How Organizational Climate Influences Job Satisfaction in Educational Sector – A Theoretical Perspective

Mr. Saurav Ghosh[1], Dr. Parikshit Joshi[2]

[1](Research Scholar, Faculty of Business & Management, Shri Venkateshwara University, Gajraula, Amroha, Uttar Pradesh, India)
[2](Assistant Professor-HR, Amity Business School, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh)

ABSTRACT: *The study aims in determining the organizational climate that would result in job satisfaction among academic staff in educational settings. Adequate literature on organizational climate and job satisfaction was reviewed. Findings results into the factors that contribute to shape culture, and its results into a framework, to encompass manifestations of organizational culture in relation to academic excellence. Further researchers can use this conceptual model to include few more pre cursors to outcomes to it, also this model can be tested empirically.*
Keywords: *Organizational Climate, Educational Sector, Job Satisfaction, Generation of Universities.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In both developed and most developing countries, there have been several job satisfaction studies of which very few of them have been focused on the job satisfaction of the university teachers in relation to their organizational climate.

Organizations that have goals to achieve would require satisfied and happy staff in her workforce, (Oshagbemi, 2000). Importantly is the fact that for any university to take off and achieve its strategic goals would strongly depend on her capacity to attract, retain and maintain competent and satisfied staff into its employment. The university being an institution of higher learning that provides manpower needs to advance national development through both the public and private sector must itself be capable of ensuring adequate manpower planning and development she could therefore not afford to neglect need and essentials of workforce satisfaction. The Indian 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 central 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 in all kinds of programmes or disciplines. Both government and private sectors fund public and private universities respectively.

Against this background, University lecturers are currently facing many challenges in form of inadequate infrastructure, lack of enabling research environment, disparity in salary and allowances, inconsistent policy implementation between Central and State governments may well affect their levels of job satisfaction (Kniveton, 1991). Infact some of these academics again are of the opinion that communication and decision-making problems exist in their institutions because the superiors take certain decisions without involving them which in turn creates additional negative work environment.

The evolving competition in the higher education environment in India evident from the increasing number of new universities has called for good organizational climate that would allow these universities to retain their best hands. Though, university is universal, meaning lecturers are also mobile managers who must move to create employment for younger ones, yet, efforts should be made to encourage senior ones to reproduce themselves for national development. At present, there are 227 government-recognized Universities in India. Out of them 20 are central universities, 109 are deemed universities and 11 are Open Universities and rest are state universities. Most of these universities in India have affiliating colleges where undergraduate courses are being taught. According to the Department of higher Education government of India, 16,885 colleges, including 1800 exclusive women's colleges functioning under these universities and institutions and there are 4.57 lakh teachers and 99.54 lakh students in various higher education institutes in India. Apart from these higher education institutes there are several private institutes in India that offer various professional courses in India. Distance learning is also a feature of the Indian higher education system. The overall scenario of higher education in India does not match with the global Quality standards. Hence, there is enough justification for an

increased assessment of the Quality of the country's educational institutions. Singh (2011) [http://www.gvctesangaria.org/websiteimg/publications/jdarticle.pdf] Reports by the NUC (2008) revealed that while universities are increasing, the number of qualified teachers is not increasing proportionately.

Thus**,** there had been constant mobility of these highly skilled persons from one university to another. Movement from federal and state universities to private universities is one and from federal to state and state to either federal or private are some of other forms. However the critical is the fact that it had been established that some of these lecturers hardly stay for long in such university before moving again, (Startup, Gruneberg and Tapfield, 1975). This mobility has been tagged as brain drain.

Therefore, one of the reasons that informed this study has to do with the unique importance of organizational climate in relation to the job satisfaction among academics in the Universities which affect the realization of these institutions vision. In so far as competent academics are necessary for academic performances, there is the need therefore to find out and examine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction among academics. This is necessary to identify how best to retain faculty in the University employment and prevent constant mobility known as brain drain.

