

**Jordanians' Perception of Organizational
Climate and Level of Satisfaction in
Non-profit Making Organizations.
A Field Study**

Dr. Hussian Abdulla El-Omari

Assistant Professor

Department of Business Administration

Faculty of Economics and

Administrative Sciences

Mu'tah University

**Jordanians' Perception of Organizational Climate
and Level of Satisfaction in Non-profit
Making Organizations. A Field Study**

Abstract

Using a non experimental research design, this exploratory study reported here attempts to identify two things: (1) whether or not organizational climate and job satisfaction are merely semantic and (2) how workers of a publicly-funded, service oriented organizations (i.e., social/welfare organizations) perceive the climate of their working environment and job satisfaction.

The results suggested two things: First, organizational climate and job satisfaction are not tautological and, therefore, they measure two different things of the organizational scenario. Second, Jordanian social/welfare workers tend to view the overall organizational climate as unfavorable, while they view the departmental climate as more favorable. This may imply great danger on the performance of these organizations. Hence, administrators of these organizations should understand and do their utmost to maintain positive perception of both, organizational and departmental climates. This is very important, especially, when one remembers that those workers are not highly paid and self-motivation could be considered as the key factor in maintaining and enhancing the level and quality of work in these organizations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Every entity - be it an individual, group of individuals, social, political or economic - is characterized by and interplay of endogenous and exogenous forces. Endogenous entity characteristics are those which are instinct and internal to the entity; they are embedded in, and are within the immediate control of, the individual or the entity. Exogenous factors, on the other hand, are a set of environmental dynamic variables that impinge upon an individual or organization. They are beyond the immediate control of the entity. The way these two sets of factors interact or react in a given situation may determine the entity context. The context may differ from one environment to another and from one individual to another. Thus, as individuals develop and manifest different characteristics in different setting (economic, political or social), so do organizations, in which they exist as actors, exhibit distinct characteristics which, in turn, differentiate one organization from another. The relationship between individual members of an organization and the organization itself, on one hand, and the effects of such interactions on employees performance and job satisfaction have been the subject of several industrial organizational behavior studies [1, 2, 3, 4, 555, 7]. Despite the burgeoning literature on the subject, there is as yet no theoretical closure on the apparent overlap of job satisfaction and organizational climate [see for example, 3, pp. 120-125; 4, pp. 287-296; 7, pp. 318-328; 8; 9].

While the debate continues, it is noticeable from the literature that most existent studies were drawn from industrial environmental context, that may be characterized as being profit oriented. Although this situation does not invalidate their findings nor attenuate their utility, the dearth of varied contextual setting (i.e., non-profit oriented or social/welfare organizations) does create an obvious gap in organizational behavior literature. The role of non-profit making organizations in any society can hardly be overemphasized. Their complementary position and the gamut of societal well-being and economic development underscores the need for a systemic study or studies, so as to assess the issues related to organizational climate (O C) and the level of satisfaction of the individual concerned, and also to address the debate of the possible over-

lap of the concepts of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Perhaps, this perceived short-fall maybe understood when put in the context of domicile of most existent studies. Most of the published studies are U.S. based, where most services are run on the basis of commercialization. However, this appreciation in itself merely begs the question. The fact that the literature has ignored non-profit motivated organizations in the field of organizational climate, skews the generalizability of the empirical findings. Conclusions reached from them are mainly derived from the characterization of profit oriented behavioral patterns and may not reflect all environmental context.

The focus of this study, therefore, is to fill this perceived gap by, providing an empirical study of the subject matter (using non-profit making organizations) as a study setting, that has been neglected in most organization behavior studies.

The exploration of this study is pursued in eight sections. The first section represents an introduction to this study and the second section states the need for the study. Section three highlights the objectives of the study and section four shows the study hypotheses. Section five provides the conceptual issues of the study and section six focuses on the issues of research design and methodology. Section seven deals with the statistical analysis and section eight presents a summary of the major findings and concluding remarks.

2. The need for the study

The parameter of considerations that seek the need for the study relates to earlier works on the subject. While existing studies have examined some important questions relevant to O C, and while it may be true to say that a great deal of further research is needed [6, pp. 126-146; 8, pp. 135-139], special importance is given to studying the subject in several specific areas. In particular, Pritchard and Karasick [6, pp. 126-146] observed that, climate dimensions be refined and operationalized so as to enhance cross-study comparability. Further, the study has been prompted by the controversy over the tautology of the perception in organizational climate and job satisfaction, is likely to yield practiced and interesting insights to the decision makers of an organization.

