Relationship between Assertiveness, Self-efficacy, and Job Satisfaction among Faculty Members at Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University

Gehan Galal El-Bialy, Assistant professor
Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University
Marwa Abd El-Gawad Ahmed Mousa, Lecturer
Psychiatric Nursing and Mental Health, Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University
Laila Helmy Ossman, Assistant professor
Psychiatric Nursing and Mental Health, Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University

Abstract

Background: Professional nursing education needs assertive, self-efficacious, and job satisfied faculty members. Such capabilities can make faculty members eligible to provide quality nursing education. There is a growing concern about considering these variables that can create appropriate work environments for nursing faculty members. Objective: To assess assertiveness, level of self-efficacy and job satisfaction among faculty member, and to shed light on the relationships between these variables s at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University. Setting: the study was conducted at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University. Subjects: faculty members of the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University, who amounted to 159 members. Tools: three tools were used; Assertiveness Scale (AS), The General Self-efficacy Scale (GSE), Woods' Faculty Job Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction Scale, in addition to socio-academic data sheet was developed. Results: 73.6% of the faculty members were assertive with 89.3% having a high level of self-efficacy, whereas those who were satisfied with their job represented 66.0%. The findings indicated that there were significant positive correlations between assertiveness and self-efficacy (r.=0.332, p<0.001), and between self-efficacy and job satisfaction (r.=0.197, p=0.013), whereas there was non-significant positive correlation between assertiveness and job satisfaction (r.=0.114, p=0.153). Conclusion: most of faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University were assertive, self-efficacious, and generally satisfied with their job. There were also significant positive correlations between assertiveness and self-efficacy, and between self-efficacy and job satisfaction, whereas there was no correlation between assertiveness and job satisfaction. Recommendations: Implementing developmental and educational programs

are needed to maximize assertiveness skills, especially for junior faculty members. Faculty managers should consider the factors that contribute to faculty members' job satisfaction. Further researches are needed to examine those factors that could impact on the levels of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of nursing faculty members.

Keywords: Assertiveness, Self-efficacy, Job satisfaction, Faculty members, Nursing education.

Introduction

For most universities, effective teaching is a major expectation. As well, produce knowledgeable and skillful graduates through classroom and clinical instructions is a great challenge[1]. Faculty members carry great responsibilities in their organizations. With increasing responsibilities and demands being placed on them, nursing faculty members wear many hats in preparing future nurses for their profession. They teach and counsel students, engage in clinical practice, as well as maintain competency in practice, develop and maintain academic performance, and conduct research[2].

During a time when the nursing profession is facing a world-wide shortage of highly qualified and competent nurse educators, faculty members with specific abilities are required. However, professional nursing education needs assertive, self-efficacious, and job satisfied faculty members. Such capabilities can make faculty members eligible to provide quality nursing education. Thus, there is a growing concern about considering these variables that can create appropriate work environments for nursing faculty members[3].

Assertiveness refers to the individual's ability to express himself, while at the same time respecting the rights of others[4]. Assertive individuals stand up for their own rights and express their personal needs, values, concerns, and ideas in direct and appropriate ways. While meeting their own needs, assertive people do not violate the needs of others or trespass on their personal space[5,6]. Assertiveness is an attitude the individual possesses to oneself and others[6,7]. It is a way of relating to the outside world, backed up by an open and effective communication[7,8].

Duckworth and Mercer (2006) stated that assertiveness is conceptualized as the behavioral middle ground, lying between ineffective passive and aggressive responses. Non-assertiveness or

passiveness is characterized by an over-attention to the opinions and needs of others and violating or restraining of the personal rights, opinions and needs. This over-attention to the others' opinions and needs may serve as a strategy for conflict avoidance[9]. Here, the person communicates a message of inferiority. This behavior creates a lose-win situation because he thinks that his needs are secondary which may lead to victimization[4]. On the other hand, aggressiveness involves inappropriate expression of one's thoughts, feelings, and beliefs in a way that violates the rights of others. By being aggressive, the person puts his needs, wants, and rights above those of others. Where the assertive person tries to find a win-win solution, the aggressive one strives for a win-lose solution[4, 9,10].

The assertive behavior necessarily leads to preferred outcomes[9,10]. This effective method of communication confirms the individual's worth and dignity and simultaneously, the assertive person confirms and maintains the worth of others[5]. It leads to the most positive outcomes. It produces effective interpersonal relationships and prevents problematic ones, gives a sense of control, reduces conflicts, minimizes anxiety and stress, and enhances self-esteem[10].

Assertiveness is considered also to be an essential social skill, especially for nurses. Becoming more assertive can lead to increased respect and recognition as a person and as a nurse. As nurses work in different situations they have to be assertive in order to meet the challenges and to win the cooperation from others. The assertive person effectively influences, listens, and negotiates, so that others choose to cooperate willingly[4]. Assertiveness skills allows both parties to maintain self-respect, pursue happiness and satisfaction of their needs, and defend their rights and personal space – all without abusing or dominating other people[5]. This may add dimensions to the nursing faculty member' relationships with managers and colleagues in the university. Faculty members can also be considered role models in what they say and do. They also have learning and coaching roles and can help students understand assertive behavior and how it differs from non-assertive, passive and aggressive behaviors. Additionally, assertive behavior is marked by openness and receptiveness which can contribute to their higher levels of life and job satisfaction[6].

Assertiveness, self-confidence, and self-esteem are linked together[11]. It would be reasonable that in order to be a self-confident, and self-advocate, one must have

assertiveness skills. All individuals have the need to be assertive at some point in their job, especially in terms of the need to be a self-confident and self-advocate. Individuals who feel that they have the necessary assertiveness skills and are comfortable using them would be more likely to advocate for themselves when placed in a position to do so[12].

Another concept in this study is *self-efficacy*. Self-efficacy can be defined as individuals' faith and beliefs in the levels of confidence they have in their abilities to organize and execute certain courses of action, or achieve specific outcomes[13]. Self-efficacy underlies also a person's capacity for coping with demands. People who perceive themselves as efficacious are realistic about their capacities and do not overestimate the difficulties they encounter. People with high levels of perceived self-efficacy use problem-solving strategies to manage workplace issues and job demands, while those with low levels of perceived self-efficacy resort to more dysfunctional coping styles[14]. Bandura (1997) identified that if a person's perceived self-efficacy as high, better coping strategies may be used in difficult work situations[13].

