

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AS A PREDICTOR OF EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION: EVIDENCE FROM COVENANT UNIVERSITY

Anthonia Adenike.

Abstract

The study aim to explore organizational climate as a predictor of employee job satisfaction of academic staff from a private Nigerian University. The study of the antecedents of job satisfaction is important because of the role it plays in job satisfaction of employees which in turn affects organizational productivity. Data were collected from three hundred and eighty-four academic staff of the university with the aid of questionnaire out of which a total of two hundred and ninety-three questionnaires were returned fully and appropriately filled. Three hypotheses were tested and the results of the finding showed a significant positive relationship between these two variables. Thus, the study then paves way into other research opportunities in the field to stretch the depth of knowledge into public universities- i.e. the federal and state universities. It also serves as eye opener to conduct the research into other zones in Nigeria to see whether their organizational climate in relation to job satisfaction of the academics in those places will differ from what we have in the south-west Nigeria. Therefore, apart from confirming a theoretical proposition, the findings of this study are likely to have significant practical value.

Introduction

Organizations that have goals to achieve require satisfied and happy staff, (Oshagbemi, 2000). The ability of any university to take off and achieve its goals is a function of its ability to attract, retain and maintain competent and satisfied staff into its employment. The university is an institution of higher learning that provides manpower needs to advance national development in both the public and private sector. The Nigerian universities could be classified according to their years of establishment thus: first, second, third and fourth generation universities. The first generation universities are the universities established in the country before the 1970's. The second-generation universities are those universities established in the 1970's. The third generation universities are those universities established either by the federal or state governments in the 1980's and 1990's while the fourth generation universities are those universities established in the late 1990's and 2000's mainly by private individuals or organizations (Gberevbie, 2006). Universities whether private or public are training grounds for students doing the comprehensive courses in order to translate theory into practice. They conduct training for all kinds of programmes or disciplines. Both government and private individuals fund public and private universities respectively.

University lecturers are currently facing many challenges in education and society, which may well affect their levels of job satisfaction (Kniveton, 1991). This raises concern regarding the attitudes of educators towards their work and their levels of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Steyn and Van Wyk, 1999). An earlier study by Kestetner (1994) showed that almost half

of new educators leave the field during the first five years of their employment. This should be of great concern to all employers because unhappy and dissatisfied employees may mean poor performance and high staff turnover.

Organizational climate serves as a measure of individual perceptions or feelings about an organization. Organizational climate includes management or leadership styles, participation in decision making, provision of challenging jobs to employees, reduction of boredom and frustration, provision of benefits, personnel policies, provision of good working conditions and creation of suitable career ladder for academics (Nicholson and Miljus, 1992).

It would appear in general that Nigerian academic staffers are largely dissatisfied with overall academic climate. This is based on the researcher's observations and interactions with members of the academic staff. The academic staff indicates that there is some form of dissatisfaction. Academics view their organizational climate as characterized by the following factors: Unchallenging jobs, shortage of personnel where lecturers are expected to perform

responsibilities, which were supposed to be performed by other employees, lack of feedback about performance, lack of recognition for work done well through merit or announcements in

meetings, lack of material resources which make it difficult for employees to carry

out duties, poor communication where there is no two-way communication between managers and subordinates and lack of staff development activities which prevent personnel from being

equipped with knowledge and skill that they need in order to provide quality service (Fajana, 2002).

When the above-mentioned problems are perceived, dissatisfaction in the workplace manifest.

Thus, it is in the view of this that the following objectives are put up.

- a. To find out the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction among academics in South-West Nigeria.
- b. To determine the proportion of faculty leaving a university who are not satisfied with their workload, feedback about performance salary package.
- c. To identify organizational climate variables that can cause job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction of academics.

Review of Literature

There are few, if any, concepts more central to industrial / organizational psychology than job satisfaction. In this century, the advent of the human relations movement is credited with emphasizing the importance of workplace attitudes. Indeed, the pioneers of the movement – Likert (1967), Maslow (1970), McGregor (1966) and Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) are credited with raising the field's consciousness with respect to workplace morale. Hoppock's (1935) landmark book roughly coincided with the Hawthorne studies that were the origin of the human relations movement. Hoppock's opening to his book aptly describes the emphasis that scholars of the time placed on Job satisfaction, "whether or not one finds his employment sufficiently satisfactory to continue in it ... is a matter of the first importance to employer and employee" (P.5). However, from this auspicious

beginning, the job satisfaction literature has had its ebbs and flows.