As had earlier been noted, the overall importance of social/welfare delivery systems in a society may justify the need for the contextual setting of this study. The next section discusses the objectives of this study.

3. Objectives of the study

This is concerned with organizational climate (O C) and job satisfaction (JS) as applied to non-profit making organizations in Jordan. The objectives of the study are:

- a. To investigate whether or not organizational climate and job satisfaction are merely semantic;
- b. To assess how the employees and management of a publicly-funded, service-oriented organizations perceive the climate of their working environment (both in terms of overall climate and departmental climate) and job satisfaction, and the relationship of their perception with their individual level of satisfaction.

4. Research hypotheses

With the above objectives in view, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

- H1- There is no difference of perception between overall organizational climate and job satisfaction.
- H2- There is no correlation between organizational climate and job satisfaction.

5. The conceptual issues

Ideally, the set of prevailing circumstances, influences and environmental conditions that characterized an organization maybe conceptualized as "organizational climate". The concept is defined in different terms by different people, but the underlying meaning and implications remain the same. For instance, Guion [3, pp. 120-125] defines O C as "an attribute, or set of attributes, of the work environment". Pritchard and Karasick [6, pp. 126-146] refer to it as "the psychological atmosphere of an organization" Forehand and Gilmer [10] define it as "a set of characteristics that describe an organization, distinguish it from other types or organizations". Drawing from the

works of several authors [10, pp. 361- 382; 11; 12; 13; 14], Pritchard and Karasick [6, p. 127] provide a very comprehensive definition of O C as:

"a relatively enduring quality of an organization's internal environmental distinguishing it from another organization; (a) which results from the behavior and policies of members of the organizations, especially top management; (b) which is perceived by members of organization; (c) which serves as a basis for interpreting the situation; and (d) acts as a source of pressure for directing activity".

Thus, however, conceived and defined, underlying assumptions and characteristics of O C, the concepts appear to be the same. What appears to be an issue in the literature relates not to the essence of O C but rather to the perception of that essence. Because organizational psychologists have found it more comfortable to operationalize O C via "individual perception", the concept of "perceived organizational climate" seems to have gained more popularity with researchers that "attempts to study or to manipulate the attributes of organizations more directly" [3, pp. 120-125]. This shift to methodological convenience, is not only pervasive among researchers [e.g., 6, pp. 126-146; 15], but indeed act as a useful surrogate to an understanding of what O C is and is not for. After all O C, in and by itself, is inanimate, immeasurable and of no functional utility. The expression any organization has, no matter how elegant its edifice maybe, is that brought in or imposed on it and expressed by the people who work in it.

Having dealt with the climate issues, it would be useful to look at the satisfaction issue. Researchers have tended to provide a wide variety of definitions of job satisfaction (JS). Notably, the literature on satisfaction has been characterized by a disagreement of operational issues. A number of researchers [e.g., 16, 17, 18] have correctly pointed out that there is a serious lack of good theory about the very meaning of

job satisfaction. Many of the operational definition of job satisfaction, in fact, imply different meanings of what it is to be satisfied, for example, some imply an equity notion of satisfaction, some imply that satisfaction is related to desires or values [18, pp. 45-105], while others have conceptualized satisfaction in terms of different need areas [19], yet others conceptualized satisfaction in terms of concrete job factors as pay and promotion [20]. It may be noted here that researchers have attempted to draw distinction between global job satisfaction with a particular job facet, known as job facet satisfaction. However, as generally understood, job satisfaction, refers to a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values. Therefore, job satisfaction is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing [21].

There appears to be a trend among several researchers to think of organizational climate as being analogous to the concept of global satisfaction and thus, refer to organizational climate and job satisfaction as tautological. By concluding that, climate as a construct is a creature rediscovery of the satisfaction wheel [3, pp. 120-125].

As already mentioned, this study attempts to deal with this semantic controversy. In so doing, the researcher adopted the approach of Schneider and Snyder [7, pp. 318-328].