However, in order to better understand assertive behavior and its role in self-efficacy, it is important to examine the theoretical basis for why individuals behave in certain ways. Accordingly, individuals choose to behave in certain ways due to their expectations of the consequences of their actions and their expectations of how well they will be able to perform certain behaviors[12].

Moreover, people with high self-efficacy have higher aspirations and greater persistence in working to attain goals, manage difficult situations, and ultimately achieve greater success than those with low self-efficacy[13]. The application of self-efficacy theory in job decision-making is indicated by the individual's confidence in his or her ability to successfully perform job-related tasks. The concept of self-efficacy enables the individual to understand and modify job-related behaviors which will significantly influence individuals' job choices, performance and goal persistence[15].

The literature on self-efficacy has demonstrated that people who perceive that they have high levels of efficacy believe they are able to get the job done and become job satisfied. They either develop strategies to manage the circumstances better or separate from the situation and expend the least effort required to manage the task. Furthermore, high levels of self-efficacy can improve the collaborative practice and also have a positive effect on team commitment[14]. Self-efficacy is an

important indicator of the personal capability of a faculty member; capabilities which the university needs to produce high-quality educational services. Faculty members who have high self-efficacy will also succeed in producing high-quality research[16].

Self-confidence has a close relationship with self-efficacy[17]. Self-efficacy defined by Bandura (1997) as a situation specific self-confidence that indicates the level at which one believes he/she can successfully perform a task[13]. Being competent and self-confident are the most important personal factors influencing job-related decision-making. It was indicated that the individual's self-confidence can facilitate or inhibit the decision-making process. Those who are self-confident have better control over their work, make more efficient decisions and intervene more independently[17]. Therefore, self-efficacy was reported to affect job satisfaction[18].

The last concept included in this study is *job satisfaction*. There are dominant theories have been proposed to explain the concept of job satisfaction[19,20]. Job satisfaction has been defined by Locke (1976) as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences[21]. Spector (1997) believes that job satisfaction can be

considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job[22]. Job satisfaction has been also regarded as a product of harmony of one's positive individual attitudes toward his or her work and the compatibility of the individual with his/her duties and with the working conditions governing the job[20].

However, Herzberg's theory was selected as the conceptual framework of this study. Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory (also known as the two-factor theory or dual-factor theory) states that there are certain factors in the workplace that cause job satisfaction, while a separate set of factors cause dissatisfaction. The theory posits two dimensions of job satisfaction; motivation and hygiene. The intrinsic factors are also called motivators or satisfiers that the worker derives from the job. They are related to the actual content of work, such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibilities, and advancement. If these factors are present, the worker would have a higher level of motivation, enhanced job performance and job satisfaction. By contrast, extrinsic factors, also called hygienic factors or dissatisfiers, are the more basic needs that the worker must receive from the work setting. They are the job components or elements associated with the work

environment, such as working conditions, salary, supervision, policy, and interpersonal relationships with co-workers and supervisors. Dissatisfiers can lead to dissatisfaction with one's job if these are not present. This theory suggests that to improve job attitudes and productivity, administrators must recognize and attend to both sets of characteristics and not assume that an increase in satisfaction leads to decrease in unpleasurable dissatisfaction[23].

A satisfied employee could deliver high-value services which will bring the customer's satisfaction and stimulate the customer loyalty[18]. Generally speaking, the motivation to investigate the concept of job satisfaction arises from the fact that the significance that employees' satisfaction seriously influences the total operation of an organization, so a better understanding of faculty members' job satisfaction is desirable to achieve a higher level of motivation which is directly associated with both the faculty member and student achievement[24].

On the other hand, less satisfied faculty members are significantly more likely to leave their organizations than those who are more satisfied. Other consequences of job dissatisfaction include high turnover, absenteeism, and decreased productivity. Dissatisfaction with job can lead to distress, emotional exhaustion and

burnout. Job dissatisfaction has been also linked to decreased retention among nursing faculty members[14].

As teaching does require a great deal of thoroughness and commitment, so in teaching it is more important for educators to have mental commitment and loyalty than physical presence. If these faculty members are not satisfied with their job they will not be able to increase their performance; and thus will not contribute to the educational process[19]. Nursing faculty members who are more satisfied with their jobs will engage in their work with greater joy and accomplishment throughout their academic careers. Consequently, student learning will be enhanced and the nursing profession is more likely to gain highly qualified graduates who ensure that patients receive that quality of care they deserve[3].

The literature showing a positive association is considered to exist between assertiveness and job satisfaction as these positive individuals will make the effort to work in more challenging jobs[25]. Hence people who judge themselves as important and capable are able to cope with difficult situations in the workplace and are more positive when they are challenged by the situations they encounter[14].

Furthermore, teachers' job satisfaction and self-efficacy are often described in the literature as being

important to teacher behavior, and they represent a personal perspective on how teachers view themselves as professionals in their work. Professional identity pertains to how teachers see themselves as teachers based on their interpretations of their continuing interaction which manifests itself in teachers' job satisfaction, and self-efficacy[26].

Today, the trend in nursing education and practice emphasizes the advanced community-based nursing care model. Future nurses should be required to independently function in a competent manner. Nursing faculty members are given the responsibility to facilitate the development of future independent nurses[27]. The manner in which one perceives personal empowerment, which is presented in his assertiveness, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction, may ultimately transfer into teaching and interaction with students. Moreover, these valued capabilities result in positive personal, academic and professional outcomes. Thus, in order to advance the academic based nursing care model of professional nursing education, such capabilities - which affect the productivity of faculty educator - should be studied[27].

Assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction were considered as indicators of teachers' sense of their professional

identity[26,5,18]. Given that role modeling is still a very powerful educational approach in nursing, the faculty member, who should have the best capabilities and skills can allow nursing students to be effectively prepared in such skills through the modeling process[8].

Many researches have focused on studying assertiveness, self-efficacy, and/or job satisfaction[5,19,20,24]. However, the relationship between these three variables together among nursing faculty members has rarely been studied. It was then interesting and important to understand how these constructs relate to each other. An understanding of the relationship between assertiveness, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction may be vital for faculty nursing leaders and policymakers when ensuring strategies and developing professional programs aimed at enhancing these constructs for all levels faculty nurse educators. Therefore, the aim of this research is to assess levels of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction, and to shed light on the relationships between these variables among faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University.