The concept of job satisfaction has been widely defined by different people. (Locke 1979) specified that job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job experiences. Spector (1997) refined the definition of job satisfaction to constitute an attitudinal variable that measures how a person feels about his or her job, including different facets of the job. Rice, Gentile and Mcfarlin (1991) defined job satisfaction as an overall feeling about ones job or career in terms of specific facets of job or careers (e.g. compensation, autonomy, coworkers). It can be related to specific outcomes, for example, productivity. Many studies on the determinants of job satisfaction in higher educational institutions in the developed world are available (Hickson and Oshagbemi, 1999; Brewer and McMahan-Landers, 2003 and Turrel, Price and Joyner, 2008). However, in developing countries such as Nigeria, efforts in this direction are scarce. Examples of investigated jobs are: Satisfaction among heads of post-primary institutions in Delta state, Nigeria (Whawho, 2008; Edem and Lawal, 2006).

Job satisfaction means the contentment of the employees because of their jobs. It is the personal evaluation of the job conditions (the job itself, the attitude of the administration etc.) or the consequences or (wages, occupational security etc.) acquired from the job (Fletcher and Williams, 2006). According to another definition, job satisfaction is the phenomenon ascertaining the contentment of the employee and appearing when the qualifications of the job and the demands of the employees match (Reichers, 2006). In line with these definitions, job satisfaction might be handled as the consequence resulting from the comparison between the

expectations of the employee from his job and the job in question which is performed. The consequence may emerge as satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the employee from the job.

When the employee sees that his expectations are not met in the job environment, the job dissatisfaction emerges. It leads to the decrease in the workforce productivity, organizational commitment and commitment to the job and increase in the rates of the optional discontinuation of the job (Santhapparaj, Srin and Ling, 2005; Payne and Morrison, 2002; Redfern, 2005 and Denizer, 2008; Gellatly, 2005; Sagie, 2002). Besides, the medical conditions of the employees might be affected negatively. Lower job satisfaction in the servers has been observed to bring about neurotic (insomnia and headache) and emotional negativeness (stress, disappointment) (Denizer, 2008). Nevertheless, the best proof to the deterioration of the works is the lower job satisfaction. It causes secretly deceleration of the works, job success and job productivity and increases in the workforce turnover (Iverson and Deery, 2007; Lum, 2006), occupational accidents and complaints.

Job satisfaction can be described as one's feelings or state of mind regarding the nature of the work. Job satisfaction can be influenced by a variety of factors such as the quality of the academics' relationships with their supervisors, the quality of the physical environment in which they work and the degree of fulfillment in their work (Lambert, Pasupuleti, Cluse-Tolar and Jennings, 2008). Job satisfaction is a key factor in productivity (Oshagbemi, 2000). However, job satisfaction is certainly not the only factor that causes people to produce at different rates (Daniels, 2001). One major reason for the continuing interest in job satisfaction, as Wilson and Rosenfeld (1990) pointed

out is that, positive and negative attitudes towards work may exert powerful effects on many forms of organizational behaviour. Relevant research data have demonstrated the importance of job satisfaction in an organization, especially, in terms of its efficiency, productivity, employee relations, absenteeism and turnover (Baron, 1996, Maghradi, 1999 and Fajana 2001).

In addition to being influenced by the level of satisfaction, performance is affected by a worker's ability as well as a number of situational and environmental factors such as mechanical breakdowns, low quality materials, inadequate supply of materials, availability of stocks and market forces (Boro, et al). Nevertheless, in the case of lower-level jobs where little ability is required, job satisfaction seems to be one of the key determinants of performance (Cockburn & Perry, 2004; Boro, et al 2001). Therefore, job satisfaction is very important in an organization because if employees are not satisfied, their work performance, productivity, commitment as well as the interpersonal relationships among the management and their subordinates tend to be lowered (Fajana, 1996). For instance, in an organization where work performance is not recognized through promotion and salary increases, productivity of employees tends to be lowered.

In an effort to satisfy the needs of employees, many managers make use of incentive programmes, despite the fact that research has consistently confirmed that no amount of money will translate into sustainable levels of job satisfaction or motivation (Joyce and Slocum, 2004). Fajana (2002) in his work identified a long range of factors combined to affect individual's level of satisfaction. These include, supervision or leadership (concern for people, task, participation), job design (scope, depth, interest, perceived value),

working conditions, social relationships, perceived long range opportunities, perceived opportunities elsewhere, levels of aspiration and need achievement.

