partially agree, 24 (6.7%) partially disagree, 32 (9.0%) disagree, and 22 (6.2%) strongly disagree. On average, the respondents partially agree that ‘unfair dismissal’ occurs (Mean = 4.22, Standard Deviation = 1.759).

Also, 33 (9.2%) of the respondents strongly agree that employees face ‘uncertain future’ 125 (35.0%) agree, 73 (20.4%) partially agree, 92 (25.8%) partially disagree, 15 (4.2%) disagree and 19 (5.3%) strongly disagree. On average, the respondents partially agree that employees face an ‘uncertain future’ (Mean = 4.11, Standard Deviation = 1.583). Further, 28 (7.8%) of the respondents strongly agree that employees enjoy ‘union intervention’, 89 (24.9%) agree, 107 (30.0%) partially agree, 26 (7.3%) partially disagree, 43 (12.0%) disagree, and 64 (17.9%) strongly disagree. On average the respondents partially agree that employees enjoy ‘union intervention’ (Mean = 4.33, Standard Deviation = 1.312). Moreover, 34 (9.5%) of the respondents strongly agree that employees face ‘threat’, 82 (23.0%) agree, 79 (22.1%) partially agree, 37 (10.4%) partially disagree, 55 (15.4%) disagree, and 70 (19.6%) strongly disagree.
On average the respondents agree that employees face ‘threat’ (Mean = 4.05, Standard Deviation = 1.658). The analysis further revealed that 59 (16.5%) of the respondents strongly agree that ‘unfair hearing’ occurs in their respective institutions, 81 (22.7%) agree, 61 (17.1%) partially agree, 31 (8.7%) partially disagree, 56 (15.7%) disagree, and 69 (19.3%) strongly disagree. On average the respondents partially disagree that ‘unfair hearing occurs’ (Mean = 3.93, Standard Deviation = 1.731). The average mean score was 4.13 with a standard deviation of 1.610 indicating that on average the respondents partially disagree that job security is realistic in their place of work.

### 4.3 Responses to Job Satisfaction

The respondents’ responses on their perception of job satisfaction in their respective institutions were collated and the results are presented in Table 3 followed by an analysis and interpretation.

**Table 3: Descriptive Analysis of Respondents’ Responses to Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Fairly high</th>
<th>Fairly low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working condition</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health support</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular promotion</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2022

Table 3 presents the results of descriptive statistics on job satisfaction of the non-teaching staff in the selected public universities. The results of the descriptive analysis revealed that 152 (42.6%) of the respondents indicated that the staff participation in the determination of ‘responsibility’ is very high, 141 (39.5%) of the respondents indicated high, 52 (14.6%) indicated fairly high, 7 (2.0%) indicated fairly low, 1 (0.3%) indicated low and 4 (1.1%) of the respondents indicated very low. On average, the respondents indicated that the staff participation in the determination of ‘responsibility’ is high (Mean = 5.19, STD = .906).
Further, the table above revealed that 43 (12.0%) of the respondents indicate that the suitability of ‘working condition’ is very high, 185 (51.8%) indicated high, 47 (13.2%) indicated fairly high, 70 (19.6%) indicated fairly low, 11 (3.1%) indicated low and 1 (0.3%) of the respondents indicated very low. On average, the respondents indicated that the suitability of ‘working conditions’ is fairly high (Mean = 4.49, STD = 1.051). On ‘health support’, 37 (10.4%) of the respondents indicated very high, 106 (29.7%) indicated high, 92 (25.8%) indicated fairly high, 30 (8.4%) indicated fairly low, 38 (10.6%) indicated low, and 54 (15.1%) of the respondents indicated very low. On average, the respondents indicated that ‘health support’ is fairly high (Mean = 3.75, STD = 1.590). The result of the descriptive analysis also revealed that 45 (12.6%) of the respondents indicated that ‘regular promotion’ is very high, 93 (26.1%) indicated high, 93 (26.1%) indicated fairly high, 24 (6.7%) fairly low, 42 (11.8%) indicated low, and 60 (16.8%) of the respondents indicated low. On average, the respondents indicated that ‘regular promotion’ is fairly high (Mean = 3.71, STD = 1.654). On ‘sense accomplishment’ 81 (22.7%) of the respondents indicated very high, 96 (26.9%) indicated high, 61 (17.1%) indicated fairly high, 31 (8.7%) indicated fairly low, 34 (9.5%) indicated low, and 54 (15.1%) of the respondents indicated very low. On average, the respondents indicated that a ‘sense of accomplishment’ is fairly high (Mean = 3.99, STD = 1.736). The average score of the statements is 4.23 with a standard deviation of 1.400 which means that on average the respondents indicated that their job satisfaction is fairly high.

Table 4: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
<td>8.060</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Independent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Source: Researcher’s computation (2022).

Table 4, presents the coefficient of the explanatory variable (Job Security). The results showed that Job Security with a coefficient value of -0.283 had negative effects on job satisfaction of the non-teaching staff in public universities in Lagos State. The result also revealed that Job Security was significant at 5% because the probability value of the variable was less than 0.05. The standardized coefficients showed that Job Security had some effect on job satisfaction of the non-teaching staff in public universities in Lagos State. It had a standardized coefficient value of 0.035., an indication of low effect.