Aims of the Study

The present study aimed to:

- Assess assertiveness, level of self-efficacy and job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University.

- Identify the relationship between assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University.

Research Questions:

- Are the faculty members assertive, self-efficacious and satisfied with their jobs at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University?

- Are there relationships between assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University?

- What are the types of relationships between assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University?

Materials and Method

Materials

Design: A correlational descriptive design was used in the current research.

Setting: This research was conducted at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University. The faculty has nine different academic departments namely; medical- surgical, critical care, pediatric, obstetric and gynecological, community health, gerantological nursing, as well as nursing education, nursing administration and psychiatric nursing and mental health.

Subjects: The subjects of the present research comprised all working faculty members 159 during the time of the study. They included; 117 junior faculty members (assistant lecturers, demonstrators and clinical instructors), and 42 senior faculty members (professors, assistant professors and lecturers) who were working at the previously mentioned setting during the academic year 2010-2011, and accepted to participate in the study.

Tools: The following three tools were used to collect data for this research:

Tool I: Assertiveness Scale (AS):

This scale was developed by the researchers after reviewing the related literature[4,5,8,9,28] to measure the level of assertiveness of nursing faculty members. It consists of 37 statements, which are rated on a four-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (rarely) to 4 (always). The faculty member who obtains a total mean score of 37.5 or more is considered assertive.

Tool II: The General Self-efficacy Scale (GSE):

The GSE scale was developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995)[29] to assess the general sense of perceived self-efficacy. It is composed of ten items, where the responses are made on a four-point Likert scale that ranges from" extremely true" (4) to" not at all" (1). Obtaining a total mean score of 15.5 or more means a high level of self-efficacy.

Tool III: Woods' Faculty Job Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction Scale:

This scale was developed by Wood (1973)[30] to measure the level of faculty members' job satisfaction. It is composed of 67 items with two subscales; intrinsic factors (motivators/satisfiers) and extrinsic factors (hygienic factors/dissatisfiers). These two subscales cover ten dimensions, five dimensions for each one. The first subscale (motivators/satisfiers) includes five dimensions which are achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibilities, and advancement. The second subscale (hygienic factors/dissatisfiers) includes five dimensions; working conditions, salary, supervision, policy, and interpersonal relationships with co-workers and supervisors.

Responses were measured on a six-point Likert scale which ranges from 1 "very dissatisfied" to 6 "very satisfied". The faculty member who obtains a total mean score of 168 or more is considered as experiencing job satisfaction.

In addition to, a socio-academic data sheet was developed by the researchers to elicit information about the socio-academic characteristics of the studied faculty members such as sex, age, marital status, academic position, and years of experience.

Method

1- An official permission was obtained from Dean of the Faculty of Nursing, to collect the required data.

2- Tools I and IV were developed by the researchers.

3- All study tools were tested for content validity by five experts in the nursing field.

4- A pilot study was carried out on 17 faculty members who were working at the Faculty of Nursing, Damanhour University, in order to ascertain the clarity and applicability of the study tools. The pilot study revealed that the four tools were clear, understood and applicable.

5- The internal consistency and reliability of tools I, II and III were tested on 17 clinical instructors who were not included in the study subjects using subjects using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient test. Tools I, II and III proved to be reliable (α =0.742, 0.829 and 0.969, respectively).

6- The researchers started the actual data collection by interviewing the subjects individually in their offices to explain the purpose of the study.

Ethical considerations:

- A written consent of the participating subjects was obtained

- Assuring confidentiality of data and anonymity of subjects.

Statistical Analysis

Data were fed to the computer and analyzed using IBM SPSS software package version 20.0. Qualitative data were described using number and percent. Quantitative data were described using mean and standard deviation. Comparison between different groups regarding categorical variables was tested using Chi-square test. When more than 20% of the cells have expected count less than 5, correction for chi-square was conducted using Fisher's Exact test. For normally distributed data, comparison between two independent population were done using independent t-test while more than two population were analyzed using F-test (ANOVA). Correlations between two quantitative variables were assessed using Pearson coefficient. Reliability Statistics was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha test. Significance test results are quoted as two-

tailed probabilities. Significance of the obtained results was judged at the 5% level. Cronbach's Alpha for Assertiveness scale was 0.742, for general self efficacy scale was 0.829 and for wood's faculty job satisfaction/ dissatisfaction scale was 0.969.

Results

Table (1) describes the socio-academic characteristics of the studied faculty members. It was observed that the great majority (96.9%) of faculty members were females. The subjects' age ranged between less than 25 to 45 years or more with a mean age of 34.75 ± 11.02 years. Regarding marital status, 34% were single whereas 62.3% were married.

As regards the academic position, 73.6% of the subjects were junior faculty members (assistant lecturers, demonstrators and clinical instructors), whereas the rest of studied subjects (26.4%) were senior faculty members (professors, assistant professors and lecturers).

The experience of the studied subjects ranged from one year to 47 years, with a mean of 11.69 ± 11.07 years.

Table (2) shows the distribution of the studied faculty members according to their scores on assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction scales. It was noted that most of the faculty members (73.6%) were

assertive, with a mean assertiveness score of 103.23±8.15. In relation to self-efficacy, it could be observed that the majority of them (89.3%) had a high level of self-efficacy, with a mean score of 31.53±3.67.

Results also indicate that those who were satisfied with their job represent 66.0%, of the subject while those who were dissatisfied represent 34.0%, with means scores of job satisfaction 281.40±31.68 and 195.91±33.44, respectively. In addition, it could be observed that 77.4% of faculty members were satisfied with the intrinsic factors (motivators/satisfiers), whereas 60.4% of them were satisfied with the extrinsic factors (hygiene factors).

Table (3) compares the studied junior and senior faculty members according to their levels of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. One can notice that 69.2% of junior faculty members (group I) were assertive, as compared to 85.7% of senior faculty members (group II) with a statistical significant difference (χ^2=4.320, p=0.038). Regarding self-efficacy, the majority of both groups had high levels of self-efficacy (88.9% and 90.5%, respectively) with no statistical significant difference between both groups.