It is thus, argued that a logical and empirical distinction between the concepts of satisfaction and climate is possible if (a) both variables are properly conceptualized and (b) each variable is assessed according to an appropriate level of analysis. The following distinctions may be set forth:

- 1.a. Organizational climate is most adequately conceptualized as a summary perception which people have of (or about) an organization. It is then a global impression of what the organization is. These perceptions are reflected in the description that employees make of the policies, practices and conditions which exist in their work environment;

- 1b. Departmental climate is most adequately conceptualized as the climate (similar to organizational climate) of the department in which an individual is working.
2. Job satisfaction is most adequately conceptualized as a personalistic evaluation of conditions existing on the job (work, supervision) or outcomes that arise as a result of having a job (Pay, security). Job satisfaction is the perception of internal responses (i.e. feeling); job satisfaction consists of filtered and processed perceptions, perceptions filtered through the individuals, system of norms, values, expectations, and so forth.

This distinction leads to a classification of climate as "deception" oriented, having an "organizational" level of analysis, and satisfaction as "evaluation" oriented, having an "individual" level of analysis.

6. Research design and methodology

6.1. Research design:

Constructing a research design that enables the testing of the hypotheses, is the next step after determining the research objectives, developing hypotheses and defining the study variables. The following discusses the type of research used in this study.

6.1.1. Non experimental design:

The nature of the investigation dictates the use of non experimental design, however, much of the researchers may prefer the elegance of pure natural science model.

- a. It is difficult to determine which is the dependent and which is the independent variable. Further, the researcher had virtually no control over the variables concerned. Control of variables in terms of treatment could possibly have been ensured if a long period of time was available. Since we are talking about organizational climate and job satisfaction, changes in variables like these do not necessarily manifest within a short span of time, like the amount of time that the researcher had at his disposal to finish the empirical work. On the contrary, the manifestation of such changes may occur after a period of one year or more, even if the researcher was allowed to manipulate changes in the normal policies, practices, norms and conditions of the organizations concerned which is extremely unlikely in this case.

- b. The second issue concerns the researcher's inability to manipulate as to who gets the social service or the help and when they will get it. The influence of the organizational climate and job satisfaction could be presumed to affect all members, if it was present, even before the researcher undertook the study. Since the influence of organizational climate, if any, acts on all members, the feasibility of having a control and experimental group is virtually null. Further, the researcher has no relevant pretest data on the area of interest.

Considering these constraints and the nature of the investigation, non experimental design -partly correlation and partly descriptive- has been adopted.

6.1.2. Content validity:

The issue of content validity has been ensured to a great extent by the adoption of widely accepted measures of organizational climate [dimensions of agency climate questionnaire (ACQ) [22, 23, 24] and job satisfaction [dimensions of job descriptive index (JOI) [e.g., 20, pp. 30-38]. Both these measures contain items aimed at measuring the variables within the domains of the interest. Also, items in the measure reasonably represent respectively the relevant domains.

6.1.3. Construct validity:

The operational definitions of organizational climate and job satisfaction have been set out earlier in section 5. There, it was stated that organizational climate refers to individuals' perception of the global impression of the organization as it is. This is a description of the world as it is. While job satisfaction refers to individuals' perception of their internal feeling as they evaluate the conditions present in their job against their system of norms, values, etc., suitable operational definitions have been used by Schneider and Snyder [7, pp. 318-328]. The ACD and JDI have been used in a number of studies and both measures are reasonably standardized, this ensures both reliability and validity. To further ensure reliability, respondents were instructed to give their responses in the light of the operational definition.

6.1.4. Reliability:

In order to increase the reliability and thereby minimize the measurement error, responses for each dimension of organizational climate and

job satisfaction were obtained by using three questions instead of one. Issues regarding reliability were tested in the Schneider and Snyder [7, pp. 318-328] study for ACQ and JDI and both of measures were found to have reasonable internal -consistency reliability estimates. Moreover, reliability analysis for all measurements of the current study was carried out. The analysis gave encouraging results (Alpha values were > 0.5).

6.2. Research methodology:

6.2.1. Instrument of the study:

The data was collected using a structured questionnaire. A three part questionnaire was administered, of which the first section relates to biographical information, the second and the third parts contain measures of organizational climate and job satisfaction respectively. The second section was sub-divided into sub-sections 'A' and 'b'. Using the same set of dimensions, the sub-section 'A' contains the measures of "overall organization climate" while the sub-section 'B' contains the measures of "departmental climate".