Gunter and Furnham (1996) state that organizational climate can directly cause work outcomes that are either positive or negative. Positive work incentives are incentives that make work interesting, e.g.; attractive work environment, good personnel policies, provision of benefits, job structure and compensation. Enabling work environment leads to motivation, good personnel policies, favourable work environment, provision of benefits, job satisfaction and compensation. However, negative work incentives include those incentives that make work boring, unchallenging and dissatisfying. They lead to increased absenteeism, turnover and accidents.

Thus to prevent these negative work outcomes, there is a need to find out which factors within the organizational climate can lead to satisfaction among academics so as to continually have productive, satisfied and contented academics.

However, it is important to point out that the researcher is not unaware of the fact that factors like clear lines of communication, adequate reward system and promotional opportunities could also encourage or discourage both positive and negative work outcomes which if not adequately put in place could result in turnover of these academics. Comparative studies of this nature would afford the researcher the opportunity to identify variations in job satisfaction of academic staffs and their impact on academic excellence.

A number of factors had been identified in literature as responsible for the extent to which dissatisfaction is associated with faculty job structure and compensation. The impact of these factors varied and are quite associated with faculty beliefs, management of factors and tolerance levels (Delery and Doty, 2006; Doty, Glick and Huber, 2003). These factors which could enhance or impede academics work performance include top management emphasis on administrative style, work load, feedback about performance and support from superiors.

Moreover, job satisfaction is relevant to the physical and mental well being of employees, i.e. job satisfaction has relevance for human health (Oshagbemi, 1999). An understanding of the factors involved in job satisfaction is relevant to improve the well being of a significant number of people. While the pursuit of the improvement of satisfaction is of humanitarian value, Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) stated that ―trite as it may seem, satisfaction is a legitimate goal in itself. Therefore, apart from its humanitarian utility, it appears to make economic sense to consider whether and how job satisfaction can be improved. Hence, the needs to identify variables within the organizational climate that can help improve the job satisfaction of academic staff working in the selected private Universities in Western Uttar Pradesh and NCR.

Most of the previous studies have made attempt to explain a worker's job satisfaction as a function of the individual's personal characteristics and the characteristics of the job itself. Variables such as age, gender, marital and parental status, educational status, hours of work and earning figures were identified as key factors that determine job satisfaction of university teachers. Gender level in the organization and educational status are often included as individual characteristics in studies of job satisfaction, but no conclusive findings with regard to the levels of satisfaction between the junior and the senior academics have been found (Fields and Blum, 1997; Oshagbemi, 1997; Oshagbemi, 1999; Oshagbemi, 2000; Klecker and Loadman, 1999).

Since the majority of researches on job satisfaction of academics had been undertaken in the foreign countries, the extent to which research findings in these countries can be applied to Indian Universities (particularly the private Universities) remained un-established.

Based on the above information, universities (private) organizational climate also have both positive and negative work outcomes that could influence the behaviour of employees within the organization. Universities are characterized by a shortage of staff which results in work overload and thus lecturers are expected to undertake certain administrative works to cover all the works that are supposed to be done. Other factors that appear to affect effective functioning of organizations include management and leadership styles, non-academic duties, unclear rules and regulations in the personnel policies, excessive work load, poor communication with supervisor cum unclear lines of communication, boredom and frustration resulting from lack of support from the

superior, suitable career ladder, unchallenging jobs and inadequate fringe benefits as expected in the working condition (Marriner- Tomey, 1996).

II.   RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
The main objective of this study is to determine factors in the organizational climate that would result in job satisfaction among academic staff in educational settings.
The specific objectives are therefore listed below:
1. To find out the relationship that exists between organizational climate and job satisfaction among academics in India.
2. To identify factors that determines job satisfaction of academics and their consequential effects on academic excellence.

To determine whether there is a difference in the way senior academics and junior academics perceive their organizational climate.