Comparing between the level of job satisfaction between junior and senior groups, it was found that 68.4% of junior faculty members were generally satisfied

with 78.6% being satisfied with the intrinsic factors (motivators/satisfiers), and 61.5% of them being satisfied with the extrinsic factors (hygiene factors).

On the other hand, 59.5% of the senior faculty members were generally satisfied with 73.8% of them being satisfied with the intrinsic factors (motivators/satisfiers), and 57.1% being satisfied with the extrinsic factors (hygiene factors). However, no statistically significant differences were found between the junior and senior faculty members in relation to their job satisfaction (generally and specifically).

Table (4) compares between the studied junior and senior faculty members according to their mean scores of assertiveness, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. It can be noticed that senior faculty members (Group II) had the highest mean scores of assertiveness (103.98 ± 10.02), self-efficacy (31.52 ± 5.10) and job satisfaction (256.74 ± 56.46) than junior faculty members (97.76 ± 9.07, 30.15 ± 4.43 and 250.79 ± 50.21, respectively).

A statistically significant difference was evident only between the junior and senior faculty members, regarding their level of assertiveness (t=3.705, p<0.001).

Table (5) shows the correlation between assertiveness, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction among the studied faculty

members. The findings indicated that there were significant positive correlations between assertiveness and self-efficacy (r.=0.332, p<0.001), and between self-efficacy and job satisfaction (r.=0.197, p=0.013), whereas there was no correlation between assertiveness and job satisfaction (r.=0.114, p=0.153).

Table (6) shows the relationship between the mean scores of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction, and socio-academic characteristics of the studied faculty members. One can notice that there were no statistically significant relationships between sex of the studied subject and all measured variables (p>0.05). However, male faculty members had the highest mean scores of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction (105.40 ± 12.32, 31.60 ± 4.72 and 282.0 ± 48.52, respectively).

Concerning the age, the results revealed statistically significant relationships between the age of the faculty members and their mean scores of assertiveness (F = 7.475, p<0.001) and self-efficacy (F = 4.098, p = 0.008), where the faculty members who aged 45 years or more had the highest mean scores on both assertiveness and self-efficacy (106.28 ± 8.94 and 33.36 ± 4.57 respectively). This

age group also had the highest mean score of job satisfaction (270.52 ± 60.51), however no statistically significant relationship was found in relation to their job satisfaction (p>0.05).

Regarding the relationship between marital status and faculty members' mean scores of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction, there were no statistically significant relationships between marital status and mean scores of the three variables (p>0.05).

As for the academic position, the only statistically significant relationship was found between the faculty members' academic position and their mean score of assertiveness (t=3.705, p=0.001), where group II (senior faculty members) had the highest mean score of assertiveness (103.98±10.02).

In relation to years of experience, the results indicated statistically significant relationships between the faculty members' years of experience and their mean score their mean scores of assertiveness (F = 6.108, p=0.001) and self-efficacy (F = 5.005, p = 0.002), where the faculty members who had 15 years of experience or more had the highest mean scores on both assertiveness and self-efficacy (104.07 ± 10.47 and 32.46 ± 4.60 respectively).

Discussion

Assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction are the representation of the more tacit construct that professional identity appears to be[26]. It was then interesting and important to determine whether theses variables could be correlated to each other. Consequently, the aim of this research is to assess levels of assertiveness, self-efficacy, and/or job satisfaction, and to shed light also on the relationship between these variables among faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University.

The results of the current research revealed that most of faculty members were assertive, self-efficacious, and generally satisfied with their job. There were also significant positive correlations between assertiveness and self-efficacy, and between self-efficacy and job satisfaction, whereas there was no significant correlation between assertiveness and job satisfaction. These results are supported and are generally consistent with similar findings of previous studies[2,14,18].

Regarding the relationship between *assertiveness and self-efficacy*, the findings of the present study are in agreement with those of Paterson et al. (2002) who noted that levels of assertiveness were positively correlated with levels of self-efficacy. They suggested that self-efficacy was a strong

indicator for assertiveness, meaning that increased levels of self-efficacy played a decisive role in the subjects' ability to assert themselves[31]. As well, Lee and Bradley (2005) demonstrated that there was a positive significant correlation between assertiveness and self-efficacy. The authors explained this finding by the premise that being assertive and having optimistic beliefs of oneself are essential behavioral components representing self-efficacy[32].

The self-efficacy theory has also implications for assertiveness. Individuals exert the assertive behavior when they have sufficient positive psychological capital, which means that they are equipped with enough self-efficacy, self-esteem, and self-confidence to be able to handle conflict situations[5]. Everyone has the occasion to assert themselves at some point or another. It would be reasonable that in order to be a self-confident, and self-advocate, one must have assertiveness skills[12]. Thus, it was postulated that assertiveness, self-confidence, and self-esteem are linked together[11]. Likewise, there is a strong evidence that assertiveness increases self-esteem and perceived self-control, while decreasing anxiety and fear[33].

In addition, self-efficacy also affects the performance where tasks are carried out successfully[16]. Individuals who feel that they have the necessary assertiveness skills

and are comfortable using them would be more likely to advocate for themselves when placed in a position to do so and would experience job satisfaction[12]. This point is in agreement with the findings of the present study where most of the faculty members were assertive and the majority of them had high of self-efficacy. In the same direction, Busch et al. (1998) reported that the academic members at the faculties of nursing generally have significantly higher levels of self-efficacy. The researchers postulated that the subject-specific culture in nursing that emphasizes the human relations towards students in schools and towards patients in hospitals may be a possible explanation for why these faculties are most able to cope with job stress which in turn could increase their job satisfaction[16].

In relation to the relationship between *self-efficacy and job satisfaction*, the results of the present study reported a positive significant correlation between these two variables which was reported also by previous research findings[14,18,34]. For instance, it was reported that high levels of self-efficacy were positively related to higher levels of job satisfaction. One researcher agued that perceived self-efficacy affects the way in which employees manage challenging job demands. In order to succeed and be satisfied, employees must believe that they have their own essential behavioral, cognitive and motivational resources required for the job or they will focus on the daunting parts of the task, use insufficient effort and fail[14].

However, in order to better understand the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction, it is important to examine Bandura's theory of self-efficacy. Bandura (1997) hypothesized that high self-efficacy will lead to increased motivation and improved performance of any given activity. He claims also that high self-efficacy can help individuals perform challenging tasks, make tasks less stressful and worthwhile, overcome hardships, and facilitate goal-setting, effort investment, persistence in face of barriers and recovery from setbacks[64].