Hypothesis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H0 Job security has no significant effect on job satisfaction of the Non-</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching staff in Public Universities in Lagos State.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Interviwees’ Background

The importance of any study is tied to finding solutions to the various problems that face mankind in society. Therefore, this study explored the views, experiences, and perceptions of stakeholders because they portend the possibility of yielding the most relevant data for the study. Prior to the commencement of the interview proceedings, verbal consent was obtained from all eight interviewees. Also, all the interviewees were informed of the study’s objectives, and methods as well as assured confidentiality. Every participant was assured that none of them will be identified by name or any other means that can reveal their identity at any time, before, or during the analysis of this study. In view of this, each of the respondents was identified in the analysis by code as indicated in Table 5, the informant codes are pseudonyms that represent the names of the non-teaching staff that were interviewed to prevent identification and protect confidentiality.

Table 5: Respondents’ Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Informants’ codes</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respondent one</td>
<td>University of Lagos</td>
<td>Middle-level Teaching Staff (NTS)</td>
<td>21st September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Respondent two</td>
<td>Unilag</td>
<td>Top-level NTS</td>
<td>27th October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Respondent three</td>
<td>Unilag</td>
<td>Top-level NTS</td>
<td>24th September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Respondent four</td>
<td>Unilag</td>
<td>Top-level NTS</td>
<td>21st October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Respondent five</td>
<td>Lagos State University (Lasu)</td>
<td>Top-level NTS</td>
<td>30th September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Respondent six</td>
<td>Lasu</td>
<td>Middle-level NTS</td>
<td>14th October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Respondent seven</td>
<td>Lasu</td>
<td>Top-level NTS</td>
<td>22nd September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respondent eight</td>
<td>Lasu</td>
<td>Top-level NTS</td>
<td>19th October 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Thematic Analysis of Job Security and Job Satisfaction of Non-teaching staff in Public Universities in Lagos State Nigeria

Job security is mostly associated with the perceived risk of job loss in the near future. If security from job loss is a more valuable job amenity when unemployment is more likely to persist and perhaps end in a worse job, worker job satisfaction may increase with job security more when job openings are scarce than when job openings are plentiful. The theme of job security and satisfaction revealed two sub-themes, emotional stability, and reduced quit intentions.

Emotional Stability

https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t4042
The first respondents suggest that when you have job security it makes you emotionally balanced. Similarly, in the words of respondent four:

“One of the most important, and powerful, job characteristics in determining job satisfaction is when you are emotionally conscious that your job is secured.”

Figure 1 Informants Views on Job Security and Job Satisfaction

4.6 Findings

The results from the qualitative analysis showed that JSec had a negative but significant effect on the JS of NAS in the public Universities in Lagos State, which is in disharmony with the findings of some authors, including Daud (2017) found a significantly positive relationship between JSec and well-being of employees in Malaysia. Imam and Javed (2019) found a significantly positive relationship between JSec and JS among health workers in Pakistan. Researchers whose findings were not in accord with finding from the test of hypothesis 3 include (Kwabiah et al., 2016; Taduvana, 2016; Hendarti et al., 2021).

However, the findings from the analysis on JSec and JS are in tandem with the work of Kim and Kim (2020) found that an employee’s perceptions and attitudes, such as job insecurity, psychological safety, and job satisfaction, significantly influence performance. Stankevičiute et al. (2021) found that job insecurity had a negative impact on happiness at work. Gallie et al. (2016) found that the measures of job tenure and job status insecurity were weakly related in Italy. Authors whose related studies offered confirmatory insight on the extent to which EP affects employees’ JS include (Jimenez & Didona, 2017; Abolade, 2018; Scicchitano et al., 2020; Mashi et al., 2019; Raeder et al., 2019; Adekiya et al., 2020; Konya et al., 2021).

The qualitative findings seemed to have salvaged the slump in Job Security revealed in the empirical findings. Therefore, qualitative findings showed that NAS in the public universities in Lagos State were receptive and eager to be liberated from emotional instability and halt the Job Security quit intentions. In this regard, strategic management and deliberate development of policies to institutionalize undisturbed career paths from entry to retirement constitute satisfaction to non-teaching staff. Comparatively, the findings from the qualitative analysis seemed to be superior to what we got from the quantitative analysis.

5.0 Conclusion

In view of the findings of the study, which revealed that Job Security had a significant effect on Job Satisfaction of non-teaching staff in the public universities in Lagos State. Unequivocally, this study concludes that Job Security can strategically elicit job satisfaction of non-teaching staff in the public universities in Lagos State. Accordingly, this study recommends that the universities’ authorities need to reconfigure their employment policies,
purposely, to eliminate unfair labor practices which may be facilitating threats, unfair dismissal, obscured career path, anti unions disposition, and unfair hearing on issues. Sincere instrumentation of fair practices will showcase authorities’ decent departure from regimentation and inflexibility and thereby relieve the non-teaching staff of emotional instability, reduce the intention of non-teaching staff to quit, encourage high commitment, institutionalize positive attitude, and accelerate the support staff’s success in their institutions.
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