



Seek Wisdom, Elevate your Intellect and Serve Humanity



COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
MBA PROGRAM

THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON JOB
SATISFACTION OF ACADEMIC STAFF: THE CASE OF SELECTED
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN
ADDIS ABABA CITY

A Thesis Submitted To the Department Of Management Presented In Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Business
Administration in Management.

Prepared by: - Rahmet Abubeker

Advisor: - Ato Teshome Bekele

2015

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this work entitled “**The Impact Of Organizational Climate On Job Satisfaction Of Academic Staff: The Case Of Selected Private Universities Found In Addis Ababa City.**” is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma of the university or other institute of higher learning, except where due acknowledgment has been made in the text.

Rahmet Abubeker Adem _____

Candidate’s Name Signature & date

Advisor’s Approval

This Thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a University advisor.

Ato Teshome Bekele _____

Advisor’s Name Signature & date

Addis Ababa University
College of Business and Economics
MBA Program

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Rahmet Abubeker Adem entitled: “**The Impact Of Organizational Climate On Job Satisfaction Of Academic Staffs: The Case Of Selected Private Universities In Addis Ababa City**” and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business administration in Management complies with the regulations of the university and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Approval of Board of Examiners

Internal Examiner Signature & date

External Examiner Signature & date

Abstract

The success, functioning and sustainability of any higher education institution are greatly influenced by the extent to which the careers of academic staff are successfully managed along all the demands and changes. As past researchers confirmed, more than any other type of organization, higher education institutions are dependent on the intellectual capital and commitment of their staff. That means, in order to be benefited from the production of Higher Learning Institutions, the existence of satisfied academic staff should be in place. In other words, it is the satisfied employee who can be more committed for the achievement of end results of organizations than the unsatisfied one. The objective of the study is to examine the impact of organizational climate on job satisfaction of academic staff the case of private universities found in Addis Ababa city. The study identifies seven dimensions of organizational climate (leadership and management, participation in decision making, pay and benefit, over all human relation, working condition, employee wellness ad corporate image) and investigates their influence on job satisfaction. To do so, the study has employed a cross-sectional study design with an explanatory and descriptive design in interpretation of the data collected through self-administered questionnaire. Accordingly, three private universities have been taken as the study sample through stratified sampling method. A randomly selected 240 instructors were participated in the study whose academic rank ranges from professor to graduate assistant. The analysis is made by making use of descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, multiple regression model and ANOVA. It was found out that the academic staffs have positive perception about their organizational climate but they have neutral feeling to their job. All selected organizational climate factors has positive relationship with job satisfaction. Among them participation in decision making, pay and benefit, human relation, employee wellness, leadership and management and corporate image are significant predictor of job satisfaction. Working condition was found out to be insignificant in explaining the variation in the level of job satisfaction. This implies that when the above factors are fulfilled working condition is a least wanted facility. In addition, it was revealed that the perception of organizational climate and level of job satisfaction does not significantly vary with different experience and job level of the staff. With the revealed findings, it was recommended to the universities to improve leadership and management and pay and benefit practices and to give more focus to other factors than working condition.

Key words: *Academic Staffs, Organizational climate dimensions, Job Satisfaction, Private Universities.*

Acknowledgements

Foremost, my sincere and loving thanks go to Allah, the almighty, who bestowed upon my knowledge and capacity that is needed for my entire life including for the achievement of this program.

Next, there are so many people who encouraged and supported me on this journey. I would like to thank the following individuals:

Ato Teshome Bekele, my thesis advisor, for your unreserved expertise guidance, and constructive comments encouraged me to successfully carry out this thesis.

My mother: (Saadya Nuru) for always believing in me and reminding me that I can do anything. Your unwavering love, support and encouragement now and throughout my studies are greatly appreciated. Words are not enough to express how grateful I am to you for all you have done and all the sacrifices you have made. This is for you. I love you.

My family: my dad (Abubeker Adem), my brothers (especially Shikur Abubeker) and sisters, in so many ways, you have made this possible. Thank you for your patience, love and support over the years.

My friends: (Yesewzer Akele, Zelalem Abera, Mulgeta Embiale, and Ibrahim Harun) thank you for listening and being there; for your support. Not only for the statistical knowledge and expertise you imparted, but also your time and patience helping me work with all the statistics. I am truly grateful. This research would not have been possible without you. Moreover, I thank you for your editing and prompt feedback also.

Last but not list my appreciation goes to all academic staffs of the participant universities who gave response for my questionnaire.

Rahmet Abubeker (October, 2015)

Table of contents

Contents	page no.
Abstract	I
Acronyms	II
List of tables	VI
List of figures.....	VII
List of appendices	VIII
CHAPTER ONE	
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the study	1
1.2. Statement of research problem.....	3
1.3. Research questions	4
1.4. Objectives of the study.....	5
1.4.1. General objective of the study	5
1.4.2. Specific Objectives of the study	5
1.5. Hypothesis of the study.....	5
1.6. Significance of the study	6
1.7. Scope and limitation of the study.....	7
1.7.1. Scope of the study.....	7
1.7.2. Limitations of the study	7
1.8. Organization of the study.....	8
1.9. Operational definition.....	8
CHAPTER TWO	
2. Literature review	9
2.1. Organizational climate	9
2.1.1. Concept of organizational climate	9
2.1.2. The development of organizational climate.....	11
2.1.2.1. The structural approach.....	11
2.1.2.2. Perceptual approach	12

2.1.2.3. The interactive approach.....	12
2.1.2.4. The cultural approach	13
2.1.3. Distinction between organizational climate and organizational culture	14
2.1.4. Levels of climate.....	16
2.1.4.1. Organisational climate.....	16
2.1.4.2. Group Climate	16
2.1.4.3. Psychological climate.....	17
2.1.5. Activities that Promote Organizational Climate.....	17
2.1.6. Measuring organizational climate.....	18
2.2. Job Satisfaction	19
2.2.1. The concept of job satisfaction	19
2.2.2. Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction	20
2.2.2.1. Extrinsic Factors	20
2.2.2.2. Intrinsic factors	20
2.2.3. Theories of Job Satisfaction.....	21
2.2.4. Consequences of job satisfaction.....	24
2.2.5. Measuring job satisfaction	25
2.2.6. Job dissatisfaction	27
2.3. Empirical literature review.....	28
2.4. Theoretical and conceptual framework	32
2.4.1. Theoretical frame work.....	32
2.4.1.2. Dimensions of Organizational Climate.....	32
2.4.3. Conceptual frame work.....	37

CHAPTER THREE

3. Research design and methodology	38
3.1. Research design.....	38
3.2. Data type and research instrument.....	38
3.2.1. Design of the questionnaire	38
3.2.2. The questionnaire.....	39
3.2.3. Reliability and validity of the questionnaire.....	40
3.3. Sampling design	42

3.3.1. Population of the study	42
3.3.3. Sampling technique and determination of sample size.....	42
3.4. Contingency for non-response	43
3.5. Distribution of questionnaire	44
3.6. Methods of Data Analysis	45
3.7. Operationalization of Variables	47
3.8. Model Specification	48
3.9. Model testing.....	49
3.9.1. Normality	49
3.9.2. Assessing outliers.....	50
3.9.2. Homoscedasticity test	50
3.9.3. Multicollinearity test for independent variables	51
CHAPTER FOUR	
4. Data presentation, analysis and interpretation of results	52
4.1. Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents	52
4.2. Findings of the study	54
4.2.1. Factor analysis.....	54
4.2.1.1. Suitability of the data	55
4.2.1.2. Exploratory factor analysis	55
4.2.1.3. Factor extraction	56
4.2.1.4. Factor rotation.....	58
4.2.2. Results of descriptive statistics	60
4.2.3. Hypothesis testing: Results of inferential statistics.....	65
CHAPTER FIVE	
5. Summary of findings, Conclusion and recommendations	85
5.1. Summary of findings and conclusion.....	85
5.2. Recommendation.....	87
5.3. Suggestions for Further Research	88
References	89
Appendices	

List of tables

Table 2.1: Summary of the differences between organizational climate and organizational culture.....	15
Table 3.1: Reliability test for the dimensions of the organizational climate questionnaire.....	41
Table 3.2: Population distribution of sampled Universities.....	42
Table 3.3: Summary of questionnaire administration, returned and analyzed.....	44
Table 3.4: VIF results of independent variables.....	51
Table 4.1: Demographic description of respondents.....	53
Table 4.2: Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity.....	55
Table 4.3: Total Variance Explained for the overall scale of the Organizational climatequestionnaire (Excluding factors with eigen values lower than 1).....	57
Table 4.4: Rotated Component Matrix for organizational climate questionnaire.....	59
Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics of organizational climate dimensions.....	61
Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics for items in job satisfaction.....	64
Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics for Job satisfaction.....	65
Table 4.8: Correlations of dependant and independent variables.....	66
Table 4.9: Model summary of multiple regression of organizational climate on job satisfaction.....	68
Table 4.10: ANOVAresult of multiple regression model.....	68
Table 4.11: Coefficients of each organizational climate dimensions.....	69
Table 4.12: T-test comparison of gender differences.....	74
Table 4.13: ANOVA analysisfor differences in level of education.....	75
Table 4.14: T-test comparison of job type.....	77
Table 4.15: ANOVA analysis for perception of organizational climate by different tenure groups.....	79
Table 4.16: ANOVA analysis for perception of organizational climate by junior and senior academics.....	81
Table 4.17: Summary of hypothesis	83

List of figures

Figure 2.1: A visual representation of the structural approach.....	11
Figure 2.2: A visual representation perceptual approach.....	12
Figure 2.3: A visual representation of the interactive approach.....	13
Figure 2.4: The cultural approach to organizational climate.....	13
Figure 2.4: Herzberg's two factor theory.....	22
Figure 2.5: Pictorial representation of employee response to dissatisfaction	27
Figure 2.6: Conceptual frame work.....	37
Figure 3.1: Homoscedasticity test.....	50
Figure 4.1: Scree plot for the overall scale of the questionnaire.....	58
Figure 4.2: Dimensions of organizational climate.....	60
Figure 4.3: Dispersion of organizational climate: own computation.....	62

List of appendices

Appendix A: Research questionnaire	ii
Appendix B: Normality test.....	v
Appendix C: Multicollinearity test.....	vi
Appendix D: Post-hoc test for tenure.....	viii
Appendix E: Factor analysis.....	xii
Appendix F: Descriptive statistics for items in organizational climate.....	xiii
Appendix G: Post-Hoc test for Job level.....	xiv
Appendix H: Post-Hoc test for level of education.....	xxiii

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

This introductory chapter orients the reader with the basic outlines of the study. It starts with background of the study where a general preview of the topic is discussed briefly. Then it followed by the statement of the problem, which presents the research problem. Objectives of the study, Research questions, and contribution of the study, scope and limitation of the study were also discussed in this chapter.

1.1. Background of the study

High-performing organizations have climates with particular measurable characteristics (Watkin& Hubbard, 2003). Their research shown that organizational climate can directly account for up to 30 per cent of the variance in key business performance measures including the satisfaction of employees. Organizational climate refers to a set of measurable properties of the work environment that are perceived by the people who live and work in it (Moran and Volkwein, 1992 and Gerber, 2003). According to the authors, it reflects the established norms, values and attitudes of organizations culture that influence individuals" behavior either positively or negatively.

As Adenike (2011) stated the nature of organizational climate differs from one organization to the other. More over steers (1977) postulates that there are no fixed dimensions of organizational climate but includes such as management or leadership styles, participation in decision making, provision of benefits, coworker relationship, reduction of boredom and frustration, corporate image, and provision of good working conditions. As Farokhi and Murty (2014) stated, the study of the climate of an organization is necessary for an insight into such important dimensions. All these factors determine the effectiveness of the organization. Thus, good organizational climate is instrumented to higher employee satisfaction, better human relations and higher productivity.

On the other hand, Job satisfaction is a multifaceted concept, which can mean different things to different people. According to Mullins (1999), job satisfaction is the attitude or feeling that one has about ones job that is either positive or negative and it is explained in terms of the fit

between what employees is seeking and what he/she is actually receiving. According to the author, the level of job satisfaction is affected by a wide range of variables relating to individual (such as personality, education and marital status); social factors (such as relationship with co-workers and group working); cultural factors (like attitudes and beliefs); organizational factors (i.e. nature and size, formal structure, personnel policies and procedures, employee relations, nature of the work, supervision and styles of leadership, management systems and working conditions); and environmental factors (such as economic and governmental influences).

Organizational climate has a major influence on human performance through its impact on individual motivation and job satisfaction (Lehal, 2004). He stated that climate does all this by creating expectations about what consequences will follow from different actions. Individuals in the organization have certain expectations, and fulfillment of these depends upon their perception whether organizational climate suits according to their needs or not.

As Oshagami (2000) stated, organizations that have goals to achieve would require satisfied and happy staff in its workforce. Moreover, for any university to take off and achieve its strategic goals would strongly depend on its capacity to attract, retain and maintain competent and satisfied staff into its employment. According to Martin and Rowley cited in Birbirs et al. (2015), the success, functioning and sustainability of any higher education institution are greatly influenced by the extent to which the careers of academic staff are successfully managed along with all the demands and changes. More than any other type of organization, higher education institutions are dependent on the intellectual capital and commitment of their staff. It could therefore not afford to neglect need and essentials of workforce satisfaction.

In Ethiopia an analysis made by Ashcroft and Rayner(2011) found out that there had been constant mobility of highly skilled persons from one university to another due to lack of satisfaction in their organization explained by the organizational climate factors.

Thus, this thesis focuses on the impact of organizational climate on academic staff's job satisfaction among of some private universities in Addis Ababa. Due to the broad nature of organizational climate, it was developed on specific organizational climate factors within organization.

1.2. Statement of research problem

High-performing organizations have climates with particular measurable characteristics (Watkin& Hubbard, 2003). Their research shown that organizational climate can directly account for up to 30 per cent of the variance in key business performance measures including the satisfaction of employees. Various studies have been conducted on the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction but there are a lot of debates regarding the result. Due to the nature of the subject matter, variables used in various studies vary from research to research. The studies also suggested that the different measurement of variables would produce different results.

In Ethiopia a study by Birbirsa et al, (2015) examines the organizational climate factors that could predict the job satisfaction of academic staff of central and western Ethiopia public universities. The study concluded that, among the factors coworker relationship, working condition, organizational commitment and leadership and management are factors that could predict the job satisfaction of academic staff. However, a study by Akula and Talluri (2013) concludes among organizational climate factors giving importance to the social values, management of rewards, benefits and recognition of the employees does not enhance the satisfaction of academic staffs whereas proper leadership and management of mistakes are important factors that are affecting the job satisfaction of the staffs. Similarly Griffin (2001) found three dimensions that predict job satisfaction, which are quality of supervision, role ambiguity, and training. While Bhutto et al. (2012) found mixed results of the relationship between the dimensions of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Organizational structure, identity, and human relations have a positive relationship with job satisfaction, whereas equity and empowerment are negatively related to job satisfaction.

In the result above, most of the studies show that there is a relation between organizational climate and employee's job satisfaction. So there is a need for the organizations to provide conducive climate to the employees.

However, the studies also showed the relationship between the variables still receives a lot of arguments. As Patterson et al. (2005) explained, the inconsistency of the findings is partly

because every study uses a different measure of climate, each assessing rather different dimensions for the reason organizational climate varies from one organization to another. This is in line with Steers (1977) which postulates that there is disagreement among researchers about which dimensions constitute the concept and new scales are constantly being developed resulting in an increase in scales claiming to measure organizational climate. Making it difficult to determine which key dimensions are relevant to all diverse situations. Moreover, similar studies are not well investigated in Ethiopia. Thus, organizations will find it difficult to understand what type of climate that the employees preferred because employee's perceptions differ from time to time and from situation to situation.

To bridge the gap, the researcher has made an attempt in the study to provide information about the climate variables, employees' perceptions towards such variables and the impact of these variables on employee's job satisfaction taking into account some selected private universities as there is problem of constant mobility of highly skilled persons from one university to another (Ashcroft and Rayner, 2011).

1.3. Research questions

The research questions which the researcher addressed are:

- What is the nature of organizational climate in selected private universities as perceived by their academic staff?
- What is the level of job satisfaction of academic staffs of selected private universities?
- Does a relationship exist between perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction of academic staffs in selected private universities of Addis Ababa city?
- How does perception of organizational climate and level of job satisfaction differ across the different biographical (gender) and organizational variables (job type, level of education, job level and years of experience)?

1.4. Objectives of the study

1.4.1. General objective of the study

The general objective of the study is to examine the impact of organizational climate on employee's job satisfaction in selected private universities found in Addis Ababa city.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives of the study

With the above general objective the specific objectives of this study are;

- ★ To investigate the nature of organizational climate of selected private universities as perceived by its employee, in Addis Ababa city.
- ★ To examine the level of job satisfaction of academic staffs of selected private universities found in Addis Ababa city.
- ★ To measure the degree of association between selected organizational climate dimensions and employees' job satisfaction among academic staffs of selected private universities found in Addis Ababa.
- ★ To analyze the impact of organizational climate dimensions on job satisfaction of academic staffs of selected private universities found in Addis Ababa city.
- ★ To determine whether perception of organizational climate and level of job satisfaction vary across the different biographical (gender) and organizational variable (job type, level of education, experience and job level).

1.5. Hypothesis of the study

Hypothesis 1: There is significant positive relationship between selected organizational climate dimensions and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: organizational climate has significant positive impact on job satisfaction.

H2a: leadership and management has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.

H2b: participation in decision making has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.

H2c: Payment and benefit has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.

H2d: Human relation has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.

H2e: Working condition has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.

H2f: Employee wellness has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.

H2g: Corporate image has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: There is no statistically significant difference between employees in perception of their organizational climate and job satisfaction that varies by their gender, job type, level of education, experience and job level.

H3a: There is no statistically significant difference between males and females perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction.

H3b: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by level of education.

H3c: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their job type.

H3d: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their experience/tenure.

H3e: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their job level.

1.6. Significance of the study

The focus of this study mainly center on academic staffs in some selected private universities found in Addis Ababa city. The study is important as it will highlight the organizational climate factors that university lecturers view as enhancing their job satisfaction. Thus, findings from this research will have value in clarifying the future direction of management policies, procedures, and conventions for education institutions. This tries to enable the organizations to adapt externally and integrate its functions internally. In doing so, the management of universities will find the research helpful in improving staff morale and bringing about job satisfaction of their academic staffs.

Moreover, the research outcome will add expertise to the existing body of knowledge and opens the door for other researchers who are going to undertake further study in the area.

1.7. Scope and limitation of the study

1.7.1. Scope of the study

This research was conducted in 3 selected private universities found in Addis Ababa city selected from eight accredited private universities for convenience purpose; it does not incorporate the total private universities. In addition, the study focuses academic staffs presented in selected private universities; it does not incorporate the management and administrative staff of the universities.

Geographically, the study focused in Addis Ababa. On top of its convenience, conducting the study in Addis Ababa was considered justifiable because of the reasons that almost all of selected private universities have branches in the city which makes it peculiar from other cities in Ethiopia.

Moreover, the study was conducted based on seven dimensions of organizational climate suggested for educational setting as they are most suggested dimensions and inclusive of many variables in higher education institutions environment.

1.7.2. Limitations of the study

With the above scope of the study, since organizational climate varies from organization to organization and only three selected private universities were represented in the sample, the generalization is limited to the universities under the study. Though the city was preferable site to conduct the study because of the reasons mentioned above, focusing only in Addis Ababa might influence the generalizability of the study to some degree.

Moreover, due to the broad nature of organizational climate the research is limited to the selected dimensions of organizational climate.

1.8. Organization of the study

This research have five chapters the first chapter contain the introduction of the paper. The second chapter deals with review of literature. The third chapter continues to deal with research design and methodology. The analysis & interpretation of the data was presented in the fourth chapter. While the last chapter, chapter five conclude the results obtained from the research & provides appropriate recommendation.

1.9. Operational definition

According to HERQA (2015), universities are institutions those provide under graduate (bachelor degree) and post graduate studies only. While university colleges provides under graduate studies including diploma and does not provide post graduate study for PHD. Moreover, universities have more departments, students and workers. However, for simplicity, the word university was used to represent the selected institutions as a whole.

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews literatures on the concept of organizational climate and key concepts relating to organizational climate such as its definition, dimensions, models and theories and its measurement. The role that climate plays in an organization and how it is measured is also explored. In addition it addressed the concept of job satisfaction, factors affecting job satisfaction and theories related to the concept and measurement of Job satisfaction. Finally the theoretical and empirical relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction is also discussed.

2.1. Organizational climate

2.1.1. Concept of organizational climate

For over 50 years, a great deal of research has been conducted and published on organizational climate; Cotton (2004) stated that organizational climate is a meaningful concept with significant implications for understanding human behavior in organizations. This is made clear through the numerous studies and research on organizational climate.

A number of definitions of organizational climate have been presented in various studies on the concept. However these definitions provide no consensus on the concept and fail to set out clear guidelines on measurement and theory building for organizational climate (Glick, 1985). Reichers and Schneider (1990) provide a possible explanation for this in stating that during organizational climate's introductory years, researchers were more concerned with gathering data and assessing the validity of the concept, rather than devoting time to quibbling over definitions and elaborating on the possible nuances of climate.

Various researchers define organizational climate on the basis of their viewpoint on how climates are formed. These researchers are classified as those who highlight objective characteristics and those who emphasize subjective elements of organizational climate. (Gray, 2007)

According to Johannesson (1973), researchers with an objective frame of reference approach the definition and measurement of organizational climate is in terms of actual, objective indices such as levels of authority, organizational rules and employee ratios, whilst the majority of researchers operationalized the concept in terms of participant perceptions, where participants indicate the extent to which specific items characterize their work situation. According to James and Jones (1974), defining organizational climate will guide the way the concept is examined and measured.

Integrating the previous authors, until 2008, different scholars has suggested different definitions. According to Gerber (2003), even though there appears to be a lack of consensus among researchers on the definition of climate and confusing definitions and inconsistencies in the operationalization of the construct most definitions include some of the following common characteristics of the organizational climate construct these are

- Climate is generally considered to be a molar construct that can change over time.
- It is perceived by and shared among organizational members, which can result in consensus among individuals.
- It consists of global impressions of the organization that members form through interacting with each other and organizational policies, structures and processes.
- Climate perceptions are descriptions of environmental events and conditions rather than evaluations of them.
- The climate construct is multidimensional.
- It refers to the „feeling of an organization“.
- Climate can potentially influence an individual’s behavior.

For the purposes of this research the integrated definitions of Moran and Volkwein (1992) and Gerber (2003) were used. Organizational climate is defined as the shared perceptions, feelings and attitudes organizational members have about the fundamental elements of the organization which reflect the established norms, values and attitudes of the organization’s culture and influence individuals’ behavior either positively or negatively.


2.1.2. The development of organizational climate

There is a lack of understanding of how climates emerge or are formed in an organization (Moran and Volkwein, 1992). A key question posed by them is how it happens that individuals who are presented with numerous stimuli at work develop relatively homogenous perceptions of these stimuli, and in addition, attach similar meanings to aspects of organizational life. Four approaches are suggested to answer the formation of climate are: The structural approach, the perceptual approach, the interactive approach, the cultural approach

2.1.2.1. The structural approach

This approach views organizational climate as a characteristic or attribute of the organization. as Payne and Pugh (1976) postulates it is the actual conditions in the organization that play a primary role in determining the people's attitudes, values and perceptions of organizational events. Hence, organizational climate is the result of the objective aspects of the work environment, namely the organization's size, a centralized or decentralized authority structure, number of hierarchical levels, advancement of technology as well as the extent to which organizational rules and policies influence members' behavior.

Figure 2.1: A visual representation of the structural approach



Source: - Moran &volkwein (1992)


However, certain dilemmas are innate in this approach (Moran &Volkwein, 1992). Firstly, the structural approach does not take into account why studies have found different work group climates in one organization where the structural factors are common throughout the organization. A second criticism relates to an organization's climate demonstrating a significant and consistent relationship with its structural characteristic. However, studies conducted in this area show a high level of inconsistency between the factors. The third and final criticism suggests that there is a lack of consideration of the subjective role that structural variables have

on an individual's reaction to a situation, and disregards the interpretive processes involved between individuals in groups.

