



Sources of Lecturers' Job Satisfaction in Universities in South-East, Nigeria

F.O. Uba-Mbibi¹ and F.O. Okwo²

¹*Michael Okpara University Of Agriculture, Umudike
College Of Applied Food Sciences And Tourism
oluchifelicia@yahoo.com (08035481568)*

²*Educational Foundations,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
fred.okwo@unn.edu.ng. (08037291021)*

Abstract

The study examined the sources of lecturers' job satisfaction in universities in South East, Nigeria. A descriptive survey design was used for the study. Five research questions guided the study. The population of the study consisted of 5,838 lecturers. The sample for the study was 416 lecturers obtained using Taro Yamane's Formula. Proportionate stratified random sampling procedure was used to select the number of lecturers per the five universities. One instrument namely "Sources of University Teachers' Job Satisfaction Questionnaire" (UTJSQ) was used. The instrument was validated by three experts in Educational Administration and Planning, and one expert from Measurement and Evaluation, from University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The reliability coefficient of 0.83 was obtained. The data collected were presented using mean, and standard deviation. The findings indicated that social interaction is a source of lecturers' job satisfaction in South-East Nigeria. These include working with colleagues, students, immediate superiors, subordinates, non teaching staff, and communities. It was revealed that working conditions, infrastructural facilities, university policies, monetary benefits are not sources of job satisfaction lecturers. It was recommended that the government should provide adequate sources of job satisfaction to enable the lecturers derive job satisfaction from their job.

Key Words: Sources, Job satisfaction, Lecturers, Qualification, University,

Introduction

Job satisfaction was once a hot topic in academia. From the 1960's till the late 1980's, management theorists looked at the question from every angle they could think of, trying to find ways to create a contented labour force (Disparate Measures in the Workplace (2011). Clark (2016), noted that job satisfaction depends not on just pay, but on pay relative to others of the same education and job qualification. Other components of job satisfaction, according to Clark include working condition, infrastructural facilities, job security and, organizational policy. Anyanwu (2018) stated that good social interactions such as working with colleagues, with students, and non-teaching staff also lead to lecturers' job satisfaction.

Traditionally, economists have argued that it is self-interest which drives the demand for high pay. In fact there is evidence that this is true for those at the highest-paid end of the scale; as far as Directors are concerned, money appears to be a motivating factor, while job satisfaction is not (Verra, 2018). But for most people satisfaction depends not on objective income, but on the relative amount, compared to others in the Organization and to others in the same occupation. Job satisfaction is therefore related to perceptions of fair pay, rather than high pay. Workers want equal pay for work of equal value (Ekpo, 2016). Ekpo

opined that monetary packages such as loans, advances, study leave with pay, attractive privileges for additional income leads to job satisfaction. Akoma (2017) noted that employment policies that anchor on merit, experience, and qualification lead to job satisfaction. Experience as viewed by Sturman (2017) is the culmination of context based events that a person perceives. It is the professional growth as a result of a period of continued work, training and retraining on the job and other related process. Qualification is the prerequisite knowledge and skills a person has acquired from training to enable him carry work proficiently in his occupation, (Akpan, 2018). Employers must be committed to the satisfaction of the needs of their workers to enable them discharge their duties effectively. There has been an enormous output of literature in this area, yet there has not been a universally acceptable definition of job satisfaction.

One set of definition regards job satisfaction as feelings workers have towards their job. Nwagwu (2016) defined job satisfaction as the amount of overall positive feelings that individuals have towards their jobs. When a lecturer's job enables him or her to cater for his or her family, he or she will feel so satisfied with his or her job and perform better. Uba-Mbibi (2016) viewed job

satisfaction as the positive feelings an individual has towards his/her job. Job satisfaction can also be viewed as attitudinal frame of minds of workers. Weiss cited in Joel (2018) argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researcher should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are emotions, beliefs and behaviours. This definition suggests that individuals form attitudes towards their jobs by taking into account their feelings, and their behaviours. In the context of this paper, job satisfaction is operationally defined as a state of the mind encompassing all those feelings determined by the extent to which an individual perceives that his/her job needs are met. These needs include working conditions, infrastructural facilities, social interaction, policies, and monetary benefits (Joel, 2018).