Climate measures: Overall organizational climate and departmental climate were assessed using a modified and short form of agency climate questionnaire (ACQ) [22, pp. 211-217; 23, pp. 323-333; 24, pp. 493-512]. While the dimensions of ACQ were taken, the specific questions were formulated by the researcher. The dimensions of ACQ are as follows:

1. Management support: Manager consideration for personnel as people (support).
2. Managerial structure: Concern for the accomplishing jobs; the importance of achievement (structure).
3. Intra-organizational conflict: The presence of 'in' and 'out' groups (also called harmony, because high score indicates lack of conflict).
4. New employee concern: The careful use of selection and training techniques (concern).
5. Independence: The independence of the employee from organizational control (independence).
6. General satisfaction: How members of the organization interact or socialize (morale).

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction was assessed, based on the job descriptive index (JDI) [20, pp. 30-38]. Similar to the ACQ, the dimensions of JDI were adopted, and the specific questions were formulated by the researcher. The dimensions of JDI are satisfaction with work, pay, promotion opportunities, supervision and Co-workers.

Directions for the responsibility were given in the questionnaire. Respondents were specifically asked to make the responses to each statement related to organizational climate as "they are" not "what they would like them to be", and to make the responses to each statement related to job satisfaction on the basis of what in their "opinion". The statements were measured on a five point scale, ranging from "don't agree 1" to "always agree 5".

6.2.2. Sample size:

The population of the study was constituted of the employees of social/welfare organizations. Of the 350 questionnaires distributed to workers of fifteen different social/welfare organizations and branches in Amman, Zarka and Irbid, 192 questionnaires were returned. 9 questionnaires were incomplete and could not be used, this gives a total of a 183 usable responses. The response rate is thus approximately 52%. Since questionnaires were returned at random out of the entire population of the ten organizations, the element of randomness was reasonably ensured.

6.2.3. Questionnaire administration:

The researcher had meetings with the administration of the ten organizations prior to the administration of the questionnaires and had the opportunity to explain the purpose of the study and assured confidentiality and anonymity of responses. Each questionnaire also had an introductory note explaining its purpose along with the assurance of confidentiality and anonymity. The questionnaires were distributed randomly to workers of each organization and each respondent was asked to return the questionnaire after a week to a specific person in each organization (e.g., a secretary).

6.3. Limitations of the study:

Although attempts have been made to make a study as robust as possible, the study is not free from limitations. The following constraints and limitations are noteworthy:

- a. The research design being a non-experimental one is greatly exposed to the threats of internal validity.
- b. The chances of spurious correlation cannot be eliminated.
- c. Although the study is based on well established measures of climate and satisfaction (ACQ and JDI), the modifications and formulation of the specific questions may raise questions regarding the contract validity and internal-consistency. This point is made on precautional grounds inspite of conducting reliability analysis which showed encouraging results (Alpha values > 0.5) to all measures.

7. Statistical analysis and results:

Considering the objectives and the research hypotheses in section 3 and 4 respectively, a number of statistical techniques have been used. Percentages have been calculated to assist the overall climate, departmental climate, and job satisfaction. To test hypotheses 1 and 2, one way analysis of variance and correlation test have been conducted respectively. The following sections highlight the analysis and the results.

7.1. Analysis of perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction:

7.1.1. Assessment of overall organizational climate:

Table (1)

Perception of different dimensions of overall organizational climate

Degree of favorableness	Support	Structure	Harmony	Concern	Independence	Morale
1	03.36	07.15	12.94	04.60	04.60	02.80
2	35.53	34.08	23.13	36.98	27.67	24.76
3	45.19	37.30	37.99	32.48	48.22	30.10
4	13.11	15.37	23.13	23.13	16.77	34.02
5	02.81	16.10	02.81	02.81	01.74	08.32
All	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

It appears from table 1 that Jordanian social/welfare workers, by large, do not see the overall organizational climate to be favourable. However, the extreme figures (least favorable and most favorable) appears to be low compared to the middle range of the degree of favorableness, which indicate that respondents have a moderate view of the organizational climate.

For the purpose of ease of visualization of the nature of organizational climate, the response of least favorable and considerably unfavorable have been combined together and the responses of considerably favorable and most favorable have also been combined together as shown in table 2. Having done so, the degree of favorableness for each dimension has been discussed separately below.