Most scholars recognize that job satisfaction is a global concept that also comprises various facets. The most typical categorization of facets; Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) considers five: pay, promotions, coworkers, supervision and the work itself. Locke (1976) adds a few other facets: recognition, working conditions and company and management. Fajana(2002) refers to job satisfaction as the general job attitudes of employees. He divided job satisfaction into five major components as including; attitude toward work group, general working conditions, attitudes toward the organization, monetary benefits and attitude toward supervision which he said is intricately connected with the individual's state of mind about the work itself and life in general.

Organizational Climate

Researchers in organizational behavior have long been interested in understanding employees' perceptions of the work environment and how these perceptions influence individuals' work-related attitudes and behaviours. Early researchers suggested that the social climate or atmosphere created in a workplace had significant consequences-employees' perceptions of the work context purportedly influenced the extent to which people were satisfied and perform up to their potential, which in turn, was predicted to influence organizational productivity (e.g Katz& Kahn, 2004; Likert,1997, McGregor, 2000). The construct of climate has been studied extensively and has proven useful in capturing perceptions of the work context (Denisson, 2006; Ostroff, Kinicki & Tamkins, 2007). Climate has been described

as an experientially based description of the work environment and, more specifically, employees' perceptions of the formal and informal policies, practices and procedures in their organization (Schneider, 2008).

An important distinction has been made between psychological and organizational climate (Hellriegel & Slocum, 1994; James & Jones, 2004). Individuals' own perceptions of the work environment constitute psychological climate at the individual level of analysis, whereas organizational climate has been proposed as an organizational or unit-level construct. When employees within a unit or organization agree on their perceptions of the work context, unit-level or organizational climate is said to exist (Jones & James, 2004; Joyce & Slocum, 2004). A large number of studies have consistently demonstrated relationships between unit or organizational climate and individual outcomes such as performance, satisfaction, commitment, involvement and accidents (Ostroff et al, 2007).

Organizational climate comprises of cognate sets of attitudes, values and practices that characterize the members of a particular organization. Xaba (1996) defined organizational climate as consciously perceived environmental factors subject to organizational control. Low (1997) coined the term climate to describe the attitudes, feelings and social process of organizations. According to him, climate in this view falls into three major and well-known categories: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. Kaczka and Kirk (1978) defined organizational climate as a set of attributes, which can be perceived within a particular organization, department or unit.

The behavioural science literature is replete with theories and empirical research focusing on employee behaviour as a function of the simultaneous variation in both organizational dimensions and individual

characteristics Hellriegel et al, 1994). Apparently neither individual organization dimensions (climate) nor individual characteristics (job satisfaction, tension, role clarity), by themselves, explain a substantial amount of the observed variation in job satisfaction or organizational effectiveness criteria. The relationship of organizational climate to individual behaviour often emphasizes the role of employee perceptions of these dimensions as intervening variables (Schneider, 2008). Likert's approach to the study of organization's illustrates the importance of employee perceptions, e.g. his interaction – influence mode/relates causal, intervening and end-result variables (Locke, 1976 & Likert, 1967). Causal variables like climate dimensions and leadership techniques interact with personality to produce perceptions, and it is through assessment of these perceptions that the relationship between causal and end-result variables may be analyzed.

Several studies have focused on perceptually based measures of climate dimensions and job satisfaction, Friedlander and Margulies (1968), using perception data from an electronics firm, studied the multiple impacts of organizational climate components and individual job values on workers satisfaction.

They found that climate had the greatest impact on satisfaction with interpersonal relationships on a job, a moderate impact upon satisfaction with recognizable advancement in the organization, and relatively less impact upon self-realization from task involvement. Pritchard and Karasick (1993) studies 76 managers from two different industrial organizations. They found climate dimensions to be moderately strongly related to such job satisfaction facets as security working conditions and advancement opportunities. Schneider (2008) surveyed bank customers and learnt

that their perception of the bank's climate was related to a form of bank switching (customer dissatisfaction). Customers who perceived their bank's climate negatively tended to switch banks more frequently than did those who perceived their banks as having a customer–employee centred atmosphere.

Methods

This study involves two important variables- organizational climate and job satisfaction. Thus, to empirically examine the relative contribution of organizational climate variables in predicting employee job satisfaction, we shall make use of the following indicators and variables: For job satisfaction, we have appropriate administrative style, support from superiors, work load, feedback about performance, clear lines of communication, salary package and promotional opportunities. Furthermore, organizational climate is measured with indicators and variables given as: management and leadership styles, participation in decision making, challenging jobs, boredom and frustration, fringe benefits, personnel policies, working conditions and suitable career ladder.

