# ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE: ITS IMPLICATIONS TO JOB SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE OF PERSONNEL IN STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (SUCS) IN EASTERN VISAYAS, PHILIPPINES

**Marilyn D. Cardoso[1], Caroline C. Uy**
[1]*Samar State University, Philippines*
malin_ssu@yahoo.com[1]

## Abstract

This study determined the relationship between organizational climate prevailing in SUCs in Eastern Visayas and the corresponding job satisfaction level and work performance of personnel. The study uses triangulation methodology in collecting the needed data. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed by Halpin and Croft (1962) was adapted to determine the organizational climate among the respondent-SUCs which involved 81 key officials, 130 faculty members, and 106 non-teaching personnel from 10 SUCs in the region during the school year 2010 – 2011. Results implied that the organizational climate prevailing in the respondent-SUCs approximated an open climate; thus, there is a high level of "esprit," "thrust," and "consideration."  The personnel enjoy friendly relations and show considerate satisfaction in their work; indicate motivation to overcome difficulties and frustrations, manifest desire, enthusiasm, and cooperation to work things out to keep the organization going. Moreover, the respondents were satisfied with their job; with a high level of work performance.  However, they had the lowest level of job satisfaction along professional growth due to limited seminars/training they have attended and inadequacy of scholarships and fellowship grants.  Results showed that the organizational climate prevailing in an SUC in Eastern Visayas could affect its personnel's job satisfaction and work performance.  A more "open climate" may lead to better job satisfaction and a higher level of work performance while in SUCs with approximately a "closed climate," the personnel may have low job satisfaction and work performance.

**Keywords**:  human resource development, HRD, organizational management, motivation, organizational culture

## I.  INTRODUCTION

Organizational climate is often referred to like the personality of the organization, and this pertains to the characteristics and properties of the organization. It is a shared perception of what the organization is like regarding practices, policies, procedures, routines, and rewards – what is important and what behaviors are expected and rewarded (Bowen and Ostroff, 2004). It can be expressed by adjectives as open, bustling, warm, easy-going, informal, cold,

impersonal, hostile, rigid and closed (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008).

Variables influencing the organizational climate, which include a variety of internal and external factors (Cherrington, 1994:470). These factors include the leadership style or behavior of the manager and the motivational techniques he employs to stimulate the employees to take goal-directed behavior. Moreover, the prevailing climate in the organization exerts significant influence on the way the members perform their duties by inducing a certain pattern of behavior about any organizational situation. It measures the mood, confidence, the trust, the feelings, the understanding and the degree of uptightness in an organization (Abasolo, 1991:27).

Halpin and Croft (1963) identified two clusters of elements, which are essential in describing the climate prevailing in an educational institution. One cluster describes the personnel's perceptions of each other as human beings, which includes intimacy, esprit, hindrance, and disengagement; while the other group describes the personnel's collective perception of their superior and includes consideration, thrust, production emphasis and aloofness. The categorization of an educational institution's climate may be chartered on a scale or continuum, that is from a closed climate – controlled – familiar – paternal - autonomous – open climate. In the same manner, Tannebaum and Smidt as cited by Abasolo (1991) contend that the style of leadership may be chartered on a scale or continuum. At the left side of the scale would be the leadership used by autocratic or dictatorial managers, and the right side of the scale is a subordinate-centered leadership evidenced by the greater delegation of authority to subordinates and a high degree of subordinate participation in decision-making through group efforts and team-building techniques. Cherrington (1994) posits that the type of leadership style adopted by the

manager produces a climate that is either autocratic (thunderstorm), participative (sunshine), or without encouragement (cloudy). This makes leading others in the pursuit of organizational objectives and motivating people to achieve them is one of the most challenging roles of management.