III.   REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Determinants of Job Satisfaction
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. For instance, in an organization where work performance is not recognized through promotion and salary increases, productivity of employees tends to be lowered (Fajana, 1996).

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 (Toloposky, 2000). 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.

However, it is not easy to determine if employees experience job satisfaction. Cockburn and Haydn (2004) suggest that the main problem might be that employees within organizations do not discuss the level of their job satisfaction, nor do they admit that their jobs might not be satisfying. Hence, managers also find it difficult to determine whether job satisfaction is experienced in the workplace. Cockburn and Haydn (2004) further contend that some employees might not even notice that they have a job satisfaction problem. Weallens (2000) suggest that most employees know when they have a satisfaction problem. A number of employees may feel that acknowledging the existence of satisfaction is tantamount to admitting failure. This conclusion serves to highlight the fact that it may be difficult to uncover the issues related to job satisfaction or the establishment of job satisfaction levels in an organization. Hence, the need for scientific studies (Carrel, Elbert, Hartfieed, Grobler, Marx and Vander Schyft, 1998).

Herberg's two- factor theory forms the theoretical framework on which the study is based. Hence, it is necessary to stipulate that this theorist does not see satisfaction and dissatisfaction as direct opposites.

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory
Herzberg's Two-Factor theory was used as a framework for this study. Herzberg's two-factor theory is concerned with factors that are responsible for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. His two factor theory was derived from Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs. He conducted a widely reported motivational study following Maslow's model using
Herzberg believed that two separate dimensions contribute to an employee's behaviour at work. Number one 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. They 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.

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. They are factors that induce satisfaction on the job and those causing no satisfaction. Hygiene factors concentrate only in the area of job dissatisfaction, while motivators focus on job satisfaction- for instance; interpersonal conflicts will cause people to be dissatisfied and the resolution of interpersonal conflicts will not lead to a high level of motivation and dissatisfaction; where, motivators such as challenging assignments and recognition must be in place before employees will be highly motivated to excel at their workplace (Daft, 2000: 540). Herzberg emphasized the importance of job centered factors that increased interest in job enrichment including effort to design jobs which would increase employees' satisfaction.

In addition, Morrison (1993) argued that there are other motivators that do not promote a sense of growth because they do not provide significant meaning to the worker. These include group feelings, job security, status, feelings about fairness, unfairness, pride and shame. Based on the above findings, the researcher's observation in the workplace is that the mentioned factors are important to employees. Employees do raise dissatisfaction if the organization does not provide job security, status and when unfairness is exhibited.

Moreover, Herzberg discovered that intrinsic factors such as achievement, responsibility, recognizing the work itself and advancement seem to be related to job satisfaction. On the other hand, when employees are not satisfied, they tend to cite extrinsic factors such as work conditions, interpersonal relations, company policy and administration and supervision as reasons for their not being satisfied. According to Herzberg, satisfaction is not the absence of dissatisfaction because removing dissatisfying characteristics from the job does not necessarily make the job more satisfying. He further argued that the opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction and the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction (Robbinson, 1988).

Job Satisfaction
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, (1976) 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, et al (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 India, efforts in this direction are scarce. Examples of investigated jobs are: Satisfaction among heads of post-primary institutions in Western Uttar Pradesh (Whawho, 2008: Edem and Lawal, 2006).

Job satisfaction means the contentment of the servers 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 server and appearing when the qualifications of the job and the demands of the server's 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 server from

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

When the server 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, Srini 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).