The literature on self-efficacy has also demonstrated that people who perceive that they have high levels of self-efficacy believe they are able to get the job done. In contrast, a lack of self-efficacy may have an effect on one's professional practice behaviors. Hence, people who judge themselves as important and capable are able to cope with difficult situations in the workplace and are more positive when they are challenged by the situations they encounter[14]. More specifically, teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction are often

described in the literature as being important to the teacher's behavior and professional identity, and they represent a personal perspective on how teachers view themselves as professionals in their work[26]. Thus, it seems that individuals with a strong sense of self-efficacy are likely to put more effort into their work and practice which can lead to increased job satisfaction[35]. This was also confirmed by the results of the present study which indicated that most of the faculty members at the faculty of nursing, Alexandria University have high level of self-efficacy and about two thirds of them are satisfied with their job.

On the other side, the results of the present study revealed no significant relationship between *assertiveness and job satisfaction* among the faculty members. This result is in contrast with findings of previous researches which reported a positive correlation between assertiveness and job satisfaction[25,36]. In this respect El-Sherif (2005) concluded that being assertive is linked to being satisfied with one's job. He added that being assertive helps to improve one's communication, provide opportunities to share difficulties with colleagues and supervisors, express feelings in difficult situations, recognize one's capabilities, and accept and know limitations, and ask advice when needed.

Such behaviors can lead to being satisfied with one's job[37].

It was also argued that all individuals have the need to be assertive at some point in their job, especially in terms of the need to be a self-efficacious[12]. This point is also supported by the results of the current study which indicated that most of the faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing were assertive and about two thirds of them were satisfied with the job they do as mentioned before.

This later finding that is related to job satisfaction is in harmony with those of other researches which concluded that faculty members are overall satisfied with their job[19,24,38]. For example, Chung and Kowalski (2012) found that job satisfaction was to be significantly higher in the nursing faculty members[38]. However, Sarmiento et al. (2004) reported that nurse educators in Canadian community colleges were only somewhat satisfied with their job[3]. Furthermore, Ali and Akhter (2009) found that faculty members are satisfied in some areas like interpersonal skills, but at the same time dissatisfied in other areas like salaries, office rooms, and computer facilities. They claimed that the source of this job satisfaction not only arises from the job, but also from the other factors like work environment (both physical and social), relationships with supervisors and

peers, corporate culture, and managerial style[19]. Again, these results are supported by the findings of the current study which revealed that the faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University were more intrinsically satisfied than extrinsically. This means that these faculty members were more satisfied with the internal motivators or satisfiers, such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibilities, and advancement, that they may derive from their job than extrinsic/hygiene factors, such as working conditions, salary, supervision, policies, and interpersonal relationships with co-workers and supervisors. In the same direction, Kirking (2007) found that nurse educators had high levels of job satisfaction. Educators in the latter study are most satisfied with the work they do, with their jobs overall and with their co-workers, and are least satisfied with opportunities for promotion and with their supervisors[39].

In terms of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, the finding of the current study is consistent with the findings of Sadeghi et al. (2012) who revealed that the academics were more satisfied with the intrinsic factors of satisfaction rather than the extrinsic ones[40]. Mostafa (2005) attributed this internal satisfaction to the fact that most of those who choose nursing practice

and education as a career sincerely believe that they do a human job and the results of their work are of value and meaning. Thus, most of them experience a sense of internal satisfaction from their achievements[41]. Higher levels of job satisfaction were noted also among individuals who perceived that the work environment provided the necessary resources of professional development, management support and flexibility, and equal and reasonable workloads[14]. In this respect, it was proposed that nursing faculty members are most satisfied with the recognition and support in their jobs. Those faculty members have human relations as a central part of their nursing profession, which may characterize human relations towards colleagues and students. Recognition by the organization, recognition in discipline, feedback, and support from colleagues are included in the job aspects of recognition and support[16]. In the same context, Keshtkaran (2006) noted that the faculty members at Shiraz University of Medical Sciences were less satisfied with their salary and promotion policies[20]. On the other hand, Kirking (2007) identified several factors that contributed to faculty members' job dissatisfaction. They included flawed processes, lack of collegiality, and ineffective leader. Areas of concerns revealed by the respondents were salaries, collegiality, lack of time and involvement

with co-workers, and ineffective leadership of department heads[39].

However, it cannot be denied that about one third of the faculty members of the present study were dissatisfied with their job. A possible explanation of this finding may be that in the last few years, the faculty was faced with various projects such as accreditation, quality and ISO project which demand a lot of extra work, a lot of meetings, too much required documentation and paper work which added a lot of stress on faculty members and increase their work load. These roles and responsibilities may be overwhelming and endure more stress regarding the time to do work, and the balance between research, teaching, and service roles which may lead to job stress and consequently job dissatisfaction. In this respect, Hamouda (2006) clarified that much of the dissatisfaction and stress come when the individuals are not sure where they are going, cannot manage time, cannot organize and control the surroundings[42]. According to Chung and Kowalski (2012), the complexities of the faculty role and the workload have led many nursing faculty to experience lower job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has an inverse relationship to job stress[38].

Turning to the results of the current research, it was revealed that although

males were more assertive, self-efficacious and job satisfied, the sex of the faculty members did not play as large a role in their assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction levels as there were no significant relationships found between sex and these three variables. Needless to say that the greater sector of the present sample were females. Although this piece of result coincides with findings of some previous studies[19,40], other researchers advocated the sex to be an influencing factor in both assertiveness[12] and job satisfaction[14]. As for the assertiveness, Orr (2003) postulated that the females may be more likely to assert themselves when necessary regardless of their cultural affiliation[12]. On the other side, Sadeghi and colleagues (2012) found that male academic staff members are more satisfied with their job than females. They explained this finding by the nature of demands that female staff members are confronting with. The researchers noted that these females confront two different demands; family demands and academic/institutional demands and duties. These demands impose bilateral pressure on them; therefore, they showed a low profile of job satisfaction as compared to male staff members[40].