The research was conducted at Covenant University, Canaanland, Ota, with a total population of four hundred and nineteen (419). Out of this population, three hundred and eighty-four questionnaires (384) were chosen as sample size but a total of two hundred and ninety-three (293) questionnaires were returned fully and appropriately filled. This represents a response rate of 76.30%. The respondents include, the professors, Associate Professors/readers and Senior Lecturers (these are classified as senior lecturers), Lecturer 1, Lecturer 11, Assistant Lecturers and Graduate Assistants (these are regarded as junior lecturers).

The questionnaire had three sections: A, B and C. Section A dealt with questions directed to senior and junior academic staff covering major areas of this research with seventy-three (73) measuring questions. Section B contained four (4) open ended questions about what the respondents feel about their organization's personal career development, their work environment, professional career development and their involvement in decision making. Lastly, Section C dealt with the respondents bio-data information (i.e. the demographic and biographical details of the academics including the years of experience, gender, highest academic qualifications) with four measuring questions.

Five-point likert scale was used in the design of the questionnaire. There is no established number of categories that is deemed optional for research scaling. In practice, scales of five categories are typical (Reichheld, 2003; Grigoroudis and Sikos, 2002).

Results

For purification of scale, we used Confirmatory Factor Analysis in which the Non-factor Index (NFI), Confirmatory Factor Index (CFI), Standardized Root Mean Square Error (SRME), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the degree of freedom were determined. 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.

The range of standardized factor loading is considerably high for all variables, the lowest being 0.30- "I am generally satisfied with the leadership style in my organization"

a variable in management and leadership style. Apart from this, all other variables have factor loading above 0.30. For example, the range of standardized factor loading for each of the major variables are management and leadership style (.30-.78), participation in decision making (.43-.77), challenging job (.80-.92), boredom and frustration (.38-.83), fringe benefits (.76-.92), personnel policies (.43-.92), working condition (.32-.97), suitable career ladder (.86-.99), Appropriate Administrative Style (.35-.91), Support from supervisors (.80-.97) Work load (.34-.91), feedback about performance (.71-.96), Clear lines of communication (.67-.99), Realistic salary package (.52-.92) and finally, Promotional opportunities (.32-.92).

Most of the variables are within the acceptable range of 0.4 for applied research. The range is highest in career ladder with 0.86-0.99. Generally, there is internal consistency and overall homogeneity among items comprising the scales. The reliability test using the Cronbach alpha shows a high value of between 0.80-0.90, indicating that the research instrument is reliable, that is, it has consistently measured what it is supposed to measure.

The structural equation model result using AMOS 18.0 with NNFI ranging from 0.90-0.96, CFI= 0.92-0.99), SRMR= (0.04-0.09) and RMSEA= (0.7-0.11) shows that the model fits the data rather well with chi-square ranging from (61.32-510.38) significant at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 1 Gender.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1	209	71.3	71.3	71.3
2	84	28.7	28.7	100.0
Total	293	100.0	100.0	

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Result (2010).

The respondents were mostly males, that is 209 respondents out of the total 293 questionnaires returned were male representing 71.3% of the total sample while 84 respondents (28.7%) were female, which is consistent with the gender distribution of academics in general.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: *There is no significant relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction among academics in South-West Nigeria.*

Table 2: Correlation Analysis of Organisational Climate and Job Satisfaction

	Organcimate	Jobsatis
Organcimate	Pearson Correlation	.671(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	40.268
	Covariance	.138
	N	293
Jobsatis	Pearson Correlation	.671(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	35.118
	Covariance	.120
	N	293

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Result (2010).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The finding showed a significant positive relationship between these two variables and the Pearson Correlation using 2-tail test at $r = .671$, 0.01 significant level and 293 degree of freedom. The sum of squares and cross products for organizational climate is 40.268 and 35.118 for job satisfaction while covariances for the two are 0.138 and 0.120 respectively for organizational climate at 293 degree of freedom.

Hypothesis 2: *Job satisfaction cannot be significantly described by work load, feedback about performance and support from superiors.*

Table 3: Summary of Estimated Coefficient of Supervisor Support, Workload and Job Satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Tolerance			VIF	B
1								
	(Constant)	1.098	.075		14.682	.000		
	SUPERVSUP	.257	.015	.553	17.059	.000	.669	1.495
	WORKLOAD	.179	.018	.269	10.106	.000	.992	1.008
	WORKLOAD	.218	.017	.417	12.884	.000	.671	1.489

a. Dependent Variable: JOBSATIS

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Result (2010).