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of ones job or job experiences. Worthy of note in this definition by Locke is the use of both cognition (appraisal) and affect (emotional state). Thus, Locke assumes that job satisfaction results from the interplay of cognition and affect, or thoughts and feelings. Recently, some organizational scholars have questioned this view, arguing that typical measures of job satisfaction are more cognitive than affective in orientation - for instance, Organ & Near (1985). Brief (1998) comments that organizational scientists often have been tapping the cognitive dimension while slighting or even excluding the affective one. In support of this argument, Brief and Roberson (1999) found that a purported measure of work cognitions correlated more strongly with job satisfaction than did positive and negative affectivity. The limitation with this study exposes the problem with the argument – it seems likely that job beliefs (cognitions) are as influenced by affect as is job satisfaction itself. Indeed, Brief and Roberson´s results show that positive affectivity correlated more strongly with their purported measure of cognitions than it did with job satisfaction itself. A recent study by Weiss, Nicholas and Daus, (1999) revealed that when cognitions about the job and mood were used to predict job satisfaction in the same equation, both were strongly related to job satisfaction and the relative effects were exactly the same.

Thus, in evaluating our jobs, both cognition and affect appear to be involved. When we think about our jobs, we have feelings about what we think. When we have feelings while at work, we think about these feelings. Cognition and affect are thus closely related in our psychology and our psychobiology. This is because when individuals perform specific mental operations, a reciprocal relationship exists between cerebral areas specialized for processing emotions and those specific for cognitive processes (Drevets and Raichle, 1998). There are cognitive theories of emotion (Reisenzein & Schoenpflug, 1992) and emotional theories of cognition Smith – Lovin 1991).

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.

Some researchers separate job satisfaction into intrinsic and extrinsic elements where pay and promotions are considered extrinsic factors and co-workers, supervision and the work itself are considered intrinsic factors. Such an organizational structure is somewhat arbitrary; other structures were offered by Locke (1976), such as events or conditions versus agents (where agents are supervisors, co-workers and company or management), or work versus rewards versus context.

Employee's job satisfaction is not only influenced by his or her own perceptions of the climate, but also by the shared perceptions of his or her work unit.

However, three types of explanations historically have been suggested to account for the variations in the job satisfaction of workers. The first has sought to explain this variation solely in terms of the personalities of individual workers and has attempted to establish a relationship between measures of adjustment or neuroticism and job satisfaction (Vroom, 1964). While personality variables undoubtedly have some effects on job satisfaction, such explanations are inadequate because they ignore the association of job satisfaction with characteristics of the job.

A second explanation views variation in job satisfaction solely as a function of differences in the nature of job people perform. In the past, this has been the numerically dominant view and studies employing this type of

reasoning generally deal with two sets of variables – one a measure of a work role characteristic(s), the other a measure of job satisfaction and attempt to establish a causal relation from the former to the latter. There is a wide variation in the types of work role characteristics that have been used. Some common ones include characteristics of the organizational structure such as span of control and size (Georgopoulus, 1978), job content factors such as degree of specialization (Smith,1992), economic factors (Givelch & Burns, 1994), social factors, promotional opportunities and hours of work (Vroom, 1964, Herzberg, 1967). Generally, these investigations have found that job satisfaction varies, often considerable with one or more of these variables. A widely tested theory of the determinants of job satisfaction that utilizes this type of explanation is Herzberg's ―two – factor theory (Herzberg, 1967).

The third explanation views that the satisfaction an individual obtains from a job is a function not only of the objective properties of that job but also of the motives of the individual was first suggested by Morse (1953). Leading exponents of this view are Terre & Durrhein (1999) who reacted against the attempts of organizational social scientist to study issues of worker satisfaction by adhering to a closed system model wherein organizations are seen as the relevant context for explaining these issues. They argued that the question of satisfaction from work cannot be thoroughly considered without knowledge of the meanings that individuals impute to their work activity. Studies within this perspective (e.g. Klecker & Loadman, 1999; Organ & Near, 1985; Brief, 1998) have contributed to our knowledge of job satisfaction by attempting to establish empirically the ways in which the wants and expectations that people attach to their work activity shape the attitudinal and behavioural patterns of their working lives as a whole.