Goals and Objectives of SUCs in the Philippines are guided by the government targets specifically by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). Achieving state mandatory requirements requires the participation of the entire organization, specifically the key officials, teaching and non-teaching staff; the key players in SUCs. As of the academic year 2013-14, there were a total of 112 SUCs in the entire Philippines with 451 more satellite campuses (CHED, 2014b). Some of the SUCs perform better than the others. For example, only 44 or 39% of SUCs has Center of Excellence (COE) and Center of Development (COD) programs. Only 15% are categorized as SUC level 4, 34% SUC level 3 and the rest are either level 1 or 2 (CHED, 2014a). The levels are a reflection of the quality of the education which is highly attributable to the university performance in instruction, research, extension and production. The delivery of all these requires the full participation of SUC employees.

Highly engaged employees are 50% more likely to exceed expectations than the least-engaged workers. They also outperform the later regarding employee retention (54%), costumer satisfaction (89%) and fourfold revenue growth (Gofee and Jones, 2013). A positive organizational climate enhances employee motivation which increases employees allocation of personal effort to complete their tasks (Brown and Leigh, 1996; Neal and Griffin, 1999)

The positive organizational climate is not the ultimate goal but its effect, the enhanced performance. The positive climate is a key link in companies' ability to maintain

and improve performance with successful leaders takes efforts to initiate the chain reaction towards improving climate which results to increased motivation and finally enhances performance (Atkinson and Frechette, 2009).

Are SUCs in Eastern Visayas maintaining a desirable positive climate where people are motivated and have the high morale to perform their tasks? This study explored the kind of organizational climate in the region and examined the relationship of the same to employee's job satisfaction.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The descriptive research design was utilized where methodological triangulation was utilized in collecting the needed data. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed by Halpin and Croft (1962) was adapted to determine the organizational climate prevailing in the ten respondent-SUCs in Eastern Visayas. The study involved 81 key officials, 130 faculty members and 106 non-teaching personnel. The key officials included the presidents, vice-presidents, deans and directors; the group comprising the faculty were those who were holding the ranks of Instructor to Professor, and the non-teaching groups were those who were in the administrative department and rank and file, who were not given teaching assignments. In the selection of respondents, total enumeration was utilized for the key officials, and proportionate probability sampling was utilized for the teaching and non-teaching personnel.

A perusal of records and interviews were used to clarify vague answers and to supply data gaps about the gathering of information with the use of the questionnaire.

The weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient, point-biserial correlation coefficient ($r_{pb}$), Fisher's t-test and Analysis of Variance were used to analyze the data with the use of SSPSS Version 16.0

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

According to the leader in organizational climate research Robert Stringer (2001), a climate is a set of measurable properties of the work environment based on the collective perceptions of the people who work in the environment and demonstrated to influence their motivation and behavior.

The foregoing is the result of the survey to key officials and employees of ten SUCs in Eastern Visayas. This SUCs are the Eastern Samar State University (ESSU), Eastern Visayas State University (EVSU), Leyte Normal University (LNU), Northwest Samar State University (NwSSU), Naval State University (NSU), Palompon Institute of Technology (PIT), Samar State University (SSU), Southern Leyte State University (SLSU), University of Eastern Philippines (UEP), and Visayas State University (VSU).

A shown in Table 1, the superiors (key officials) of the ten SUCs see their subordinates' organizational climate dimension to be of Esprit dimension with them saying it is often observed. The key officials believe that their employees feel that their social needs are being satisfied while enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job. On the other hand, the subordinates see the Esprit climate sometimes occurring, a slight deviation from supervisors observation. The said difference is statistically insignificant. The Esprit characteristic received the highest rate from all groups of respondents. Esprit dimension is highly present in an open climate (Lunenburg & Omstein, 2008).