The table of the estimate coefficients is presented above. The first line of the table indicates that the dependent variable is job satisfaction. This is followed by the three estimated coefficients. These include .257, .179, and .218. Reported to the right of the coefficient in the output are the standard errors. The standard error for each of the factors include .015 for lack of support from superiors (SUPERVSUP), .18 for work overload (WORKLOAD) and .17 for lack of feedback about performance (FEEDBACK).

The corresponding t statistics for each of these factors include 17.059 for lack of support from superiors, 10.106 for work overload and 12.884 for lack of feedback

about performance, all of which have a significance of 0.000 in a one-tailed test. Therefore, the result supported the alternative hypothesis that job dissatisfaction can be significantly described by work overload, lack of feedback about performance and lack of support from superiors.

Hypothesis 3: *Organizational climate does not include boredom and frustration, personnel policies, working conditions and participation in decision making.*

Table 4: Regression table on Coefficient of Determination of participation in Decision-making, Boredom and Frustration, Personnel Policies, Working Conditions and Organizational Climate

Model 1	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.926(a)	.857	.855	.14150

a. Predictors: (Constant), DECISIONMAKE, BOREDOM, WORKCOND, PERSPOLICY b. Dependent Variable: ORGANCLIMATE. Source: Researcher's Field Survey Result (2010).

The coefficient of determination table above presents a statistic index. This statistic is called the coefficient of determination and referred to as r^2 . In this analysis, 85.7% of the variability in organizational climate can be explained by boredom and frustration,

personnel policies, working conditions and participation in decision making. The remaining 14.30% of variability is due to other unexplained factors. This supports the further retention of the alternative hypothesis and the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 5: Paired Samples Test of Covenant Staff (Junior and Senior) Perception on Organisational Climate

		Paired Differences				t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	mgtcuj – mgtcus	.69231	5.26702	1.03295	-1.43509	2.81970	.670	25	.509
Pair 2	deccuj – deccus	.30769	5.68344	1.11462	-1.98790	2.60329	.276	25	.785
Pair 3	challcuj – challcus	.92308	4.11750	.80751	-.74002	2.58617	1.143	25	.264
Pair 4	borecuj – borecus	.07692	2.36513	.46384	-.87837	1.03222	.166	25	.870
Pair 5	fringcuj – fringecus	.53846	5.78433	1.13440	-1.79788	2.87480	.475	25	.639
Pair 6	perscuj – perscus	1.69231	5.15961	1.01188	-.39170	3.77632	1.672	25	.107
Pair 7	wkconcuj – wkconcus	2.11538	7.08422	1.38933	-.74599	4.97676	1.523	25	.140
Pair 8	careercuj – careercus	.07692	4.99538	.97968	-2.09460	1.94076	-.079	25	.938

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Result (2010).

From the responses as shown in the table above, none of the values on the final column labeled Sig. (2-tailed) is less than .005. Obviously, these values are higher than our specified alpha value of .05. Thus, we can rightly conclude that there is no significant difference in the way junior and senior academics of Covenant University experience their organizational climate. Worthy of note again on the table is the fact that none of the t-values has negative sign in the figure except for the last variable – career ladder i.e. -0.79.

In comparing the mean values, we can conclude that there was a significant decrease in all of the organizational climate variables test score between the junior and senior academics in Covenant University except for the career ladder variable that has a slight increase between the means for the junior and senior academics (i.e. $\text{careercuj}=15.4615$ and $\text{careercus}=15.5385$).

Table 6: Descriptive Paired Samples Statistics of Covenant Staff (Junior and Senior) Perception on Organisational Climate

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	mgtcuj	20.3462	26	3.56586	.69932
	mgtcus	19.6538	26	4.54262	.89088
Pair 2	deccuj	21.8462	26	3.27038	.64137
	deccus	21.5385	26	4.25423	.83432
Pair 3	challcuj	21.9615	26	3.16835	.62137
	challcus	21.0385	26	2.47355	.48510
Pair 4	borecuj	7.2308	26	1.30561	.25605
	borecus	7.1538	26	1.93271	.37904
Pair 5	ringcuj	12.3846	26	3.85826	.75667
	fringcus	11.8462	26	4.44245	.87124
Pair 6	perscuj	16.7308	26	3.43578	.67381
	perscus	15.0385	26	3.75745	.73690
Pair 7	wkconcuj	25.8462	26	3.51787	.68991
	wkconcus	23.7308	26	5.26542	1.03263
Pair 8	careercuj	15.4615	26	4.46525	.87571
	careercus	15.5385	26	3.62470	.71086

Source: Researcher's Field Survey Result (2010).