2.1.2.2. The perceptual approach

This approach postulates that organizational climate originates in the individual, which is in direct contrast to the aforementioned approach which views organizational structure as the basis of organizational climate (Moran & Volkwein, 1992). According to this approach, the individual interprets and responds to the situation in a way that is psychologically meaningful to him/her.

Figure 2.2: A visual representation of perceptual approach




Source: Moran & Volkwein (1992)

Moran and Volkwein (1992) identify key criticism to the perceptual approach that it assumes meaning which is something that individuals bring to and force on organizational processes and events rather than as a result of the interaction of organizational members.

2.1.2.3. The interactive approach

This approach builds on the aforementioned approaches and combines the objectivism of the structural approach and the subjectivism of the perceptual approach (Gerber, 2003). The underlying assumption of the interactive approach is that organizational climate is the result of the interaction of individuals in response to their situation which results in the shared agreement of organizational members (Moran & Volkwein, 1992). They also states that this approach identifies communication as a key contributor of organizational climate.

Figure 2.3: A visual representation of the interactive approach




Source: Moran & Volkwein (1992)

A criticism of the interactive approach is that it does not explain the role that the social context or organizational culture plays in shaping interaction and only takes cognizance of the interactions of individuals. (Moran & Volkwein, 1992)

2.1.2.4. The cultural approach

The approaches discussed in the previous section do not take into consideration the influence organizational culture has on individuals' perceptions and on exactly how they interact. According to the cultural approach, organizational climate is shaped by individuals in a group who interact and who share the same abstract frame of reference, organizational culture, as they learn to deal with the organization's demands (Moran & Volkwein, 1992).

Figure 2.4: The cultural approach to organizational climate



Source: - Moran & Volkwein (1992)

From the above model, it is clear that organizational climate forms part of organizational culture. The model illustrates how the individual perceives organizational conditions, which is moderated by his/her personality, cognition and inter-subjectivity owing to interactions with other individuals.

2.1.3. Distinction between organizational climate and organizational culture

The concepts of organizational climate and organizational culture are often used interchangeably with researchers in organizational studies treating the concepts as if they are identical. However, in the literature, organizational climate and organizational culture are two distinct concepts. (Hughes, 2002)

According to Allen (2003), there are two primary reasons why there is confusion about these two constructs. The first refers to the lack of adequate definitions and the second is because of researchers failing to recognize that these constructs originate from disciplines that are polar opposites.

Given the definition of organizational climate above, Denison (1990) provides the following formal definition of organizational culture:

“Organizational culture provides the underlying values, beliefs and principles that serve as a foundation for an organization’s management system, as well as the set of management practices and behaviors that both exemplify and reinforce those basic principles. These principles and practices endure because they have meaning to the members of an organization.”

According to Punia et al. (2012), the difference can be elaborated in two levels i.e. visible and invisible parts of the system. The visible part can be seen at the surface level and largely include dress codes, office layout, symbols, slogans, and ceremonies etc. However the invisible part cannot be seen but only felt and encompasses stories about people performance, symbols (flag, trademark, logos, etc.), corporate mission statements, methods used for recruitment/selection, fairness in treatment, social equality, risk taking in business deals, formality in approach, discipline, departmental autonomy, responsiveness to communication and employee empowerment etc. Thus organizational culture describes all the unwritten rules, practices,

attitudes and beliefs that affect the way in which business is done and underpins the interactions of internal and external customers whereas organizational climate is its state of health and describe the morale and perceptions and is quite subjective and thus can be said the invisible part.

Moreover, how do the two terms differ from research perspective is summarized by Schneider (2000) and Moran and Volkwein (1992); it is shown in the table 2.1

Table 2.1: Summary of the differences between organizational climate and organizational culture

Organizational climate	Organizational culture
Have its roots in social psychology discipline.	Originates from within the anthropology domain.
Focus is on the individual's perceptions and cognitions.	Focus is on analyzing the underlying structure of symbols, myths and rituals.
Is a relatively enduring characteristic of the organization	Is a highly enduring characteristic of the organization
Is more visible and operates at the level of attitudes and values.	Is relatively invisible and is preconscious in individuals.
Evolves more quickly and changes rapidly.	Evolves slowly and is not easy to change.
Unique characteristics of individuals are evident.	Collective characteristics are exhibited.
Quantitative methodology is used.	Qualitative methodology is used.

Even though, Organizational climate and organizational culture are distinct, yet related concepts. This includes both are concerned with the internal psychological environments in organizations as well as the relationships between these environments, individual meaning and adapting to the organization. Moreover, both concepts take into account the shared, holistic and collective social context of organizations that occurs over a period of time, the durability of these social contexts and their origins in an organization's system of beliefs, values and assumptions. According to the

author, social contexts as being the product of individual interaction and influencing individual interaction are also addressed with both organizational culture and climate. (Gerber, 2003)

2.1.4. Levels of climate

The definitions of climate by various researchers, as discussed above, put forward the idea that climate exists at three different levels. According to Castroo (2008), empirical evidence supports the notion of three levels of climate- organizational climate, group climate and psychological climate.

2.1.4.1. Organizational climate

Field and Abelson (1982) postulate that organizational climate can be created through experimental manipulation. They believe that climate created in this manner is an attribute of the organization because it is the result of a manipulation of organizational conditions. Organizational members perceive the climate created which, in turn, affects their motivation and behavior.

2.1.4.2. Group climate

Sub climates exist for different organizational groups because of differences relating to task relationships and job functions. They also postulate that a number of studies in the literature support the concept of group climate(Field and Abelson, 1982). Howe cited in above author reports that climate responses can be seen as more of a group function than being caused by personal characteristics.

As the author stated, the results of the above and other studies support the construct validity of organizational and group climate. The results also show that different climates correspond to different subgroups in an organization. Organizational climate is used to describe climate differences between organizations, but it should be borne in mind that various sub climates may exist in one organization as a result of the different practices and procedures relevant to the group's situation.

2.1.4.3. Psychological climate

James and Jones (1974) postulate that it is necessary to differentiate between climate that is regarded as an organizational attribute and climate that is considered an individual attribute. When it is regarded as an organizational attribute, it should be referred to as organizational climate and when it is as an individual attribute, as psychological climate.

2.1.5. Activities that Promote Organizational Climate

Positive organizational climate is important for the smooth running of the organization in order to promote a high level performance and satisfaction among employees. The management has the duty to make sure that the workplace climate is always positive to prevent job dissatisfaction among employees and create a sense of well-being. The management can take certain actions to change the environment. Booyens (1998) identified actions that can be utilized by the management to create a positive organizational climate.

Setting Organization vision and mission statement - The development of the organization's vision, mission statement, goals and objectives can influence the management to promote a positive climate that allow full use of input from the employees in the implementation of these factors. By allowing those to participate will make them feel highly motivated to develop a sense of belonging and this becomes their organizational goal attainment.

Open communication- there should be two-way communication in the organizations so that employees know what is going on and react to it. When employees react to what is happening in the organization the management can make proper decision based on the act of the employees.

Trust - By establishing trust and openness between the management and the employees through communication including frequent feedback in an organization, would help in keeping morale high. Through communication, employees can raise problems that they encounter in the workplace as well as problems relating to them as individuals. Prompt feedback can thus help employees to know their strengths and weaknesses so that they can improve their performance.

Practice of an open-door policy- Communication improves interpersonal relationships between managers and their subordinates. Communication can be promoted upwards, downwards and laterally. This can be achieved by encouraging free expression of ideas, constructive criticism and opinions. Thus, employees should be allowed to express their views freely.

Provision of workable careerladder- Management should provide promotion opportunities for their employees. This will help the management identify employees with exceptional performance to promotion to higher positions, which will spur them for higher achievement in their units.

Technological Changes- It is often said that employees resist changes. But where technological changes can improve the working conditions of the employees, the change is easily accepted. There will be a better climate if the management adopts improved methods of work in consultation with the employees.

2.1.6. Measuring organizational climate

Managers need to have a clear understanding of the organization's climate, so that practices developed for and implemented by the organization are in line with the organization's goals. To gain this understanding, the climate must be measured.

The methods used to measure organizational climate fall into four categories, namely field studies, experimental variation of organizational properties, observations of objective organization properties and perceptions of organizational members. The last two approaches, perceptual or subjective and objective methods, represent the primary methods used to measure organizational climate (Forehand & Gilmer, 1964).

According to Hellriegel and Slocum (1974), Researchers who focus on objective measures of organizational climate examine the objective properties of organizations such as organizational size, levels of authority, decision-making authority, degree of centralization and rules and policies (Forehand & Gilmer, 1964). According to the authors, even though objective methods tend to be more accurate and reliable, they have at least three limitations. Firstly, there is an abundance of variables that may be extremely specific, making interpretation difficult. Secondly, these methods do not consider how organizational properties are related to each other and to

organizational functioning. The third limitation relates to the assumption that objective properties affect organizational members indirectly.

Researchers who prefer perceptual measures of organizational climate contend that the perceptions of organizational members should be measured because they provide a more encompassing description of the concept (Schnake, cited in Gerber 2003). The focus is on the active role the individual plays in perceiving organizational characteristics (Forehand & Gilmer, 1964). It is important to note that dimensions are descriptive and not affective or evaluative, which measures attitudes (Jones & James, 1979). This research employs the perceptual measure of organizational climate.

2.2. Job satisfaction

2.2.1. The concept of job satisfaction

According to Cranny et al. (1992) a review of the literature pertaining to job satisfaction suggests numerous definitions of the concept, with no one agreed upon definition. Even though job satisfaction is defined in various ways, they suggest that there is general consensus on the definition of job satisfaction as an emotional reaction. They define job satisfaction as one's affective or emotional reaction to a job that is the result of one's comparison of actual outcomes with expected or deserved outcomes. Several authors define job satisfaction along the same lines.

The definition of Mullins (1999) was used in this study as it describes the content of the study. According to him, job satisfaction is defined as the attitude or feeling that one has about one's job that is either positive or negative. Hence someone who has a high level of job satisfaction will have a positive feeling about his/her job, while someone who is dissatisfied will have negative feelings.

As Hussin (2011) stated, job satisfaction plays a vital role in the life of an employee, because it affects the personal and social adjustment of the individual positively. On the contrary, job dissatisfaction adversely affects physical and mental health of the individual.

2.2.2. Factors affecting job Satisfaction

Researches indicate that the various factors of the job can be divided into two broad distinct dimensions, namely extrinsic and intrinsic factors. (Buitendach & Witte, 2005)

2.2.2.1. Extrinsic factors

According to Snipes et al., (2005), these dimensions are external to the individual and are likely to satisfy lower-order needs. Extrinsic dimensions of job satisfaction are therefore beyond the employees' control and include factors such as the work itself, pay, promotion opportunities, working conditions, supervision and co-workers.

2.2.2.2. Intrinsic factors

Intrinsic rewards, however, are those rewards that an individual receives as a direct result of his/her performance. These rewards are self-regulated because the person does not rely on someone else to present them, which is in direct contrast to extrinsic rewards, which are externally controlled. According to Robbins et al (2003), intrinsic rewards satisfy higher-order needs such as feelings of accomplishment and achievement and satisfaction of utilizing one's skills and abilities. According to him intrinsic factors, such as advancement, recognition, responsibility and achievement appear to be related to job satisfaction.

The factors discussed above are considered to be the primary dimensions influencing job satisfaction (Luthans, 2005; Robbins et al., 2003; Robbins & Judge, 2007) and have therefore been included. Spector (1997) conducted a review of the most popular job satisfaction instruments and summarized other factors that may influence job satisfaction. These include appreciation, communication, fringe benefits, security, the organization's policies and procedures as well as the organization itself.

2.2.3. Theories of job satisfaction

Researchers stated that an individual's affective reaction is dependent on the interaction between the individual and the environment. But the mental process that determines these reactions is different for different researchers. Keeping this in mind, theories concerning the causes of job satisfaction can be loosely classified as falling into one of three categories:

- I. Situational theories- hypothesize that job satisfaction results from the nature of one's job or other aspects of the environment.
- II. Dispositional approaches- assume that job satisfaction is rooted in the personological make-up of the individual, and
- III. Interactive theories- propose that job satisfaction results from the interplay of the situation and personality.

This study focuses on situations that could predict job satisfaction; it does not concern with personality, the focus of the dispositional and interactive approach. Thus only situational theories are further discussed.

2.2.3.1. Situational theories

Many situational theories of job satisfaction have been proposed, but three stand out as most influential. These are: Herzberg's two-factor theory, Social information processing, Job characteristics model.


a. Herzberg's Two-Factor theory

Herzberg's two-factor theory is concerned with factors that are responsible for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg (1967) argued that an individual's relation to his work is a basic one and that his attitude to his work can determine his success or failure. He believed that two separate dimensions contribute to an employee's behavior at work.

The first dimension is the hygiene factors that involve the presence or absence of job dissatisfaction. These factors are related to job content; they are concerned with job environment and extrinsic to the job itself. They are also known as maintenance factors and serve to prevent

dissatisfaction. These factors include salary/pay, interpersonal relations with supervisors, peer and subordinates, working conditions, company policy and administration, status, security, personal life and supervision. If these factors are poor, work is dissatisfying. When there are good hygiene factors, dissatisfaction is removed. Good hygiene factors simply remove the dissatisfaction and do not cause people to become highly satisfied and motivated in their work. They are needed to avoid unpleasantness at work and to deny unfair treatment.

Figure 2.4: Herzberg's two factor theory



Source: own computation

The second dimension of factors is motivating factors. They are the variables, which actually motivate people and influence job satisfaction (Judge, et al 2001 and Luthans, 2002). Motivators are high-level needs and they include aspects such as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement or opportunity for growth. When these are absent, workers are neutral toward work but when present, workers are highly motivated and satisfied. These two dimensions of factors influence motivation. Hygiene factors concentrate only in the area of job dissatisfaction, while motivators focus on job satisfaction.

b. Job characteristics model

The Job Characteristics model argues that jobs which contain intrinsically motivating characteristics would lead to higher levels of job satisfaction as well as other positive work outcomes such as enhanced job performance and lower withdrawal. The model introduced by Hackman and Oldham (1976) but derived from earlier work by Hackman and Lawler (1971) focuses on 5 core job characteristics:

Skill Variety- This dimension is concerned with the various activities associated with a particular job which involved a range of the employee's skills and abilities.

Task Identity- This refers to the degree to which the job requires completing a task, from start to finish, with an identifiable outcome.

Task Significance- This dimension refers to how important the job is and its impact on the organization and/or to the external environment.

Autonomy- In this dimension, issues such as independence, freedom and discretion are highlighted. This refers to the degree to which an employee is able to make decisions regarding how they prioritize and schedule the work for completion.

Feedback- This refers to the degree to which the employee receives direct and clear feedback regarding their performance and work outcomes.

According to the theory, jobs that are enriched to provide these core characteristics are likely to be more satisfying and motivating than jobs that do not provide these characteristics. More specifically, it is proposed that the core job characteristics would lead to three critical psychological states: Experienced meaningfulness of the work; Responsibility for outcomes; and Knowledge of results – which in turn led to the outcomes

c. Social information processing

Social Information Processing approaches to job attitudes argue that job satisfaction is a socially constructed reality (Salancik&Pfeffer, 1978). According to the theory, individuals do not really form judgments of job satisfaction until they are asked and, when they are asked, they rely on social sources of information such as interpretation of their own behaviors, cues by their co-workers, or even the way survey questions are posed. Substantively, the theory holds that

individuals are apt to provide the responses they are expected to, and then seek to rationalize or justify their responses. As Hulin (1991) notes, one piece of evidence against the social information processing perspective is that the same job attributes appear to predict job satisfaction in different cultures, despite the social environments, values and mores in these cultures often are quite different. Stone (1992) provides an in-depth and fairly devastating, review and critique of the social information perspective.

2.2.4. Consequences of job satisfaction

According to Luthans (2005), job satisfaction is a desired outcome, not only for individuals, but also for society as a whole. Organizations will also benefit from understanding if there is any relationship between employee levels of job satisfaction and outcome variables, such as employee and organizational performance. A number of studies have investigated that job satisfaction impacts on employee productivity, turnover, physical and psychological health and absenteeism, (Luthans, 2005; Mullins, 1996).

Productivity- Research findings indicate that the relationship between satisfaction and productivity is positive, but very low and inconsistent Luthans (2005). The author maintains that the most satisfied employee will not necessarily be the most productive employee. However, this inconsistency is often at individual level but at an organizational level a strong relationship exists between satisfaction and productivity (Robbins et al., 2003)

Physical and psychological health- Spector (1997) states that individuals who dislike their jobs could experience negative health effects that are either psychological or physical. On the other hand, Luthans (2002) mentions that employees with high levels of job satisfaction tend to experience better mental and physical health.

Turnover-A number of studies strongly support the view that turnover is inversely related to job satisfaction (Griffon, Hand, Meglino& Mobley (1979) and Price (1977) cited in Robbins et al., 2003). He stated that a high employee turnover rate is often prevalent in an environment where employees are highly dissatisfied. Greenberg and Baron (1995) contend that employees lacking job satisfaction often tend to withdraw from situations and environments as a means of dealing with their dissatisfaction. A major form of employee withdrawal is voluntary turnover. A study

conducted by Stone and Phillips (2001) established a moderately strong relationship between job satisfaction and turnover, indicating that less satisfied workers are more likely to quit their jobs. Even with these two different results, even though a high job satisfaction will not necessarily contribute to a low turnover rate, but will inadvertently assist in maintaining a low turnover rate.

Absenteeism- Research indicates that job satisfaction levels are related to absenteeism Luthans (2005). He maintains that “absenteeism is regarded as withdrawal behavior when it is used as a way to escape an undesirable working environment.” He also stated that various studies conducted on the relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism indicates an inverse relationship between the two variables. Thus, when satisfaction is high, absenteeism tends to be low.

2.2.5. Measuring job satisfaction

Saura et al. (2005) holds that measuring job satisfaction is significant for organizations for two reasons. Firstly, job satisfaction can explain a range of employee behaviors relevant to the work environment such as loyalty or motivation. Secondly, these authors believe that job satisfaction relates to company variables including quality, efficiency, productivity and consumer evaluation of the service.

The concept of job satisfaction is extremely broad because it includes all the characteristics of the job as well as the characteristics of the work environment which employees find rewarding, fulfilling and satisfying or which they find frustrating or unsatisfying (Snipes et al., 2005). the obvious activities associated with the particular job includes factors such as interacting with colleagues, adhering to organizational policies and rules and achieving performance goals, satisfaction with the supervisor, work, pay, advancement opportunities, co-workers and customers. Hence an employee’s assessment of his/her level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is a multifarious summation of various job elements.

According to McKenna (2000) and Khandelwal (2003), the two major ways of measuring job satisfaction are facet approach and global approach.

Facet approach: Individuals can express feelings about certain aspects or facets of their job. its aim of being to individually assess how employees feel about various aspects of the general job satisfaction domain such as rewards, job conditions, supervisors and, co-workers, communication, security, promotion opportunities and the work itself (Robbins, 1998; Spector, 2005; Snipes et al., 2005). Each facet is relatively homogenous and discriminately different from the other.

Global approach: Another approach that Robbins (1998), Khandelwal (2003) and Snipes et al (2005) suggest to measure job satisfaction is directly asking individuals how they feel about their jobs overall. This global approach explains job satisfaction as a single, overall feeling an individual has about his/her job (Robbins et al., 2003; Spector, 2005). Statements that directly measure job satisfaction are presented to the respondents and they are required to rate their responses on a Likert-scale (Khandelwal, 2003).

This study defines job satisfaction as the feeling an individual has about his/her job, and therefore is concerned with measuring the affective (emotional and feeling) aspect of job satisfaction. This was done by including a number of statements in a questionnaire measuring job satisfaction as stated in the global approach. The respondents were required to answer these statements by indicating the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with them using a five-point Likert scale. The statements included in the job satisfaction dimension are listed below:


- I feel positive about my future in the organization.
- I find my work interesting.
- I find my work challenging.
- I feel that the organization cares for its employees.
- The organization retains its best employees.

It is obvious that by investigating the various facets of job satisfaction and adding the responses of each dimension will provide a more accurate evaluation of job satisfaction. However, research has shown that when comparing the one-question global rating with the longer job-facet method, the global rating method appears to be more accurate (Robbins, 1998). A possible reason for this is that because job satisfaction is such a broad concept, a single question encompasses all facets.

2.2.6. Job dissatisfaction

When employees are dissatisfied, they tend to express their dissatisfaction in a number of ways (Robbins & Judge, 2007). Employees' responses to dissatisfaction may differ along two dimensions - constructive/destructive and active/passive as represented in the figure below.

Figure 2.5: Pictorial representation of employee response to dissatisfaction



Source: Robbins & Judge (2007)

The exit-voice-loyalty-neglect framework of job dissatisfaction

- Exit. This refers to the employee leaving the organization, either by finding a new job or resigning.
- Voice. This involves employees trying to improve the situation actively and constructively through discussions with superiors or other relevant parties.
- Loyalty. This involves employees hoping that the situation will improve and includes them speaking well of the organization and trusting that management will make positive changes.
- Neglect. Employees will tend to let the situation worsen through absenteeism or lateness, reduced effort and an increase in mistakes in the workplace.

2.3. Empirical literature review

Several studies have been conducted to show the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Al-Shammari (1992) indicated that there are a lot of debates regarding the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Brimhall et al. (2014) and Payne et al. (1976) indicated that organizational climate and job satisfaction was correlated. The study also suggested that the different measurement of variables would produce different results. The following discussion proved the statements above.

Sofianos (2004) examined the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction among executive secretaries to the presidents of community college. The results of this analysis found that job satisfaction among individuals in this position was strongly related to organizational climate; and this relationship was most significant among the organizational climate factors institutional regard for personal concern, relationship with coworkers, and salary and benefits. Correspondingly a study by Hackman and Oldham (1976) infer that organizational climate is a significant determinant of job satisfaction, which reported organizational climates that showed an interest in their employees, provided opportunities for them and recognized their accomplishments, resulted in their employees being more satisfied. It was also found by Al-Shammari (1992) that a significant relationship exists between organizational climate and job satisfaction. The supportiveness of organizational climate has positive relationship with job satisfaction, commitment with the organization and performance at work.

Similarly Griffin (2001) found three dimensions that predict job satisfaction, which are quality of supervision, role ambiguity, and training. While Bhutto et al. (2012) found mixed results of the relationship between the dimensions of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Organizational structure, identity, and human relations have a positive relationship with job satisfaction, whereas equity and empowerment are negatively related to job satisfaction.

Other studies also demonstrated the consistent and impressive relationship between climate and satisfaction (Batlis, 1980; Lawler et al., (1974); Pritchard & Karasick, 1973). According to McGregor (1960), organizational characteristics such as its purpose, structure, the tasks to be performed, opportunities for promotion and the political nature of the work environment

impacted on how people felt about their jobs. This is because people come to the work environment with specific attitudes, needs and aspirations, which are influenced, positively or negatively by the organizational climate. The work environment can be seen as a social activity, which affects quality of life which is determined by experiences on the job. According to Gini (cited in Peek, 2003), the general climate in an organization, regardless of where one works, the job one does or how one works, will have an impact on one's life. The degree to which the work environment affects people is obvious.

Researchers have been interested in understanding how employee's perceptions of the work environment influence their level of job satisfaction. According to Mayo's (1933) studies at Western Electric it found that environmental factors influence worker productivity and morale. Bisconti and Solomon (cited in Peek, 2003) reported that organizational climates that allowed a high degree of autonomy and nurtured relationships between peers, supervisors and subordinates result in more satisfied workers. Hackman and Suttle (cited in Peek, 2003) also reported that organizational climates that showed an interest in their employees, provided opportunities for them and recognized their accomplishments, resulted in their employees being more satisfied. In Ford's (cited in Peek, 2003) study of industrial engineers, organizational climate characteristics such as concern for the feelings of others impacted on job satisfaction.

Similar results were found in a study conducted by Hopkins (cited in Peek, 2003), where a high regard for the feelings of others increased satisfaction. Opportunities for employee advancement and development appear to be organizational characteristics that have an influence on job satisfaction. According to Schlesinger (2000), a work environment that encourages continuous learning and provides new opportunities influences job satisfaction. Similarly, Brief (1998) found that salary, benefits and advancement opportunities were components of organizational climate that had a direct influence on job satisfaction, while Freeman and Rodgers (cited in Peek, 2003) found that people desire plenty of opportunities for advancement in addition to an environment that is not political and encourages open communication. All of these studies support earlier research by Barbash (cited in Peek, 2003) on the influence of individual development opportunities on job satisfaction.