Job satisfaction refers to an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles, which they are presently occupying. It must be distinguished from satisfaction with specific dimension of those work roles. This conceptualization implies that job satisfaction is a unitary concept and that individuals maybe characterized by some sort of vaguely defined attitude toward their total job situation. To say that job satisfaction is a unitary concept however does not imply that the causes of this overall attitude are not multidimensional. A person may be satisfied with one dimension of the job and dissatisfied with another. The assumption underlying the present view is that it is possible for individuals to balance these specific satisfactions against the specific dissatisfactions and thus arrive at a composite satisfaction with the job as a whole (Hoppock, 1935). In line with these considerations, a measure of overall job satisfaction was developed based on the responses of workers to five questions concerning how satisfied they are with their jobs as a whole. These questions included such direct inquires as ―how satisfied are you with your job as well as such indirect measures as whether the worker would recommend the job to a friend, whether the workers plans to look for a new job within the next year, whether the worker would take the same job again if given a choice and how the job measures up to the type of job the worker wanted when he took it.

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). While past researches had greatly contributed to our understanding of relationships between psychological climate and a diverse set of individual-level criteria, there are two key limitations inherent in this work. Firstly, studies have tended to focus on either psychological or organizational climate on individual outcomes. This is an important omission because employee attitudes may not only be influenced by one's personal perceptions of the work environment but also by the shared perceptions of co-workers (Mathieu & Kohler, 20000). The study of emergent processes suggests that a work group's shared perceptions might influence individual attitudes above individual perceptions of the work environment

(Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

Secondly, research has increasingly examined a global index representing a single strategically focused climate (e.g. a climate for service or a climate for safety) or has focused on a set of climate dimensions (Ostroff et al., 2007). Examining single dimensions or a set of independent dimensions of climate ignores the broader context in which they are operating. This is a limitation because it may be useful to examine multiple dimensions of climate together, as a system. Different organizational attributes are likely to mutually reinforce one another, making the total effect greater than the sum of individual dimensions (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004).

Again, there have been several approaches to the concept of climate of which two in particular have received substantial patronage (1) the cognitive scheme approach and (2) the shared perception approach. The first approach regards the concept of climate as an individual perception and cognitive representation of the work environment – meaning from this perspective, climate assessments should be conducted at an individual level. The second approach emphasizes the importance of shared perceptions as underpinning the notion of climate (Whitley, 2002). Wolpin, Burke & Green (1999) define organizational climate as the shared perception of the way things are around here.

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) explained 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 leadership styles: 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.

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) studied 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

(1973) 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 centered atmosphere.

Some behaviorists have proposed that organizational climate can be perceived by employees within an organization (Rizzo, et al 1990; Friedlander and Margulies, 1969; Litwin and Stringer, 1978; Lawler, et al, 1994; Payne, et al, 1986; Pritchard and Karasick, 1993 and Schneider, 1982). In forming climate perceptions, the individual acts as an information processor, using information from:
(a) The events occurring around him and the characteristics of the organization, and
(b) Personal characteristics, e.g. needs. Thus it is that perceptions emerge as a result of the activities, interactions and experiences of the individual (Pruden 1989; Schwab, et al 1990 and Litwin and Stringer, 1978).

To Pruden (1989), organization climate means the set of characteristics that describe an organization and that: (a) distinguish the organization from other organizations, (b) are relatively enduring over time, and (c) influence the behaviour of people in the organization.

Litwin and Stringer (1978) considered this definition deficient in terms of individual perceptions, noting that the climate of an organization is interpreted by its members in ways, which impact their attitude and motivation and thus proposed the following:

Organizational climate is a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that: (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behaviour and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (of attributes) of the organization.

From the definition above, employees interacting with each other can also reveal the climate of the organization. If there are no good linkages between workgroups, the climate will be full of conflict, poor communication and lack of commitment and understanding among groups.

Organizational climate can have positive and negative effects on employees. A climate that does not promote communication upwards, downwards and literally would lead to fear of expression of ideas and opinions. Absence of an open-door policy (situations where employees are not allowed to come to the manager with anything that is bothering them) can also have negative effects on the climate.