Thus, the result of the paired-sample t-test conducted to determine if there is a difference in the way senior and junior academics perceive the existing organizational climate (for Covenant University) can be presented as follows: $M=20.3462$, $SD=3.56586$ for management and leadership style Covenant junior academics (mgtcuj), and $M=19.6538$, $SD=4.54262$ (mgtcus), $t(26)=.670$, $P>.005$. For challenging job junior academics (challcuj), $M=21.9615$, $SD=3.16835$, Senior academics (challcus), $M=21.0385$, $SD=2.47355$, $t(25)=1.143$. For working condition junior academics (wkconcuj), $M=25.8462$, $SD=3.51787$ and senior academics (wkconcus), $M=23.7308$, $SD=5.26542$, $t(25)=1.523$. In the same manner, the mean values, standard deviation, t-values and the p-values for the other variables are as shown in the table above with their significant decreases except for the last variable which is career ladder that has a slight

Discussion of Findings

For hypothesis one, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis finding shows that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Therefore, the first hypothesis is upheld at sum of squares and cross-products of 40.268 and 35.118 respectively, $df=293$ and $p\text{ value}=0.671$ significant level.

Correlation here is high because Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis reveals the significant positive relationship between the major variables i.e. Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction.

Literature indicates climates of an organization and job satisfactions of their employees vary together. That climate had the greatest impact on satisfaction with interpersonal relationships on a

job, a moderate impact upon satisfaction with recognizable advancement in the organization and relatively less impact upon self-realization from task involvement. Friedlander and Margulies (1999); Pritchard and Karasick, (1993); Salkind (2000). For the second hypothesis, findings from the use of multiple regression shows that the variability in job satisfaction can be explained by the factors like work load, feedback about performance and support from superiors. The remaining 20.2% of variability is due to other unexplained factors. Thus, this supports the rejection of the null hypothesis but support the acceptance of alternative hypothesis at $r = .798$, $df = 291$ and 0.000 significant level.

Literature suggests that satisfaction within an organization is as a result of poor planning, poor communication, unclear rules and regulations, unreasonable pressures, excessive work (otherwise known as work load), understaffing, uncooperative heads of departments/ units and non-academic duties. This was confirmed by our analysis. Several other studies affirmed these factors listed above as describing job satisfaction in organization. Baron, (1996), Carrell, Elbert and Hatfield (1998) and Denizer, (2008), in their studies identified organizational structure; rules, regulation and policies; supervision and leadership, work group; work environment, etc as factors that cause satisfaction in the work environment (Fajana, 2001).

The third hypothesis is upheld at $r^2 = .857$, $df = 292$ and at 0.000 significant level. The findings show that 85.7% of the variability in organizational climate can be explained by boredom and frustration, personnel policies, working conditions and participation in decision making. The remaining 14.30% of variability is due to other unexplained factors. This supports the further retention of the alternative hypothesis

and the rejection of the null hypothesis. Literature indicates different organizational climate as comprising personnel policies, working conditions, opportunity in partaking in decision making. For example, Sagie, (2002) and Udogo, (2008), admitted that communication, problem solving, decision making, learning and motivation all can be affected by the organizational climate, which in turn might have impact on the effectiveness and productivity of the organization as well as the work environment and employee well being in the workplace. Some studies (Weallens, 2000, Salkind, 2000 and Schneider, 2008) found that these variables- boredom and frustration, personnel policies working conditions and participation in decision making can be said to reliably make up organizational climate.

Conclusion

The main aim of this study is to test the validity in the Nigerian context of a widely accepted theory which suggests that the satisfaction of employee is the product of the climate in the organization in which he or she works using academics in a private University (Covenant University, Ota).

The study has contributed in the following ways:

The study provides valuable compact of ideas, facts and figures that can be used by academics, management practitioners and consultants in understanding the dynamics of relationships and resultant effects between organizational climate variables and job satisfaction variables.

The study provides insight into organizational factors that impinge on job satisfaction in a privatized environment using private university (in the South-West Nigeria) as sample area.

The previous studies on ground have explained a worker's job satisfaction as

a function of the individual's personal characteristics and characteristics of the job itself using variables like age, gender, educational status, time in position, conflict, closeness of supervision, amount of communication, etc. However, this study had provided other variables like lines of communication, salary package, promotional opportunities, personal policies, working conditions, participation in decision making, etc, to study job satisfaction in which none of these studies used combination of these variables. This study therefore, provides research opportunities for further researchers on the field to expand the horizon of knowledge on these variables identified as job satisfaction antecedents.