Recent studies have also found similar results for the climate/satisfaction relationship, where various organizational climate characteristics can lead to the satisfaction of organizational members (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006; Fisher et al., 2007; Gratto, 2001; Lephoko et al., 2006; Peek, 2003). The results of the above studies indicate that many positive correlations have been found between organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Further, in Ethiopia, a study by Birbirsa et al, 2015 on organizational climate factor that could predict the job satisfaction of academic staff of public universities found out that, among the organizational climate factors, coworker relationship, working condition, organizational commitment and leadership and management are factors that could predict the job satisfaction of academic staff. That means, integrated coworker relationship, better working conditions, high organizational commitment, and good leadership and management that could result in increasing the level of job satisfaction of academic staff.

Although there are relatively few studies investigating the relationship between satisfaction and job level (Oshagbemi, 2000), generally there does seem to be a positive relationship between job level and satisfaction (Josias, 2005; Miles, et al., 1996). And the opposite finding of (Frances, 1986 & Castro, 2008) who found higher-level employees to be less satisfied than lower-level employees. Moreover, from the results obtained by (Gerber, 2003; Bown and cattle, 2008 ; Martin, 2007; and Hugwane, 2006) significant variations have emerged in the perception of overall organizational climate on the basis of public/private sector, gender of the respondents, Job level of the respondents, and the academic qualifications of the respondents. That is senior level employees score positive organizational climate than junior levels. On rest of the dimensions of the study i.e. category of the operation, salary band of the employee, and work experience category of the employees band, no significant differences have been found in the respondents' perception of the overall organizational climate of the corporate sector. However, Josias (2005) and Lambert et al. (2001) reported an inverse relationship between experience and job satisfaction; they concluded that employees who had been with the organization for a long time were less satisfied than those who had been with the organization for only a short period.

with regard to the dimensions of organizational climate , a study by Castro (2008) and Gerber (2003) found out that among the dimensions considered which are Personal Growth & Development , leadership of immediate manager ,image, pay ,recognition & acknowledgement, transformation & diversity ,physical work environment ,challenging & interesting work ,employee wellness the internal factors or factor that have a direct impact on individual(personal growth and development, pay, recognition and acknowledgement) have greater influence than the external factors (leadership of immediate manager, image, transformation and diversity physical work environment and employee wellness)

The results of the above studies indicate that many positive correlations have been found between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Despite the diverse and competing needs of organizational members, these studies highlight that successful organizations try to find ways to nurture a climate in which individuals can succeed. More over the studies showed the relationship between the variables still receives a lot of arguments. Patterson et al. (2005) explained that the inconsistency of the findings is partly because every study uses a different measure of climate, each assessing rather different dimensions. The reason behind is that organizational climate varies from one organization to another for the reason that, according to Patterson et al. (2005), first all climates are held to be perceptual and psychological in nature, and are abstract thus they are held to be subject to the same principles of perceptions as other psychological concepts more over climates are also considered to be predominantly descriptive rather than evaluative in nature.

Therefore, it is a must to examine an organizational climate in each organization in order to cater to the unique environment of an individual organization.

2.4. Theoretical and conceptual framework

This section discussed the variables used to answer the central research question of the study. It first assessed previous works on the area, identified the variables employed and then outlined the elements this study retained, dropped, modified or added. Finally, it presented the conceptual framework designed based on the theoretical framework.

2.4.1. Theoretical frame work

2.4.1.1. Dimensions of organizational climate

To study the subjective matter of organizational climate constructs should be first in place. According to Davidson (2000), the components of the climate construct can be seen as the characteristics that define an organization and differentiate it from other organizations and which can be measured and controlled. In the literature it is the dimensions and measurement of organizational climate varies. This is because a wide variety of dimensions are used by various researchers to assess organizational climate.

Steers (1977) postulates that there is disagreement among researchers about which dimensions constitute the concept. This is because firstly organizational climate has been researched in diverse situations, such as businesses, laboratories, schools and government; making it difficult to determine which key dimensions are relevant to all of the above environments. Secondly new scales are constantly being developed without consideration of how these compare to existing scales of organizational climate, resulting in an increase in scales claiming to measure organizational climate. In addition, validity and reliability do not receive the required attention.

Different authors have proposed different dimensions of organizational climate. Some of these are mentioned under:

One of the most commonly referred to set of dimensions measuring organizational climate is that of Litwin and Stringer (1968). They identified the dimensions based on organizations that are mainly task orientated and that will describe a particular situation. Accordingly the nine dimensions of organizational climate are: Structure, Responsibility, Reward, Risk, Warmth, Support, Standards, Conflict and Identity.

The advantage of this measure is it is designed for service climate and safety climate. However, it has a drawback that it might not be applicable for any country. For example, Dippenaar and Roodt (1996) investigated the applicability of Litwin and Stringer's questionnaire in the South African environment and found that only two factors of organizational climate were evident. It is therefore advisable not to make use of this questionnaire in this research.

Martins and Ohe, 2003 suggested organizational climate measurement – new and emerging dimensions during a period of transformation and the eight dimensions listed are Autonomy, Cohesion, Trust, Pressure, Support, Recognition, Fairness and Innovation

Understanding the gap, Patterson et al. (2005) claimed that they have developed a new measure of organizational climate based on competing value model (CVM) which is both theoretically grounded and empirically validated called Organizational climate measure (OCM). They divided organizational climate into four dimensions: human relations, internal process, open systems, and rational goal; that consists of seventeen (17) scales of organizational climate which consists of Autonomy, Integration, Participation, Supervisory Support, Training, Welfare, Innovation and Flexibility, Outward Focus, Reflexivity, Clarity of Organizational Goals, Efficiency, Effort, Performance Feedback, Pressure to Produce, Quality, Formalization, and Tradition.

Nordgard, 2011 in his study of validating Organizational Climate Measure for Universities and Colleges explains that Patterson's OCM is meant to be applicable to many sectors. However he states that OCM might also be too general to be able to capture contextual aspects specific for a particular sector. And he amends the dimensions for educational setting as Autonomy, participation in decision making, training and development, employee wellness, innovation and performance feedback.

In addition Kuenzi, 2008 has also modified the CVM for molar concept variables and suggested the integrated model of organizational climate with seven dimensions for overall measures as human relation climate, overall internal process climate, rational goal climate, open system climate, overall fairness climate, service climate and safety climate.

Reyesa and Zapata, 2014 also suggested seven organizational climate dimensions for university and college which are Organizational communication ,Personal growth, Working conditions, Corporate image, Leadership and Management, Level of work and, Interpersonal relationships

For this particular research dimensions of Nordgard (2011), (Participation indecision making and Employee wellness) Kuenzi (2008), (human relation) and Reyesa and Zapata (2014), (Leadership and management, Working condition and Corporate image) are integrated and adopted. These dimensions are selected because they are the most frequently chosen scales to measure organizational climate in most organizational climate studies on educational settings and standardized dimensions for all situations. And particularly, overall human relation is adapted because it is integrative of all the human relation scales of Patterson organizational climate measure and it is time saving for respondents. The discussion about the dimentions presented as follows.

Leadership and management

Gerber (2003) in his study of organizational climate defined management and leadership as supervision hindering or helping employees in performing their duties. However, in this research, leadership refers to the ability of managers to manage and lead employees, how they behave and treat employees and their knowledge. Leadership is the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of a vision or set of goals.

The source of this influence may be formal such as provided by the superior. Employees are more satisfied when their managers are good leaders. It includes motivating employees to do a good job and striving them for excellence. Effective communication and feed back is must for leaders as this is vital for achieving the organizational vision. Senior leaders should communicate often with their employees and they recognize the completion of task is dependent on leading and motivating others. Leadership is multi skilled.

Participation in decision making

Literatures stated that this dimension refers the feeling that the supervisor has confidence in the subordinate's ability to participate in decision-making.

Pay and benefit

This refers to fairness of salary and benefit package in relation to the market and in comparison with similar jobs in the organization. There is no doubt that monetary rewards play a very influential role in determining job satisfaction. Pay is one of the fundamental components of job satisfaction since it has a powerful effect in determining job satisfaction so that individuals can their needs, (Arnold and Feldman 1996).

However, there is no such empirical evidence that asserts that pay alone improves worker satisfaction or reduces dissatisfaction. (Bassett 1994) stated that even highly paid employees may still be dissatisfied if they do not like the nature of their job. Moreover, a study conducted by Young and Woer (1998) in the public sector organizations revealed the failure of any significant relationship between job satisfaction and pay.

However, Bogie (2005) Chung (1977) Van Dyad Werner (2004) says that poor pay and absence of recognition often leads to a problem with employee retention.

Human relation

According to Kutenai, 2008 Human relations climate refers to shared perceptions of cohesion, morale, and human resource development. Social systems with this climate type are perceived to emphasize an internal focus and flexibility. Cohesion, morale, and human resources development are stressed in the social system. The social system has a concern for the employees with a focus on recruiting, training, and motivating people. The focus is on developing positive working relationships among workers so there is a balance of various interests and maintaining a level of satisfaction and loyalty.

Working condition

According to Gerber et al (1998), working conditions are created by the interaction of employees with their organizational climate. Working conditions include the physical layout of the job and psychological work conditions.

The physical working conditions include the availability of facilities like Quality of equipment protective clothing, quality equipment, appliances and technology. Failure to provide these

facilities makes it difficult for employees to carry out their jobs and thus promote job dissatisfaction because employees cannot perform their jobs in an easy non-obstructive way. More over neatness, organization, convenience and attractiveness of the work environment come under this category; employees will find it easier to carry out their jobs. (Gerber et al, 1998)

However, the psychological contract includes the psychological expectations of both employees and their employers. Employees will perform better when they know what the employer expects from them and vice versa. They will be productive because they know the benefits they will get from their employer if their performance is satisfactory otherwise they will be unsure and less productive and feel dissatisfied.

Employee Welfare

This Refers to the support given to employees to balance work and family life (commonly referred work life balance) and the pace of the work and level of stress. The factor of regard for personal concerns measures an institutions official response to personal issues among employees that potentially affect their well being and the performance of their job (Duncan &Harlacher, 1994). When employees perceive that their institution takes an interest in their personal concerns and individual needs, the result is generally an increased sense of dedication and commitment to that institution (Blau, 2001). In essence, institutional regard for personal concerns has an advantageous effect on both organizational climate and job satisfaction.


Corporate image

The final dimension, corporate image refers to Image of the organization; Perception of the organization's positioning and subjective impact. According to Ruperti (2009), the corporate image is the organization's personality; in other words, what defines it: It is a definite element of differentiation and positioning. It is measured based on Proud to be associated with the organization. It is an employer of choice, well known in the market and highly rated.

2.4.2. Conceptual frame work

Form the theoretical literature review the following conceptual frame work is developed for this study. This frame work is modified to fit the requirement of this study. It shows the relationship and impact of organizational climate, as expressed by its selected dimensions and job satisfaction.

Figure 2.6: Conceptual frame work



Source: developed by the researcher

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The primary aim of the study was to find out the effect of organizational climate on job satisfaction, the case of private universities found in Addis Ababa city and thereby answering related questions. This section discusses the research design and methodology chosen to answer the research questions.

3.1. Research design.

To achieve the objectives of this research a cross-sectional study design with explanatory and descriptive type of research was employed to analyze the collected data.

Cross-sectional design is used when information is to be collected only once (Barbie, 1989; Mallhota et al, 1996). Cross-sectional survey design is justified on the ground that we should adopt one time observation, involving proximate and ultimate variables necessary for the study. Explanatory research focus on explanations of observed organizational climate related phenomenon and behaviors. While descriptive research examined the what, where, and when of a phenomenon, explanatory research seek answers to why and how types of questions. It attempts to “connect the dots” in research, by identifying causal factors and outcomes of the target phenomenon (Polit and Hungler, 1991). The questions presented in this study were both explanatory and descriptive.

3.2. Data type and research instrument

Primary data were used for the study, which consisted responses collected from questionnaire respondents.

3.2.1. Design of the questionnaire

The study used questionnaire as the research instrument. The majority of questions used were adapted from a questionnaire on organizational climate and job satisfaction by Lee (1987) and Castro (2008), with modifications to suit the research context; i.e the questions were selected to

represent the research dimensions and rephrasing was also takes place on some questions. The following steps were followed in going about the research instrument design:

- a. A pilot study (of the questionnaire) was conducted to establish the adequacy and reliability of the instrument in wording, content, question sequencing and bias. It is a way of providing ideas and to test the relevance of the instrument to the environment in which the academics are employed.
- b. The unstructured interviews were conducted with the academic staff after the pilot study to ascertain that all the questions in the study are simple and easy to comprehend.
- c. The final stage was the administration of the adapted questionnaire to a sample from selected private universities within the Addis Ababa city.

3.2.2. The questionnaire

The questionnaire had two parts: one and two. Section 1 dealt with the respondent's bio-data information (i.e. the demographic and biographical details of the academics including the years of experience, gender, highest academic qualifications and job level) with five measuring questions. Section 2 contained questions directed to senior and junior academic staff covering major areas of this research with thirty six measuring questions. The questions focuses on what the respondents feel about their organization climate with respected dimensions in correlation with job satisfaction.

Five-point Likert scale was used in the design of the questionnaire. According to Reichheld (2003), in practice, scales of five categories are typical. He also stated that in an investigation of the effects of scale points on reliability, scale reliability increases with the number of intervals, five points or more being more reliable than 4, 3 or 2 points.

For purification of scale, the researcher used factor analysis. This purification exercise revealed the degree of internal consistency and overall homogeneity among the items comprising the scales. It also showed the extent the model fits the data which depended on the loading of the items on the hypothesized constructs.

3.2.3. Reliability and validity of the questionnaire

Owing to the fact that the questionnaire used in this study was adapted and modified specifically to meet the requirements of the organization from which the data were obtained, no previous research studies had examined the reliability or validity of the questionnaire. Hence the analysis of the reliability and validity of the results would form a key component of the data analysis of the results.

3.2.3.1. Validity

Validity is the ability of the research instrument to measure what it is intended to measure (Asika, 2000). According to Cooper and Schindler (2003), constructs and content validity are a widely accepted measure to measure validity a questionnaire.

a. Construct Validity

Construct validity refers to the process of examining whether or not a test actually measures a theoretical construct or trait (Anastasi&Urbina, 1997). Factorial validity represents the extent to which a scale structure is empirically and theoretically justified.

This study examines the construct validity of the instrument through the use of a factor analysis to determine whether the 8 constructs of the questionnaire can be replicated (discussed in the next chapter). For a measure to demonstrate construct validity, its factor structure should comprise the theorized number and pattern of factors. In this study, 8 constructs were expected and to emerge from the data. The study confirmed that 8 constructs were emerged.

b. Content Validity

Content validity of an instrument is to ensure that all the relevant dimensions of the topic are being fully explored; and that, the measuring instrument adequately covers all the dimensions or at least a good representation of all the dimensions of the topic of research.

In this research to ensure content validity, a literature review was conducted and key concepts identified and used in the formulation of questions, which were sent to the experts (statisticians,

my advisor and co- advisor and the senior colleagues in the field) to evaluate the appropriateness of the test items and to ensure that all the questions asked in the questionnaire fully exhaust all that are implied by the research questions and hypotheses. They examined each item and confirmed that the questionnaire fulfills majority of the required content validity.

3.2.3.2. Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which the measure of a research instrument is consistent (Spector, 2000). Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is the commonly considered as an “index of reliability associated with the variation accounted for the true score of the underlying construct” (Santos, 1999). According to Hair et al., (2010) an acceptable reliability coefficient is 0.70.

In order to establish the reliability of items, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was calculated for each dimension to ensure that the items included all had indices that indicated internal consistency. Table 3.1 shows that the measure of L_M began with 4 items, P_M with 5 items, P_B with 4 items ,H_R with 4 items, W_C with 5 items ,E_W with 5 items C_I with 4 items and the dependant variable J_S with five items.

Table 3.1: Reliability test for the dimensions of the organizational climate questionnaire

Constructs	No. of items	Reliability (Cronbach’s α)
Leadership and management (L_M)	4	0.877
Participation in decision making (P_D)	5	0.817
Pay and benefit(P_B)	4	0.761
Human relation (H_R)	4	0.869
Working condition (W_C)	5	0.936
Employee wellness (E_W)	5	0.857
Corporate image(C_I)	4	0.890
Job satisfaction (J_S)	5	0.774
Total questionnaire	36	0.864

Source: own computation

As shown in table 3.1 the results of the scales, all appeared to have good internal consistency reliabilities of above 0.70. This indicates that all the constructs had internal consistencies within the recommended range. Moreover, the overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient obtained for the organizational climate questionnaire was 0.864 for the total 36 items. Owing to the total value being above 0.7, the scale was deemed to be a reliable measure for examining the current sample

3.3. Sampling design

3.3.1. Population of the study

The study population from which the sample was drawn for the study consists of three selected private universities and university colleges in Addis Ababa city. The institutions under study are St. Mary's University, Unity University and Alpha University College which are the oldest and well experienced institutions and are selected because of their cooperation and convenience for data collection. The target population of the study was the total academic staffs of the three institutions under the study. Questionnaires were administered to the academic staff ranging from professors, associate professors, assistant professor, lecturers, assistant lecturers and graduate assistants. The total academic staff in the institutions is 635 and the unit of analysis was set to be individual level that meant each academic staff.

3.3.2. Sampling techniques and determination of sample size

This refers to the selection and negotiating access to the participants or respondents (Steyn and Van Wyk, 1999). The study was based on three selected higher institutions and the total number of academic staff in the selected institutions is 635. However, below is the statistical information regarding the selected universities academic staff as of August, 2015.

Table 3.2: Population distribution of selected institutions

University	Total Population
St marry University	401
Unity University	207
Alpha University College	27
Total	635

Source: The institutions human resource department, 2015.

The formula of Penwarden (2014) adjustment for finite population was used to determine the sample size as it was used in more recent studies like Punia et al., (2015) i.e.

$$\mathit{truesample} = \frac{(n * P)}{(n + P - 1)}$$

Where: **P**=Population (615 in this case)

n=Sample Size for infinite population ($n = \frac{D}{(E/Z)^2}$, D = Distribution (50%)E =

Margin of Error% (5%)andZ = Confidence Level Score (95% = 1.96))

The confidence level score is the standard deviation value that goes along with the confidence level. In the case of a confidence level of 95%, the confidence level score would equal 1.96. Distribution, on the other hand, reflects how skewed the respondents are on a topic. In the survey world it is almost always safest to stick with a 50% distribution, which is the most conservative.

For this particular research

$$\mathbf{True\ Sample} = \frac{3.84 * 635}{384.16 + 635 - 1}, n = \frac{(0.5*(1-0.5))}{(0.05/1.96)^2} = 384$$

True sample = 239.52...

Thus our sample size is 240.

3.4. Contingency for non-response

Non-response was expected due to various reasons. Especially in this study non-response was expected, in the assumptions that some respondents may not be willing to fill questionnaires in fear of giving responses about their feeling about the organization or inadequate time to fill questionnaires due to their busy schedule.

Although this would vary somewhat from setting to setting, an allowance of 10 percent should prove adequate in most situations (Magnani, 1997). To this end, 24 questionnaires (10% of 240) were allotted to compensate non-response problem, which finally made the number of total distributed questionnaires 264.

Questionnaires were distributed to academic staffs found in randomly selected university branches. The Sampling design is random sampling.

3.5. Distribution of questionnaire

Survey research method with convenience sampling technique was used for this study through the distribution of copies of questionnaire because not everybody would be around as such whoever is around completes the questionnaire. The researcher utilized structured questionnaire for academicians and was presented personally to all respondents by the researcher in the selected private universities which ensured a high return rate and encouraged freedom of expression from the respondents. Thus, this enhanced uniformity of response bearing in mind the degree of variations in perception of what the organizational climate is.

Going by the information on the academic staff in these universities as shown in Table 3.3 above, the following Table 3.3 was therefore designed on questionnaire administered to respondents in the study Universities, rate of questionnaires returned and the total number analyzed.

Table 3.3: Summary of questionnaire administration, returned and analyzed

Name of university	Determination of sample size	Copies administered	Copies returned	Copies analyzed
Alpha university college	Total population	27	26	26
Unity university	$(207*237)/608$	81	78	77
St Mary's University	$(401*237)/608$	156	131	126
Total		264	235	229

Source: researcher's field survey report, 2015

From Table 3.2 above, for Alpha university serve as the sample size, i.e. 27 copies of questionnaires were administered. The justification for the use of the total population as the sample size include the fact that total sample size for this University is relatively very small, and the fact that the researcher wanted to avoid incidence of low response rate from the respondents. This is in line with Asika (2000) and Otokiti (2005) assertion that the best sample size is a

complete census of the population and that all the elements of the population are expected to be included in the survey. This will make the sample statistics valid estimates of the population parameters.

Moreover, the remaining Universities, i.e., Unity University and St Mary's university 81 and 156 copies of questionnaire were administered respectively being the balance of one another from the total sample of 237 after giving the other university the numbers as indicated above being the population equal to the sample size.

The distribution of the sample size over these Universities were carried out using Proportional Affixation Criterion (PAC), i.e. Universities sample in each stratum is proportional to the relative weight of the stratum in relation to the population. Within each University, selection is conducted through simple random sampling.

3.6. Methods of Data Analysis

The researcher collected quantitative data. It was then coded and edited to have the required quality, accuracy, consistency and completeness. The data was then entered into a database and analyzed using a statistical computer package – SPSS 20 (statistical package for social scientist).

The collected data were analyzed by making use of descriptive and inferential statistics, which enabled the researcher to synthesize and summaries the quantitative data. The descriptive statistics described the sample in terms of the responses to the questions using frequencies, means and standard deviations. The hypothesized relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction was examined using inferential statistics procedures. Inferential statistics allow the researcher to draw conclusions about a population from the sample of a particular study (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). The inferential statistics relevant to this study include Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient, multiple regression analysis, independent group t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

3.6.1. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient

According to Muchinsky (1993), correlation reflects the degree of linear relationship between two variables and highlights two elements - the direction and the strength of the relationship. The most commonly used instrument is Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient.

Results that are considered to be statistically significant may not necessarily be practically significant, and vice versa (Pallant, 2001). She postulates that it is dangerous to interpret data on the basis of their significance only because this could lead to a misrepresentation of the data. It is therefore necessary to describe the measure of association between the independent and dependent variables. This is achieved by utilizing effect size or strength of association.

Effect size or strength of association indicates the relative magnitude of the differences between group means (Pallant, 2001). In other words, it relates to the extent to which the changes in the dependent variable are caused by changes in the independent variable. Cohen's measure of effect size is used in this study.

3.6.2. Multiple regression analysis

Regression analysis is a statistical technique used to measure linear relationships between two or more variables. Not only does it indicate how well a set of variables explains a dependent variable, but also gives the direction and size of the effect of the variables on the dependent variable (Neuman, cited in Josias, 2005).

In order to determine the degree to which different dimensions of organizational climate predict job satisfaction, a multiple-regression was used. This technique allows the interpretation of result based on the coefficients of each dimensions (Pallant, 2001).

3.6.3. Independent group t- test

For the purpose of this study, t-tests were used to determine statistically significant differences on the basis of the perception to organizational climate and job satisfaction between groups of the sample on the basis of gender and job type.

The t-test refers to a statistical technique used to compare the means of two groups and determine if a significant difference exists (Muchinsky, 1993). A typical example of the use of t-tests is for comparisons between groups of only two categories, such as males or female (gender).

3.6.4. Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

According to Muchinsky (1993), ANOVA is used to test for differences between two or more groups. In the present study, ANOVA was utilized to investigate differences in perception of organizational climate and level of satisfaction relative to their experience and job level. The Bonferroni test was used to control for the likelihood of a Type 1 error (rejecting the null hypothesis when it is actually true) and to indicate where the specific areas of difference lay.

3.7. Operationalization of Variables

The research work is based on two major constructs, namely organizational climate and job satisfaction, that is,

$JS = f(OC)$ Where JS = Job Satisfaction.

OC = Organizational Climate

This implies that job satisfaction is a function of organizational climate.