Working conditions entail payment of salaries, payment of other remunerations, opportunities for other professional growth, prospects for promotions, job security, and class size. Infrastructural facilities are very important in school systems. These include teaching equipment for laboratories, or workshops, teaching material or furniture, office accommodation, libraries and research facilities. Social interactions in the universities include working with colleagues, students, immediate superiors,

subordinates, non-teaching staff, and communities among others.

Ekpo (2016) in his view stated that in the university system, adequate policies lead to job satisfaction. University policies include employment policy, promotion policy, retirement policy, promotion policy, retirement policy, withdrawal from service policy, suspension policy, housing, and vehicle loan polices. Anyanwu (2018) noted that good university policies motivate lecturers to dedication of duties and job satisfaction. Monetary benefits include payment of other remunerations, for instance yearly increments, loans, advances and grants.

When a worker is satisfied with the job and he/she is able to carter for his/her family, such a worker puts in more effort. An unsatisfied worker may look for job alternative. It has also been observed that dedication to duty is a function of job satisfaction (Egbeogu, 2018). This is so because job satisfaction refers to the extent to which personal wants such as salaries, recognition for work done, job security, provision of adequate facilities/equipment, are realized by the individual while performing a task. This agrees with the views of Ukpabia (2016) that employees work harder and perform better if satisfied with their jobs. The factor of job satisfaction could prevent staff

frustration. It is therefore, very desirable that every Organization should look into the factor of job satisfaction of its workers. Udoka (2018) opined that if the school system is to succeed, and if the huge investments in education are to be fully realized, lecturers should be satisfied with their job.

Hutt (2016) noted that these needs such as good working conditions, infrastructural facilities, social interaction, university policies, monetary benefits, through which lecturers derive job satisfaction, are the sources of their job satisfaction. Hutt also observed that these sources are basis of lecturers' job satisfaction. Joel (2018) is of the sources include - working conditions, infrastructural facilities, social interaction, policies, and monetary benefits. Egbeogu (2018) carried out a research work on sources of lecturers' job satisfaction in South East, Nigeria, Egbeogu pointed out that social interaction, and good university policies are sources of job satisfaction for the lecturers. Udoka (2018) while working on infrastructural facilities as a source of job satisfaction observed that when this is adequately present in the universities leads to job satisfaction. However, Cipher (2018) while working on polices like dismissal, housing, vehicle, retirement, as sources of lecturers' job satisfaction observed that these policies are not sources of lecturers' job satisfaction. Ibiam

(2015) in his study: job satisfaction of university lecturers' in Enugu State, asserted that monetary value for lecturers' should be enhanced to serve as a source of job satisfaction.

Jones (2016) while working on the extent of lecturers' job satisfaction in universities in Abia, and Enugu states, stated that the extent of the lecturers' job satisfaction is low since the lecturers' are satisfied with only social interaction with students, and colleagues. The level of the lecturers' job satisfaction is low with other aspects such as working conditions.

There are frequent demand for improved condition of service and the associated series of strike actions by the university lecturers. There are other unwholesome behaviours by some lecturers such as secret sales of prohibited handouts, and different forms of corruption that have bedeviled the university system by some lecturers in South-East, Nigeria. The success or failure of the university system is often attributed to university lecturers who are seen as life wire of the universities in Nigeria. Consequently, university lecturers in South-East, Nigeria, may be experiencing different levels of job satisfaction in different areas. The problem of the study put in a question form is: What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in South-East, Nigeria?

Research Questions:

The study is guided by the following research questions.

1. What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of working conditions?
2. What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of infrastructural facilities?
3. What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of social interaction?
4. What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of university policies?
5. What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of monetary benefits?