For supervisors, they see themselves practicing a Thrust climate which they feel as occurring often. The subordinates see them have the same climate with slightly lower

Table 1: Organizational Climate Prevailing in the Respondent-SUCs as Perceived by the Respondents

| Dimension | Respondents' Category | | | | | | Combined | |
| | Superiors | | Subordinates | | | | | |
| | Key Officials | | Faculty | | Non-Teaching | | | |
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **_On Co-workers_** | | | | | | | | |
| Disengagement[NS] | 2.43 | 0.30 | 2.35 | 0.35 | 2.43 | 0.33 | 2.40 | 0.32 |
| Hindrance[NS] | 2.79 | 0.49 | 2.75 | 0.31 | 2.64 | 0.46 | 2.73 | 0.41 |
| Esprit[NS] | 3.65 | 0.36 | 3.36 | 0.27 | 3.47 | 0.33 | 3.49 | 0.29 |
| Intimacy[NS] | 3.24 | 0.31 | 3.05 | 0.19 | 3.07 | 0.33 | 3.12 | 0.20 |
| **_On Superiors_** | | | | | | | | |
| Aloofness[NS] | 2.85 | 0.34 | 2.79 | 0.35 | 2.87 | 0.26 | 2.84 | 0.31 |
| Production Emphasis[NS] | 3.17 | 0.38 | 3.07 | 0.19 | 2.99 | 0.40 | 3.08 | 0.30 |
| Thrust[NS] | 3.75 | 0.32 | 3.34 | 0.26 | 3.38 | 0.32 | 3.49 | 0.29 |
| Consideration[NS] | 3.46 | 0.32 | 3.04 | 0.28 | 3.12 | 0.40 | 3.22 | 0.33 |

Legend:  NS - Not significant, that is, $p < 0.05$ using F test

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| < 1.50 | Does not occur | 3.50 - 4.49 | Often Occurs |
| 1.50 - 2.49 | Rarely Occurs | 4.50 or higher | Always Occurs |
| 2.50 - 3.49 | Sometimes Occurs | | |

Table 2: Respondents Job Satisfaction Level

| Areas | Respondents' Category | | | Combined |
| | Key Officials | Faculty | Non-Teaching | |
| | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Working Condition | 6.66 | 7.63 | 7.42 | 7.24 |
| Salary and Fringe Benefits | 7.44 | 8.24 | 7.86 | 7.85 |
| Supervision | 6.97 | 7.86 | 7.51 | 7.45 |
| Interpersonal Relationship | 7.44 | 8.11 | 7.86 | 7.80 |
| Professional Growth | 6.35 | 7.34 | 6.44 | 6.71 |
| The Work Itself | 7.70 | 8.40 | 7.95 | 8.02 |
| Mean | 7.09* | 7.93* | 7.51 | 7.51 |
| SD | 0.52 | 0.40 | 0.56 | 0.48 |

Legend:    *Significant;  $p < 0.05$ for Key Officials and Faculty

1   - Not Satisfied;  ←  →   10 - Very Much Satisfied

rating suggesting it only sometimes occurring. The said difference is found to be statistically insignificant. A thrust dimension of climate suggests that they key officials' attempts to "move the school" or initiate changes through examples that the

Table 3: Respondents' Perceived Work Performance

| Indicators | Respondents' Category | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Key Officials | Faculty | Non-Teaching |
| 1  Coming to work on time (punctuality). | 7.95 | 8.47 | 8.24 |
| 2  Submission of reports on time. | 7.91 | 8.19 | 8.42 |
| 3  Quality of work outputs. | 7.96 | 8.11 | 8.42 |
| 4  Participation to legal activities of the SUC. | 6.86 | 7.67 | 7.34 |
| 5  Compliance to policies, rules and regulations of the SUC. | 7.95 | 8.65 | 8.51 |
| 6  Ability to solve work-related problems. | 7.97 | 8.26 | 8.32 |
| 7  Ability to interact with supervisors, colleagues, peers and/or subordinates. | 7.98 | 8.21 | 8.26 |
| 8  Ability to deal/interact with employees of other agencies/instrumentalities. | 7.64 | 8.05 | 8.04 |
| 9  Ability to meet the needs of clients/students. | 8.01 | 7.99 | 8.45 |
| 10  Ability to respond to/assist/help to the immediate needs of the SUC. | 7.72 | 8.04 | 8.18 |
| Mean | 7.80* | 8.16 | 8.22* |
| SD | 0.35 | 0.27 | 0.34 |