Bunker and Wijnberg (1985), view organizational climate differently from the other authors. They see it as a generalized perception of the organization that the person forms as a result of numerous experiences in the workplace. From this definition, it can be deduced that organizational climate comprises different meanings to different employees working in a particular situation because each employee attaches different meaning to different situations. Climate then, can influence the behaviour of people found within the organization. For instance, an employee experiencing job dissatisfaction may be absent himself or herself from the workplace. Not only that, Keuter, Byrne, Voell and Larson (2000) support Bunker and Wijnberg (1985) in that they see organizational climate as a set of measurable properties of the work environment perceived directly or indirectly by the people who worked in the environment and assumed to influence their motivation and behaviour. Both authors see organizational climate as influential to the behaviour of employees in an organization. Peterson (1995) views work environment differently – i.e. he postulated that organizational climate cannot be described as psychologically neat and orderly if they present ambiguous and conflicting stimuli – that organizational members should be viewed as active perceivers and interpreters of their organizational climate. These perceived environments could be viewed as psychologically meaningful descriptions of contingencies that individuals use to apprehend order and predict outcomes and gauge the appropriateness of their behaviour.

Schneider and Rentsch (2008) stated that there are bound to be differences in the way junior academics perceive their organizational climate in relation to their counterparts. Those junior academics are likely to experience variables in their organizational climate as negative compare to the way senior academics will perceive these variables. Glisson and James (2006) and Chan, (2008) noted that perceptions emerge as a result of the activities, interactions and experiences of the individual which in the case of senior academics are more favourable to them than the junior academics who attach meaning to different situations most times negatively.

Dimensions of Organizational Culture
Work organizations are characterized by a variety of dimensions related to organizational climate. These dimensions embody criteria such as means emphasis, goal emphasis, reward orientation, task support and social support (Peterson, 1995).

Means Emphasis: This relates to extent to which managers inform employees of methods and procedures they are expected to observe when performing their jobs.

Social Support: This relates to the extent to which managers take into consideration the personal welfare of their employees, for instance, giving free medical attention to sick employees, free lunch or subsidized canteen, incentive bonus, furniture allowances, extra duty allowances, lump sum payment in lieu of accommodation, etc.

Goal Emphasis: This is concerned with the way managers make their employees aware of organizational outcomes and standards that they are expected to achieve.

Reward Orientation: This is concerned with the way rewards are conferred to employees. The rewards are determined on how well the employees perform their jobs based on the standards set by the organization.

Task Support: This emphasizes that managers should provide employees with the necessary equipment, services and resources in order to be able to perform the allocated duties. However, in an organization, employees may perceive their environment as positive or negative. It is, therefore, the duty of the management to utilize certain actions that can promote a positive organizational climate. When managers utilize these actions, the attitudes of the employees will change and focus on the goals of the organization.

IV.   DISCUSSION

The chapter looked at the framework on which the research will be based. The theoretical framework chosen for the study is Herzberg two-factor theory, which sees people as having two sets of needs: motivators and hygiene factors. The hygiene factors also known as dissatisfies are aspects such as organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary and work conditions, – whereas satisfiers are aspects such as achievements, recognition, work itself, responsibility and development.

Again the chapter looked at the literature review that addressed issues pertaining to organizational climate. The purpose is to identify factors within the organizational climate that can lead to job dissatisfaction and to see how these factors can influence the performance of employees. Those factors identified evaluate the extent to which managers can utilize the organizational climate to increase job satisfaction and also use these factors to eliminate job dissatisfaction in the workplace.

Key concepts had been identified and explained in the chapter to facilitate understanding of all the necessary concepts in the study.