Methodology:

A descriptive survey design was used for the study. The population of the study consisted of 5,838 lecturers from Universities in the South-East, Nigeria that offers uniform courses. Uniform courses are the same courses offered in various faculties in different universities such as Imo State

University, ABSU, NAU, EBSU and UNN. The sample of this study was 416 lecturers from four federal and five state Universities in South-East, Nigeria. The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's formula. The instrument used was a self-constructed four point scale titled "Sources of University Lecturers 'Job Satisfaction Questionnaire" (SULJSQ). The instrument is a 4-point scale structured thus Strongly agree (3.50 - 4.00), Agree (2.50 - 3.49), Disagree (1.50 - 2.49), and Strongly disagree (0.50 - 1.49). The validity of the instrument was determined by the agreement of two experts from Educational Administration and Planning, and one expert from Measurement and Evaluation, from University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Internal consistency reliability coefficient was obtained for the clusters and 0.83 for the entire scale obtained by using Cronbach Alpha Technique.

The instrument was administered on the subjects by five research assistants and collected back after the completion. Mean and Standard Deviation were used to answer the research questions.

Research Question 1: What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of working conditions?

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation scores of ‘working condition’ as sources of university lecturers’ job satisfaction (N = 416).

S/no	Questionnaire Items (Working Condition)	\bar{X}	SD	Rank	Decision
1	Payment of salaries	2.30	1.09	1	Disagree
2	Payment of other remuneration	2.15	.975	5	Disagree
3	Opportunities for professional growth	2.14	.961	7	Disagree
4	Prospects for promotion	2.10	.948	12	Disagree
5	Job security	2.10	.889	10	Disagree
6	Class size	2.06	.876	14	Disagree
7	Opportunities for research	2.10	.882	9	Disagree
8	Recognition of a job well done	2.06	.858	13	Disagree
9	Work load	2.14	.912	6	Disagree
10	Opportunity for challenging assignments	2.10	.864	8	Disagree
11	Opportunity for sabbatical leave	2.17	.925	4	Disagree
12	Opportunity for community services	2.18	.932	3	Disagree
13	Teaching in any area of interest	2.20	.929	2	Disagree
14	Retirement benefits	2.10	.921	11	Disagree
	Grand Mean	2.15	.92		Disagree

D = Disagree

Table 1 showed that items 1 to 14 had low mean scores of 2.30, 2.15, 2.14, 2.10, 2.10, 2.06, 2.14, 2.10, 2.17, 2.18, 2.20, and 2.10 respectively, while their standard deviations were 1.09, .975, .961, .948, .889, .876, .882, .858, .912, .864, .925, .932, .929, and .921 respectively. The grand mean and standard deviation were not satisfied 2.15 and .92 respectively. Based on the data, the respondents shared the view that they were not satisfied with payment of salaries (\bar{X} = 2.30, SD = 1.09), payment of

other remunerations (\bar{X} = 2.15, SD = .975), opportunity for professional growth (\bar{X} = 2.14, SD = .961), prospects for promotion (\bar{X} = 2.10, SD = .948), job security (\bar{X} = 2.10, SD = .889), class size (\bar{X} = 2.06, SD = .876), opportunity for research (\bar{X} = 2.10, SD = .882), recognition of a job well done (\bar{X} = 2.06, SD = .858), work load (\bar{X} = 2.14, SD = .912), opportunity for challenging assignments (\bar{X} = 2.10, SD = .864), opportunity for

sabbatical leave ($\bar{X} = 2.17$, $SD = .925$), opportunity for community services ($\bar{X} = 2.18$, $SD = .932$), teaching in any area of interest ($\bar{X} = 2.20$, $SD = .929$), retirement benefits ($\bar{X} = 2.10$, $SD = .921$). The grand mean of (2.15) indicated that working condition is not a

source of university lecturers' job satisfaction in the South-East, Nigeria.

Research Question 2: What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of infrastructural facilities?

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation scores of 'infrastructural facilities' as sources of lecturers' job satisfaction (N = 416).