Legend:     *Significant;  $p < 0.05$ for Key Officials and Non-teaching Personnel

1 – Poor    ← →   10 - Outstanding

superiors sets for their subordinates. This characteristic is also highly present in an open climate (ibid)

Regarding job satisfaction along the six identified areas, the three groups of respondents perceived themselves to have the highest level of satisfaction along "*the work itself*" with the faculty giving the highest rating of 8.4 on a scale of 1 to 10. On the other hand, the respondents all agree that they are less satisfied with the area of professional growth with a rating of 6.71.

The computed p using ANOVA for comparing the perceptions of the job satisfaction of key officials and faculty is lesser than 0.05 which signifies that the observed differences in the means are significant. Meanwhile, for the key officials and non-teaching as well as the non-teaching and faculty satisfaction level is not significant.

Regarding work performance, the three groups of respondents perceived themselves to have *a Very Satisfactory* performance with the following grand means; 8.22 for non-teaching, 8.16 for faculty and 7.80 for the key officials. The computed p using ANOVA for comparing the perceptions of the work performance of key officials and the non-teaching group is lesser than 0.05 which signifies that the observed differences in the means are significant. Meanwhile, for the key officials and faculty members as well as the non-teaching and faculty, the computed p is greater than 0.05. Hence the observed differences are not significant.

For job satisfaction, the following OC dimensions were found to have highly significant correlation coefficients, that is $p < 0.01$:  disengagement ($r_{xy} = -0.38$), esprit ($r_{xy} = 0.23$), intimacy $r_{xy} = 0.59$, aloofness ($r_{xy} = 0.46$), production emphasis ($r_{xy} = 034$), thrust ($r_{xy} = 0.69$), and consideration ($r_{xy} = 0.88$).

Table 4: Correlation Between the Eight Dimensions of Organizational Climate and the Respondents' Job Satisfaction Level and Work Performance

| OC Dimensions | $r_{xy}$ | |
|---|---|---|
| | Job Satisfaction | Work Performance |
| Disengagement | -0.38** | 0.07[NS] |
| Hindrance | 0.011[NS] | -0.26** |
| Esprit | 0.23** | 0.32** |
| Intimacy | 0.59** | 0.29** |
| Aloofness | 0.46** | -0.22** |
| Production Empahsis | 0.34** | 0.44** |
| Thrust | 0.69** | 0.42** |
| Consideration | 0.88** | 0.38** |

Legend:

** Highly Significant (p<0.01)  * Significant (p<0.05)  NS-Not significant (p>0.05)

For work performance, the following OC dimensions were found to have significant or highly significant correlation coefficients:  hindrance ($r_{xy}$ = -0.26), esprit($r_{xy}$ = 0.32), intimacy ($r_{xy}$ = 0.29), aloofness ($r_{xy}$ = -0.22), production emphasis ($r_{xy}$ = 0.44), thrust ($r_{xy}$ = 0.42), and consideration ($r_{xy}$ = 0.38).

As shown by the results, there is a high level of esprit and thrust among the respondent-SUCs which approximate an open organizational climate.  This means that majority of the personnel feel secure and happy in their work and is proud of it. Moreover, the teaching and non-teaching personnel perceived that their supervisors set as examples in the institution;  are competent and show concern for their subordinates.