Additionally, the levels of assertiveness and self-efficacy of subjects

in the current study were significantly associated with their age as older facilities were significantly more assertive and self-efficacious. This result may be attributed to certain factors which include the levels of acquired experience gained by age, levels of authorities and supervisory responsibilities the faculty members had in their academic positions. These factors may give the faculty members more autonomy in decision making and more opportunities to manage their work effectively which may add to their level of assertiveness and self-efficacy. In the support of this explanation, the faculty members of the present study who had 15 years and more of experience had the highest levels of both assertiveness and self-efficacy than the other faculty members. Significant relationships were also found between assertiveness and self-efficacy, and the faculty members' years of experience. This goes with the findings of Reid (2012) who proved the association of self-efficacy with the age and years of experience[14]. Nonetheless, the results of the present study demonstrated that there was no significant relationship between faculty members' levels of job satisfaction and their years of experience. This is contradictory to the findings of Johnson (2001) who pointed out that the total years of experience was a positive contributor to the faculty member's job satisfaction[27].

The results of the present research continued to suggest that there were no significant relationships between the levels of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of the faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing and their marital status. This was in contrast with the results of Reid (2012) who found that the marital status, for instance, was associated with job satisfaction where the subjects' highest levels of job satisfaction were noted among faculty members who were married whereas the lowest levels were found among those who were widowed and divorced[14].

Considering the academic position, it was noticed that senior faculty members (professors, assistant professors and lecturers) who belonged to group II in the present research showed more assertiveness than junior faculty members (assistant lecturers, demonstrators and clinical instructors) who belonged to group I. This may be due to the tendency of senior faculty members to express their opinions freely and frankly as they often have better opportunities to do so in their academic and administrative positions. Many of them have managerial and supervisory responsibilities in their scientific departments, so they are given ample opportunities in decision making which may add to their level of assertiveness. In

terms of achieving educational and academic goals, group II (senior faculty members) had more professional authority and opportunities for promotions than junior faculty members which in turn may increase their level of job satisfaction. This explanation appears true knowing that senior faculty members were more satisfied with their jobs than the junior ones. This finding is in harmony with findings of other studies which demonstrated that senior faculty members with doctorate degree and professorship were more satisfied with job than those junior members with less academic degrees[40,14,43,27].

Conclusion

Based on the results of the current research, it could be concluded that most of faculty members at the Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University were assertive, self-efficacious, and generally satisfied with their job. There were also significant positive correlations between assertiveness and self-efficacy, and between self-efficacy and job satisfaction, whereas there was no significant correlation between assertiveness and job satisfaction.

Recommendations

The following are the main recommendations yielded by this study:

- Implementing developmental and educational programs are needed to maximize assertiveness skills, especially for junior faculty members

- Faculty managers should consider the factors that appear to be sources of faculty members' job satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

- Further researches are needed to examine those factors that could impact on the levels of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction of nursing faculty members.

- Replication of this research is needed on a wider scale to investigate faculty members' levels of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction at faculties of nursing in different universities.

Table (1): The socio-academic characteristics of the studied faculty members.

Socio-academic characteristics	(no.=159)	%
Sex:		
Female	154	96.9
Male	5	3.1
Age (in years):		
<25	17	10.7
25 - <35	85	53.5
35 - <45	32	20.1
≥45	25	15.7
Min. – Max.	*23.0 – 70.0*	
Mean ± SD	*34.75 ± 11.02*	
Marital status:		
Single	54	34.0
Married	99	62.3
Divorced	1	0.6
Widow	5	3.1
Academic position:		
Group I. (Junior faculty members)	**117**	**73.6**
Clinical instructors	24	15.1
Demonstrators	39	24.5
Assistant lecturers	54	34.0
Group II. (Senior faculty members)	**42**	**26.4**
Lecturers	21	13.2
Assistant professors	5	3.1
Professors	16	10.1
Years of experience:		
<5	50	31.4
5 - <10	32	20.1
10 - <15	36	22.6
≥ 15	41	25.9
Min. – Max.	*1.0 – 47.0*	
Mean ± SD	*11.69 ± 11.07*	

Table (2): Distribution of the studied faculty members according to their assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction scores.

Variables	no.=159	%	Mean ± SD
Assertiveness (total score: 148)			
Assertiveness	117	73.6	103.23±8.15
Non-assertive	42	26.4	88.74±3.98
Self-efficacy (total score: 40)			
High self-efficacy	142	89.3	31.53±3.67
Low self-efficacy	17	10.7	22.06±3.03
Job satisfaction (total score: 432)			
Satisfied	105	66.0	281.40±31.68
Dissatisfied	54	34.0	195.91±33.44
• *Intrinsic factors* **(total score: 146)** *(Motivators/satisfiers):*			
Satisfied	*123*	*77.4*	*112.89±13.25*
Dissatisfied	*36*	*22.6*	*76.81±12.37*
• *Extrinsic factors (Hygienic factors)* **(total score: 246)**			
Satisfied	*96*	*60.4*	*170.23±18.88*
Dissatisfied	*63*	*39.6*	*113.24±21.93*

Table (3): Comparison between the studied junior and senior faculty members according to their distribution on assertiveness, level of self-efficacy and job satisfaction scores.

Variables	Group I[#] (no.=117)		Group II[##] (no.=42)		Test of significance
	No.	%	No.	%	
Assertiveness:					
Assertive	81	69.2	36	85.7	χ^2=4.320[*]
Non-assertive	36	30.8	6	14.3	p=0.038
Self-efficacy:					
High self-efficacy	104	88.9	38	90.5	FE=0.082
Low self-efficacy	13	11.1	4	9.5	p=1.000
Job satisfaction:					
Satisfied	80	68.4	25	59.5	χ^2=1.080
Dissatisfied	37	31.6	17	40.5	p=0.299
• *Intrinsic factors (Motivators/satisfiers):*					
Satisfied	92	78.6	31	73.8	χ^2=0.410
Dissatisfied	25	21.4	11	26.2	p=0.522
• *Extrinsic factors (Hygienic factors):*					
Satisfied	72	61.5	24	57.1	χ^2=0.250
Dissatisfied	45	38.5	18	42.9	p=0.617

[#]: Group I: Junior faculty members (assistant lecturers, demonstrators and clinical instructors).

[##]: Group II: Senior faculty members (professors, assistant professors and lecturers).

χ^2: Chi square test.

FE: Fisher Exact test.

p: p value for the statistical test.

*:Significant value at $p \leq 0.05$

Table (4): Comparison between the studied junior and senior faculty members regarding their mean scores of assertiveness, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction.