Evidence from literature, including the work of Litwin and Stringer, (1960) described organization climate as an individual's direct or indirect perception of the work environment which embodies characteristics such as leadership and management of organization, reward system, support, standards, conflict and organization image in the organization. However, the work of these scholars along with others represents the platform used for the selection of independent (X) variables used in the study. Consequently, organizational climate is measured with indicators and variables given as follows:

OC= LM, DM, PB, HR, WC, EW and CI

Where OC-organizational climate

LM -Leadership and management.

DM -Participatory in decision making process

PB -Pay and benefit.

HR -Human relation

WC -Working condition

EW -Employee wellness

CI-corporate image

Unlike to organizational climate, according to Robbins & Judge, 2007 this study defines job satisfaction as the feeling an individual has about his/her job, and therefore is concerned with measuring the affective aspect of job satisfaction and measure it with 5 questions as stated in chapter two.

3.8. Model Specification

This study considered the following ordinary list square (OLS) (multiple linear regression model) linear model with 7 independent variables. The model element under explain how interactional organizational variables impact on job satisfaction in sample study.

Regression functions

- **Dependent Variable:** Job satisfaction (JS)
- **Independent variables:** Selected organizational climate dimensions

$$JS = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LM + \beta_2 DM + \beta_3 HR + \beta_4 WC + \beta_5 EW + \beta_6 PB + \beta_7 CI + \varepsilon$$

Where:

- JS- Job satisfaction
- LM, DM, HR, WC, EW, PB, CI are the explanatory variables, β_0 is intercept and $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6, \beta_7$ are coefficients and ε is error term

3.9. Model testing

According to Castro (2008), multiple regression models are subject to multivariate data analysis assumptions such as normality, homoscedasticity, and multi-collinearity assumptions. Keeping this in mind, the tests should be checked in order to make sure the model is the right one. The following section provides the tests and its respective result for the study.

3.9.1. Normality

A normal distribution or a Gaussian distribution assumes that the populations from which the samples are taken are normally distributed. Normal distributions take the form of a bell-shaped curve. (Liao et al., 2004)

Kurtosis, skewness and their standard errors are common descriptive statistics that measure the shape of the distribution. Skewness refers to the skew of a distribution. Kurtosis refers to the peakiness of a distribution and measures the relationship between a distribution's tails and its most numerous values. (Everitt, 2006) Even though kurtosis can lead to an underestimation of variance, with bigger samples (200+) this risk is reduced (Tabachnick&Fidell 2007). A commonly used rule-of-thumb test for normality is to run descriptive statistics to obtain skewness and kurtosis. The results are then divided by the standard errors. Skewness and kurtosis should be within the +2 to -2 range when the data are normally distributed (Liao et al, 2004). The results of the normality test for this study are displayed in Appendix B.

The table (appendix B) demonstrates that most of values for the items fall within the range of the rigorous level of -1 to +1 for skewness. Only some item meets the proposed level of -2 to +2 for kurtosis (Liao et al, 2004). Furthermore, the underestimation of variance with positive kurtosis diminishes with large sample sizes (200+) (Tabachnick&Fidell 2007). Therefore, all variables can be considered to be normally distributed.

3.9.2. Assessing outliers


Outliers are so extreme values which are either on one or a set of variables (Hamsici, 2007). Outliers can cause negative effects on data analysis. As the author stated, outliers can occur as “a result of an error in the data file (e.g., entry of an incorrect value), a programming error (e.g., an error in recoding or transforming variables or a failure to identify missing data values correctly), or the presence of a valid but exceptional data point”.

In order to find univariate outliers, the researcher used the frequency distributions of z scores. If the Z score is greater than 3.29 with $p < .001$, it indicates that there is a univariate outlier (Liao et al., 2004). Accordingly, based on the previous rule, no outlier values were detected in this study.

3.9.3. Homoscedasticity test

Homoscedasticity is where the variances along the line of best fit remain similar as you move along the line. (Hamsici, 2007)

Figure 3.1: Homoscedasticity test



Source: own computation

As shown in the figure above the distribution of residual looks more or less homoscedastic.

3.9.4. Multicollinearity test for independent variables

Multicollinearity is a high degree of correlation (linear dependency) among several independent variables. It commonly occurs when a large number of independent variables are incorporated in a regression model. It is because some of them may measure the same concepts or phenomena (Lynn, 2012). According to him if there is a multicollinearity problem Variance of the model and variances of coefficients will be inflated.

As Williams (2015) explained multicollinearity problem can be detected either by computing correlation coefficients of independent variables or checking related statistics such as tolerance value or variance inflation factor (VIF). But high correlation coefficients do not necessarily imply multicollinearity. VIF shows how multicollinearity has increased the instability of the coefficient estimates. Most researchers argue that a tolerance value less than 0.1 or VIF greater than 4 indicates significant multi-collinearity problem.

To assess multicollinearity VIF was calculated between independent variables (see Appendix C). The following table shows the average VIF result for each independent variable.

Table 3.4: VIF results of independent variables

Independent variables	VIF
leadership and management	1.290
Participation in decision making	1.278
pay and benefit	1.212
Human relation	1.235
Working condition	1.111
Employee wellness	1.142
Corporate image	1.233

Source: own computation

As shown both in the above table and appendix C, no Multicollinearity item was identified as the result revealed all of the VIF results are below the threshold 4.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study based on the empirical analysis of the data collected from the research respondents and discussion of results with respect to previous research findings and literature. Here both descriptive and inferences on the data analysis and procedures are presented.

Three Private Universities (for ethical purposes in chapters four and five, the Universities are denoted with the alphabets A,B,and C) were visited and all of them co-operated. In all, 264 copies of questionnaires were administered to these private Universities, but a total of 235 questionnaires were returned. The returned questionnaires are carefully checked, and those with excessive missing data were discarded. Thus 229 questionnaires were fully and appropriately filled as usable for further analysis. This represents an acceptable response rate of 95.41%. An analysis of the questionnaires by total responses showed that Alpha University College has the highest response rate of 26 (96.29%); University has 77 (95.05%) and St Mary's has 126 (80.76%). Therefore the whole 219 questionnaires retrieved were used in the analysis of this study.

4.1. Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

In this section, the researcher reported the biographic and organizational variable profile of the sample, showing the sample distributions in terms of gender, Job type, level of education, rank/level in the University, years they have spent lecturing in the University system generally. The descriptive statistics is presented for each variable mentioned in the table below.

Table 4.1: Demographic description of respondents

Demography Factors	Category	Frequency	Percentile (%)
Gender	Male	217	94.8
	Female	12	5.2
	<i>total</i>	<i>229</i>	<i>100</i>
Job type	Full time	212	92.6
	Part time	17	7.4
Level of education	B.A/B.Sc.	91	39.7
	M.A/M.Sc.	106	46.3
	PHD	32	14.0
	<i>Total</i>	<i>229</i>	<i>100</i>
Years of experience	0-5	110	48.0
	6-10	73	31.9
	10-15	29	12.7
	<i>16 or above</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>7.4</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>229</i>	<i>100</i>
Job level	Graduate assistant	27	11.8
	Assistant lecturer	40	17.5
	Lecturer	133	58.1
	Assistant professor	23	10.0
	Associate professor	4	1.7
	Other	2	0.9
	<i>Total</i>	<i>229</i>	<i>100</i>

Source: researcher's calculation of field survey result (2015)

As the above table indicates, from the total sample of majority of respondents (94.8%) were found to be male whereas, females of respondents accounts 5.2% of the total respondents.

The kind of lectures job in the universities is presented above as part time and full time employee. Most of the respondents are full time workers which accounted 92.6 % of the total of

229 respondents and 7.4% are part-time workers. This shows that most of the respondents are relatively aware of their organizational climate since they spend most of their time in their respective campus.

When it came to the educational background of the respondents, about 39.7% of respondents have first degree, whereas 46.3% of respondents have Masters and 14% has PHD educational qualification.

With regard to the education experience of the respondents, 110(48%) of the respondents has five and less years experience followed by 73(31.9%) between six and ten years experience, 46(20.1%) has over ten years experience, respectively.

Finally, the table presented that the job level of respondents as per the university title matrix. The table above depicts the breakdown of the sample according to job level or grade. The respondents for this study fall into six categories, which are grouped into two main groups: Senior academics and junior academics. These two groups were considered with regards to their perceptions concerning the organizational climate. As the table showed, 58.3% of respondents are lecturers, 18.3% are assistant lecturers, 10.5% are graduate assistant, 8.3% and 1.7% are assistant and associate professors, and other two respondents are senior lecturers.

4.2. Findings of the study

4.2.1. Factor analysis

To examine the validity of the factor structure of the organizational climate questionnaire an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted. According to Field (2005), EFA shows the extent the model fits the data which depended on the loading of the items on the hypothesized constructs.

4.2.1.1. Suitability of the data

Prior to performing the factor analysis, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed. According to Pallant (2001), the major issue needs to be considered in order to determine the suitability of the data refers to sample size. Researchers believe that the larger the sample is the better.

Two statistical measures that help to assess the factorability of the data are the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (see table 4.2). The KMO index ranges from 0 to 1, with 0.6 suggested as a minimum value for acceptable factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity should be significant at the level of $p < 0.05$ for the factor analysis to be considered appropriate (Pallant, 2001).

Table 4.2: Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.761
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6438.934
	df	630
	Sig.	.000

Source: researcher's calculation of field survey result

The KMO value was 0.761 which exceeded the recommended value of 0.6. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ($p=0.000$), and is therefore accepted that the factor analysis was appropriate.

4.2.1.2. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

In order to assess the construct validity of the questionnaire EFA was made to the questionnaire. In other words it is to determine whether 8 constructs could be extracted from the questionnaire as expected. In addition, it was expected that these dimensions would be distinct from one another as identified in the theoretical component of this research (discussed in chapter two). The

job satisfaction scale was also expected to load independently from the other 7 dimensions of the questionnaire.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to investigate the underlying factor structure of the questionnaire. Finally the questionnaire fit the 8 constructs distinct to each other only one item from job satisfaction was loaded in two different dimensions so that it was deleted for analysis sine exploratory factor analysis in an effort to seek a more appropriate solution. According to Kline (2005), to correctly identify the structure of the items, items which has loading on more than one construct should be deleted.

4.2.1.3. Factor extraction

It is necessary to decide how many factors or dimensions to extract. According to Pallant (2001), factor extraction involves determining the smallest number of factors used to best represent the interrelationships between the set of variables. For the purposes of this research, it was decided to utilize the principal component factoring technique. The reason for this is that principal component factoring takes all variance into account (Pallant, 2001).

As pallant (2001) stated, Kaiser's criterion or eigenvalue rule is one technique that can be used to determine which factors should be retained. The initial eigenvalues were examined to determine the number of factors to use for the factor analysis. Initial eigenvalues with a total value greater than 1 indicates a strong extraction (Pallant, 2001). Here eight factors were found to have eigenvalues (Kaiser Criterion) exceeding 1 (see Table 4.3). This 8-factor model accounted for 73.58% of the total variance.

Table 4.3: Total variance explained for the overall scale of the organizational climate questionnaire (Excluding factors with eigenvalues lower than 1)


Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.195	22.765	22.765	8.195	22.765	22.765
2	4.462	12.394	35.158	4.462	12.394	35.158
3	3.370	9.362	44.520	3.370	9.362	44.520
4	3.225	8.958	53.479	3.225	8.958	53.479
5	2.393	6.649	60.127	2.393	6.649	60.127
6	1.972	5.477	65.604	1.972	5.477	65.604
7	1.594	4.427	70.031	1.594	4.427	70.031
8	1.279	3.553	73.585	1.279	3.553	73.585

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Source:own computation

A second technique that can be used to decide which factors to retain is referred to as Cattell's scree test (Pallant, 2001). This process involves plotting each of the eigenvalues of the factors and inspecting the plot in order to find the point at which the shape of the curve changes direction and becomes horizontal (Pallant, 2001). Inspection of Cattell's scree test revealed that the graph leveled off at the eighth factor, indicating that the first eight factors have a strong influence (see figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1: Scree plot for the overall scale of the questionnaire



Source: own computation

Therefore, as indicated in table 4.3 and confirmed by the scree test, the whole eight factors have a strong influence, explaining 73.585% of the variance.

4.2.1.4. Factor Rotation

Factor rotation does not change the underlying solution - its purpose is to present the pattern of loadings in such a way that it is easier to interpret (Pallant, 2001). On the basis of the results found in the previous analyses, the 8-factor model was assessed using varimax method which is most suitable method for analyzing the factor structure (Kline, 2005). As stated in table 4.3 the model explained a total of 73.58% of the variance.

As discussed above, the scree test indicated that the graph leveled off at the eighth factor, indicating that the first eight factors have a strong influence. Table 4.4 displays the rotated pattern matrix, which indicates a clearer distribution among 8 factors. Pattern matrices are used more frequently because they explain the unique relationships between items and factors and the loadings represent the direct effects of factors on items. According to Kline (2005), an item's loading of 0.5 signifies a strong relationship between the item and the factor.

The factor analysis result shows that the questionnaire fulfills construct validity and the model is fit to the analysis of the study. Thus the results of the questionnaire are discussed in the following sections.

4.2.2. Results of descriptive statistics

Figure 4.2: Dimensions of organizational climate



Source: own computation

4.2.2.1. Describing the organizational climate

In order to investigate the first objective the climate of the universities was measured using the organizational climate questionnaire discussed in chapter 3 (see appendix A). The descriptive statistics presented in table 4.5 below were computed for the various dimensions assessed by the questionnaire. It shows the descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for organizational climate of each university as well as the paired result.

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics of organizational climate dimensions

	University A		University B		University C		Pair			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	Skew	Kur
LM	2.96	0.92	2.48	0.67	2.60	0.75	2.57	0.74	.543	-.511
DM	3.54	1.12	3.63	0.69	3.14	0.74	3.46	0.79	-.469	.072
PB	2.86	0.80	2.74	0.65	3.07	0.79	2.86	0.73	.275	-.117
HR	3.38	0.85	3.81	0.71	3.61	0.73	3.69	0.75	-.335	-.051
WC	3.37	0.71	3.64	0.61	3.39	0.77	3.52	0.69	-.671	-.456
EW	3.45	0.60	3.69	0.58	3.53	0.70	3.61	0.63	-.640	.875
CI	3.96	0.43	3.67	0.88	3.74	0.83	3.72	0.83	-.287	-.956
OC	3.36	0.40	3.40	0.36	3.28	0.35	3.36	0.36	-.090	-.266

M=mean, SD= std. deviation, Skew=Skewness, Kur=Kurtosis

Mean is rounded in to three digits

Source: own computation


The climate in the current universities under study is described according to the items (see appendix F) and dimensions in the questionnaire. The mean scores of the total organizational climate scale as well as the mean scores of the dimensions were used to summaries the climate in the organizations. According to Zaidaton&Bagheri cited in Castro (2014) the mean score below 2.87 was considered as low, the mean score from 2.88 up to 3.2 was considered as moderate and mean score above 3.3 was considers as high. For the purposes of this study, this cut-off score was used to differentiate between potential positive and negative perceptions, with scores below 2.87 indicating a negative perception and scores above 3.2 a positive perception and scores between 2.87 and 3.2 neutral perception of that dimension.

In the above table it can be seen that the climate of each of the institutions shows positive organizational climate, with different mean value, in the total organizational climate. In dimensions wise, as the table stated, all the institution has a good climate of participation in decision making with University B (M=3.63) receives more positive perception than others and University C (M=3.14) receives neutral perception of the dimension. This means the climate of participation in decision making in University C is neither good nor poor available dimension.

More over human relation, working condition and employee wellness are also perceived positive with University B receives more positive perception followed by University C and A as second and third. The institutions also has positive climate of corporate image as perceived by their respective academic staff with University A receives extreme positive perception as $M=3.96$. However, leadership and management is negatively perceived in University B and C with mean score of 2.48 and 2.6 respectively while in University A ($M=2.96$) it perceived as neutral climate dimension. Pay and benefit practice was negatively perceived in all institutions with relatively better perception in University C. however, the total organizational climate is positive for the institutions with University B score of more favorable climate followed by University C and University C as 2nd and 3rd.

In terms of the general climate of the universities (pair wise calculation), the histogram depicted in figure 4.3 illustrates that the total score for organizational climate as perceived by the organization's employees was **positively** skewed (that is the values are clustered in the center). However, because of the larger sample size the risk of underestimation of variance is reduced. The figure also suggests a slight deviation from a normal shaped curve with some peaking contributed by greater frequency of 6 values.

Figure 4.3: dispersion of organizational climate: own computation



According to the table the pair climate in the institutions can be defined as positive, with a mean score of 3.35, which is above the 3.2 cut-off. The results indicate that the employees were generally satisfied with the various aspects of the organization as measured by the 7 climate dimensions. In particular, employees perceived the image of the organization to be more positive (3.72) than other dimensions. The positive score indicates that respondents held the organization and the brand in high regard and were proud to be associated with the company.

The results also highlight that the respondents had a positive perception of the human relation (3.69). The positive score indicates that respondents held the organization and employees develop positive and supportive environment and cooperate with each other. This is supported by (Cooper, Dewe&O'Driscoll, 2001) as he stated that organizations that encourage teamwork and participation have been found to report less burnout among their employees because they function in favorable working conditions. Employee welfare was also perceived positively (3.61); with respondents agreeing that the universities are supportive of employee to balance work and life (personal) responsibilities. In which the amount of work is reasonable so that it does not cause unreasonable amounts of stress in their life. More over they are interested in their work and this enables them to do a good job.

The respondents also reported positive perception of Working condition (3,65), indicating that the universities provides necessary equipment to execute their responsibility, facilitated to overcome limitations, and feel that work place is safe and noise free environment.

Similarly, participation in decision making (3.46) was also perceived as positive, with respondents agreeing that they participate in decision making, and this enhance their ability to perform. In addition they perceive that they are allowed autonomy in discharging their duties and their abilities are taken in to consideration when delegating.

The two dimensions that reported a mean below the cut-off point of 2.87 are Leadership and management (2.57) and Pay and benefit (2.86). These results indicate that employees perceived management and leadership style and pay and benefit practice in the universities negatively. Hence, these dimensions could be considered possible areas of development for the organizations.

4.2.2.2. Describing the level of job satisfaction of academic staffs

In order to achieve the second objective of the study job satisfaction of the academicians was also measured. This was achieved by adopting the global approach, whereby certain questions were asked to elicit affective responses about the employee's job. According to table 4.7 below the results indicate that the respondents were neutral, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, with their job (3.13).

The descriptive statistics of each item are indicated in table 4.6 showing the mean and standard deviation scores of items for measuring job satisfaction.

Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics for items in Job satisfaction

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
I feel positive about my future in the University.	3.05	.411
I find my work challenging	3.08	.489
I feel that the University cares for its employees	2.89	.444
The University retains its best employees.	3.34	.625

Source: own computation

As the table above indicates the items of job satisfaction scores both neutral and positive perception of the staffs of the selected universities. However, in the table below, on the average on a 5-point scale, the feeling of total job satisfaction of the academic staff in the selected universities scores 3.13 which is neutral feeling of their job. However, the academic staff in university A & B are satisfied with their job as the mean score is equal to 3.2 while academic staffs of University C has a feeling of dissatisfaction as its mean value score 3.00 which is less than the cut off 3.2.

Table 4.7:Descriptive Statistics for Job satisfaction

	University A		University B		University C		pair	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
JS	3.21	0.38	3.19	0.33	3.00	0.33	3.13	0.34

From the above discussions, the positive perception of organizational climate and neutral feeling of the staffs about their job shows there are also other factors, which are not included in this study, that affect their job satisfaction. There also might be mediator or moderator factor.

4.2.3. Hypothesis testing: Results of inferential statistics

In this section, the results of the statistical techniques used to test the study's hypotheses are presented and interpreted.

Hypothesis 1: There is significant positive relationship between selected organizational climate dimensions and job satisfaction.

Effect size

To interpret the practical significance of the statistical results, Cohen's (1988) guidelines for the interpretation of effect size were applied. Calculating and interpreting effect sizes not only determines the practical significance of statistical findings, but also prevents the probability of deducing statistically significant differences between groups or relationships between variables, when the effect size is extremely small (Cohen, 1988).

Where statistically significant relationships were found through correlation coefficients, r-values (equal to the correlation magnitude) were interpreted according to the following guidelines:

- r - 0.1 (small effect)
- r - 0.3 (medium effect)
- r - 0.5 (large effect)

The researcher has tested the hypothesis mentioned first by using person correlation coefficient analysis on all the variables considered in this study. As Table 4.7 indicates correlation analysis

confirmed a perfectly positive correlation between all the dimensions and the level of job satisfaction. It shows leadership and management, participation in decision making, pay and benefit, human relation, working condition, employee wellness and corporate image were positively and statistically related (at the 0.01 level) to general feeling of job satisfaction.

Table 4.8: Correlations of dependant and independent variables

		LM	DM	PB	HR	WC	EW	CI	JS
LM	r	1	-.026	-.028	.040	.030	.048	.024	.277
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.345	.336	.272	.327	.236	.360	.000
	N		229	229	229	229	229	229	229
DM	r		1	-.035	.074	.103	.017	.108	.516
	Sig. (1-tailed)			.298	.133	.059	.396	.052	.000
	N			229	229	229	229	229	229
PB	r			1	.155	.212	.259	.354	.415
	Sig. (1-tailed)				.010	.001	.000	.000	.000
	N				229	229	229	229	229
HR	r				1	.389	.242	.065	.386
	Sig. (1-tailed)					.000	.000	.162	.000
	N					229	229	229	229
WC	r					1	.548	.031	.350
	Sig. (1-tailed)						.000	.320	.000
	N						229	229	229
EW	r						1	.034	.368
	Sig. (1-tailed)							.302	.000
	N							229	229
CI	r							1	.444
	Sig. (1-tailed)								.000
	N								229
JS	r								1
	Sig. (1-tailed)								
	N								229

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

r=Pearson Correlation

LM- leadership and management ,DM- participation in decision making, PB- pay and benefit, HR -Human relation, WC- Working condition ,EW- Employee wellness, CI- Corporate image

Source: own computation

As the table indicates, Participation in decision making point out the strongest relationship ($r = 0.516$; $p = 0.000$) followed by Corporate image ($r = 0.444$; $p = 0.000$), pay and benefit ($r = 0.415$; $p = 0.000$), Human relation ($r = 0.386$; $p = 0.000$), Employee wellness ($r = 0.368$; $p = 0.000$), Working condition ($r = 0.350$; $p = 0.000$) and leadership and management ($r = 0.277$; $p = 0.000$). The result also confirms the relationship of all the dimensions with job satisfaction is significant at 0.01 level as $p = 0.000$ for all dimensions.

In terms of the practical significance guidelines provided by Cohen (1988), the relationships between the organizational climate dimensions and satisfaction variables possessed effect sizes of small (leadership and management), medium (Corporate image and pay and benefit, human relation, employee wellness and working condition) and large (participation in decision making) which are belonging to less than 0.3 between 0.3 and 0.5 and greater than 0.5 respectively.

It is revealed that the organizational climate grouped under organizational climate dimensions reported more or less the strongest relationship to general feeling of satisfaction. Therefore, the research hypothesis that there is positive significant relationship between organizational climate dimensions and job satisfaction is **accepted**.

The findings on this hypothesis concurred with Sofonias (2004), Griffen (1989), and Al-Shamiri (1994) and Bhutto et al. (2012) that aspects of organizational climate such as human relation, regard for personal concern which is employee wellness and pay and benefit coupled with the quality of supervision or management are related to the employee's level of job satisfaction. More over it is consistent with the past studies that organizational climates is positively related to job satisfaction (Gini, cited in Peek (2003), Hackman and Oldham (1976)) that allowed a high degree of autonomy and nurtured relationships between peers, supervisors and subordinates result in more satisfied workers.

Hypothesis 2: organizational climate has significant positive impact on job satisfaction.

Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure that there were no violations of the assumptions of normality, multi colinearity and homoscedasticity (stated in chapter 3). Since correlation does not mean causation, multiple regressions are computed in order to analyze the impact of organizational climate on job satisfaction. Table below presents the results of the influence of organizational climate on job satisfaction.

Table 4.9: Model summary of multiple regression of organizational climate on job satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.848 ^a	.719	.710	.18455

Dependent Variable: JS

Predictors: (Constant), CI, LM, WC, DM, HR, PB, EW

Table 4.10: ANOVA result of multiple regression model

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19.262	7	2.752	80.796	.000
	Residual	7.527	221	.034		
	Total	26.789	228			

Dependent Variable: JS

Predictors: (Constant), CI, LM, WC, DM, HR, PB, EW

From table 4.9 it can be seen that R square is 0.719, and adjusted R square is 0.710. This indicates that 71.9% of the variance in the model can be predicted using the independent Variables (organizational climate). The remaining 28.1% of the variance is explained by other variables that are not included in this study.