Table (2)
Perception of different dimensions of overall organizational climate

Degree of favorableness	Support	Structure	Harmony	Concern	Independence	Morale
1	38.89	41.33	36.07	41.58	32.27	27.56
2	45.19	37.30	37.99	32.48	48.22	30.10
3	15.92	21.47	25.94	25.94	19.51	42.34
All	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Support:

38.89% of surveyed staff members of Jordanian social/welfare organizations had unfavorable perception of the support dimension of overall climate, and, on the other hand, 15.92% of the staff members had a favorable outlook toward this dimension. 45.19% of respondents had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward this dimension. That is to say the majority of respondents held neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward the support dimension.

Structure:

The majority (i.e., 41.23%) of respondents did not perceive the structure dimension of overall climate as favorable, on the other hand, 21.47%

had a favorable outlook toward this dimension, and 37.30% of them had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward this dimension.

Harmony:

Again, the majority (i.e., 37.99%) of respondents had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward the harmony dimension. 36.07% did not perceive this dimension as favorable and 25.94% perceived this dimension as favorable.

Concern:

Taking 'Concern' into consideration, the results show a majority (i.e., 41.58%) of respondents did not perceive it as favorable, while those who perceived it as favorable were almost half (i.e., 25.94%) of those who do not. On the other hand, 32.48% perceived this dimension as neither favorable nor unfavorable.

Independence:

Considering independence, one can see that, the majority (48.22%) of respondents had neither positive nor negative outlook toward this dimension. On the other hand, 32.27% of respondents had negative outlook and 19.51% had a positive outlook toward it. This means that the majority of Jordanian social workers were unsure as to whether these organizations encourage self instead of organizational control over their work.

Morale:

Table 2 also shows that the majority (42.34%) of respondents perceived moral as favorable, 27.56% did not perceive it as favorable and 30.10% had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward it.

Following the analysis in the preceding section, it appears that the following interdimensional ranking in terms of the degree of favorableness may be inferred:

- a. Most of Jordanian social/welfare workers perceive 'Concern' to be least favorable, which is followed by 'Structure', 'Support', 'Independence', and 'Morale' respectively. 'Morale' seems to be the lesser evil.
- b. To most of respondents, 'Independence' did not matter much which is followed by 'Support', 'Harmony', 'Structure', respectively. The lowest percentage of respondents in this group was 'Concern' and 'Morale'.

c. To most of respondents 'Morale' seems to be the dimension that is most favorable, while 'Harmony', 'Concern' ranks next then comes 'Structure' and least of the favorables is the 'Support'.

7.1.2. Assessment of departmental climate:

Table (3)

Perception of different dimensions of departmental climate

Degree of favorableness	Support	Structure	Harmony	Concern	Independence	Morale
1	02.45	04.30	00.60	04.30	00.60	00.60
2	13.56	15.42	11.71	17.27	02.45	09.86
3	19.17	30.28	15.47	13.61	28.43	22.87
4	24.98	36.19	52.75	37.94	41.64	34.24
5	39.84	13.81	19.47	26.88	26.88	32.43
All	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

A similar table (i.e., table 3) has been constructed to present the responses for departmental climate of Jordanian social/welfare organizations, according to similar dimensions. As contrast to overall organizational climate, table 3 reveals that respondents tend to perceive departmental climate to be more favorable than unfavorable. Also, as contrast to the overall organizational climate, the departmental climate, by large, shows a symmetrical percentages in extreme cases (most favorable and least favorable) having higher percentages in most favorableness. The observation supports the immediately preceding observation.

A similar analysis of dimension-wise perception of the degree of favorableness is discussed below.

Table (4)

Perception of different dimensions of departmental climate

Degree of favorableness	Support	Structure	Harmony	Concern	Independence	Morale
1	16.01	19.71	12.31	21.57	03.05	10.46
2	19.17	30.28	15.47	13.61	28.43	22.87
3	64.82	50.00	72.22	64.82	68.52	66.67
All	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Support:

The majority (i.e., 64.82%) of respondents perceived the support dimension of the departmental climate as favorable and 16.01% did not perceive this dimension as favorable. On the other hand, 19.17% of respondents had neither positive nor negative outlook toward it.

Structure:

50% of respondents perceived the structure dimension in their departmental climate as favorable and 19.71% did not perceive it as favorable. On the other hand, 30.28% of respondents had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward this dimension of their departmental climate.