Variables	Group I[#] (mean ± SD)	Group II[##] (mean ± SD)	Test of significance t (p)
Assertiveness	97.76 ± 9.07	103.98 ± 10.02	3.705** (<0.001)
Self-efficacy	30.15 ± 4.43	31.52 ± 5.10	1.650 (0.101)
General job satisfaction	250.79 ± 50.21	256.74 ± 56.46	0.654 (0.514)

[#]: Group I: Junior faculty members (assistant lecturers, demonstrators and clinical instructors).

[##]: Group II: Senior faculty members (professors, assistant professors and lecturers).

**: Significant value at $p \leq 0.001$

Table (5): Correlation between assertiveness, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction among the studied faculty members.

Variables	Assertiveness	Self-efficacy	General Job satisfaction
Assertiveness r. (p)	1	0.332** (<0.001)	0.114 (0.153)
Self-efficacy r. (p)		1	0.197* (0.013)
General Job satisfaction r. (p)			1

r.: Pearson correlation coefficient.

*: Significant value at $p \leq 0.05$

**: Significant value at $p \leq 0.001$

Table (6): Relationship between the mean scores of assertiveness, self-efficacy and job satisfaction, and socio-academic characteristics of the studied faculty members.

Socio-academic characteristics	Assertiveness (Mean ± SD)	Self-efficacy (Mean ± SD)	Job satisfaction (Mean ± SD)
Sex:			
Male	105.40 ± 12.32	31.60 ± 4.72	282.0 ± 48.52
Female	99.21 ± 9.58	30.48 ± 4.65	251.40 ± 51.79
Test of significance	*t=1.410* *p=0.161*	*t=0.530* *p=0.597*	*t=1.302* *p=0.195*
Age (in years):			
<25	96.76 ± 12.04	30.71 ± 3.22	262.7 ± 41.83
25 - <35	97.13 ± 7.53	29.87 ± 4.14	249.27 ± 51.56
35 - <45	101.47 ± 11.31	29.91 ± 5.81	240.88 ± 47.50
≥45	106.28 ± 8.94	33.36 ± 4.57	270.52 ± 60.51
Test of significance	*F=7.475*** *p= ≤0.001*	*F=4.098*** *p=0.008*	*F=1.909* *p=0.130*
Marital status:			
Single	97.39±9.15	30.22 ± 3.99	248.83±54.28
Married	100.23±9.93	30.77±4.88	252.48±50.36
Divorced	108.0	26.0	268.0
Widow	103.0±8.92	29.60±6.88	285.0±57.81
Test of significance	*F=1.525* *p=0.210*	*F=0.545* *p=0.652*	*F=0.772* *p=0.511*
Academic position:			
Group I[#]	97.76±9.07	30.15±4.43	250.79±50.21
Group II[##]	103.98±10.02	31.52±5.11	256.74±56.46
Test of significance	*t=3.705*** *p=0.001*	*t=1.650* *p=0.101*	*t=0.636* *p=0.525*
Years of experience:			
<5	96.94 ± 9.29	30.84 ± 3.96	259.24 ± 55.03
5 - <10	96.16 ± 7.22	28.84 ± 4.00	242.63 ± 51.46
10 - <15	100.39 ± 9.33	29.33 ± 5.32	251.78 ± 37.13
≥ 15	104.07 ± 10.47	32.46 ± 4.60	252.10 ± 59.19
Test of significance	*F=6.108*** *p=0.001*	*F=5.005*** *p=0.002*	*F=0.668* *p=0.573*

[#]: Group I: Junior faculty members (assistant lecturers, demonstrators and clinical instructors).

[##]: Group II: Senior faculty members (professors, assistant professors and lecturers).

F: F test (ANOVA).   t: Student t-test.   p: p value for comparing between the studied groups.

*: Statistically significant at p ≤ 0.05   **: Statistically significant at p ≤ 0.001

References

1. Welk DS, Thomas PL. Considering a career change to a nursing faculty position? Key interview questions to ask and why. Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing 2009; 40(4): 165-70.

2. Gormley DK. Factors affecting job satisfaction in nurse faculty: a meta-analysis. Journal of Nursing Education 2003; 42(4): 174-8.

3. Sarmiento TP, Laschinger HKS, Iwasiw C. Nurse educators' workplace empowerment, burnout, and job satisfaction: testing Kanter's theory. Journal of Advanced Nursing 2004; 46(2): 134-43.

4. Sudha R. How to be an assertive nurse?. Nursing Journal of India 2005; 96(8): 182-3.

5. Gaddis S. Positive, Assertive "Pushback" For Nurses. Oklahoma Nurse 2006; 51(4): 15-6.

6. Anant HS. The importance and benefits of assertiveness training. 2009. Available at: http://www.anants.org/articles/Assertiveness.pdf. (Retrieved on: 7/9/2013).

7. Heaton N. Improving assertiveness. 2013. Available at: http://www.bupa.co.uk/individuals/health-information/directory/a/improving-assertiveness (Retrieved on: 7/9/2013).

8. Deltsidou A. Undergraduate nursing students' level of assertiveness in Greece: a questionnaire survey. Nurse Education in Practice 2009; 9(5): 322-30.

9. Duckworth P, Mercer V. Assertiveness Training. In: Fisher JE, O'Donohue W. Practitioner's Guide to Evidence-Based Psychotherapy. New York: Springer, 2006.

10. Patterson P. Assertive self-esteem. 2013. Available at: http://www.csuchico.edu/counseling/services/self-esteem-and-assertiveness-2013.pdf. (Retrieved on: 7/9/2013).

11. Centre for Clinical Interventions. Assertive communication. 2008. Available at: http://www.cci.health.wa.gov.au/resources/docs/Info-assertive%20communication.pdf. (Retrieved on: 7/9/2013).

12. Orr KS. College students' comfort with assertive behaviors: an analysis of students with and without disabilities in three different

postsecondary institutions. Published Doctoral Dissertation, School Psychology, Texas A&M University, 2003. Available at: http://repository.tamu.edu/bitstream/handle/1969.1/71/etd/tamu-2003C-2003082915-Orr-1.pdf. (Retrieved on: 30/8/2013).

13. Bandura A. Self-efficacy the exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman, 1997. In: Feldman RS. Essentials of understanding psychology. 5th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 2003.