S/no		\bar{X}	SD	Rank	Decision
15	Teaching equipment for laboratories/workshops	2.43	.957	1	Disagree
16	Teaching materials/furniture	2.31	.888	2	Disagree
17	Office accommodation	2.22	.873	3	Disagree
18	Staff quarters	2.12	.839	6	Disagree
19	Libraries	2.19	.866	4	Disagree
20	Research facilities	2.18	.888	5	Disagree
	Grand mean	2.24	.88		Disagree

D = Disagree

Table 2 showed that items 15 – 20 had low mean scores of 2.43, 2.31, 2.22, 2.12, 2.19, and 2.18, respectively while their respective standard deviation scores were .957, .888, .873, .839, .866, and .888. The grand mean and standard deviation were 2.24 and .885 respectively. Based on the data, the respondents were of the view that teaching equipment laboratories/workshops ($\bar{X} = 2.43$, $SD = .957$), teaching materials/furniture ($\bar{X} = 2.31$, $SD = .888$), office accommodation ($\bar{X} =$

2.22, $SD = .873$), libraries ($\bar{X} = 2.19$, $SD = .866$), research facilities ($\bar{X} = 2.18$, $SD = .888$), and staff quarters ($X = 2.12$, $SD = .839$) is not their sources of job satisfaction, in their respective universities. The low grand mean and standard deviation indicated that infrastructural facilities were not sources of the lecturers' job satisfactions.

Research Question 3: What are the sources of university lecturers' job satisfaction in respect of social interaction?

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of ‘social interaction’ as sources of Lecturers’ job satisfaction (N = 416)

S/no	Questionnaire Items (Social interaction)	\bar{X}	SD	Rank	Decision
21	Working with colleagues	2.75	.950	2	Agree
22	Working with students	2.82	.935	1	Agree
23	Working with immediate superior	2.74	.942	3	Agree
24	Working with subordinates	2.71	.901	4	Agree
25	Working with non-teaching staff	2.68	.905	5	Agree
26	Working with Committees	2.68	.961	6	Agree
	Grand mean	2.73	.93		Agree

A = Agree

Table 3 showed that items 21 – 26 had mean scores of 2.75, 2.82, 2.74, 2.71, 2.68, and 2.68 respectively, while their respective standard deviation scores were .950, .935, .942, .901, .905, and .961. The grand mean and standard deviation were 2.73 and .939 respectively. Based on the data, the respondents were of the view that working with students ($\bar{X} = 2.82$, $SD = .935$), working with colleagues ($\bar{X} = 2.75$, $SD = .950$), working with immediate superior ($\bar{X} = 2.74$, $SD = .942$), working with subordinates

($\bar{X} = 2.71$, $SD = .901$), working with non-teaching staff ($\bar{X} = 2.68$, $SD = .905$), and working with committees ($\bar{X} = 2.68$, $SD = .961$), were sources of job satisfaction to the lecturers. The grand mean ($\bar{X} = 2.73$), and standard deviation ($SD = .939$), were high and this indicates that social interaction is a source of job satisfaction to lecturers in universities in South East, Nigeria.

Research Question 4: What are the sources of university lecturers’ job satisfaction in respect

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation scores of ‘university policies’ as sources of University lecturers’ job satisfaction (N = 416)

S/no	Questionnaire Items (University policies)	\bar{X}	SD	Rank	Decision
27	Employment policy	2.59	.854	1	Agree

28	Promotion policy	2.54	.818	2	Agree
29	Retirement policy	2.41	.802	6	Disagree
30	Withdrawal from service policy	2.39	.826	9	Disagree
31	Suspension policy	2.42	.820	5	Disagree
32	Dismissal policy	2.47	.869	3	Disagree
33	Policy on loans and advances	2.43	.841	4	Disagree
34	Housing policy	2.40	.853	8	Disagree
35	Vehicle loan policy	2.35	.814	11	Disagree
36	Study leave policy	2.40	.836	7	Disagree
37	Policy of no work, no pay	2.37	.829	10	Disagree
	Grand mean	2.43	.85		Disagree

A = Agree

D = Disagree

Table 4 showed that items 27 – 28 had mean scores of 2.59, and 2.54 respectively, while Standard deviation were .854 and .818 respectively. Based on the data, the respondents were of the view that employment policy ($\bar{X} = 2.59$, $SD = .854$) and promotion policy ($\bar{X} = 2.54$, $SD = .818$) were sources of job satisfaction to the lecturers in South East of Nigeria. Items 29 – 37 had mean scores of 2.41, 2.39, 2.42, 2.47, 2.43, 2.40, 2.35, 2.40, and 2.37, and standard deviations of .802, .826, .820, .869, .841, .853, .814, .836, .829 respectively. Retirement policy ($\bar{X} = 2.41$, $SD = .802$), withdrawal policy ($\bar{X} =$

