



THE INTERVENING EFFECTS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE INNOVATIVENESS ON THE EMPLOYEES' JOB SATISFACTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAGAYAN VALLEY

DR. MARY ROSE F. ESTEBAN-Faculty, University of Cagayan Valley Tuguegarao City,
Cagayan, Philippines

ABSTRACT: *The quality of the staff of a school has a large impact and is one of the primary factors that determines student achievement in a school. Such achievement is strongly linked to preparation and ability to deal with diverse students. Certification and experience also play a huge role in tests scores and the better delivery of instruction. This study attempted to determine the intervening effects of school climate innovativeness on the employees' job satisfaction of the University of Cagayan Valley. The respondents of the study were the members of the administration, faculty, and personnel of the University. Vice Presidents and Maintenance group were excluded in the study. The instrument used was a questionnaire consisting of a 57-item statements on the 9 dimensions of school climate innovativeness. The tool used was patterned from the Organizational Survey O.P. Services crafted by Tiia Vahalamukka (2011). Added to the instrument are statements from the Dimensions of the Learning Organization Instrument by Victoria J. Marsick and Karen E. Watkins (2010) and the Innovative Work Behavior Scale by Jansen (2000). The instrument was modified to fit in to the level of the respondents and to the objectives of the study. For the assessment of teachers' job satisfaction, the researcher made use of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Lester (1982) with nine factors. This study made use of the descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive design was used to describe the respondent's existing school climate innovativeness and correlated with the employees' mean job satisfaction. Different statistical tools were used to treat the data gathered. The weighted mean was used to find the level of school climate innovativeness of the respondents. The Pearson r Correlation was used in finding the significant relationship of the extent of school climate innovativeness of respondents' mean job satisfaction. Likewise, the F -test was used to compare the assessment of the three groups of respondents on their assessment of school climate innovativeness and their job satisfaction. Based on the findings of the study, there is a high level of school climate innovativeness influences employees job*



satisfaction. This therefore explains the interrelationship between and among school climate innovativeness and job satisfaction. Thus, a positive organizational climate, stimulates positive behavior among employees which ultimately results to job satisfaction. To ensure a school interpersonal relationship among employees' compensation, working conditions, programs and policies of the school have yet to be optimized, to avoid factions, confusions, and communication gap in the organization. Therefore, if the school desires to get the best from its human resources, then it must reflect on what it offers to ensure that the university performs at its maximum efficiency. Having arrived at the findings, the researcher recommends that the school should do something to increase the level of job satisfaction of the employees, team building activities must be conducted among administrators, faculty, and personnel to encourage collaboration and teamwork, recognition of outstanding performance of employees should be conducted and rewarded. Top management must provide a recognition and reward system to increase job satisfaction and devise a way to motivate employees, information availability mechanisms of the institution should be improved, the institution may opt to introduce a more technology-driven capability in keeping employee database, and additional opportunities may be provided to ensure that administrators feel that they are in a path of constant advancement if they perform according to expectations.

KEYWORDS: Intervening, effects, Administration, climate innovativeness, job satisfaction, communication, compensation, personnel, recognition, incentives, resources, security, work-balance,

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important considerations in a school is the human resource aspect. More than any other field of improvement, human resource directly affects the school's goal to deliver learning and instruction to students.

While a school can invest in improving hardware and facilities, new and groundbreaking school policies, delivery of student services, and other factors that affect the academic climate, no enhancements will be worthwhile if there are no equivalent developments in



the capacities and capabilities of the workforce of a school. It is no stretch to say that the past, present, and future of a school hinges on its human resource development.

Thus, it is incumbent on a school's management to study the specific factors that positively or negatively affect its workforce. More importantly, it is imperative that a school take advantage of opportunities and address weaknesses that are revealed or laid bare by these studies. Also integral is that there is continuous improvement in human resources, that there are constant efforts to improve the workforce, or at least efforts that are performed in short, regular intervals. Otherwise, the increased efficiency and effectivity that is created by these efforts will eventually erode or would be taken over by subsequent factors or developments in the space.

Of specific importance is the development and improvement of administrators and other middle managers who have a direct impact on the delivery of services. People who implement policies crafted by top-level management, ensure that these policies are performed according to the broad vision, mission, and goals of the school, and create intermediate-level policies that address specific problems encountered in classrooms, offices, and other learning spaces.