Harmony:

72.22% of respondents perceived harmony as a favorable dimension in their departmental climate, 12.31% did not perceive it as favorable and 15.47% had neither positive nor negative outlook toward it.

Concern:

64.82% of respondents perceived concern as a favorable dimension of their departmental climate. 21.57% did not perceive concern as favorable and 13.61% had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward it.

Independence:

While 68.52% perceived this dimension as favorable, 3.05% did not perceive independence of the departmental climate as favorable and 28.43% had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward this dimension.

Morale:

66.67% of respondents perceived morale of their departmental climate as a favorable dimension. 10.46% did not perceive it as favorable and on the other hand, 22.87% had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook toward it.

Following the analysis in the preceding section, it appears that the following interdimensional ranking in terms of degree of favorableness may be inferred.

- a. Most respondents perceived 'Concern' to be the least favorable which is followed by 'Structure', 'Support', 'Harmony', 'Morale' and 'Independence', is least favorable to only 3.05% of the respondents.
- b. When considering respondents who had neither favorable nor unfavorable outlook, it appears from table 3 that 'Structure' has the highest percentage which is followed by 'Independence', 'Morale', 'Support', 'Harmony' and 'Concern'.
- c. The percentage of all dimensions were quite large when favorableness is considered. Respondents seem to be most happy with 'Harmony' which is followed by 'Independence', 'Morale', 'Concern'. and 'Support', and finally 'Structure'.

7.1.3. Comparative analysis of overall organizational and departmental climates:

The problem of responses to overall climate and departmental climate appear to be significantly different. Some comparative analysis has already been done in the beginning of section 7.1.2. Therefore, in this section the researcher concentrates on the dimension-wise comparative analysis of overall organizational and departmental climates, taking into consideration table 2 and table 4.

Respondents tend to perceive the departmental climate more favorable than the overall climate. While they tend to view the overall climate more unfavorable than the departmental climate when 'Support' dimension is considered, more respondents see the 'support' dimension as neither favorable nor unfavorable, in case of overall climate than departmental climate. Similar patterns of responses can be observed in all other dimensions.

7.1.4. Assessment of job satisfaction:

**Table (5)
Perception of job satisfaction**

Degree of Satisfaction	Work	Pay	Promotion	Supervision	Co-workers
1	00.60	20.97	17.27	00.60	00.60
2	11.71	48.75	35.79	06.16	13.56
3	28.43	11.76	32.13	28.43	15.47
4	32.38	15.72	12.01	49.05	30.53
5	26.88	02.80	02.80	15.76	39.48
All	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Considering all dimensions of job satisfaction, table 5 has been constructed. A review of the table would reveal that the percentages of responses for each dimension are arranged according to the perception of the degree of satisfaction. The pattern of responses in the same table shows two distinct trends. Respondents appear to be more satisfied in terms of dimensions like 'Work', 'Co-workers' and 'Supervision' while they are more dissatisfied with 'Pay' and 'Promotion'.

For the purpose of ease of visualization of the perception of job satisfaction, table 5 has been converted to table 6 by combining the first two rows of table 6 together and the last two rows of the same table together. This gave us three degrees of satisfaction. The first row represents dissatisfaction, the second row represents neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction and the third row represents satisfaction. Having done so, the perception of job satisfaction in terms of each dimension has been discussed below.

Table (6)
Perception of job satisfaction

Degree of Satisfaction	Work	Pay	Promotion	Supervision	Co-workers
1	12.31	69.72	53.06	06.76	14.16
2	28.43	11.76	32.13	28.43	15.47
3	59.26	18.52	14.81	64.81	70.37
All	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Work:

The majority (i.e., 59.26%) of respondents were satisfied with their work, 12.31% were not satisfied and 28.43% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Promotion:

53.06% of respondents were not satisfied with their promotion, 14.81% were satisfied and 32.13% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

Co-workers:

Most of respondents (i.e., 70.37%) were satisfied with their co-workers and 14.16% of respondents were not satisfied. Furthermore, 15.47% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their Co-workers.

Pay:

The majority (i.e., 69.72%) were not satisfied with their level of payment and 18.52% were satisfied. On the other hand, 11.76% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the level of payment.