The F-ratio in the ANOVA table (see table 4.10) tests whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly

predict the dependent variable, $F(7, 221) = 80.796$, $p < .05$ (i.e., the regression model is a good fit of the data). Therefore the influence is significant that $p = 0.000$. On the basis of the presentation of the above result, the second hypothesis is also **confirmed**.

From the above discussions in describing organizational climate and job satisfaction, the positive perception of organizational climate and neutral feeling of the staffs about their job shows there are other factors which affect satisfaction and it is confirmed in the regression result as 28% is explained by other factors.

Sub hypotheses

With the general influence of organizational climate, table 4.10 shows the standardized Beta coefficients that present the contributions of each variable to the model. Standardized coefficients indicate how much the dependent variable varies with an independent variable when all other independent variables are held constant. The t and p values showed the significance of the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

Table 4.11: Coefficients of each organizational climate dimensions

Model	Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	Beta			
1 (Constant)	.494		4.263	.000
LM	.271		7.565	.000
DM	.479		13.188	.000
PB	.249		6.228	.000
HR	.220		5.661	.000
WC	.037		.815	.416
EW	.199		4.580	.000
CI	.275		7.136	.000

Source: own computation

The hypotheses under second hypothesis are discussed based on the beta value of their coefficients. Table 4.11 presents all the variables included in the model and their contribution in

predicting job satisfaction. The value provides information on the contribution of each independent variable. The beta largest value contributes the most.

H2a: leadership and management has significant positive influence on job satisfaction

Leadership and management is the third largest contributor to the variation in the dependant variable (job satisfaction). From table above The positive Beta-value of 0.271 indicates that leadership and management has direct (positive) influence on job satisfaction which is statistically significant at 99% confidence level as $p=0.000$. In other word, it means that as leadership and management increase by 1% job satisfaction also increased by 27.1% and vice versa.

This reflects that as employees perceive better leadership and management, the level of satisfaction towards their job increases. As such, hypothesis 2a is **accepted**.

H2b: participation in decision making has significant positive influence on job satisfaction

In the above table, the largest beta coefficient is 0.479, which is for participation in decision making. This means that this variable has a direct influence and it makes the strongest unique contribution in explaining job satisfaction, when the variance explained by all the other variables in the model is controlled for. Statistically, the result interprets that when participation in decision making increase by 1% job satisfaction will also increase by 47.9% units and vice versa. More over The large t value (t-13.2) and corresponding low p-value ($p < 0.01$) which is significant, Supports the result for this dimension which had the highest beta coefficient.

Thus the second sub hypothesis also **supported**

H2c: Payment and benefit has significant positive influence on job satisfaction

Pay and benefit with a beta coefficient of 0.249 contributing the fourth largest variance in job satisfaction. This influence is also statistically significant as $p=0.000$, at 0.01 level of significance. The above table indicates that keeping other factors constant pay and benefit

explains 24.9% in the variation of job satisfaction which is a significant influence. Thus again the third sub hypothesis is also confirmed

H2d: Human relation has significant positive influence on job satisfaction

Likewise the above table indicates keeping other dimensions constant human relation contributes 22% of the variance in job satisfaction. This influence is statistically significant as $p=0.000$ significance level. The standardized beta coefficient is 0.220 which is again positive influence on job satisfaction.

Thus the hypothesis that human relation can positively and significantly influence job satisfaction the fourth hypothesis also **accepted**.

H2e: Working condition has significant positive influence on job satisfaction

Working condition rank the seventh place with beta coefficient values of 0.037. This shows the positive influence with the dependant variable. But this influence is not statistically significant with 0.01 levels as it appears $p =0.416$. Thus this hypothesis is **not supported** because it does not appear to significantly contribute to the total variation in job satisfaction.

H2f: Employee wellness has significant positive influence on job satisfaction

Employee wellness with a beta coefficient of 0.199 contributes to the variation in the job satisfaction of academic staffs of the universities under study. Employee wellness makes a statistically unique contribution (at the comparison wise significance level of 0.001) with a p value of 0.000. Therefore the six sub hypothesis is **accepted**.

H2g: Corporate image has significant positive influence on job satisfaction

In the table above Corporate image is the second largest contributor in explaining job satisfaction with a beta coefficient of 0.275. This shows positive impact on job satisfaction and it shows when Corporate image increases by 1% job satisfaction also increases by 27.5% and the reverse will also be true. This influence is significant with the significance value of $p=0,000$ at 0.01 significance level. Therefore the last sub hypothesis of second hypothesis is also **accepted**.

Generally, Table 4.9 depicts the variables entered and the fit of the model in which R-squared and adjusted R-squared were presented. It is evident that through estimation technique, seven variables predicted 71.9% of variance in job satisfaction. The model was statistically significant. More over from table 4.9 it is clear that when one variable (Working condition) is controlled five of other predictor variables statistically and significantly determine the variation in job satisfaction, at 99% confidence level.

This finding is similar to that of previous studies in which issues relating to organizational climate dimension leadership and management was considered to have an influence on job satisfaction (Birbirsa (2015); Brief (1998); Schlesinger (2000); and Barbash, Freeman & Rodgers, Hackman & Suttle, (cited in Peek, 2003)) Similarly, the study's finding that human relation and participation in decision making influence job satisfaction is also evident in other studies. Bisconti and Solomon (cited in Peek, 2003) found that individuals and groups who were able to make their own decisions and worked in a situation in which positive employee relationships were nurtured were more satisfied. A study by Griffen(2001) found that relationships with peers, supervisors and subordinates were one of the leading factors in job satisfaction of college staff. This finding was also reported in a study conducted on South African doctors, which reported that doctors were most satisfied with the social aspects of their work (relationships with colleagues and staff) (Pillay, 2008).

More over The above findings of this study on the role of employee wellness and corporate image in influencing satisfaction were also reported in previous studies (Hackman & Suttle, cited in Peek, 2003). In addition, the role of pay and benefits in influencing satisfaction was also documented (Brief, 1998).

However, this study found out that working condition is not significant predictor of job satisfaction which is inconsistent with Hackman & Suttle (cited in Peek, 2003) and Birbirsa et al. (2015)

Hypothesis 3: There is no statistically significant difference between employees in perception of their organizational climate and job satisfaction that varies by their gender, job type, level of education, experience and job level.

In this research, demographic (gender) and organizational variables (job type, level of education, experience and job level) were discussed to identify possible subgroups. Independent t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the subgroups with each other in terms of how they differ in perception respect of organizational climate and job satisfaction. To ensure a total organizational climate score the mean score for each dimension was calculated. Moreover, for general analysis the total organizational climate and job satisfaction data will be provided here. In case of ANOVA analysis, post-hoc comparison tables are calculated where there is a significant difference between groups exists. The Post-hoc comparison tables will not be included in this chapter due to space limitations, but will be included as Appendix D.

Gender

H3a: There is no statistically significant difference between males and females perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction.

Table 4.12: T-test comparison of gender differences

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	variance	t	p
LM	Male	2.58	0.74174	0.05035	Equal	0.75	.455
	Female	2.42	0.66856	0.193			
DM	Male	3.46	0.78482	0.05328	Equal	.372	.710
	Female	3.37	0.95542	0.27581			
PB	Male	2.85	0.71594	0.0486	Equal	-.976	.330
	Female	3.06	0.93617	0.27025			
HR	Male	3.71	0.74624	0.05066	Equal	1.73	.085
	Female	3.33	0.65134	0.18803			
WC	Male	3.54	0.68317	0.04638	Equal	1.69	.092
	Female	3.2	0.69805	0.20151			
EW	Male	3.60	0.6342	0.04305	Equal	-0.24	.813
	Female	3.65	0.45227	0.13056			
CI	Male	3.71	0.83426	0.05663	equal	-1.28	.202
	Female	4.02	0.63477	0.18324			
JS	Male	3.13	0.34157	0.02319	Equal	.471	.638
	Female	3.08	0.37692	0.10881			
OC	Male	3.35	0.36779	0.02497	Equal	.527	.599
	Female	3.29	0.35077	0.10126			

Source: own computation

The results in table 4.12 indicate that there was no difference between males and females regarding their perception to total organizational climate ($t=0.527$, $p=0.599$) and level of job satisfaction ($t=0.471$, $p=0.638$) as $p>0.05$. Moreover, there was no difference for the organizational climate dimension as well.

Thus hypothesis 3a is **accepted**.

This finding is commensurate with the findings of the majority of other studies, indicating that there are no statistically significant differences between males and females (Martin, 2007; Hlungwane, 2006; Josias, 2005; Gerber, 2003).

Level of education

H3b: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their level of education.

A one way ANOVA analysis was computed to measure the differences based on level of education.

The groups considered are group 1: BA/BSc, group 2: MA/MSc, and group 3: PHD.

Table 4.13: ANOVA analysis for differences in level of education

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
LM	Between Groups	8.948	2	4.474	8.784	.000
	Within Groups	115.113	226	.509		
	Total	124.061	228			
DM	Between Groups	.776	2	.388	.616	.541
	Within Groups	142.395	226	.630		
	Total	143.170	228			
PB	Between Groups	3.027	2	1.514	2.903	.057
	Within Groups	117.833	226	.521		
	Total	120.860	228			
HR	Between Groups	1.011	2	.506	.910	.404
	Within Groups	125.591	226	.556		
	Total	126.603	228			
WC	Between Groups	.318	2	.159	.336	.715
	Within Groups	107.190	226	.474		
	Total	107.508	228			
EW	Between Groups	.311	2	.156	.396	.674
	Within Groups	88.838	226	.393		
	Total	89.149	228			
CI	Between Groups	6.198	2	3.099	4.679	.010
	Within Groups	149.682	226	.662		
	Total	155.880	228			
JS	Between Groups	1.310	2	.655	5.811	.003
	Within Groups	25.479	226	.113		
	Total	26.789	228			
OC	Between Groups	1.129	2	.565	4.412	.013
	Within Groups	28.919	226	.128		
	Total	30.048	228			

The results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$ level in the total organizational climate scores [$F(2,226) = 4.412, p = 0.013$] and job satisfaction [$F(2,226) = 5.811, p = 0.003$] of participants with different level of education. This means, according to the Post-hoc comparisons of organizational climate using the Bonferroni test the mean score for group 3 ($M = 3.52$), was significantly different from group 1 ($M = 3.34$) and group 2 ($M = 3.31$). This shows that respondents with higher educational level (PHD) have more positive perception to overall organizational climate. Similarly Post-hoc result (see appendix H) for job satisfaction indicates, again, the mean score for group 4 ($M = 3.33$) was significantly different from group 1 and 2 with a mean score of 3.10 and 3.09 respectively. One may infer from the results that again respondents with different level of education perceive the climate dimensions in different way.

In dimension wise the result indicates that the perception to leadership and management and corporate image is significantly differ between the three groups. According to the post hoc comparison, in the perception of leadership and management group 3 ($M = 3.06$) is significantly differ from group 1 ($M = 2.49$) and group 2 ($M = 2.49$) this shows while group 2 and 2 report poor climate of the dimension group three reports neutral (neither good nor poor) climate of the respective dimension. For corporate image again group 4 ($M = 4.12$) is significantly differ from group 1 ($M = 3.7$) and group 2 ($M = 3.6$). However, no significant difference of climate dimensions including perception participation in decision making, pay and benefit, human relation, employee wellness and working condition

Generally PHD holders have more positive perception to organizational climate of the institutions and they are satisfied with their job. While the staffs with BA/BSc and MA/MSc qualification has less positive perception to organizational climate than their seniors and have neutral feeling about their job.

Thus hypothesis 3b is **partially confirmed**.

Job type

H3c: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their job type.

Table 4.14: T-test comparison of job type

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Variance	t	p
LM	Full time	2.6038	.75009	.05152	Equal	2.320	.021
	part time	2.1765	.39295	.09531			
DM	Full time	3.4534	.78321	.05379	Equal	-0.200	.841
	part time	3.4935	.92580	.22454			
PB	Full time	2.8966	.73473	.05046	Equal	2.510	.013
	part time	2.4412	.48031	.11649			
HR	Full time	3.7217	.73691	.05061	Equal	1.976	.049
	part time	3.3529	.78591	.19061			
WC	Full time	3.5340	.68358	.04695	Equal	0.705	.481
	part time	3.4118	.73645	.17861			
EW	Full time	3.6175	.62408	.04286	Equal	0.782	.435
	part time	3.4941	.64853	.15729			
CI	Full time	3.7634	.83057	.05704	Equal	2.565	.011
	part time	3.2353	.60899	.14770			
JS	Full time	3.1485	.33592	.02307	Equal	3.409	.001
	part time	2.8606	.32351	.07846			
OC	Full time	3.3698	.36137	.02482	Equal	3.296	.001
	part time	3.0718	.32182	.07805			

Source: own computation

The results in the above table indicate that there was statistically significant difference between the perception of organizational climate ($t=3.296$, $p=0.001$) and job satisfaction ($t=3.409$, $p=0.001$) of the participants based on their job type. Moreover, there was also statistically significant difference for leadership and management ($t=2.320$, $p=0.021$), pay and benefit ($t=2.51$, $p=0.013$), human relation ($t=1.076$, $p=0.049$) and corporate image ($t=2.565$, $p=0.011$), with part timers reporting less satisfaction with these organizational climate factors.

However, there is no statistical difference in terms of perception for participation in decision making, working condition and Employee wellness as $p > 0.05$. That is both full timers and par timers perceive similarly with positive perception for participation in decision making, working condition and employee well new and negative perception of pay and benefit practices.

Therefore, hypothesis 3c is **partially accepted**.

The findings of this study are therefore inconsistent with previous findings. Even though this study found the full timers to be more satisfied in terms of organizational climate and job satisfaction, the general findings were inconsistent with Castro (2008), who reported that par timers were more satisfied than their full timer counterparts, and Adenike (2011) who found that par timers perceived their work environment more favorably than fulltime employees.

Experience / Tenure

H3d: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and job satisfaction that varies by their experience.

A one-way between-group analysis of variance was conducted to investigate whether the respondents reported a difference in perceived organizational climate and job satisfaction on the basis of number of years of service with the profession. The subjects were divided into four groups according to the number of years service in the profession (group 1: 0 to 5 year, group 2: 6 to 10 years, group 3: 11 to 15 years and group 4: 16 years+). The research results of the ANOVA are presented in table 4.15 and then discussed.

Table 4.15: ANOVA analysis for perception of organizational climate by different tenure groups

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
LM	Between Groups	22.261	3	7.420	16.400	.000
	Within Groups	101.800	225	.452		
	Total	124.061	228			
DM	Between Groups	3.298	3	1.099	1.769	.154
	Within Groups	139.872	225	.622		
	Total	143.170	228			
PB	Between Groups	3.643	3	1.214	2.331	.075
	Within Groups	117.217	225	.521		
	Total	120.860	228			
HR	Between Groups	1.654	3	.551	.993	.397
	Within Groups	124.948	225	.555		
	Total	126.603	228			
WC	Between Groups	.292	3	.097	.204	.893
	Within Groups	107.216	225	.477		
	Total	107.508	228			
EW	Between Groups	.685	3	.228	.581	.628
	Within Groups	88.464	225	.393		
	Total	89.149	228			
CI	Between Groups	2.361	3	.787	1.153	.328
	Within Groups	153.519	225	.682		
	Total	155.880	228			
JS	Between Groups	.119	3	.040	.334	.801
	Within Groups	26.671	225	.119		
	Total	26.789	228			
Total organizational climate	Between Groups	.096	3	.032	.236	.871
	Within Groups	30.513	225	.136		
	Total	30.609	228			

Source: Own computation

The results indicate that there was no a statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$ level in the total organizational climate scores [$F(3,225) = 0.236, p = 0.871$] and job satisfaction [$F(3,225) = 0.334, p = 0.801$] of participants with different tenure. This means, according to the Post-hoc comparisons of job satisfaction using the Bonferroni test the mean score for group 1 ($M = 3.14$),

was not significantly different from group 2 (M=3.09), group 3 (M=3.15), and group 4 (M=3.15). This shows that respondents irrespective of their experience have similar level of job satisfaction. Similarly Post-hoc result for total organizational climate indicated that the mean score for group 1 (M=3.33) was not significantly different from group the other groups. One may infer from the results, that again respondents irrespective of their experience perceived the climate alike.

The results in table 4.15 also reported no statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level in perception of respondents for the dimensions participation in decision making pay and benefit , human relation, employee wellness, working condition and corporate image.

However, statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level was found between the groups regarding leadership and management. The Post-hoc comparisons (see appendix D) indicated that group 1 (M-2.36, SD-0.68) appeared to be less satisfied than group 3 (M-2.82, SD-0.80) and group 4 (M-3.52, SD-0.71) about the leadership and management. Group 2 (M-2.56, SD-0.60) did not differ significantly from groups 1 and 3, but differed significantly from group 4(M-3.52, SD-.71). Again group 3 (M-2.82, SD-0.80) significantly differ from group 4(M-3.52, SD-.71). This difference indicates that group 4 was more satisfied with the leadership and management style than any of the other groups.

Thus hypothesis 3d is **confirmed partially**.

The above findings are in line with previous job satisfaction studies (Bowen & Cattle, 2008; Martin, 2007; Hlungwane, 2006, Gerber, 2003) which reported tenure and satisfaction to be u-shaped (Shields & Ward, 2001) or no significant relationship between tenure and organizational climate. This finding however, is inconsistent with previous job satisfaction studies (Josias, 2005; Lambert et al., 2001) which reported an inverse relationship between tenure and job satisfaction; employees who had been with the organization for a long time were less satisfied than those who had been with the organization for only a short period.

Job level

H3e: There is no statistically significant difference on employee's perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their job level.

Table 4.16: ANOVA analysis for perception of organizational climate by junior and senior academics

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
LM	Between Groups	11.441	5	2.288	4.531	.001
	Within Groups	112.620	223	.505		
	Total	124.061	228			
DM	Between Groups	2.593	5	.519	.823	.535
	Within Groups	140.578	223	.630		
	Total	143.170	228			
PB	Between Groups	.851	5	.170	.316	.903
	Within Groups	120.010	223	.538		
	Total	120.860	228			
HR	Between Groups	1.967	5	.393	.704	.621
	Within Groups	124.635	223	.559		
	Total	126.603	228			
WC	Between Groups	3.143	5	.629	1.343	.247
	Within Groups	104.365	223	.468		
	Total	107.508	228			
EW	Between Groups	.686	5	.137	.346	.884
	Within Groups	88.463	223	.397		
	Total	89.149	228			
CI	Between Groups	3.144	5	.629	.918	.470
	Within Groups	152.736	223	.685		
	Total	155.880	228			
JS	Between Groups	1.118	5	.224	1.943	.088
	Within Groups	25.671	223	.115		
	Total	26.789	228			
OC	Between Groups	.504	5	.101	.747	.589
	Within Groups	30.105	223	.135		
	Total	30.609	228			

Source: own computation

Again, a one-way between-group analysis of variance was conducted to investigate whether the respondents reported a difference in perceived organizational climate and job satisfaction on the basis of their job level. The subjects were divided into six groups according to their job level in the universities title matrix as 1: graduate assistant, 2: assistant lecturer, 3: lecturer, 4: senior lecturer, 5: assistant professor and 6: associate professor/ reader. The research results of the ANOVA are presented in table 4.16 above.

The research results of the ANOVA are presented in table 4.17 and indicate that there was no statistical significance between the different groups for perceived organizational climate [$F(5,223)=0.747, p=0.589$] and level of job satisfaction [$F(5,223)=1.943, p=0.88$]. Moreover, the results reported statistically insignificant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level in the dimensions of organizational climate (Participation in decision making, Pay and benefit, Human relation, Working condition, Employee wellness, and Corporate image) scores for the different job level groups.

The results, however, do indicate a statistically significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level between the different job levels regarding their perception of leadership and management.

Post-hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni test in appendix G indicated that the mean score for group 1 ($M=2.44$) and group 2 ($M=2.50$) was significantly different from that of group 5 ($M=3.75$), with the former group reporting a negative perception of the dimension. Group 3 (lecturers) ($M= 2.51$) differ significantly from the 4th (3.00) and 5th (3.75) groups. Group six, senior lectures ($M=2.00$) does not significantly differ from other groups.

Therefore, as the result infers there is no statistically significant difference in the mean perception of the organizational climate dimensions and their level of job satisfaction between senior and junior academicians and significant difference in leadership and management. Thus the last hypothesis is also **partially confirmed**.

The findings of this research were partially consistent to the findings of the previous studies that a positive relationship between job level and satisfaction (Josias, 2005; Miles, et al., 1996; Gerber (2003); Bown and Cattell (2008); Martin (2007); and Hugwane (2006)) and inconsistent the opposite finding of (Frances, 1986 & Castro, 2008) who found higher-level employees to be

less satisfied than lower-level employees. This study found the perception of organizational climate is independent to the difference in job level except for leadership and management.

Table 4.17:Summary of hypothesis

Hypotheses	Yes/No
Hypothesis 1: There is significant positive relationship between selected organizational climate dimensions and job satisfaction.	Yes
Hypothesis 2: organizational climate has significant positive impact on job satisfaction.	Yes
<i>H2a:</i> leadership and management has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.	Yes
<i>H2b:</i> participation in decision making has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.	Yes
<i>H2c:</i> Payment and benefit has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.	Yes
<i>H2d:</i> Human relation has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.	Yes
<i>H2e:</i> Working condition has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.	No
<i>H2f:</i> Employee wellness has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.	Yes
<i>H2g:</i> Corporate image has significant positive influence on job satisfaction.	Yes
Hypothesis 3: There is no statistically significant difference between employees in perception of their organizational climate and job satisfaction who varied by gender, level of education, job type, experience and job level.	-
<i>H3a:</i> There is no statistically significant difference between males and females perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction.	Yes
<i>H3b:</i> There is no statistically significant difference between employee"s perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by level of education	Partial
<i>H3c:</i> There is no statistically significant difference between employee"s perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their job type.	Partial
<i>H3d:</i> There is no statistically significant difference on employee"s perception of	Partial

<p>their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their experience/tenure.</p>	
<p><i>H3e</i>: There is no statistically significant difference on employee’s perception of their organizational climate and their level of job satisfaction that varies by their job level</p>	<p>Partial</p>

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents summary of important findings of the study and drive brief conclusions drowned from the findings. Future study areas were also laid down.

5.1. Summary of findings and conclusion

- It goes saying that organizational climate describes the morale and perceptions of the organization and is quite subjective in its description. The employees' perception of organizational climate is the thing on which the smooth working of any organization depends so it is very essential to study the organizational climate and various factors which directly or indirectly influence the climate of any organization. The results of the present study bring out many interesting facts which may help the future of universities in reshaping their climate. From the results obtained employees perceive their university's participation in decision making, human relation working condition employee wellness and corporate image positively. However the leadership and management and pay and benefit practice of the institutions perceived as negative. The negative perception provides the basis for further improvement in leadership and management and pay and benefit practice of the universities so as to enhance their employee's levels of job satisfaction.
- The study found out that most of employees have neutral feeling about their jobs. Moreover, level of satisfaction was found to be largely influenced by the level of employees' participation in decision making, leadership and management of universities, image of institutions and pay and benefit. However, working condition of the staffs does not significantly affect the variation in job satisfaction. This showed that excluding working condition the other dimensions can significantly determine the variation of job satisfaction.

- Both significant and insignificant variations have emerged in the corporate perception of overall organizational climate and level of job satisfaction on the basis of serving variables i.e. gender, level of education, job type, experience and job level. No significant variation for both variables was obtained in gender difference. Experience and job level. However, significant difference was examined for different level of education and job type. Moreover, significant differences also perceived on perception of specific dimensions of the study based on serving variables. Leadership and management and corporate image were perceived differently with different level of education. Participation in decision making, working condition and employee wellness are differently perceive with different job type. Only leadership and management was perceived differently with different experience and job level groups.

5.2. Recommendation

In order to fulfill the mission of institutions it should have satisfied work force which strive for excellence and perform to the best of his effort. Therefore, the following recommendations are provided from the result of the study to improve the satisfaction of employees. However the following are the recommendations using the various organizational climate variables identified in the study.