A lot of limitations were identified during the study such as the concentration of the study on the private university alone, which limit the reliability and validity of the results obtained. Thus, the study then paves way into other research opportunities in the field to stretch the depth of knowledge into public universities- i.e. the federal and state universities. It also serves as eye opener to conduct the research into other zones in Nigeria to see whether their organizational climate in relation to job satisfaction of the academics in those places will differ from what we have in the south-western Nigeria. Therefore, apart from confirming a theoretical proposition, the findings of this study are likely to have significant practical value.

References

- Baron, R. (1996). *Behaviour in Organizations*. Newton: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boro, L.; Thopeson, S & Patton, C. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour*. London: Routledge.
- Carrell, M. R.; Elbert, N. F., Hatfield, R. D.; Grobler, P. A.; Max, M. & Van der Schyft. (1998). *Human Resource Management in South Africa*. Cape Town: Prentice-Hall.
- Cockburn, D. and Haydn, T. (2004). *Recruiting and Retaining Teachers: Understanding Why Teachers Teach*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Cockburn, N. and Perry, D. (2004). *Human Resources Management*. Orlando: F. L. Dryden.
- Daniels, B. (2001). *The Wellness Payoff*. New York: Wiley.
- Denisson, D.R. (2006). *Organisational Culture: Can it be a key Lever for Driving Organisational Change? The International Handbook of Organisational Culture and Climate*. 4(2). 347-372.
- Denizer, D. (2008). *Accidents at Work and Work Related Health Problems by Sex, Status, Age and Severity*. *Journal of Health Management*. 26(2), 721-760.
- Edem, U.S and Lawal, O.O. (2006). *Job Satisfaction and Publication Output Among Librarians in Nigeria Universities*. *Library Management*. 20(2). 39-46.
- Fajana, Sola (1996). *Organizational Policies and Human Behaviour in Trade Unions Within the Confines of Democracy and Human Rights Objectives*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Fajana, Sola (2001). *The Nigerian Informal Sector: Freeing The Hidden Potential and Raising Standards*. Poster Session Paper Submitted to The Global Employment Forum, Geneva.