While this broad group can be further divided into managers such as deans, directors, and faculty, it can be said that the findings and conclusions regarding teachers specifically can also be applied to them in general. This significant undertaking must be made since most of the body of research focus on the impact of several factors on teachers. There is a logical basis for this claim since the factors that would affect teachers would also affect other employees in the school and that non-teaching personnel would logically also have an impact on student learning. Besides, the policies used to improve the conditions of teachers would also be applicable to other staff members.

The quality of the staff of a school has a large impact and is one of the primary factors that determines student achievement in a school. Such achievement is strongly linked to preparation and ability to deal with diverse students. Certification and experience also play a huge role in tests scores and the better delivery of instruction.



One of the factors that can lead to high satisfaction and commitment is the school climate for innovativeness. In an increasingly technological and globalized world, schools must be ready to embrace new concepts and ideas and be able to nurture a school climate that breeds these new concepts and ideas. Innovativeness is the ability of an organization to create, develop, foster, and preserve new knowledge and techniques. While organizational innovativeness is an issue that began and has been analyzed in a business perspective, there are key differences between schools and businesses, and thus school climate innovativeness must be seen in a different perspective. In particular, the capacity of schools to generate knowledge as a core part of their nature means that fostering innovativeness can be together with increasing the research focus of the school.

There are multiple ways in creating the school climate for innovation. One of the most pressing factors is the entrepreneurial leadership styles of school heads and other school administrators which has a huge impact in a school's innovativeness. This necessitates training for employees, making them more knowledgeable and competent in employing these leadership styles to bring more innovation into schools.

School climate refers to the quality and character of school life. It has been described as "the heart and soul of the school", that essence of a school that leads a child, a teacher, and an administrator to love the school and to look forward to being there each school day (Freinerg, H. J. 1999). A positive school climate helps people feel socially, emotionally and physically safe in schools. It includes students', parents' and school personnel's norms, beliefs, relationships, teaching and learning practices, as well as organizational and structural features of the school (Cohen, J, 2009).

According to The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments (NCSSLE), **school climate is a broad, multi-faceted concept that involves many aspects of the student's educational experience. A positive school climate is the product of a school's attention to fostering safety; promoting a supportive academic, disciplinary, and physical environment; and encouraging and maintaining respectful, trusting, and caring**



relationships throughout the school community no matter the setting—from Pre-K/Elementary School to higher education.

A positive school climate is critically related to school success. For example, it can improve attendance, achievement, and retention and even rates of graduation, according to research. School climate has many aspects. Defining a framework for understanding school climate can help educators identify key areas to focus on to create safe and supportive climates in their schools. (<https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov>)

As part of the school climate improvement process, these measures can be used to highlight a school's areas of strength and areas in need of improvement. It can also be used to assess changes in school climate over time. School climate can be assessed indirectly through measures such as student attendance, suspensions, teacher turnover, or student mobility. It can also be assessed more directly by gathering information from members of the school. (Thomas, A; Grimes, J, 2002).

When gathering information about school climate, it is recommended to gather information from multiple perspectives (e.g., teachers, administrators, students, etc.). For instance, a study comparing parents', teachers', and students' perceptions of school climate found that students reported worse ratings of safety and connectedness than the adults. (Tanner, C. K., 2000). In addition, some student characteristics also affect their perception of school climate. Therefore, having behavior problems, being held back a grade, coming from a single-parent family, or having a different ethnic background can all influence a student's perception of school climate. This emphasizes the importance of gathering information from different informants when assessing school climate. (Thapa, A.; Cohen, J.; Guffey, S.; Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. 2013).

One of the most widely used definitions in organizational research is that of Locke (1976), who defines job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1304). Others have defined it as simply how content an individual is with his or her job; whether he or she likes the job or not. It is assessed at both the global level (whether or not the individual is satisfied with the job



overall), or at the facet level (whether or not the individual is satisfied with different aspects of the job).

Job satisfaction can be defined also as the extent to which a worker is content with the rewards he or she gets out of his or her job, particularly in terms of intrinsic motivation (Statt, 2004).

The term job satisfaction refers to the attitude and feelings people have about their work. Positive and favorable attitudes towards the job indicate job satisfaction. Negative and unfavorable attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2006).

Spector (1997) lists 14 common facets: Appreciation, Communication, Coworkers, Fringe benefits, Job conditions, Nature of the work, Organization, Personal growth, Policies and procedures, Promotion opportunities, Recognition, Security, and Supervision.

Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have towards their work. Meanwhile, when a worker employed in a business organization, brings with it the needs, desires and experiences which determinates expectations that he has dismissed. Job satisfaction represents the extent to which expectations are and match the real awards. Job satisfaction is closely linked to that individual's behavior in the workplace (Davis et al.,1985).

In the field of Information Technology, modern software development relies on collaborative work as a means for sharing knowledge, distributing tasks and responsibilities, reducing risk of failures, and increasing the overall quality of the software product. Such objectives are achieved with a continuous share of the programmers' daily working life that inevitably influences the programmers' job satisfaction. One of the major challenges in process management is to determine the causes of this satisfaction. Traditional research models job satisfaction with social aspects of collaborative work like communication, work sustainability, and work environment. (Pedrycz, W. et.al, 2011).



Therefore, school policies and programs that ensure effective, satisfied, and committed employees are necessary in effective school administration. Being the most important resource in a school, it is incumbent on the school administration to determine the factors that affect them to effect improvements on their ability to perform their work, which would have a trickle-down effect on students.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study attempted to determine the intervening effects of school climate innovativeness on the employees' job satisfaction of the University of Cagayan Valley. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do administration, faculty and personnel assess their school climate innovativeness as assessed by themselves and as a whole relative to the following dimensions?

- 1.1. Mission, Vision and Purpose
- 1.2. Feedback
- 1.3. Communication
- 1.4. Resources and Procedures
- 1.5. Opportunities for Growth
- 1.6. Compensation
- 1.7. Work/Life Balance
- 1.8. Fairness and Security

1.9. Innovative Work Behavior

2. Is there a significant difference among the assessment of the three groups of respondents on the extent to which they assess their school climate innovativeness relative to the above dimensions?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the school climate innovativeness as assessed by the three groups of respondents and their job satisfaction level?



4. What dimensions of school climate innovativeness least influence the job satisfaction level and organizational commitment of the employees?

5. What program interventions may be proposed to address the dimensions of school climate innovativeness that least influenced the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the employees?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The respondents of the study were the members of the administration, faculty, and personnel of the University. Vice Presidents and Maintenance group were excluded in the study. The instrument used was a questionnaire consisting of a 57-item statements on the 9 dimensions of school climate innovativeness along Mission, Vision and Purpose, Feedback, Communication, Resources and Procedures, Opportunities for Growth, Compensation, Work/Life Balance, Fairness and Security, Innovative Work Behavior. The tool used was patterned from the Organizational Survey O.P. Services crafted by Tiia Vahalamukka (2011). Added to the instrument are statements from the Dimensions of the Learning Organization Instrument by Victoria J. Marsick and Karen E. Watkins (2010) and the Innovative Work Behavior Scale by Jansen (2000). The instrument was modified to fit in to the level of the respondents and to the objectives of the study. For the assessment of teachers' job satisfaction, the researcher made use of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Lester (1982) with nine factors as to supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security, and recognition. This comprised of 66 items with five-point scale format assessing the nine facets of job satisfaction.

This study made use of the descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive design was used to describe the respondent's existing school climate innovativeness and correlated with the employees' mean job satisfaction. Different statistical tools were used



to treat the data gathered. The weighted mean was used to find the level of school climate innovativeness of the respondents.

The employees' level of school climate innovativeness was analyzed and interpreted using the following scale:

Numerical Scale	Mean Rating	Qualitative Equivalent
4	3.25-4.00	Strongly Agree/ Very High
3	2.50-3.24	Agree/High
2	1.75-2.49	Disagree/Low
1	1.00-1.74	Strongly Disagree/Very Low

Likewise, employees' job satisfaction was interpreted using the following scale:

Numerical Scale Mean Rating Qualitative Equivalent

4	3.25-4.00	Strongly Agree/Very High
3	2.50-3.24	Agree/High
2	1.75-2.49	Disagree/Low
1	1.00-1.74	Strongly Disagree/Very Low

The Pearson r Correlation was used in finding the significant relationship of the extent of school climate innovativeness of respondents' mean job satisfaction. Likewise, the F-test was used to compare the assessment of the three groups of respondents on their assessment of school climate innovativeness and their job satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Administrators, Faculty and Personnel Level of School Climate Innovativeness