A desirable organizational climate allows leadership acts to emerge easily; the leader and other group members can initiate and consummate acts of leadership (Halpin and Croft, 1963).  Organizational climate matters in the respondent SUCs. This confirms the results of the studies conducted by  Castro and Martins (2010),  Zhang and Liu (2010), Putter (2010), Smith (2009) and

Catt and Miller (1994); that that there is a causal link between organizational climate, job satisfaction, and employee performance. Thus, the level of esprit among personnel both teaching and non-teaching and level of "thrust" on the part of the leader could lead to higher level of job satisfaction and work performance.

This study takes cognizance of the importance for a leader to *inspire* his subordinates, that is, develop the level of esprit and thrust among the personnel who will consequently enable them to *connect* to the organization's vision, mission, goals, and objectives and eventually ensure that they will engage with the different undertakings and activities.

## IV.  CONCLUSIONS

The SUCs in Eastern Visayas practices an open climate with subordinates having a high level of sprit and superiors with high-level thrust. The open climate resulted into the satisfied workforce and satisfactory performance.

The employees of SUCs in Eastern Visayas are more satisfied with their work itself while are less satisfied on professional

growth. The employees are best in compliance to policies, rules and regulation and less participative on legal activities of the SUCs.

To better improve the satisfaction level and work performance of SUCs employees, the management needs to further improve positive organizational climate.

## REFERENCES

Atkinson T and Frechette H, (2009). Creating a Positive Organizational Climate in a Negative Economic One. Improving Organizational Climate to Transform Performance. Point of View. IIR Holdings, Ltd, https://cdns3.trainingindustry.com/media/2505214/creatingpositiveorgclimate_us_aug09.pdf Accessed: 3/4/2015

Abasolo, P (1991). Personnel Management. *Manila: GIC Enterprises and Co., Inc.*

Bowen, D. & Ostroff, E. (2004). Understanding HRM – firm performance linkages: The role of the strength of the HRM system. *Academy Management Revie, 29(2).*

Brown, SP and Leigh, TW (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 81. Pp 358-368

Castro , M. and Martins, N. (2010). *The Relationship between organizational climate and employee satisfaction in South African Information & Technology Organization.* SA Journal of Industrial Psychology.

Commission on Higher Education, (2014a). Results of SUC Levelling. http://ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/SUC-Level.pdf Accessed: 2/3/2015

Commission on Higher Education, (2014b). State Universities and Colleges Statistical Bulletin, Academic Year 2013-2014. http://www.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2014/temp/10-03/home/State%20Universities%20and%20Colleges%20Statistical%20Bulletin.pdf Accessed: 2/3/2015

Cherrington, A. (1994) Management and Performance. *California: Goodyear Publishing.*

Gofee R & Jones G. (2013). Creating the Best Workplace on Earth. Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2013/05/creating-the-best-workplace-on-earth Accessed: 03/12/2015

Halpin A. and Croft D. (1963). The organizational climate of schools. *The Administrator's Notebook. The University of Chicago, Vol. XI, No. 7.*

Lunenburg FC and Ornstein AC. (2008). Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices. Thompson Learning, Inc.

Neal A. and Griffin MA, (1999). Developing a theory of performance for human resource management. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources. Vol 37, pp. 44-59

Permarupan, P. (2013). *Organizational Climate on Employees' Workk Passion: A Review.*Canadian Social Science, Vol. 9, No. 4.

Putter, L. (2010). *Organizational climate and performance: The relation between organizational climate and performance and an investigation of the antecedents of organizational climate.* Graduation thesis. Master of Science in Management of Technology. Delft University of Technology, Delft.

Smith, L. (2009). *School Climate and Teacher Commitment.* A doctoral dissertation. Doctor of Education. The University of Alabama, Alabama.

Stringer R, (2001). Leadership and Organizational Climate. Prentice Hall.

Watkin, C. and Hubbard, B. (2003). Leadership motivation and the drivers of share price: The business case for measuring organizational climate. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 24 (7).*

Zhang, J. and Liu, Y. (2010). "Organizational climate and Its Effects on Organizational Variables: An empirical Study," *International Journal of Psychological Studies,Vol. 2, No. 2.*