- Fajana, Sola (2002). Human Resource Management: An Introduction. Lagos: Labofin and Company.
- Fletcher, C and Williams, R. (2006). Performance Management, Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment. *British Journal of Management*. 7(2), 169-179.
- Friedlander, F and Margulies, N. (1999). "Multiple Impacts of Organizational Climate and Industrial Value Systems Upon Job Satisfaction". *Personnel Psychology*. 22, 171-183.
- Gberevbie, D.E.I (2006) "Recruitment and Quality Academic Staff Selection: The case study of Covenant University". *Ife PsycholoGia*. 14(2), p.118.
- Hellriegel, D and Slocum, J.W.(1984). "Organizational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies". *Academy of Management Journal*. 17, 255-280.
- Hickson, C and Oshagbemi, T. (1999). The Effect of Age on Satisfaction of Academics with Teaching and Research. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 26(5). 537-544.
- Hoppock, R. (1935) . *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper.
- Gellatly, I.R (2005). Individual and Group Determinants of Employee Absenteeism: A Test of a Causal Model. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*. 16(1). 469-485.
- Iverson, R.D and Deery, M.(2007). Turnover Culture in the Hospitality Industry. *Human Resource Journal*. 7(4), 71-82.
- James, O.J and James, O.P(2004). The Meaning of Organisations: The Role of Cognition and Values. *Organisational Climate and Culture*. 5(2). 40-84.
- Joyce, O.U and Slocum, J.W. (2004). Collective Climate: Agreement as a Basis for Defining Aggregate Climates in Organisations. *Academy of Management Journal*. 27(6) 721-742.
- Kaczka, E and Kirk, R (1978). "Managerial Climate, Work Groups and Organizational Performance". *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 12, 252-271.
- Katz, A.U and Kahn, J.K (2004). Organisational Climate and Job Satisfaction: A Conceptual Synthesis. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*. 16(2). 45-62.
- Kestetner, J. (1994). "New Teacher Induction. Findings of the Research and Implications for Minority Groups". *Journal of Teacher Education*. 45(1), 39-45.
- Kniveton, B. (1991). "An Investigation of Factors Contributing to Teachers Job Satisfaction". *School Psychology International*, 12, 361 – 370.
- Lambert, E.G; Pasupuleti,S; Cluse-Tolar,T and Jennings, M (2008). The Impact of Work-Family Conflict on Social Work and Human Service Worker Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment: An Exploratory Study. *Administration in Social Work*. 30(5) 55-74.
- Likert, R (1967). *The Human Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Likert, R (1997). Organisational Climate: Relationship to Organisational Structure, Process and Performance. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*. 11(4) 139-155.
- Locke, E.A (1976) "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction". In M.D Dunnette (Ed), *Handbook of Industrial and organizational Psychology*.
- Locke, E.A(1979) "What is Job Satisfaction? Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance" *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 4, 309-336.
- Low, D.A.(1997). *Human Development*. Pretoria: Kagiso.
- Lum, L.K.(2006). Explaining Nursing Turnover Intent: Job Satisfaction or Organisational Commitment. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*. 19(6), 305-320.
- Maghradi , A. (1999) "Assessing the Effect of Job Satisfaction on Managers". *Intl. J. Value –Based Management*, 12: 1-2.
- Maslow, A.H. (1965) *Eupsychian Management*, Homewood, IL: Irwin
- McGregor, D.M. (1966) *Leadership and Motivation*. Cambridge, MA : MIT press.
- McGregor, D.M (2000). A Note on Organisational Climate. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*. 16(2). 250-279.
- Nicholson, E.A and Miljus, R.C (1992). "Job Satisfaction and Turnover Among Liberal Arts College Professors". *Personnel Journal* .51: 840-845.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000) "Gender Differences in the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers". *Women in Management Review*. 15, 331-343.
- Ostroff, O.R; Kinicki, S.N and Tamkins, U.O(2007). Relationships Between Psychological Climate Perceptions and Work Outcomes: A Meta- Analytic Review. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*. 24(4) 389-416.
- Payne, R..L and Morrison, D (2002). The Differential Effects of Negative Affectivity on Measures of Well-Being Versus Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*. 24(3), 415-432.
- Pritchard, R and Karasick, B (1993). "The Effects of Organizational Climate on Managerial Job Performance and Job Satisfaction". *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*. 9, 110-119.
- Redfern, S.H (2005). Work Satisfaction, Stress, Quality of Care and Morale of older People in a Nursing Home. *Health and Social Care in the Community*. 10(6), 512-517.
- Reichers, A.E (2006). A Review and Reconceptualisation of Organisational Commitment. *Academy of Management Review*. 10(3), 465-476.
- Rice, R.W; Gentile, D.A & Mcfarlin, D.B. (1991). "Facet Importance and Job Satisfaction". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 76, 31- 39.
- Roethlisberger, F.J & Dickson, W.J (1939). *Management and The Worker*. New York: Wiley.

- Smith, P.C ; Kendall, L.M &Hulin, C.L (1969).The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA Sage.
- Sagie,A. (2002). Employee Absenteeism, Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: Another Look. Journal of Vocational Behaviour. 52(2), 156-171.
- Salkind, N. J. (2000). "Exploring Research". New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 4th Edition.
- Santhapparaj, A.S; Srini,V.J and Ling, K.L (2005). Job Satisfaction Among Women Managers in Malaysia Automobile Manufacturing Sector. Journal of Applied Science. 5(1).1553-1578.
- Schneider, I.I. (2008). Motivation and Organisational Climate. Journal of Personnel Psychology. 29(3). 371-392.
- Steyn, G. M. & Van Wyk, J. N. (1999)." Job Satisfaction. Perceptions of the Principals and Teachers in Urban Black Schools in South Africa". South African Journal of Education. 19(1), 37 – 43.
- Terrel, A.D; Price, W.T and Joyner, R.L (2008). Job Satisfaction Among Community College Occupational Technical Faculty Community. Journal of Applied Science. 22(1), 111-122.
- Udogo, (2008).Understanding Employee Commitment in the Public Organisation: A Study of the Juvenile Detention Center. International Journal of Public Administration. 18(8), 1269-1295.
- Weallens, F. (2000). Psychology at Work. New York: Columbia University, Press.
- Whawho, D.D (2008). Educational Administration: Planning and Supervision. Benin City. Spectrum Associates.
- Wilson, D.C and Rosenfeld, R.H (1990). Managing Organizations, London: McGraw Hill.
- Xaba, M. I. (1996). "Factors Influencing the Job Satisfaction of Senior Teachers in Schools Attended by Black Students". Unpublished MEd Dissertation, Patchefsroom, University for Christian Higher Education.