However, not all the questions raised for this study under the research questions were answered. The review succeeded in giving us the meaning of job satisfaction as indicated by different authors. The various facets of job satisfaction, the theories of job satisfaction antecedents, job characteristics model, the need for promotion of job satisfaction, the motivating factors (e.g. achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth and development etc.), and the barriers leading to dissatisfaction were enumerated and discussed.

Also, organizational climate and the various elements involved were identified including the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate, and the likely factors experienced by lecturers that could contribute to job satisfaction.

Limitations and Future Researches

Despite the wealth of research linking organizational culture with job satisfaction, commitment, performance and effectiveness, there is an absence of research that examined effectiveness, commitment and empowerment at the subunit level. In addition, literature also lacking pertaining to historical, legal political and environmental effects on universities functioning mostly researcher focused on dimensional approach to analyze culture. To gain a better understanding of how culture work and influence various units, research needs to be done to explore institution's culture at various level and it influence on various subgroups functioning.

Additional studies may also be done which examine how gender affects leadership behavior and its impact on organizational culture, performance and decision-making? It's Dominating culture or subculture that has greater impact on employee commitment? The impact of university or institution's philosophy, values, on student's performance. Explore employee psychological empowerment in various academic unite. There's an absence of literature addressing organizational culture and effectiveness for minority institutions, specifically at the sub-unit level.

Ultimately, the report demonstrates the alternative ways of thinking about education in order to shift thinking away from education as a place of getting degree, toward the social purposes and importance of higher education in reforming the educational system. Institutions can be given new frames and reformers can activate a different set of cultural models, the public will be better positioned to think about and understand the broader societal benefits of education and the need for educational reform.

REFERENCES

[1]. Oshagbemi, T. (2000) ―Gender Differences in the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers. Women in Management Review. 15, 331-343.
[2]. Oshagbemi, T. (2000) . ―Is the length of service related to the level of Job Satisfaction.? International Journal of Social Economics. 27, 213-226.
[3]. Gberevbie, D.E.I (2006) ―Recruitment and Quality Academic Staff Selection: The case study of Covenant University. Ife PsycholoGia. 14(2), p.118.
[4]. Kniveton, B. (1991). ―An Investigation of Factors Contributing to Teachers Job Satisfaction. School Psychology International, 12, 361 – 370.
[5]. Startup ,R ,Gruneberg , M. M and Tapfield , P(1975). ―The Satisfaction of University Staff with their Teaching". Research in Education 13: 57-66.
[6]. Gunter, Y.J and Furnham, P.K. (1996). Individual Differences and Organisational Climate: Measurement of Organisational Climate by the Multi-trait, Multi-rater Matrix. Personnel Psychology. 23. 493-512.
[7]. Delery, R.Y and Doty, D.O(2006). Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Perceived Organisational Climate Among the Assistants and Lower Managerial Personnel of Government Organisation. Indian Journal of Applied Psychology. 24(2) 58-64.
[8]. Doty, D.O; Glick, O.J and Huber, U.U(2003). A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction in the Post- Liberalization Scenario Among Executives of Private and Public Sector Organisations. Indian Management Studies Journal. 7(3). 21-31.
[9]. 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.
[10]. Oshagbemi, T.(1999). ―Academics and Their Managers: A Comparative Study in Job Satisfaction. Personnel Review. 28, 108-123.Smith, P.C ; Kendall, L.M &Hulin, C.L (1969).The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.
[11]. Fields, D and Blum, T (1997). ―Employee Satisfaction in Work Groups with Different Gender Composition. Journal of organizational Behavior. 18, 181-196.
[12]. Oshagbemi, T. (1997). ―Job Satisfaction Profiles of University Teachers. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 12, 27-39.
[13]. Oshagbemi, T. (2000) ―Gender Differences in the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers. Women in Management Review. 15, 331-343.
[14]. Marriner-Tomey, A. (1996). Guide to Nursing Management and Leadership. Chicago: Mosby. 5th Edition.
[15]. Daniels, B. (2001). The Wellness Payoff. New York: Wiley.
[16]. Wilson, D.C and Rosenfeld, R.H (1990). Managing Organizations, London: McGraw Hill.
[17]. Baron, R (1996). Behaviour in Organizations. Newton: Allyn and Bacon.
[18]. Maghradi , A. (1999) ―Assessing the Effect of Job Satisfaction on Managers‖. .Intl. J. Value –Based Management, 12: 1-2
[19]. Fajana, Sola (2001). The Nigerian Informal Sector: Freeing The Hidden Potential and Raising Standards. Poster Session Paper Submitted to The Global Employment Forum, Geneva. Boro,L; Thopeson, S &Patton, C.(2001). Organizational Behaviour. London: Routledge.
[20]. Cockburn, N. and Perry, D. (2004). Human Resources Management. Orlando: F. L. Dryden.
[21]. Fajana, Sola (1996).Organizational Policies and Human Behaviour in Trade Unions Within the Confines of Democracy and Human Rights Objectives. Unpublished Manuscript.
[22]. Fajana, Sola (2002). Human Resource Management: An Introduction. Lagos: Labofin and Company.