- ★ The universities should continues focusing on the areas in which it is doing well and find ways to improve these areas by giving employee feedback and encouraging open and honest feedback. That is it should design a system that will encourage academic to put forward their inputs regarding empowering possibilities by creating suggestion boxes that can be placed in prominent areas.
- ★ In the area of the universities leadership and management, The universities management should be more responsive to the academic career development programs. That is, Management team should design a year plan regarding career development for all categories of academic staff to ensure that all academics are given a fair opportunity to develop. This can be done by designing criteria for selecting the staff that are to be sent for career development and training, and administer these selection criteria fairly.
- ★ The management team should continually conduct workshops, or seminars to update their staff in their various endeavors and different leadership styles so that they can select the most appropriate leadership style in accordance with a particular situation maturity of their staff and be updated on the current research modules and outlets.
- ★ In practice of pay and benefit the institutions should ensure that existing benefits for academic staff are adequately, fairly, justly and competitively allocated to them. They should allocate benefits to academics according to their job and contribution so that they would feel positive.
- ★ In addition to the above recommendations, the institutions should also more focus on the climate regarding participation in decision making, human relation, employee wellness and corporate image than working condition.

5.3. Suggestions for further research

The limitations of this study are identified so that the findings can be interpreted correctly within the context of the study; the limitation of the study covers areas such as the scope and methodology.

- This study was conducted based on some selected dimensions of organizational climate so the result is limited to the selected variable. Further research can be conducted with different dimensions.
- This study is conducted by using the general measurement of job satisfaction therefore the result of this study is on the basis of general level of job satisfaction. There for similar study should be done with different factors of job satisfaction in order to assess more deep investigations.
- Cross-sectional research design is used because it uses one-time-only observation but involves as many variables as are necessary for the study. Thus, the research design may fail to capture the continuous relationships between variables. Unlike longitudinal study, cross-sectional design does not capture causal relationships and the continuous changes in the variables. It only provides on the spot assessment of an institution (or company) and it saves time. Thus the research is open for different methodology.
- Moreover, further research is recommended in order to reassess the perceptions of the academic staff regarding the organizational climate in order to re-evaluate whether the situation is improving and also to determine the true work load of different categories of academic staff in public universities.

References

- Aarons, G.A., & Sawitzky, A.C. (2006). *Organizational climate partially mediates the effect of culture on work attitudes and staff turnover in Mental Health Services*. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 33(3).
- Adenike, A. (2011). *Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in Some Selected Private Universities in Southwest Nigeria*. Published doctoral dissertation. Nigeria: Covenant University.
- Akula R. L. K. and Talluri, S. (2013), *Impact of Organizational Climate on Job Satisfaction*, The international journals research, journal of social science and management: Volume: 03
- Allen, D.K. (2003). *Organizational climate and strategic change in higher education: Organizational insecurity*. *Higher Education*, 46(1), 61-92. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Queensland: Griffith University.
- Al-Shammari, M. (1992). *Organizational Climate*. Leadership & Organization Development Journal. vol. 13, no. 6.
- Arnold, H.J & Feldman, R.J (1996). *Methodological and Substantive Extensions to the Job Characteristics Model of Motivation*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 25.
- Asika, N. (2000). *Research Methodology in the Behavioral Science*. Ikeja: Longman
- Barbie, E. (1989). *Survey Research Methods*, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2nd, Edition
- Batlis, N. (1980). *The effect of organizational climate on job satisfaction, anxiety, and propensity to leave*. The Journal of Psychology, 104(2).
- Bhutto N., Laghari M., & Butt, F. (2012). *A comparative study of organizational climate and job satisfaction in public, private and foreign banks*. Asian Social Science. vol. 8.No. 4.

- Birbirsa Z. A., Prof. Shankar k. Jha S., Muleta G., Jemal S., Gelashe U. and Issa, I. (2015). *The Organizational Climate Factors That Could Predict the Job Satisfaction of Academic Staff of Central and Western Ethiopia Public Universities*.ZENITH International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research ISSN 2231-5780 Vol.5 (4).
- Blau, J.G (2000). *The Team Climate Inventory: Development of the TCI and Its Applications in Team Building for Innovativeness*. European Journal of Work and Organizational Behavior.19(3).
- Booyens, S. W. (1998).*Dimensions of Nursing Management*.Kenwyn: Juta 2ndEdition.
- Bowen, P. &Cattell, K. (2008).*Job satisfaction of South African quantity surveyors*. Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 15(3), 260-269.
- Brief, A.P. (1998).*Attitudes in and around organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brimhall K., Lizono E., & Barak, M. (2014).*The mediating role of inclusion: a longitudinal study of the effects of leader-member exchange and diversity climate on job satisfaction and intention to leave among child welfare workers*.Children and Youth Services Review.vol. 40.
- Buitendach, J.H., & De Witte, H. (2005).*Job Insecurity, Extrinsic and Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Affective Organizational Commitment of Maintenance Workers in a Parastatal*.South African Journal of Business Management, 36(2).
- Burns, A.C and Bush, R.F (1998).*Marketing Research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lawler, E.E., III, &Weick, K.E., Jr. (2006). *Managerial Behavior, Performance, and Effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Castro, M. L. (2008). *The Relationship between Organizational Climate and Employee Satisfaction in a South African Information and Technology Organization*. University of South Africa

- Cooper, D and Schinder, P. (2003). *Business Research Methods*. 8th edition. New York. McGrawHill.
- Cotton, P. (2004). *Developing an Optimal Organizational Climate*. Paper presented at Towards Australia's Safest Workplaces, Australia
- Davidson, M.C.G. (2000). *Organizational climate and its influence on performance*.
- Everitt, B. (2006). The *Cambridge dictionary of statistics*, 3rd edn, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK ; New York.
- Farokhi K. M. and Murty T. N. (2014), **Factors Influencing Organizational Climate**. International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology Volume3, ISSN – 2320-0073
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (2nd)*. London: Sage.
- Field, R.H.G., & Abelson, M.A. (1982). Climate: *A Reconceptualization and Proposed Model*. Human Relations, 35(3).
- Fisher J., Milner K., & Chandraprakash A. (2007). *Organisational climate, job tension and job satisfaction in a South African call centre case study*. Ergonomics SA, 19(2).
- Forehand, G.A., & Gilmer, B. (1964). *Environmental Variations in Studies of Organizational Behavior*. Psychological Bulletin, 62(6).
- Frances, R. (1986). *Job and education level of company managers: Their relations with job satisfaction*. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 35.
- Friedlander, F., & Margulies, N. (1969). *Multiple impacts of organizational climate and individual value systems upon job satisfaction*. Personnel Psychology, 22(2).
- Gerber, F.J. (2003). *Die Invloed Van Organisasieklimaat Op Werksmotivering. (The Influence of Organizational Climate on Work Motivation)*. Unpublished MComm dissertation. Pretoria: University of South Africa

- Gerber, P. D.; Nel, P. & Van Dyk, P. S. (1998). *Human Resource Management*. Johannesburg: International Thompson Publishing.
- Gjuraj, E. (2013). *The importance of national culture studies in the organizational context*. European Scientific Journal, 9(11).
- Glick, W.H. (1985). *Conceptualizing and Measuring: Organizational and Psychological Climate: Pitfalls in Multilevel Research*. Academy of Management Review, 10(3).
- Gratto, F. J. (2001). *The Relationship between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction for Directors of Physical Plants*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Florida, United States -- Florida.
- Griffin, M. (2001). *Job satisfaction among detention officers assessing the relative contribution of organizational climate variables*. Journal of Criminal Justice. vol. 29.
- Hackman, J.R and Lawler, E.E (1971). *Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics*. Journal of Applied Psychology; 55.
- Hackman, J.R and Oldham, G.R (1976). *Motivation through the Design of Work. Test of a Theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 16.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. & Tatham, R. L. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*, 6th edn, Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Hamsici, Onur C.; Martinez, Aleix M. (2007). *Spherical-Homoscedastic Distributions: The Equivalency of Spherical and Normal Distributions in Classification*. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 8, 1583-1623
- Hellriegel, D. and Slocum, J.W. (1984). *Organizational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies*. Academy of Management Journal. 17.
- HERQA, (2015). *Lists of Institutions and Programs Which Are Given Pre Accreditation, Accreditation, and License Renewal*. HERQA publication series (086).

- Herzberg, F. (1967). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: OH. World Book.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh
- Hlungwane, N.T. (2006). *The influence of job satisfaction on burnout of pharmaceutical sales representatives*. Published MA dissertation. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (2002). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of leadership*. Boston, MA: MacGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Hulin, C.L (1991). *Adaptation, Persistence and Commitment in Organizations*. In M.D. Dunnette & L.M. Hough (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 2. Palo Alto, CA : Consulting psychologists press.
- Hussin, A. (2011). *The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Job Performance among Employees in Trade winds Group of Companies*. Master's Thesis. Open University Malaysia.
- James, L.R., & Jones, A.P. (1974). *Organizational Climate: A review of theory and research*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(12).
- Johannesson, R.E. (1973). *Some Problems in the Measurement of Organizational Climate*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 10.
- Josias, B.A. (2005). *The relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism in a selected field services section within an electricity utility in the Western Cape*. Published MCom dissertation. Cape Town: University of the Western Cape.
- Judge, T.; Bona, J.; Thoresen, C. and Patton, G. (2001). *The Job Satisfaction – Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(4).

- Jyoti, J. (2013). *Impact of Organizational Climate on Job Satisfaction, Job Commitment and Intention to Leave: An Empirical Mode*, Journal of Business Theory and Practice. 1(1).
- Kestetner, J. (1994). *New Teacher Induction. Findings of the Research and Implications for Minority Groups*. Journal of Teacher Education. 45(1).
- Khandelwal, P. (2003). *Job Satisfaction in M.S. Saiyadain (Ed.). Organizational Behavior*. New Delhi : Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*, 2nd edn, Methodology in the social sciences, Guilford Press, New York.
- Kuenzi, M. (2008). *An Integrated Model of Work Climate*. A doctoral dissertation. Orlando, Florida
- Lawler E., Hall D., & Oldham G. (1974). *Organizational climate: Relationship to organizational structure, process and performance*. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 11.
- Lee, G.A(1987). *Normative Structure Variables and Organizational Behavior*. Academy of Management Review. 10(2).
- Lehal, R. (2004). *Research Design in Relation to Study of Organizational Climate, Job Satisfaction and Managerial Effectiveness*. Research Methodology in Management Theory and Cases, Deep and Deep Publishers, New Delhi.
- Lephoko, C.S., Bezuidenhout, M.C., & Roos, J.H. (2006). *Organisational climate as a cause for job dissatisfaction among nursing staff in selected hospitals within the Mpumalanga Province*. Curationis, 29(4).
- Liao, T., Lewis-Beck, M. S., & Bryman, A. (2004). *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods*. 3 vols. Sage Thousand Oaks, Calif.

- Litwin, G. and Stringer R. (1968). *Motivation and Organizational Climate*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press
- Litwin, G and Stringer, R (1978). *Motivation and Organizational Climate*. Cambridge: Harvard University, Press
- Locke, E.A. (1975). *The nature and causes of job satisfaction*. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College.
- Luthans, F. (2005). *Organizational Behavior*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin. 10th Edition.
- Luthans, F. (2002). *Organizational Behavior*. Chicago: Mosby. 8th Edition.
- Lynn, G. S. and Kock, N. (2012). *Lateral collinearity and misleading results in variance-based SEM: An illustration and recommendations*, [*Journal of the Association for Information Systems*](#) vol.13
- Mahajan, J., Churchill, G. A., Jr., Ford, N. M., & Walker, O. C., Jr. (1984). *A Comparison of the Impact of Organizational Climate on the Job Satisfaction of Manufacturers' Agents and Company Salespeople: An Exploratory Study*. *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 4(1), 1.
- Malhota, B.R; Jackofsky, E.F and Indik, B.P (1996). *A Longitudinal Study of Climates*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 9(3).
- Martins, N. & Von der Ohe, H. (2003). *Organizational climate measurement: New and emerging dimensions during a period of transformation*. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*.
- Martin, A. (2007). *Employee perceptions of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions in a post-merger institution*. Unpublished MCom dissertation. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of industrial civilization*. New York: Macmillan.

- McGregor, D.M. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McKenna, E. (2000). *Business Psychology and Organizational Behavior: A student's handbook* (3rd ed.). Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Miles, E.S., Patrick, S.L., & King, W.C. (1996). *Job level as a systematic variable in predicting the relationship between supervisory communication and job satisfaction*.
- Moran, E.T., & Volkwein, J.F. (1992). *The Cultural Approach to the Formation of Organizational Climate*. Human Relations. 45(1).
- Muchinsky, P.M. (1993). *Psychology applied to work*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole. 4th edition.
- Mullins, L.J. (1999). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. England Pearson Education Limited. 5th Edition.
- Odendaal, A. (1997). *Deelneemende bestuur and korporatiewekultuur: Onafhanklike konstrakte? (Participative management and corporate culture: Independent constructs?)*. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). *Is the length of service related to the level of Job Satisfaction?* *International Journal of Social Economics*. 27.
- Otokiti, S.O. (2005). *Methodologies and Mechanics of Computational System*. New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Son.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: St. Edmundsbury Press.
- Patterson, M.G., West, M.A., Shackleton, V.J., Dawson, J.F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., Robinson, D.L., & Wallace, A.M. (2005). *Validating the Organizational Climate Measure: Links to Managerial Practices, Productivity and Innovation*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26.

- Payne R., Fineman S. & Wall, T. (1976), *Organizational climate and job satisfaction: a conceptual synthesis*. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, vol. 16.
- Peek, R.C. (2003). *The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction as reported by institutional research staff at Florida community colleges*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Florida.
- Penwarden, R. (2014), *Calculating the Right Survey Sample Size*. LinkedIn: <https://ca.linkedin.com/pub/rick-penwarden/65/472/b93>. Fluid Surveys Presents.
- Pillay, R. (2008). *Work satisfaction of medical doctors in the South African private health sector*. Journal of Health Organization and Management, 22(3).
- Polit, D. F. and Hungler, B. P. (1991). *Essentials of Nursing Research Methods, Appraisal and Utilization*. Philadelphia: Lipincot. 4th Edition.
- Punia BK., Sheoran S., and Kavitr, (2015). *Employees' Perception of Organizational Climate in Indian Corporate Sector: A Study across Sectoral and Demographic Variables*. Amity Management Analyst. Vol 7. No I & II.
- Putti, J. M., & Kheun, L. S. (1986). *Organizational Climate -- Job Satisfaction Relationship in a Public Sector Organization*. International Journal of Public Administration, 8(3).
- Reichheld, G.H. (2003). *Motivation and Organizational Climate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School, Division of Research.
- Rice, R.W; Phillips, S.M & Mcfarlin, D.B (1990), *Multiple Discrepancies and Pay Satisfaction*, Journal of Applied Psychology. 75.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies and applications*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 8th edition.
- Robbins, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. 12th edition

- Robbins, S. P., Odendaal, A. & Roodt, G. (2003). ***Organizational Behavior – Global and Southern African perspective***. Pretoria: Pearson Education.
- Robert, M. (1997). ***Sampling Guide***. Washington DC: Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance Project (FANTA) Academy for Educational Development
- Salancik, P. and Pfeffer, J. (2008). ***Climate for Creativity: A Quantitative Review***. Creativity Research Journal. 19(1).
- Santos, J.R.A. (1999). ***Cronbach's Alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales***. Journal of Extension.
- Saura, I.G., Contri, G.B., Taulet, A.C., & Velazquez, B. M. (2005). ***Relationships among customer orientation, service orientation and job satisfaction in financial services***. International Journal of Service, 16(5).
- Schneider, B. (2000). ***The psychological life of organizations***. In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom & M.F. Peterson (Eds.), Handbook of organizational culture and climate. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Shahram S., Hamid J. and Rahim, N. M. (2013). ***The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction of Educational Teachers At High School Grade of Ardabil City***. European Journal of Experimental Biology, ISSN: 2248 –9215
- Smith, P.C; Kendall, L.M and Hulin, C.L (1969). ***The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes***. The Handbook of Psychology. 2nd Edition.
- Snipes, R.L., Oswald, S.L., La Tour, M., & Armenakis, A.A. (2005). ***The Effects of Specific Job Satisfaction Facets on Customer Perceptions of Service Quality: An Employee Level Analysis***. Journal of Business Research.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). ***Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause and Consequences***. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

- Spector, P. E. (2005). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Research and Practice*. New York: Wiley. 4th Edition
- Steers, R.M. (1977). *Organizational Effectiveness: A behavioral view*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Stone, E.F. (1992). *A Critical Analysis of Social Information Processing Models of Job Perceptions and Job Attitudes*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Pearson/Allyn & Bacon, Boston. 5th edition.
- The M., and Goi (2014). *Impact of Organizational Climate on Intentions to Leave and Job Satisfaction*. World Journal of Management Vol. 5.No. 2.
- Verbeke, W., Volgering, M., & Hessels, M (1998). *Exploring the Conceptual Expansion within the Field of Organizational Behavior: Organizational Climate and Organizational Culture*. Journal of Management Studies, 35(3).
- Wendell L. French and Cecil H. Bell, (2004). *Organization Development*. Tan Prints (India) Pvt. Ltd India.
- Williams, R. (2015). *Multicollinearity*. University of Notre Dame. <http://www3.nd.edu/~rwilliam/>

Appendices

Appendix A: Research questionnaire

Addis Ababa University

Master of Business Administration Program

Dear Respondent:

This questionnaire is designed to collect information for the master thesis on the topic “*The impact of organizational climate on job satisfaction of academic staffs the case of private universities found in Addis Ababa city*” to fulfill the partial requirements of the Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree in Management.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the organizational climates factors that could predict job satisfaction. There is no “right” or “wrong” responses, only the expression of your real thoughts and feelings is important.

Please respond to each question by indicating the extent to which you regard the statements. Your participation is of great value for the success of this study, and therefore, I would like to thank you in advance for your kind cooperation in responding to this questionnaire. The information you provide will be kept confidential. Hence it is not necessary to write your name. Please attempt all the questions.

Yours faithfully,
RahmetAbubeker

PART ONE

Instruction: a. Put sign "X" in the box against the answer that you think best suits.

b. For each question where alternative answers are not given write your answer clearly in the blank space provided against each question.

General Information

1. Name of the university _____

Biographical information

2. Sex:

Female

Male

3. Job type

Full time

Part time

4. Level of education:

Diploma

M.A. /M.Sc.

other _____

B.A/ B.Sc.

PHD

5. Total years of experiences in university lecturing

0-5

11-15

6-10

16 or above

6. What is your job level as per the university's title matrix?

Graduate assistant

Associate Professor

Assistant Lecturer

Professor

Lecturer

Other

Assistant professor

PART TWO

Rate the following statements by putting a tick mark“√” where,

1=Strongly Disagree (SD), 2=Disagree (D), 3=Not sure (NS), 4=Agree (A), 5= Strongly Agree (SA)

Statements	SD	D	NS	A	SA
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE					
Leadership and management					
1. Management and leadership style is sensitive and supportive of lecturer,s work schedule.					
2. Management style encourages junior academic career path and growth.					
3. Immediate managers provide feedback on employees“ evaluation and performance.					
4. I wouldn“t like my Head of Department to change his or her leadership style					
Participation in decision making					
5. Junior academics participate in decision making.					
6. My participation in decision making enhance my ability to perform.					
7. I am allowed autonomy in discharging my duties.					
8. My abilities are taken into consideration when delegating					
9. I am involved when the University policies are reviewed.					
Pay and benefits					
10. I am satisfied with the benefits that I receive at the University.					
11. Organization provides adequate fringe benefits					
12. I am satisfied with the salary given to me for the work I do					
13. My benefits equal my contributions to the University goals.					
14. The benefits in my University are equal with the external labor market.					
Human relation					
15. Employees in my department develop supportive, positive working relationships.					
16. The organization“s environment is such that it makes it easy to get along well with each other.					
17. We have little conflict between our organization members					
18. Members of this organization are committed to each other.					
19. Lecturers co-operate well with each other in the University.					
	SD	D	NS	A	SA
Working condition					
20. My department provides sufficient material for our use.					
21. The University provides the equipment and resources necessary for me to execute my responsibilities.					

22. I am facilitated to overcome limitations in my experience					
23. My senior colleagues create a challenging environment for me.					
24. My work place is a noise-free environment					
25. I feel that my work place is a safe environment.					
Employee wellness					
26. Senior academic supports employees' efforts to balance work, family and personal responsibilities.					
27. The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable					
28. I find delegated responsibilities interesting.					
29. The pace of work enables me to do a good job.					
30. My job does not cause unreasonable amounts of stress in my life					
Corporate Image					
31. The university's brand is well known in the market place.					
32. I think the university's brand is highly rated.					
33. I am proud to be associated with the university brand.					
34. My university is regarded as an employer of choice.					
JOB SATISFACTION					
35. I feel positive about my future in the University.					
36. I find my work interesting.					
37. I find my work challenging					
38. I feel that the University cares for its employees					
39. The University retains its best employees.					