Supervision:

Most of the respondents (i.e., 64.81%) were satisfied with the level of supervision and 6.76% were not satisfied. Moreover, 28.43% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with this dimension.

Following the analysis in the preceding section, it appears that the following interdimensional ranking in terms of degree of satisfaction maybe inferred.

- a. To most of respondents 'Pay' seems to be the most dissatisfying dimension of job satisfaction, which is followed by 'Promotion', 'Co-workers', 'Work' and finally 'Supervision'.
- b. Taking into consideration those who were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, it appears that most respondents ranked 'promotion' first which is followed by 'Supervision' and 'Work', 'Co-workers' and finally 'Pay'.
- c. Jordanian Social/Welfare workers seem to be most satisfied with 'Co-workers' followed by 'Supervision', 'Work', 'Pay' and finally 'Promotion'.

7.2. Analysis of Variance to test hypothesis 1:

The first hypothesis states that, there is no difference of perception between overall organizational climate and job satisfaction. In order to test this hypothesis, one way analysis of Variance has been applied. First, the mean of the climate scores and the mean of the job satisfaction scores of each individual under study have been computed, then these two sets of mean have been used to perform the test. In passing, it may however, be noted that the researcher found the use of this test is justified in terms of the assumptions of the test.

Ryan [25] reported on the use of this test and stated that, in practice the normality assumption for this test is not important, the equal variation assumption is not important (provided the number of observations in each group is about the same), but the assumption of a random sample is very important.

The researcher found the distribution of the mean scores of the organizational climate and job satisfaction to be reasonably normal, and the researcher had equal number of observations in both distributions. Finally and most importantly, the researcher has ensured randomness of the responses.

In order to perform the test, the null hypothesis was formulated:

H₀-There is no different between the means of scores of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

The results of the analysis of variance for organizational climate and job satisfaction showed that, the calculated value of (F) is 11.15. The

theoretical value of F ratio at 99% level of confidence is approximately 3.92 which is far less than the calculated value; therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the two means represent two different distributions. Consequently, this supports the contention that the dimensions of organizational climate and job satisfaction measure two different things as they represent two different distributions of responses.

Therefore, we have evidence to reject the first hypothesis of the study and conclude that the concept of perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction are not tautological.

7.3. Correlation test for H2:

The second hypothesis states that, there is no correlation between organizational climate and job satisfaction. For the purpose of testing this hypothesis a correlation test was conducted using the mean scores of overall organizational climate and the mean scores of job satisfaction. The Coefficient of correlation of the two variables is ($r=0.630$). This gives us the evidence to reject the hypothesis and conclude that organizational climate and job satisfaction are generally related to each other.

8. Summary of major findings and concluding remarks:

The major findings maybe summarized below:

- a. It appears from the analysis of the results that Jordanian workers of Social/Welfare organizations tend to view the overall organizational climate as unfavorable, while they view the departmental climate as more favorable.
- b. Of the six dimensions of the overall organizational climate, 'Morale' seems to be quite high with respect to others, while in case of departmental climate 'Harmony' seems to be quite high with respect to others.
- c. Employees of the Social/Welfare organizations seem to be very dissatisfied with 'Pay' and 'Promotion' and very satisfied with Co-workers' meaning that they have strong affiliation with fellow members and they have highly satisfying social relationships with other members of their organizations. They are also quite satisfied with 'Supervision' and 'Work' indicating that they enjoy the nature of supervision and they have a reasonable degree of involvement with the work they do.

However, these organizations should devote lots of effort to understand workers' unfavorableness to the overall organizational climate. This is important for keeping these organizations going, especially, when one remembers that those workers are not highly paid and their work efficiency depends greatly on their self-motivation. For instance, a drop in workers' morale or a little bit more of dissatisfaction with other overall organizational dimensions would jeopardize the social activities of these organizations.

- d. Based on the evidence generated in the study one may reasonably conclude that organizational climate is positively correlated to job satisfaction. However, no attempts have been made to establish causality of the relationship, which could be a subject of further study.
- e. Finally, the data strongly supports that the concepts of organizational climate and job satisfaction are not tautological and they measure different things of the organizational scenario. However, the extent of generalizability of the conclusions of this study is an open question and can hardly be considered a definite answer as a result of a single study like this. This is made on precautional grounds and in answer to the question of the possible overlap of the concepts and empirical domains of organizational climate and job satisfaction. It is proposed that in order to obtain a greater generalizability of the conclusions of the study, further research maybe conducted using the same set of constructs and questionnaire.