2.39, $SD = .826$), suspension policy ($\bar{X} = 2.42$, $SD = .820$), dismissal policy ($\bar{X} = 2.47$, $SD = .869$), policy on loans and advances ($\bar{X} = 2.43$, $SD = .841$), housing policy ($\bar{X} = 2.40$, $SD = .853$), vehicle loan policy ($\bar{X} = 2.35$, $SD = .814$), study leave policy ($\bar{X} = 2.40$, $SD = .836$), and policy of ‘no work no pay’ ($\bar{X} = 2.37$, $SD = .829$) were not sources of lecturers’ job satisfaction.

Research Question 5: What are the sources of university lecturers’ job satisfaction in respect of monetary benefits?

Table 5: Mean and standard deviation scores of ‘monetary benefits’ as sources of lecturers’ job satisfaction (N = 416)

S/no	Questionnaire Items (Monetary benefits)	\bar{X}	SD	Rank	Decision
------	---	-----------	----	------	----------

38	Salaries/allowances	2.26	.932	3	Disagree
39	Payment of other remuneration	2.12	.927	6	Disagree
40	Yearly increment	2.06	.879,	8	Disagree
41	Loans	2.07	.877	7	Disagree
42	Advances	2.16	.896	5	Disagree
43	Privileges for additional income (Consultancy services, part time lecturing)	2.22	.846	4	Disagree
44	Other fringe benefits such as medical services	2.35	.895	1	Disagree
45	Research grants.	2.26	.858	2	Disagree
	Grand mean	2.19	0.89		Disagree

D = Disagree

Table 5 showed that items 38 – 45 had mean scores of 2.26, 2.12, 2.06, 2.07, 2.16, 2.22, 2.35, and 2.26 respectively, while their standard deviation were .932, .927, .879, .877, .896, .846, .895, and .858 respectively. Based on the data, the respondents shared the view that payment of salaries/allowances ($\bar{X} = 2.26$, $SD = .932$), payment of other remuneration, ($\bar{X} = 2.12$, $SD = .927$), yearly increment ($\bar{X} = 2.06$, $SD = .879$), loans ($\bar{X} = 2.07$, $SD = .877$), advances ($\bar{X} = 2.16$, $SD = .896$), privileges for additional income such as consultancy services, part time lecturing ($\bar{X} = 2.22$, $SD = .846$), other fringe benefits such as medical services ($\bar{X} = 2.35$, $SD = .895$), and research grants ($\bar{X} = 2.26$, $SD = .858$) were not sources of lecturers job satisfaction. The grand mean ($\bar{X} = 2.19$), and standard deviation ($SD = 0.89$) indicated that

monetary benefits were not sources of lecturers’ job satisfaction.

Discussion of Findings

The findings indicated that a social interaction is a source of the lecturers’ job satisfaction. This was as a result of their ability to interact well and work in harmony with their colleagues, students, non-teaching staff, and communities. This finding is in agreement with that of Joel, (2012) who noted that the presence of different platforms for interaction in a work place could lead to job satisfaction. This is also in consonant with the views of the lecturers that they were deriving job satisfaction from their job due to social interaction with the students and other workers.

On the other hand, working conditions of the lecturers were poor and never served as sources of lecturers’ job satisfaction. This is in agreement with Clark (2016) and the lecturers who indicated that

their working conditions were not attractive to serve as sources of their job satisfaction. The South East, Nigeria, was ravaged by civil war fought between 1967 – 1970. The effects of the war are still visible today, and have contributed in no small measures to the poor state of facilities in the zone. This has impacted negatively on the state of university education in the zone. This explains; partly, why lecturers in universities in the zone did not see their working conditions as sources of their job satisfaction in South East, Nigeria.

The findings in respect of infrastructural facilities, by Udoka (2018) indicated that when infrastructural facilities are adequately present in the universities leads to job satisfaction. However, in the responses of the lecturers, the state of infrastructural facilities in universities is not a source of lecturers' job satisfaction as they are not adequately present.