Thank you for your cooperation

Appendix B_ normality test

Descriptive Statistics									
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
L_M1	229	1	5	2.88	.924	.481	.161	-.255	.320
L_M2	229	1	5	2.78	.741	.112	.161	-.336	.320
L_M3	227	1	5	1.91	1.041	1.041	.162	.190	.322
L_M4	229	1	4	2.59	.748	.530	.161	-.571	.320
DM5	229	1	5	3.25	.872	-.196	.161	.001	.320
DM6	229	1	5	3.79	1.104	-.839	.161	.016	.320
DM7	219	1	5	3.78	.961	-.861	.164	.583	.327
DM8	229	1	5	3.60	1.019	-.695	.161	.142	.320
DM9	228	1	5	2.75	1.239	.108	.161	-1.060	.321
P_B10	228	1	5	2.91	1.022	.236	.161	-.519	.321
P_B11	227	1	5	2.78	.975	.368	.162	-.739	.322
P_B12	227	1	5	2.73	.894	.256	.162	-.183	.322
P_B13	228	1	5	3.02	.910	.178	.161	-.073	.321
HR14	229	2	5	3.65	.702	.081	.161	-.331	.320
HR15	229	2	5	3.91	.790	-.598	.161	.225	.320
HR16	229	1	5	3.52	.916	-.711	.161	.501	.320
HR17	229	1	5	3.58	.777	-.640	.161	.165	.320
WC18	229	1	5	3.53	.710	-.804	.161	.322	.320
WC19	228	1	5	3.56	.786	-.849	.161	.973	.321
WC20	229	2	5	3.67	.616	-.114	.161	-.131	.320
WC21	229	2	5	3.52	.803	-.997	.161	-.379	.320
WC22	229	1	5	3.35	.904	-.652	.161	-1.115	.320
EW23	229	1	5	3.45	.785	-.476	.161	.022	.320
EW24	229	1	5	3.69	.916	-.957	.161	.776	.320
EW25	227	1	5	3.55	.747	-.656	.162	.571	.322
EW26	227	1	5	3.67	.789	-.640	.162	.325	.322
EW27	229	2	5	3.70	.670	-.801	.161	.723	.320
CI28	229	2	5	4.15	.906	-.548	.161	-.992	.320
CI29	229	1	5	3.84	.980	-.263	.161	-.940	.320
CI30	229	2	5	3.66	.907	-.234	.161	-.703	.320
CI31	225	1	5	3.25	1.048	-.372	.162	.054	.323
JS32	229	2	4	3.05	.411	.347	.161	2.879	.320
JS33	229	2	4	3.17	.451	.685	.161	.781	.320
JS34	229	2	4	3.08	.489	.190	.161	1.076	.320
JS35	229	2	4	2.89	.444	-.520	.161	1.550	.320
JS36	229	2	5	3.34	.625	1.130	.161	.960	.320
Valid N (list wise)	205								

Appendix C: Multi colinearity tests

Model	Colinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 DM	.965	1.036
PB	.797	1.254
HR	.841	1.189
WC	.621	1.611
EW	.675	1.480
CI	.855	1.169
a. Dependent Variable: LM		
Mean		1.290

Model	Colinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 WC	.684	1.462
EW	.675	1.482
CI	.854	1.171
LM	.993	1.007
DM	.966	1.036
PB	.798	1.253
a. Dependent Variable: HR		
Mean		1.235

Model	Colinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 PB	.803	1.246
HR	.841	1.189
WC	.627	1.594
EW	.675	1.482
CI	.869	1.151
LM	.993	1.007
a. Dependent Variable: DM		
Mean		1.278

Coefficients		
Model	Colinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 EW	.884	1.131
CI	.855	1.170
LM	.992	1.008
DM	.974	1.026
PB	.799	1.252
HR	.925	1.081
a. Dependent Variable: WC		
Mean		1.111

Model	Colinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1 HR	.843	1.186
WC	.624	1.602
EW	.696	1.438
CI	.984	1.016
LM	.995	1.005
DM	.974	1.027
a. Dependent Variable: PB		
Mean		1.212

Coefficients			
Model		Colinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	CI	.855	1.169
	LM	.994	1.006
	DM	.965	1.036
	PB	.820	1.220
	HR	.840	1.190
	WC	.814	1.228
a. Dependent Variable: EW			
Mean		1.142	

Coefficients			
Model		Colinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	LM	.994	1.006
	DM	.982	1.019
	PB	.916	1.092
	HR	.840	1.190
	WC	.622	1.608
	EW	.675	1.481
a. Dependent Variable: CI			
Mean		1.233	

Appendix D: Post- Hoc test for tenure/ experience

Multiple Comparisons								
Bonferroni								
Dependent Variable	(I) Exp	(J) Exp	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
LM	0-5	6-10	-.19801	.10154	.315	-.4683	.0723	
		11-15	-.46395	.14041	.007	-.8377	-.0902	
		>=16	-1.16578	.17529	.000	-1.6324	-.6992	
	6-10	0-5	.19801	.10154	.315	-.0723	.4683	
		11-15	-.26594	.14765	.438	-.6589	.1271	
		>=16	-.96777	.18114	.000	-1.4499	-.4856	
	11-15	0-5	.46395	.14041	.007	.0902	.8377	
		6-10	.26594	.14765	.438	-.1271	.6589	
		>=16	-.70183	.20547	.005	-1.2487	-.1549	
	>=16	0-5	1.16578	.17529	.000	.6992	1.6324	
		6-10	.96777	.18114	.000	.4856	1.4499	
		11-15	.70183	.20547	.005	.1549	1.2487	
	DM	0-5	6-10	.20565	.11903	.512	-.1112	.5225
			11-15	.32111	.16458	.314	-.1170	.7592
			>=16	.14201	.20547	1.000	-.4049	.6889
6-10		0-5	-.20565	.11903	.512	-.5225	.1112	
		11-15	.11547	.17307	1.000	-.3452	.5761	
		>=16	-.06364	.21233	1.000	-.6288	.5015	
11-15		0-5	-.32111	.16458	.314	-.7592	.1170	
		6-10	-.11547	.17307	1.000	-.5761	.3452	
		>=16	-.17911	.24084	1.000	-.8202	.4620	
>=16		0-5	-.14201	.20547	1.000	-.6889	.4049	
		6-10	.06364	.21233	1.000	-.5015	.6288	
		11-15	.17911	.24084	1.000	-.4620	.8202	
PB		0-5	6-10	.02110	.10896	1.000	-.2689	.3111
			11-15	-.11136	.15067	1.000	-.5124	.2897
			>=16	.44746	.18810	.109	-.0532	.9481
	6-10	0-5	-.02110	.10896	1.000	-.3111	.2689	
		11-15	-.13247	.15843	1.000	-.5542	.2892	
		>=16	.42636	.19437	.176	-.0910	.9437	
	11-15	0-5	.11136	.15067	1.000	-.2897	.5124	
		6-10	.13247	.15843	1.000	-.2892	.5542	
		>=16	.55882	.22048	.072	-.0280	1.1457	
	>=16	0-5	-.44746	.18810	.109	-.9481	.0532	
		6-10	-.42636	.19437	.176	-.9437	.0910	
		11-15	-.55882	.22048	.072	-1.1457	.0280	
	HR	0-5	6-10	-.18543	.11250	.604	-.4849	.1140
			11-15	-.14953	.15556	1.000	-.5636	.2645
			>=16	-.09679	.19420	1.000	-.6137	.4201
6-10		0-5	.18543	.11250	.604	-.1140	.4849	
		11-15	.03590	.16357	1.000	-.3995	.4713	
		>=16	.08864	.20068	1.000	-.4455	.6228	
11-15		0-5	.14953	.15556	1.000	-.2645	.5636	
		6-10	-.03590	.16357	1.000	-.4713	.3995	
		>=16	.05274	.22763	1.000	-.5532	.6586	
>=16		0-5	.09679	.19420	1.000	-.4201	.6137	
		6-10	-.08864	.20068	1.000	-.6228	.4455	
		11-15	-.05274	.22763	1.000	-.6586	.5532	

WC	0-5	6-10	-.02159	.10421	1.000	-.2990	.2558
		11-15	.09461	.14410	1.000	-.2889	.4782
		>=16	-.01209	.17990	1.000	-.4909	.4668
	6-10	0-5	.02159	.10421	1.000	-.2558	.2990
		11-15	.11620	.15152	1.000	-.2871	.5195
		>=16	.00951	.18590	1.000	-.4853	.5043
	11-15	0-5	-.09461	.14410	1.000	-.4782	.2889
		6-10	-.11620	.15152	1.000	-.5195	.2871
		>=16	-.10669	.21086	1.000	-.6680	.4546
	>=16	0-5	.01209	.17990	1.000	-.4668	.4909
		6-10	-.00951	.18590	1.000	-.5043	.4853
		11-15	.10669	.21086	1.000	-.4546	.6680
EW	0-5	6-10	-.03953	.09466	1.000	-.2915	.2124
		11-15	.13187	.13089	1.000	-.2165	.4803
		>=16	-.06286	.16341	1.000	-.4978	.3721
	6-10	0-5	.03953	.09466	1.000	-.2124	.2915
		11-15	.17140	.13764	1.000	-.1950	.5378
		>=16	-.02333	.16886	1.000	-.4728	.4261
	11-15	0-5	-.13187	.13089	1.000	-.4803	.2165
		6-10	-.17140	.13764	1.000	-.5378	.1950
		>=16	-.19473	.19153	1.000	-.7046	.3151
	>=16	0-5	.06286	.16341	1.000	-.3721	.4978
		6-10	.02333	.16886	1.000	-.4261	.4728
		11-15	.19473	.19153	1.000	-.3151	.7046
CI	0-5	6-10	.05596	.12470	1.000	-.2760	.3879
		11-15	-.15101	.17243	1.000	-.6100	.3080
		>=16	.30437	.21526	.953	-.2686	.8774
	6-10	0-5	-.05596	.12470	1.000	-.3879	.2760
		11-15	-.20696	.18131	1.000	-.6896	.2757
		>=16	.24841	.22245	1.000	-.3437	.8405
	11-15	0-5	.15101	.17243	1.000	-.3080	.6100
		6-10	.20696	.18131	1.000	-.2757	.6896
		>=16	.45538	.25232	.435	-.2162	1.1270
	>=16	0-5	-.30437	.21526	.953	-.8774	.2686
		6-10	-.24841	.22245	1.000	-.8405	.3437
		11-15	-.45538	.25232	.435	-1.1270	.2162
JS	0-5	6-10	.04321	.05197	1.000	-.0951	.1816
		11-15	-.01441	.07187	1.000	-.2057	.1769
		>=16	-.01435	.08972	1.000	-.2532	.2245
	6-10	0-5	-.04321	.05197	1.000	-.1816	.0951
		11-15	-.05762	.07557	1.000	-.2588	.1435
		>=16	-.05756	.09272	1.000	-.3044	.1892
	11-15	0-5	.01441	.07187	1.000	-.1769	.2057
		6-10	.05762	.07557	1.000	-.1435	.2588
		>=16	.00006	.10517	1.000	-.2799	.2800
	>=16	0-5	.01435	.08972	1.000	-.2245	.2532
		6-10	.05756	.09272	1.000	-.1892	.3044
		11-15	-.00006	.10517	1.000	-.2800	.2799
Total organizational climate	0-5	6-10	-.02014	.05559	1.000	-.1681	.1278
		11-15	-.04670	.07687	1.000	-.2513	.1579
		>=16	-.06416	.09597	1.000	-.3196	.1913
	6-10	0-5	.02014	.05559	1.000	-.1278	.1681
		11-15	-.02656	.08083	1.000	-.2417	.1886
		>=16	-.04402	.09917	1.000	-.3080	.2200
	11-15	0-5	.04670	.07687	1.000	-.1579	.2513
		6-10	.02656	.08083	1.000	-.1886	.2417
		>=16	-.01746	.11249	1.000	-.3169	.2820

	>=16	0-5	.06416	.09597	1.000	-.1913	.3196
		6-10	.04402	.09917	1.000	-.2200	.3080
		11-15	.01746	.11249	1.000	-.2820	.3169

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Descriptive

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
LM	0-5	110	2.3636	.67358	.06422	2.2363	2.4909	1.00	4.00
	6-10	73	2.5616	.60061	.07030	2.4215	2.7018	2.00	4.00
	11-15	29	2.8276	.80485	.14946	2.5214	3.1337	1.00	4.00
	>=16	17	3.5294	.71743	.17400	3.1605	3.8983	2.00	4.00
	Total	229	2.5721	.73765	.04875	2.4760	2.6681	1.00	4.00
DM	0-5	110	3.5732	.63806	.06084	3.4526	3.6938	1.95	5.00
	6-10	73	3.3675	.89205	.10441	3.1594	3.5757	1.68	5.00
	11-15	29	3.2521	.98852	.18356	2.8761	3.6281	1.00	4.75
	>=16	17	3.4312	.82313	.19964	3.0080	3.8544	1.68	4.25
	Total	229	3.4564	.79243	.05237	3.3532	3.5596	1.00	5.00
PB	0-5	110	2.8886	.78444	.07479	2.7404	3.0369	1.00	5.00
	6-10	73	2.8675	.71762	.08399	2.7001	3.0350	1.00	4.50
	11-15	29	3.0000	.55902	.10381	2.7874	3.2126	2.00	4.25
	>=16	17	2.4412	.51939	.12597	2.1741	2.7082	1.50	3.75
	Total	229	2.8628	.72807	.04811	2.7680	2.9576	1.00	5.00
HR	0-5	110	3.6091	.71799	.06846	3.4734	3.7448	2.00	5.00
	6-10	73	3.7945	.81580	.09548	3.6042	3.9849	2.00	5.00
	11-15	29	3.7586	.73946	.13731	3.4773	4.0399	2.00	5.00
	>=16	17	3.7059	.58787	.14258	3.4036	4.0081	2.00	4.00
	Total	229	3.6943	.74517	.04924	3.5973	3.7914	2.00	5.00
WC	0-5	110	3.5291	.69788	.06654	3.3972	3.6610	1.40	4.80
	6-10	73	3.5507	.68701	.08041	3.3904	3.7110	1.80	4.80
	11-15	29	3.4345	.65915	.12240	3.1838	3.6852	2.20	4.20
	>=16	17	3.5412	.70627	.17130	3.1780	3.9043	2.20	4.20
	Total	229	3.5249	.68668	.04538	3.4355	3.6143	1.40	4.80

EW	0-5	110	3.6077	.60968	.05813	3.4925	3.7229	2.00	5.00
	6-10	73	3.6473	.66164	.07744	3.4929	3.8016	1.80	5.00
	11-15	29	3.4759	.65118	.12092	3.2282	3.7236	2.00	4.20
	>=16	17	3.6706	.53358	.12941	3.3962	3.9449	2.60	4.20
	Total	229	3.6083	.62530	.04132	3.5269	3.6897	1.80	5.00
CI	0-5	110	3.7455	.85042	.08108	3.5848	3.9063	2.25	5.00
	6-10	73	3.6896	.77221	.09038	3.5094	3.8698	2.25	5.00
	11-15	29	3.8966	.73045	.13564	3.6187	4.1744	2.25	4.75
	>=16	17	3.4412	1.02519	.24864	2.9141	3.9683	2.25	5.00
	Total	229	3.7242	.82685	.05464	3.6166	3.8319	2.25	5.00
JS	0-5	110	3.1380	.28083	.02678	3.0849	3.1911	2.29	3.89
	6-10	73	3.0948	.39213	.04590	3.0033	3.1863	2.22	3.94
	11-15	29	3.1524	.39871	.07404	3.0008	3.3041	2.38	3.74
	>=16	17	3.1524	.39938	.09686	2.9470	3.3577	2.46	3.80
	Total	229	3.1271	.34278	.02265	3.0825	3.1718	2.22	3.94
Total organizational climate	0-5	110	3.3305	.33555	.03199	3.2671	3.3940	2.34	4.14
	6-10	73	3.3507	.40428	.04732	3.2564	3.4450	2.41	4.07
	11-15	29	3.3772	.40141	.07454	3.2246	3.5299	2.63	4.13
	>=16	17	3.3947	.35011	.08491	3.2147	3.5747	2.66	3.90
	Total	229	3.3476	.36640	.02421	3.2999	3.3954	2.34	4.14

Appendix E: factor analysis

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.195	22.765	22.765	8.195	22.765	22.765	4.541	12.614	12.614
2	4.462	12.394	35.158	4.462	12.394	35.158	3.695	10.264	22.877
3	3.370	9.362	44.520	3.370	9.362	44.520	3.491	9.699	32.576
4	3.225	8.958	53.479	3.225	8.958	53.479	3.458	9.606	42.182
5	2.393	6.649	60.127	2.393	6.649	60.127	3.265	9.068	51.250
6	1.972	5.477	65.604	1.972	5.477	65.604	3.195	8.876	60.126
7	1.594	4.427	70.031	1.594	4.427	70.031	2.624	7.290	67.416
8	1.279	3.553	73.585	1.279	3.553	73.585	2.221	6.169	73.585
9	.998	2.771	76.356						
10	.881	2.447	78.803						
11	.768	2.132	80.935						
12	.715	1.985	82.920						
13	.635	1.763	84.683						
14	.578	1.606	86.289						
15	.479	1.331	87.621						
16	.469	1.302	88.923						
17	.436	1.212	90.135						
18	.413	1.146	91.281						
19	.366	1.017	92.298						
20	.362	1.004	93.302						
21	.318	.882	94.184						
22	.270	.751	94.935						
23	.249	.692	95.626						
24	.222	.618	96.244						
25	.211	.585	96.829						
26	.195	.541	97.370						
27	.168	.466	97.837						
28	.139	.387	98.223						
29	.135	.374	98.597						
30	.121	.337	98.934						
31	.107	.296	99.230						
32	.083	.229	99.460						
33	.073	.203	99.663						
34	.049	.137	99.800						
35	.043	.118	99.919						
36	.029	.081	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Appendix F: Descriptive statistics for items in organizational climate

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
L_M1	229	1	5	2.88	.924
L_M2	229	1	5	2.78	.741
L_M3	227	1	5	1.91	1.041
L_M4	229	1	4	2.59	.748
DM5	229	1	5	3.25	.872
DM6	229	1	5	3.79	1.104
DM7	219	1	5	3.78	.961
DM8	229	1	5	3.60	1.019
DM9	228	1	5	2.75	1.239
P_B10	228	1	5	2.91	1.022
P_B11	227	1	5	2.78	.975
P_B12	227	1	5	2.73	.894
P_B13	228	1	5	3.02	.910
HR14	229	2	5	3.65	.702
HR15	229	2	5	3.91	.790
HR16	229	1	5	3.52	.916
HR17	229	1	5	3.58	.777
WC18	229	1	5	3.53	.710
WC19	228	1	5	3.56	.786
WC20	229	2	5	3.67	.616
WC21	229	2	5	3.52	.803
WC22	229	1	5	3.35	.904
EW23	229	1	5	3.45	.785
EW24	229	1	5	3.69	.916
EW25	227	1	5	3.55	.747
EW26	227	1	5	3.67	.789
EW27	229	2	5	3.70	.670
CI28	229	2	5	4.15	.906
CI29	229	1	5	3.84	.980
CI30	229	2	5	3.66	.907
CI31	224	1	5	3.25	1.049
Valid N (list wise)	205				

Appendix G: Post-Hoc test for Job level

Multiple Comparisons							
Bonferroni							
Dependent Variable	(I) JI	(J) JI	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LM	Graduate assistant	Assistant lecturer	-.05556	.17700	1.000	-.5808	.4696
		lecturer	-.07435	.15001	1.000	-.5194	.3707
		Assistant professor	-.55556	.20165	.095	-1.1539	.0428
		Associate professor	-1.30556*	.38074	.011	-2.4353	-.1759
		other	.44444	.52078	1.000	-1.1008	1.9897
	Assistant lecturer	Graduate assistant	.05556	.17700	1.000	-.4696	.5808
		lecturer	-.01880	.12815	1.000	-.3990	.3614
		Assistant professor	-.50000	.18596	.116	-1.0518	.0518
		Associate professor	-1.25000*	.37267	.014	-2.3558	-.1442
		other	.50000	.51491	1.000	-1.0278	2.0278
	lecturer	Graduate assistant	.07435	.15001	1.000	-.3707	.5194
		Assistant lecturer	.01880	.12815	1.000	-.3614	.3990
		Assistant professor	-.48120*	.16048	.045	-.9574	-.0050
		Associate professor	-1.23120*	.36063	.011	-2.3012	-.1612
		other	.51880	.50627	1.000	-.9834	2.0210
	Assistant professor	Graduate assistant	.55556	.20165	.095	-.0428	1.1539
		Assistant lecturer	.50000	.18596	.116	-.0518	1.0518
		lecturer	.48120*	.16048	.045	.0050	.9574
		Associate professor	-.75000	.38498	.790	-1.8923	.3923
		other	1.00000	.52390	.864	-.5545	2.5545
	Associate professor	Graduate assistant	1.30556*	.38074	.011	.1759	2.4353
		Assistant lecturer	1.25000*	.37267	.014	.1442	2.3558
		lecturer	1.23120*	.36063	.011	.1612	2.3012
		Assistant professor	.75000	.38498	.790	-.3923	1.8923
		other	1.75000	.61544	.073	-.0761	3.5761
other	Graduate assistant	-.44444	.52078	1.000	-1.9897	1.1008	
	Assistant lecturer	-.50000	.51491	1.000	-2.0278	1.0278	
	lecturer	-.51880	.50627	1.000	-2.0210	.9834	
	Assistant professor	-1.00000	.52390	.864	-2.5545	.5545	
	Associate professor	-1.75000	.61544	.073	-3.5761	.0761	

DM	Graduate assistant	Assistant lecturer	-.03207	.19776	1.000	-.6188	.5547
		lecturer	.06841	.16759	1.000	-.4289	.5657
		Assistant professor	-.19016	.22529	1.000	-.8586	.4783
		Associate professor	-.11907	.42538	1.000	-1.3812	1.1431
		other	.75093	.58185	1.000	-.9755	2.4774
	Assistant lecturer	Graduate assistant	.03207	.19776	1.000	-.5547	.6188
		lecturer	.10048	.14318	1.000	-.3243	.5253
		Assistant professor	-.15809	.20777	1.000	-.7746	.4584
		Associate professor	-.08700	.41636	1.000	-1.3224	1.1484
		other	.78300	.57529	1.000	-.9240	2.4900
	lecturer	Graduate assistant	-.06841	.16759	1.000	-.5657	.4289
		Assistant lecturer	-.10048	.14318	1.000	-.5253	.3243
		Assistant professor	-.25857	.17930	1.000	-.7906	.2734
		Associate professor	-.18748	.40291	1.000	-1.3830	1.0080
		other	.68252	.56563	1.000	-.9958	2.3608
	Assistant professor	Graduate assistant	.19016	.22529	1.000	-.4783	.8586
		Assistant lecturer	.15809	.20777	1.000	-.4584	.7746
		lecturer	.25857	.17930	1.000	-.2734	.7906
		Associate professor	.07109	.43012	1.000	-1.2052	1.3473
		other	.94109	.58533	1.000	-.7957	2.6778
	Associate professor	Graduate assistant	.11907	.42538	1.000	-1.1431	1.3812
		Assistant lecturer	.08700	.41636	1.000	-1.1484	1.3224
		lecturer	.18748	.40291	1.000	-1.0080	1.3830
		Assistant professor	-.07109	.43012	1.000	-1.3473	1.2052
		other	.87000	.68760	1.000	-1.1702	2.9102
other	Graduate assistant	-.75093	.58185	1.000	-2.4774	.9755	
	Assistant lecturer	-.78300	.57529	1.000	-2.4900	.9240	
	lecturer	-.68252	.56563	1.000	-2.3608	.9958	
	Assistant professor	-.94109	.58533	1.000	-2.6778	.7957	
	Associate professor	-.87000	.68760	1.000	-2.9102	1.1702	
PB	Graduate assistant	Assistant lecturer	-.20200	.18272	1.000	-.7442	.3402
		lecturer	-.10526	.15485	1.000	-.5647	.3542
		Assistant professor	-.16304	.20816	1.000	-.7807	.4546
		Associate professor	-.06250	.39303	1.000	-1.2287	1.1037
		other	.12500	.53760	1.000	-1.4701	1.7201
	Assistant lecturer	Graduate assistant	.20200	.18272	1.000	-.3402	.7442
		lecturer	.09674	.13229	1.000	-.2958	.4893
		Assistant professor	.03896	.19197	1.000	-.5306	.6086