References:

- [1] Alderfer, C. "An empirical test on new theory of human needs", Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 2 (1969), 142-175
- [2] Argyris, C. "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 2, (1957), 501-520.
- [3] Guion, R. "A Note on Organizational Climate", Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 9, (1973), 120-125..
- [4] Guion, R. "Open a New Window: Validities and Values in Psychological Measurement". American Psychologist, Vol. 29, (1974), 287-296.
- [5] Porter, L. W. and Lawler, E.E., "Properties of Organization Structure in Relation to Job Attitudes and Job Behavior", Psychological Bulletin, Vol 64, (1965), 23-51.
- [6] Pritchard, R.D. and Karasick. "The Effects of Organizational Climate on Managerial Job Performance and Job Satisfaction", Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 9, (1973), 126-146.
- [7] Schneider and Snyder, "Some Relationships between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 60, No. 3, (1970), 318-328.
- [8] Gavin James. "Organizational Climate as a Function of Personal and Organizational Variables", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 60, No. 1, (1975), 135-139.
- [9] Johanneson, R. E., "Some Problems in the Measurement of the Organizational Climate", Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, Vol. 10, (1973), 118-144.
- [10] Forehand, G. and Gilmer, B. "Environmental Variation in Studies of Organizational Behavior", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 62, (1964), 361-382.
- [11] Georgopolous, B. "Normative Structure Variables and Organizational Behavior", Human Relations, Vol. 18, (1965), 115-170.
- [12] Gellerman, S. "The Company Personality", Management Review, Vol. 48, (1959), 69-76.
- [13] Glimer, B. Industrial Psychology, New York: Mcgraw-Hill, 1966.
- [14] Taguiri, R. "The Concept of Organizational Climate" in: Taguiri and Litwin. "Organizational Climate: Explorations of a Concept", Division of Research, Harvard Business School, (1968).
- [15] Lawshe and Nagle "Productivity and Attitude Toward Supervisors", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 37, (1954), 159-162.
- [16] Evans, W. "Indices of the Hierarchical Structure of Industrial Organizations", Management Science, Vol. 9, (1963), 468-477.

-
- [17] Schwab and Cummings, "Theories of Performance and Satisfaction: A Review", **Industrial Relations**, Vol. 9, (1970), 408-430.
- [18] Wanous, J. and Lawler, E. E. "Measurement and Measuring of Job Satisfaction", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, Vol. 56, (1972), 95-105.
- [19] Porter, L. W. "Job Attitudes in Management: Perceived Deficiencies in Need Fulfillment as A function of Job Level", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, Vol. 46, (1962), 375-384.
- [20] Smith, Kendal and Hulin. **The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work Retirement**, Chicago: Rand McNally. 1969.
- [21] Locke, E. A. "What is Job Satisfaction", **Organizational Behavior and Human Performance**, Vol. 4, (1969), 309-336.
- [22] Schneider, B. "Organizational Climate: Individual Preferences and Organizational Realities", **Journal of Applied Psychology**, Vol. 56, (1972), 211-217.
- [23] Schneider and Bartlett. "Individual Differences and Organizational Climate: The Research Plan and Questionnaire Development", **Personal Psychology**, Vol. 21, (1968) 323-333.
- [24] Schneider and Bartlett. "Individual Differences and Organizational Climate: Measurement of Organizational Climate to the Multirater Matrix", **Personal Psychology**, Vol. 23, (1970), 493-512.
- [25] Ryan et. al. **Minitab Handbook**, Boston: BWS Publishers, 1985.
- [26] Feldman, D. C. "The Multiple Socialization of Organization Members", **Academy of Management Review**, Vol. 6, No. 2, (1981), 309-318.
- [27] Louis, M.R. "Surprise and Sensemaking: What Newcomers Experience in Entering Unfamiliar Organizational Setting", **Administrative Science Quarterly**, Vol. 25, (1980), 226-251.
- [28] Pritchard, P. **Manual of Primary Health Care: Its Nature and Organization**, Oxford University Press, 1981.
- [29] Reichers, A. E. "An Interactionist on Newcomer Socialization rates", **Academy of Management Review**, Vol. 12 (1987), 278-287.