[23]. Cockburn, D. and Haydn, T. (2004). Recruiting and Retaining Teachers: Understanding Why Teachers Teach, London: Routledge Falmer. Weallens, F. (2000). Psychology at Work. New York: Columbia University, Press.
[24]. 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.
[25]. 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), 376 – 407.
[26]. Luthans, F. (2002). Organizational Behaviour. Chicago: Mosby. 8th Edition.
[27]. Daft, R. L. (2000). Management, New York: The Dryden Press. 5th Edition.
[28]. Morrison, M. (1993). Professional Skills for Leadership: Foundations of a Successful Career. London: Mosby.
[29]. Robbinson, S. P. (1988). Essentials of Organizational Behaviour. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
[30]. Likert, R (1967). The Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.
[31]. McGregor, D.M. (1966) .Leadership and Motivation. Cambridge, MA : MIT press.
[32]. Roethlisberger, F.J & Dickson, W.J (1939). Management and The Worker. New York : Wiley.
[33]. Hoppock , R. (1935) . Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and Row.
[34]. Locke, E.A (1976) ―The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In M.D Dunnette (Ed), Handbook of Industrial and organizational Psychology.
[35]. Spector, P.E. (1997). Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA Sage.
[36]. Rice, R.W; Gentile, D.A & Mcfarlin, D.B. (1991). ―Facet Importance and Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 76, 31-39.
[37]. McMahan-Landers, I.J (2003). Strategies for Improving the Quality of Part-Time Teacher Programme in Colleges of Education in Oshodi. Teacher Programme in Colleges of Education in Nigeria. Benin City. Uniben Press.
[38]. 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.
[39]. Whawho, D.D (2008). Educational Administration: Planning and Supervision. Benin City. Spectrum Associates.
[40]. Edem, U.S and Lawal,O.O. (2006). Job Satisfaction and Publication Output Among Librarians in Nigeria Universities. Library Management. 20(2). 39-46.
[41]. Fletcher, C and Williams, R. (2006). Performance Management, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. British Journal of Management. 7(2), 169-179.
[42]. Reichers, A.E (2006). A Review and Reconceptualisation of Organisational Commitment. Academy of Management Review. 10(3), 465-476.
[43]. 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.
[44]. 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.
[45]. 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.
[46]. 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.
[47]. 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.
[48]. Sagie,A. (2002). Employee Absenteeism, Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: Another Look. Journal of Vocational Behaviour. 52(2), 156-171.
[49]. Iverson, R.D and Deery, M.(2007). Turnover Culture in the Hospitality Industry. Human Resource Journal. 7(4), 71-82.
[50]. Lum, L.K.(2006). Explaining Nursing Turnover Intent: Job Satisfaction or Organisational Commitment. Journal of Organisational Behaviour. 19(6), 305-320.