14. Reid C. Examination of relationships and mediating effects of self-efficacy, locus of control, coping and the practice environment on caring efficacy and job satisfaction in Australian registered nurses. Published Doctoral Dissertation, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Health, Queensland University of Technology, 2012. Available at: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/53139/1/Carol_Reid_Thesis.pdf. (Retrieved on: 13/9/2013).

15. Lumley EJ. Exploring the relationship between career anchors, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Published Master

Dissertation, University of South Africa, 2009. Available at: http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/3455/dissertation_lumley_e.pdf (Retrieved on: 23/8/2013).

16. Busch T, Fallan L, Pettersen A. Disciplinary differences in job satisfaction, self-efficacy, goal commitment, and organizational commitment among faculty employees in Norwegian colleges: an empirical assessment of indicators of performance. Quality in Higher education 1998; 4(2): 137-57.

17. Hagbaghery MA, Salsali1 M, Ahmadi F. The factors facilitating and inhibiting effective clinical decision-making in nursing: a qualitative study. BMC Nursing 2004, 3(2).
Available at: http://www.biomedcentral.com/content/pdf/1472-6955-3-2.pdf. (Retrieved on: 23/8/2013).

18. Lai M, Chen Y. Self-efficacy, effort, job performance, job satisfaction, and turnover intention: the effect of personal characteristics on organization performance. International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology 2012; 3(4): 387-91.

19. Ali T, Akhter I. Job satisfaction of faculty members in private universities–in context of Bangladesh. International Business research 2009; 2(4): 167-175.

20. Keshtkaran A. A study of job satisfaction and its demographic correlates of faculty members at Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. Journal of Medical Education 2006; 8(2): 65-71.

21. Locke EA. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1976. In: Brief A, Weiss H. Organizational behavior: affect in the workplace. Annual Review of Psychology 2002; 53, 279-307.

22. Spector PE. Job Satisfaction: application, assessment, cause and consequences. California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1997. In: Ali T, Akhter I. Job satisfaction of faculty members in private universities–in context of Bangladesh. International Business research 2009; 2(4): 167-75.

23. Herzberg F, Mausner B, Synderman B. The Motivation to Work. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1952. In: Malik N. Study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at University of Balochistan. International Journal of Academic Research 2011; 3(1): 267-72.

24. Malik N. Study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at University of Balochistan. International Journal of Academic Research 2011; 3(1): 267-72.

25. Lounsbury JW, Moffitt L, Gibson LW, Drost AW, Stevens M. An investigation of personality traits in relation to job and career satisfaction of information technology professionals. Journal of Information 2007; 22(2): 174–83.

26. Canrinus ET, Helms-Lorenz M, Beijaard D, Buitink J, Hofman A. Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment: exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity. European Journal of Psychology of Education 2012; 27(1): 115–32.

27. Johnson BA. Organizational culture & job satisfaction as antecedents for empowerment of associate degree nursing faculty. Published Doctoral Dissertation, School of Nursing, Georgia State University, 2001. Available at: http://proquest.umi.com.UMInumber

:3150752. (Retrieved on: 10/11/2013).

28. Begley CM, Glacken M. Irish nursing students' changing levels of assertiveness during their pre-registration programme. Nurse Education Today 2004; 24(7): 501–10.

29. Schwarzer R, Jerusalem M. Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In: Weinman J, Wright S, Johnston M. Measures in health psychology: a user's portfolio. Windsor: NFER-NELSON, 1995.

30. Wood OR. An analysis of faculty motivation to work in the North Carolina community college system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1973. In: Sadeghi A, Zaidatol ALP, Habibah E, Foo SF. Demographic analysis on academic staff's job satisfaction in Malaysian Research Universities. Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities 2012; 20 (S): 1 – 20.

31. Paterson M, Green JM, Basson CJ, Ross F. Probability of assertive behavior, interpersonal anxiety and self-efficacy of South African registered dietitians. Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics 2002; 15(1): 9-17.

32. Lee Seongjik, Bradley KD. Relation between general self-efficacy, assertiveness, spirituality, and acculturative stress among international students. 2005. Available at: http://www.uky.edu/~kdbrad2/InternationalStudents.pdf. (Retrieved on: 25/1/2014).

33. Wesley JM, Mattaini MA. Assertiveness skills education. 2008. Available at: http://www.peacepower.info/modules/RespectAssert.pdf. (Retrieved on: 7/9/2013).

34. Nielsen K, Yarker J, Randall R, Munir F. The mediating effects of team and self-efficacy on the relationship between transformational leadership, and job satisfaction and psychological well-being in healthcare professionals: a cross-sectional questionnaire survey. International Journal of Nursing Studies 2009; 46(9): 1236-44.

35. Nugent KE, Bradshaw MJ, Kito N. Teacher self-efficacy in new nurse educators. Journal of Professional Nursing 1999; 15(4): 229-37.

36. Patrick HA. Personality traits in relation to job satisfaction of management educators. Asian Journal of Management Research. 2010. Available at: http://www.ipublishing.co.in/ajmrvol1no1/EIJMRS1020.pdf. (Retrieved on: 26/1/2014).

37. El-Sherif ZA. The effect of assertive training techniques on improving coping skills of nurses in psychiatric setup. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University, 2005.

38. Chung CE, Kowalski S. Job stress, mentoring, psychological empowerment, and job satisfaction among nursing faculty. Journal of Nursing Education 2012; 51(7): 381-8.

39. Kirking EM. Job satisfaction and occupational commitment among Wisconsin and Minnesota associate degree nursing educators. Published Doctoral Dissertation, The Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 2007. Available at: http://proquest.umi.com.UMInumber:304859. (Retrieved on: 10/11/2013).

40. Sadeghi A, Zaidatol ALP, Habibah E, Foo SF. Demographic analysis on academic staff's job satisfaction in Malaysian Research Universities. Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities 2012; 20 (S): 1 – 20.

41. Mostafa WH. The relation between head nurses' leadership styles and their nurses' job satisfaction. Unpublished Master Thesis, Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University, 2005.

42. Hamouda GM. The effect of time management training program for head nurses on their performance, stress and job satisfaction. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Faculty of Nursing, Alexandria University, 2006.

43. Castillo JX, Jamie Cano. Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. Journal of Agricultural Education 2004; 45(3): 65-74.