The Federal and State Universities are reasonably autonomous, but their policies are influenced and sometimes dictated by the respective governments which are the major provider of resources to the universities. Consequently, lecturers who expect policies that are appropriate to Universities were not satisfied with their job as most of the universities policies did not give them job satisfaction. This finding is in agreement with

Cipher (2018) who noted that policies in the Universities are not giving the lecturers job satisfaction. This is also in line with the lecturers that they are not getting job satisfaction due to inadequate universities polices.

The monetary benefits that are available to lecturers are as dictated by government. Sometimes the university administrators tamper with the benefits to the extent that federal public universities do not use the same schedule in preparing lectures' monetary benefits. These may explain why monetary benefits are not sources of lecturers' job satisfaction. The result agrees with Ekpo (2016) who opined that lack of monetary packages such as loans, advances, study leave with pay, attractive privileges for additional income is not serving as sources of lecturers' job satisfaction in South East, Nigeria. This also agrees with Akoma (2017) and Joel (2018) that the absent of monetary values in a job do not serve as sources of job satisfaction.

On the extent of lecturers' job satisfaction, the finding indicates that the lecturers' job satisfaction was low since social interaction was the only source of their job satisfaction. The finding is in line with that of Anyawu (2018) who noted that good social interaction like working with students, non teaching staff leads to lecturers' sources of job satisfaction.

Conclusions

Lecturers derived job satisfaction by interacting with student, colleagues, superior and subordinates. However, working conditions, infrastructural facilities, university policies and monetary benefits were not sources of job satisfaction to the lecturers in universities in South -East, Nigeria

References:

- Akoma, T. (2017). Management of Schools in Nigeria. *Journal of Sociology of Education*. 67, 20 – 39.
- Anyawu, J. (2018). Effect of Lecturers Interpersonal Relationship between Lecturers and Students' Academic Performance. *Unpublished M. Ed Theses*. Department of Educational Administration and Planning, Nnamdi Azikiwe University.
- Cipher, C. (2018). *Educational Management in Schools*. New York. Van. Nestorian.
- Clark, L. (2016). *Facet and Overall Job Satisfaction of Teachers*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15, 40-45.
- Disparate Measures in the Work Place (2011). Retrieved Sept. 2012 from www.supportoristor.org
- Egbeogu, V.B. (2018). *The Leaders of our Time*. Lagos. Educational Research Publishers.
- Ekpo, O. (2016). *Motivation in Work Organization*. Monterey: C.A. Books/Coll.
- Hutt, T. (2016). *Attitudes in and Around Universities*. New York. Lexington Books.
- Ibiam, O. (2015). *Motivation to Work in Institutions*. Onitsha. Lumark Press.
- Joel, M. (2018). The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Productivity Commitment of Universities in Abia state, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 45(917), 71 – 90
- Jones, E. (2016). *A Hand Book on Educational Administration. Theory and Practice*. New York. Harper.
- Mark, T.O. (2018). Emotion and Adaptation in Relation to Job Experience. *Journal of*

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Government should endeavour to provide good working conditions, adequate infrastructural facilities, good policies, adequate monetary benefits to the lecturers in South East, Nigeria to enable them be satisfied with their job.

- Occupational Behaviour, 14(3), 101 – 105.otion*
- Nwagwu, B. (2016). *Towards a Theory of Job Satisfaction and Incentives. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance.* Owerri: New Nigerian Publishers.
- Sturman, A. (2017). *The Theories of Job Satisfaction and Productivity.* Lagos: Lola Publishers
- Uba-Mbibi, F.O. (2016). *Demographic Variable Job Satisfaction and Productivity of University Lectures in South-East, Nigeria. Education Zone. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, UNN.*
- Udoka, N. (2018). *Organized Educational Management in Nigerian Schools.* Kaduna: Thamac Publishers.
- Ukpabia, S.I. (2016). *A Study of Some Selected Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction among Tertiary Institutions. Department of Vocational Education Unpublished Ph. D Thesis, University of Port-Harcourt.*
- Verra, L. (2018). *The Causes of Job Satisfaction in Schools.* Owerri: Uta Publishers.