		Associate professor	.13950	.38470	1.000	-1.0020	1.2810
		other	.32700	.53154	1.000	-1.2502	1.9042
lecturer		Graduate assistant	.10526	.15485	1.000	-.3542	.5647
		Assistant lecturer	-.09674	.13229	1.000	-.4893	.2958
		Assistant professor	-.05778	.16566	1.000	-.5493	.4338
		Associate professor	.04276	.37227	1.000	-1.0618	1.1474
		other	.23026	.52262	1.000	-1.3204	1.7809
Assistant professor		Graduate assistant	.16304	.20816	1.000	-.4546	.7807
		Assistant lecturer	-.03896	.19197	1.000	-.6086	.5306
		lecturer	.05778	.16566	1.000	-.4338	.5493
		Associate professor	.10054	.39741	1.000	-1.0786	1.2797
		other	.28804	.54081	1.000	-1.3166	1.8927
Associate professor		Graduate assistant	.06250	.39303	1.000	-1.1037	1.2287
		Assistant lecturer	-.13950	.38470	1.000	-1.2810	1.0020
		lecturer	-.04276	.37227	1.000	-1.1474	1.0618
		Assistant professor	-.10054	.39741	1.000	-1.2797	1.0786
		other	.18750	.63531	1.000	-1.6976	2.0726
other		Graduate assistant	-.12500	.53760	1.000	-1.7201	1.4701
		Assistant lecturer	-.32700	.53154	1.000	-1.9042	1.2502
		lecturer	-.23026	.52262	1.000	-1.7809	1.3204
		Assistant professor	-.28804	.54081	1.000	-1.8927	1.3166
		Associate professor	-.18750	.63531	1.000	-2.0726	1.6976
HR	Graduate assistant	Assistant lecturer	-.28241	.18621	1.000	-.8349	.2701
		lecturer	-.06906	.15780	1.000	-.5373	.3992
		Assistant professor	-.05958	.21213	1.000	-.6890	.5698
		Associate professor	-.15741	.40053	1.000	-1.3458	1.0310
		other	-.40741	.54786	1.000	-2.0330	1.2182
	Assistant lecturer	Graduate assistant	.28241	.18621	1.000	-.2701	.8349
		lecturer	.21335	.13481	1.000	-.1867	.6134
		Assistant professor	.22283	.19563	1.000	-.3577	.8033
		Associate professor	.12500	.39204	1.000	-1.0383	1.2883
		other	-.12500	.54169	1.000	-1.7323	1.4823
	lecturer	Graduate assistant	.06906	.15780	1.000	-.3992	.5373
		Assistant lecturer	-.21335	.13481	1.000	-.6134	.1867
		Assistant professor	.00948	.16883	1.000	-.4915	.5104
		Associate professor	-.08835	.37938	1.000	-1.2140	1.0373
		other	-.33835	.53259	1.000	-1.9186	1.2419
	Assistant	Graduate assistant	.05958	.21213	1.000	-.5698	.6890

professor	Assistant lecturer	-.22283	.19563	1.000	-.8033	.3577
	lecturer	-.00948	.16883	1.000	-.5104	.4915
	Associate professor	-.09783	.40500	1.000	-1.2995	1.1039
	other	-.34783	.55114	1.000	-1.9831	1.2875
Associate professor	Graduate assistant	.15741	.40053	1.000	-1.0310	1.3458
	Assistant lecturer	-.12500	.39204	1.000	-1.2883	1.0383
	lecturer	.08835	.37938	1.000	-1.0373	1.2140
	Assistant professor	.09783	.40500	1.000	-1.1039	1.2995
other	Graduate assistant	.40741	.54786	1.000	-1.2182	2.0330
	Assistant lecturer	.12500	.54169	1.000	-1.4823	1.7323
	lecturer	.33835	.53259	1.000	-1.2419	1.9186
	Assistant professor	.34783	.55114	1.000	-1.2875	1.9831
WC	Graduate assistant	.32296	.17039	.890	-.1826	.8285
	lecturer	.23665	.14440	1.000	-.1918	.6651
	Assistant professor	.35427	.19412	1.000	-.2217	.9302
	Associate professor	.61296	.36652	1.000	-.4746	1.7005
Assistant lecturer	other	-.23704	.50133	1.000	-1.7246	1.2505
	Graduate assistant	-.32296	.17039	.890	-.8285	.1826
	lecturer	-.08632	.12337	1.000	-.4524	.2797
	Assistant professor	.03130	.17902	1.000	-.4999	.5625
lecturer	Associate professor	.29000	.35875	1.000	-.7745	1.3545
	other	-.56000	.49568	1.000	-2.0308	.9108
	Graduate assistant	-.23665	.14440	1.000	-.6651	.1918
	Assistant lecturer	.08632	.12337	1.000	-.2797	.4524
Assistant professor	Assistant professor	.11762	.15449	1.000	-.3408	.5760
	Associate professor	.37632	.34716	1.000	-.6538	1.4064
	other	-.47368	.48736	1.000	-1.9198	.9724
	Graduate assistant	-.35427	.19412	1.000	-.9302	.2217
Associate professor	Assistant lecturer	-.03130	.17902	1.000	-.5625	.4999
	lecturer	-.11762	.15449	1.000	-.5760	.3408
	Associate professor	.25870	.37061	1.000	-.8410	1.3583
	other	-.59130	.50433	1.000	-2.0877	.9051
Associate professor	Graduate assistant	-.61296	.36652	1.000	-1.7005	.4746
	Assistant lecturer	-.29000	.35875	1.000	-1.3545	.7745
	lecturer	-.37632	.34716	1.000	-1.4064	.6538
	Assistant professor	-.25870	.37061	1.000	-1.3583	.8410

		other	-.85000	.59246	1.000	-2.6079	.9079
	other	Graduate assistant	.23704	.50133	1.000	-1.2505	1.7246
		Assistant lecturer	.56000	.49568	1.000	-.9108	2.0308
		lecturer	.47368	.48736	1.000	-.9724	1.9198
		Assistant professor	.59130	.50433	1.000	-.9051	2.0877
		Associate professor	.85000	.59246	1.000	-.9079	2.6079
EW	Graduate assistant	Assistant lecturer	.09727	.15688	1.000	-.3682	.5627
		lecturer	.14972	.13295	1.000	-.2448	.5442
		Assistant professor	.05765	.17872	1.000	-.4726	.5879
		Associate professor	.06852	.33744	1.000	-.9327	1.0698
		other	-.08148	.46156	1.000	-1.4510	1.2880
	Assistant lecturer	Graduate assistant	-.09727	.15688	1.000	-.5627	.3682
		lecturer	.05245	.11358	1.000	-.2846	.3895
		Assistant professor	-.03962	.16482	1.000	-.5287	.4494
		Associate professor	-.02875	.33029	1.000	-1.0088	.9513
		other	-.17875	.45636	1.000	-1.5328	1.1753
	lecturer	Graduate assistant	-.14972	.13295	1.000	-.5442	.2448
		Assistant lecturer	-.05245	.11358	1.000	-.3895	.2846
		Assistant professor	-.09207	.14223	1.000	-.5141	.3300
		Associate professor	-.08120	.31962	1.000	-1.0296	.8672
		other	-.23120	.44870	1.000	-1.5626	1.1002
	Assistant professor	Graduate assistant	-.05765	.17872	1.000	-.5879	.4726
		Assistant lecturer	.03962	.16482	1.000	-.4494	.5287
		lecturer	.09207	.14223	1.000	-.3300	.5141
		Associate professor	.01087	.34121	1.000	-1.0015	1.0233
		other	-.13913	.46432	1.000	-1.5168	1.2386
	Associate professor	Graduate assistant	-.06852	.33744	1.000	-1.0698	.9327
		Assistant lecturer	.02875	.33029	1.000	-.9513	1.0088
		lecturer	.08120	.31962	1.000	-.8672	1.0296
		Assistant professor	-.01087	.34121	1.000	-1.0233	1.0015
		other	-.15000	.54546	1.000	-1.7685	1.4685
other	Graduate assistant	.08148	.46156	1.000	-1.2880	1.4510	
	Assistant lecturer	.17875	.45636	1.000	-1.1753	1.5328	
	lecturer	.23120	.44870	1.000	-1.1002	1.5626	
	Assistant professor	.13913	.46432	1.000	-1.2386	1.5168	
	Associate professor	.15000	.54546	1.000	-1.4685	1.7685	
CI	Graduate assistant	Assistant lecturer	-.04592	.20613	1.000	-.6575	.5657
		lecturer	-.16110	.17469	1.000	-.6794	.3572

		Assistant professor	-.39145	.23483	1.000	-1.0882	.3053
		Associate professor	-.22917	.44339	1.000	-1.5448	1.0864
		other	.45833	.60648	1.000	-1.3412	2.2579
Assistant		Graduate assistant	.04592	.20613	1.000	-.5657	.6575
lecturer		lecturer	-.11519	.14924	1.000	-.5580	.3276
		Assistant professor	-.34553	.21657	1.000	-.9881	.2971
		Associate professor	-.18325	.43399	1.000	-1.4710	1.1045
		other	.50425	.59965	1.000	-1.2750	2.2835
	lecturer	Graduate assistant	.16110	.17469	1.000	-.3572	.6794
		Assistant lecturer	.11519	.14924	1.000	-.3276	.5580
		Assistant professor	-.23035	.18689	1.000	-.7849	.3242
		Associate professor	-.06806	.41997	1.000	-1.3142	1.1781
		other	.61944	.58958	1.000	-1.1299	2.3688
Assistant		Graduate assistant	.39145	.23483	1.000	-.3053	1.0882
professor		Assistant lecturer	.34553	.21657	1.000	-.2971	.9881
		lecturer	.23035	.18689	1.000	-.3242	.7849
		Associate professor	.16228	.44834	1.000	-1.1680	1.4926
		other	.84978	.61011	1.000	-.9605	2.6601
Associate		Graduate assistant	.22917	.44339	1.000	-1.0864	1.5448
professor		Assistant lecturer	.18325	.43399	1.000	-1.1045	1.4710
		lecturer	.06806	.41997	1.000	-1.1781	1.3142
		Assistant professor	-.16228	.44834	1.000	-1.4926	1.1680
		other	.68750	.71672	1.000	-1.4391	2.8141
	other	Graduate assistant	-.45833	.60648	1.000	-2.2579	1.3412
		Assistant lecturer	-.50425	.59965	1.000	-2.2835	1.2750
		lecturer	-.61944	.58958	1.000	-2.3688	1.1299
		Assistant professor	-.84978	.61011	1.000	-2.6601	.9605
		Associate professor	-.68750	.71672	1.000	-2.8141	1.4391
JS	Graduate	Assistant lecturer	-.01189	.08451	1.000	-.2626	.2389
	assistant	lecturer	-.00212	.07162	1.000	-.2146	.2104
		Assistant professor	-.22585	.09627	.298	-.5115	.0598
		Associate professor	-.08889	.18178	1.000	-.6283	.4505
		other	.17611	.24864	1.000	-.5616	.9139
	Assistant	Graduate assistant	.01189	.08451	1.000	-.2389	.2626
	lecturer	lecturer	.00977	.06118	1.000	-.1718	.1913
		Assistant professor	-.21396	.08879	.252	-.4774	.0495
		Associate professor	-.07700	.17792	1.000	-.6049	.4509
		other	.18800	.24584	1.000	-.5414	.9174

lecturer	Graduate assistant	.00212	.07162	1.000	-.2104	.2146	
	Assistant lecturer	-.00977	.06118	1.000	-.1913	.1718	
	Assistant professor	-.22372	.07662	.058	-.4511	.0036	
	Associate professor	-.08677	.17218	1.000	-.5976	.4241	
	other	.17823	.24171	1.000	-.5390	.8954	
Assistant professor	Graduate assistant	.22585	.09627	.298	-.0598	.5115	
	Assistant lecturer	.21396	.08879	.252	-.0495	.4774	
	lecturer	.22372	.07662	.058	-.0036	.4511	
	Associate professor	.13696	.18381	1.000	-.4084	.6823	
	other	.40196	.25013	1.000	-.3402	1.1441	
Associate professor	Graduate assistant	.08889	.18178	1.000	-.4505	.6283	
	Assistant lecturer	.07700	.17792	1.000	-.4509	.6049	
	lecturer	.08677	.17218	1.000	-.4241	.5976	
	Assistant professor	-.13696	.18381	1.000	-.6823	.4084	
	other	.26500	.29383	1.000	-.6068	1.1368	
other	Graduate assistant	-.17611	.24864	1.000	-.9139	.5616	
	Assistant lecturer	-.18800	.24584	1.000	-.9174	.5414	
	lecturer	-.17823	.24171	1.000	-.8954	.5390	
	Assistant professor	-.40196	.25013	1.000	-1.1441	.3402	
	Associate professor	-.26500	.29383	1.000	-1.1368	.6068	
Total organizational climate	Graduate assistant	Assistant lecturer	-.02890	.09151	1.000	-.3004	.2426
		lecturer	.00614	.07756	1.000	-.2240	.2363
		Assistant professor	-.12510	.10426	1.000	-.4345	.1842
		Associate professor	-.17315	.19685	1.000	-.7572	.4109
		other	.14685	.26926	1.000	-.6521	.9458
	Assistant lecturer	Graduate assistant	.02890	.09151	1.000	-.2426	.3004
		lecturer	.03504	.06626	1.000	-.1616	.2316
		Assistant professor	-.09621	.09615	1.000	-.3815	.1891
		Associate professor	-.14425	.19268	1.000	-.7160	.4275
		other	.17575	.26622	1.000	-.6142	.9657
	lecturer	Graduate assistant	-.00614	.07756	1.000	-.2363	.2240
		Assistant lecturer	-.03504	.06626	1.000	-.2316	.1616
		Assistant professor	-.13124	.08297	1.000	-.3774	.1150
		Associate professor	-.17929	.18645	1.000	-.7325	.3740
		other	.14071	.26175	1.000	-.6359	.9174
	Assistant professor	Graduate assistant	.12510	.10426	1.000	-.1842	.4345
		Assistant lecturer	.09621	.09615	1.000	-.1891	.3815
		lecturer	.13124	.08297	1.000	-.1150	.3774

	Associate professor	-.04804	.19905	1.000	-.6386	.5426
	other	.27196	.27087	1.000	-.5317	1.0757
Associate professor	Graduate assistant	.17315	.19685	1.000	-.4109	.7572
	Assistant lecturer	.14425	.19268	1.000	-.4275	.7160
	lecturer	.17929	.18645	1.000	-.3740	.7325
	Assistant professor	.04804	.19905	1.000	-.5426	.6386
	other	.32000	.31820	1.000	-.6241	1.2641
other	Graduate assistant	-.14685	.26926	1.000	-.9458	.6521
	Assistant lecturer	-.17575	.26622	1.000	-.9657	.6142
	lecturer	-.14071	.26175	1.000	-.9174	.6359
	Assistant professor	-.27196	.27087	1.000	-1.0757	.5317
	Associate professor	-.32000	.31820	1.000	-1.2641	.6241

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Descriptive statistics

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
LM	Graduate assistant	2.44	0.75	0.14	2.15	2.74	1.00	4.00
	Assistant lecturer	2.50	0.60	0.09	2.31	2.69	2.00	4.00
	lecturer	2.52	0.72	0.06	2.39	2.64	1.00	4.00
	Assistant professor	3.00	0.80	0.17	2.66	3.35	2.00	4.00
	Associate professor	3.75	0.50	0.25	2.95	4.55	3.00	4.00
	other	2.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	Total	2.57	0.74	0.05	2.48	2.67	1.00	4.00
DM	Graduate assistant	3.48	0.70	0.13	3.20	3.75	1.97	5.00
	Assistant lecturer	3.51	0.83	0.13	3.24	3.77	1.90	5.00
	lecturer	3.41	0.79	0.07	3.27	3.54	1.00	5.00
	Assistant professor	3.67	0.89	0.19	3.28	4.05	1.68	5.00
	Associate professor	3.60	0.68	0.34	2.52	4.67	2.73	4.25
	other	2.73	0.73	0.52	-3.82	9.27	2.21	3.24
	Total	3.46	0.79	0.05	3.35	3.56	1.00	5.00
PB	Graduate assistant	2.75	0.84	0.16	2.42	3.08	1.25	5.00
	Assistant lecturer	2.95	0.64	0.10	2.75	3.16	2.00	4.00
	lecturer	2.86	0.74	0.06	2.73	2.98	1.00	4.75
	Assistant professor	2.91	0.73	0.15	2.60	3.23	1.50	4.25
	Associate professor	2.81	0.66	0.33	1.77	3.86	2.25	3.75
	other	2.63	0.53	0.38	-2.14	7.39	2.25	3.00

	Total	2.86	0.73	0.05	2.77	2.96	1.00	5.00
HR	Graduate assistant	3.59	0.80	0.15	3.28	3.91	2.00	5.00
	Assistant lecturer	3.88	0.52	0.08	3.71	4.04	3.00	5.00
	lecturer	3.66	0.75	0.06	3.53	3.79	2.00	5.00
	Assistant professor	3.65	1.03	0.21	3.21	4.10	2.00	5.00
	Associate professor	3.75	0.50	0.25	2.95	4.55	3.00	4.00
	other	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Total	3.69	0.75	0.05	3.60	3.79	2.00	5.00
WC	Graduate assistant	3.76	0.59	0.11	3.53	4.00	2.20	4.80
	Assistant lecturer	3.44	0.81	0.13	3.18	3.70	1.40	4.80
	lecturer	3.53	0.63	0.05	3.42	3.63	2.00	4.80
	Assistant professor	3.41	0.78	0.16	3.07	3.75	1.80	4.20
	Associate professor	3.15	1.10	0.55	1.40	4.90	2.20	4.20
	other	4.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	Total	3.52	0.69	0.05	3.44	3.61	1.40	4.80
EW	Graduate assistant	3.72	0.65	0.13	3.46	3.98	2.60	5.00
	Assistant lecturer	3.62	0.63	0.10	3.42	3.82	2.00	5.00
	lecturer	3.57	0.61	0.05	3.46	3.67	2.00	5.00
	Assistant professor	3.66	0.72	0.15	3.35	3.97	1.80	4.80
	Associate professor	3.65	0.53	0.26	2.81	4.49	3.20	4.20
	other	3.80	0.28	0.20	1.26	6.34	3.60	4.00
	Total	3.61	0.63	0.04	3.53	3.69	1.80	5.00
CI	Graduate assistant	3.58	0.87	0.17	3.24	3.93	2.25	5.00
	Assistant lecturer	3.63	0.77	0.12	3.38	3.88	2.25	5.00
	lecturer	3.74	0.86	0.07	3.60	3.89	2.25	5.00
	Assistant professor	3.97	0.54	0.11	3.74	4.21	2.25	4.75
	Associate professor	3.81	1.14	0.57	1.99	5.63	2.25	5.00
	other	3.13	1.24	0.88	-7.99	14.24	2.25	4.00
	Total	3.72	0.83	0.05	3.62	3.83	2.25	5.00
JS	Graduate assistant	3.10	0.30	0.06	2.98	3.22	2.46	3.76
	Assistant lecturer	3.11	0.32	0.05	3.01	3.22	2.51	3.76
	lecturer	3.10	0.33	0.03	3.05	3.16	2.22	3.94
	Assistant professor	3.33	0.44	0.09	3.14	3.52	2.45	3.91
	Associate professor	3.19	0.07	0.03	3.08	3.30	3.09	3.23
	other	2.93	0.71	0.51	-3.49	9.34	2.42	3.43
	Total	3.13	0.34	0.02	3.08	3.17	2.22	3.94
Total organizational climate	Graduate assistant	3.33	0.39	0.07	3.18	3.48	2.34	3.99
	Assistant lecturer	3.36	0.30	0.05	3.27	3.46	2.77	4.14
	lecturer	3.33	0.37	0.03	3.26	3.39	2.46	4.08
	Assistant professor	3.46	0.45	0.09	3.26	3.65	2.41	4.13
	Associate professor	3.51	0.32	0.16	3.00	4.01	3.13	3.90
	other	3.19	0.32	0.23	0.33	6.04	2.96	3.41
	Total	3.35	0.37	0.02	3.30	3.40	2.34	4.14

Appendix H: Post-Hoc test for level of education

Multiple Comparisons							
Bonferroni							
Dependent Variable	(I) Edu	(J) Edu	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
LM	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	.00394	.10199	1.000	-.2421	.2499
		PHD	-.56799	.14668	.000	-.9218	-.2142
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	-.00394	.10199	1.000	-.2499	.2421
		PHD	-.57193	.14395	.000	-.9191	-.2247
	PHD	BA/BSC	.56799	.14668	.000	.2142	.9218
		MA/MSC	.57193	.14395	.000	.2247	.9191
DM	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	.10542	.11344	1.000	-.1682	.3790
		PHD	-.03498	.16314	1.000	-.4285	.3585
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	-.10542	.11344	1.000	-.3790	.1682
		PHD	-.14041	.16010	1.000	-.5266	.2458
	PHD	BA/BSC	.03498	.16314	1.000	-.3585	.4285
		MA/MSC	.14041	.16010	1.000	-.2458	.5266
PB	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	.22532	.10319	.090	-.0236	.4742
		PHD	.26144	.14840	.238	-.0965	.6194
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	-.22532	.10319	.090	-.4742	.0236
		PHD	.03611	.14564	1.000	-.3152	.3874
	PHD	BA/BSC	-.26144	.14840	.238	-.6194	.0965
		MA/MSC	-.03611	.14564	1.000	-.3874	.3152
HR	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	-.06075	.10653	1.000	-.3177	.1962
		PHD	-.20639	.15321	.538	-.5759	.1631
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	.06075	.10653	1.000	-.1962	.3177
		PHD	-.14564	.15036	1.000	-.5083	.2170
	PHD	BA/BSC	.20639	.15321	.538	-.1631	.5759
		MA/MSC	.14564	.15036	1.000	-.2170	.5083
WC	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	-.02594	.09842	1.000	-.2633	.2114
		PHD	-.11580	.14154	1.000	-.4572	.2256
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	.02594	.09842	1.000	-.2114	.2633
		PHD	-.08986	.13891	1.000	-.4249	.2452
	PHD	BA/BSC	.11580	.14154	1.000	-.2256	.4572
		MA/MSC	.08986	.13891	1.000	-.2452	.4249
EW	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	-.02843	.08960	1.000	-.2445	.1877
		PHD	-.11463	.12886	1.000	-.4254	.1962
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	.02843	.08960	1.000	-.1877	.2445
		PHD	-.08620	.12646	1.000	-.3912	.2188
	PHD	BA/BSC	.11463	.12886	1.000	-.1962	.4254
		MA/MSC	.08620	.12646	1.000	-.2188	.3912
CI	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	.07805	.11630	1.000	-.2025	.3586
		PHD	-.42096	.16726	.038	-.8244	-.0175
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	-.07805	.11630	1.000	-.3586	.2025
		PHD	-.49901	.16415	.008	-.8949	-.1031
	PHD	BA/BSC	.42096	.16726	.038	.0175	.8244
		MA/MSC	.49901	.16415	.008	.1031	.8949
JS	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	.01103	.04798	1.000	-.1047	.1268
		PHD	-.21174	.06901	.007	-.3782	-.0453
	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	-.01103	.04798	1.000	-.1268	.1047
		PHD	-.22277	.06772	.003	-.3861	-.0594
	PHD	BA/BSC	.21174	.06901	.007	.0453	.3782
		MA/MSC	.22277	.06772	.003	.0594	.3861
OC	BA/BSC	MA/MSC	.03116	.05112	1.000	-.0921	.1545
		PHD	-.18145	.07352	.043	-.3588	-.0041

	MA/MSC	BA/BSC	-.03116	.05112	1.000	-.1545	.0921
		PHD	-.21261	.07215	.011	-.3866	-.0386
	PHD	BA/BSC	.18145	.07352	.043	.0041	.3588
		MA/MSC	.21261	.07215	.011	.0386	.3866

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

		Descriptives							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
LM	BA/BSC	91	2.4945	.70512	.07392	2.3477	2.6414	1.00	4.00
	MA/MSC	106	2.4906	.66541	.06463	2.3624	2.6187	1.00	4.00
	PHD	32	3.0625	.87759	.15514	2.7461	3.3789	1.00	4.00
	TOTAL	229	2.5721	.73765	.04875	2.4760	2.6681	1.00	4.00
DM	BA/BSC	91	3.5003	.76441	.08013	3.3411	3.6595	1.90	5.00
	MA/MSC	106	3.3949	.85085	.08264	3.2310	3.5588	1.00	5.00
	PHD	32	3.5353	.66697	.11790	3.2948	3.7758	1.68	4.25
	TOTAL	229	3.4564	.79243	.05237	3.3532	3.5596	1.00	5.00
PB	BA/BSC	91	3.0036	.74616	.07822	2.8482	3.1590	1.00	5.00
	MA/MSC	106	2.7783	.72729	.07064	2.6382	2.9184	1.00	4.75
	PHD	32	2.7422	.62696	.11083	2.5161	2.9682	1.25	4.00
	TOTAL	229	2.8628	.72807	.04811	2.7680	2.9576	1.00	5.00
HR	BA/BSC	91	3.6374	.72290	.07578	3.4868	3.7879	2.00	5.00
	MA/MSC	106	3.6981	.74540	.07240	3.5546	3.8417	2.00	5.00
	PHD	32	3.8438	.80760	.14276	3.5526	4.1349	2.00	5.00
	TOTAL	229	3.6943	.74517	.04924	3.5973	3.7914	2.00	5.00
WC	BA/BSC	91	3.4967	.76033	.07970	3.3384	3.6550	1.40	4.80
	MA/MSC	106	3.5226	.64236	.06239	3.3989	3.6464	2.20	4.80
	PHD	32	3.6125	.61788	.10923	3.3897	3.8353	2.20	4.20
	TOTAL	229	3.5249	.68668	.04538	3.4355	3.6143	1.40	4.80
EW	BA/BSC	91	3.5791	.64743	.06787	3.4443	3.7140	1.80	5.00
	MA/MSC	106	3.6075	.64316	.06247	3.4837	3.7314	2.00	5.00
	PHD	32	3.6937	.49770	.08798	3.5143	3.8732	2.80	4.80
	TOTAL	229	3.6083	.62530	.04132	3.5269	3.6897	1.80	5.00
CI	BA/BSC	91	3.7015	.79398	.08323	3.5362	3.8669	2.25	5.00
	MA/MSC	106	3.6235	.86122	.08365	3.4576	3.7894	2.25	5.00
	PHD	32	4.1225	.69714	.12324	3.8712	4.3738	2.25	5.00
	TOTAL	229	3.7242	.82685	.05464	3.6166	3.8319	2.25	5.00
JS	BA/BSC	91	3.1026	.30770	.03226	3.0386	3.1667	2.29	3.76
	MA/MSC	106	3.0916	.35365	.03435	3.0235	3.1597	2.22	3.94
	PHD	32	3.3144	.35130	.06210	3.1877	3.4410	2.38	3.91
	TOTAL	229	3.1271	.34278	.02265	3.0825	3.1718	2.22	3.94
OC	BA/BSC	91	3.3442	.34462	.03613	3.2724	3.4159	2.42	4.19
	MA/MSC	106	3.3130	.37756	.03667	3.2403	3.3857	2.42	4.10
	PHD	32	3.5256	.32438	.05734	3.4087	3.6426	2.77	4.10
	TOTAL	229	3.3551	.36303	.02399	3.3078	3.4024	2.42	4.19