1.1. Mission, Vision and Purpose

Table 2a: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole



Relative to Mission, Vision and Purpose Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I am familiar with the mission, vision and values of the institution.	3.74	SA	3.53	SA	3.37	SA	3.55	SA
2. I can see the link between my work and the institution objectives.	3.60	SA	3.46	SA	3.27	SA	3.44	SA
3. Mission, vision and values show in everyday work and procedures.	3.46	SA	3.3	SA	3.15	A	3.3	SA
4. The institution is able to drive and mobilize others towards its goals.	3.31	SA	3.13	A	3.22	A	3.22	A
5. The institution conveys the goals and objectives to others.	3.43	SA	3.29	SA	3.33	SA	3.35	SA
The institution invites people to contribute to its vision	3.51	SA	3.3	SA	3.28	SA	3.36	SA
Category Mean	3.46	SA	3.34	SA	3.28	SA	3.36	SA

For **Administrators**, rated highest by the respondents is item number 1 which state that “ I am familiar with the mission, vision and values of the institution.” with a mean of 3.74 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrators are aware of the mission, vision and values of the institution, as well as their importance in relation to the performance of the administrator’s functions. These are reflected in their manual of operations, aside from being posted in their offices. To be able to lead a department or an office, it is expected that they provide direction towards the attainment of the mission, vision, goals, and objectives of the organization and even the values exhibited by their staff. Rated lowest is item number 4 “The institution is able to drive and mobilize others towards its goals.” with a mean of 3.31 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the institution is able to motivate administrators to work towards the goals of the school. It also implies that they are driven to perform their roles and responsibilities as heads and are mindful of their mandate. In fact the mission, vision and goals are also transcended to the other stakeholders for their realization. The category mean is 3.46 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrators



are very much aware on the school climate innovativeness relative to mission, vision and purpose dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 “I am familiar with the mission, vision and values of the institution.” with a mean of 3.53 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that faculty are aware of their roles and exhibit strong familiarity of the mission, vision, and values of the institution because they discuss these in class with their students. Besides these are contained in their syllabi and in the faculty manual. Rated lowest is item number 4 “The institution is able to drive and mobilize others towards its goals.” with a mean of 3.13 or “Agree”. This implies that the institution can mobilize the faculty towards the goal of the university and perform what is expected from them because these are very well discussed during pre-opening assembly and discussed during faculty meetings. They also discussed them during them during their first meeting with students in classes. The category mean of 3.34 implies that the faculty are also very knowledgeable on the school climate innovativeness relative to Mission, Vision and Purpose dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 “I am familiar with the mission, vision and values of the institution.” with a mean of 3.37 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that personnel are mindful of the mission, vision and values of the institution, and their roles in attaining these. They strongly agree since these are posted in strategic places and even recite them, when needed, especially during external assessment and accreditation. Rated lowest is item number 3 “Mission, vision and values show in everyday work and procedures.” with a mean of 3.15 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel can see and actualize the mission, vision, and values of the institution, in their daily functions. In fact, in serving the students they are guided by the mission and vision of the institution. The category mean of 3.28 implies that personnel just like the administrators and family are very much aware on the school climate innovativeness relative to Mission, Vision and Purpose dimension.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 1 “I am familiar with the mission, vision and values of the institution” with a mean of 3.53 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the three



groups of respondents are aware of the mission, vision and values of the institution, their role in the attainment of these goals, and how these goals must be affected as they perform their responsibilities. Rated lowest is item number 4 “The institution is able to drive and mobilize others towards its goals.” with a mean of 3.22 or “Agree”. This means that the three groups of respondents are influenced, driven, and mobilized by the institution to work towards the attainment of its goals. They are guided by the institutional development plan and the annual plan of the deans and heads of office, which are also reflected in their performance commitment. The overall category mean is 3.36 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are fully aware on the school climate innovativeness relative to Mission, Vision and Purpose dimension. The philosophy, mission, vision and core values of the University are posted in all offices, bulletin boards and other conspicuous places where it is visible to all employees and students of the university. As a result, it is easier for the employee and everyone to recall and better understand the mission, vision of the school.

1.2. Feedback

Table 2b: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Feedback Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I am recognized whenever I do a good job.	2.97	A	2.98	A	3.07	A	3.01	A
2. My boss provides one with adequate feedback.	3.29	SA	3.2	A	3.00	SA	3.16	A
3. The feedback I receive is useful and constructive.	3.14	A	3.21	A	2.95	A	3.10	A
4. I use the information from others to develop and grow.	3.37	SA	3.34	SA	3.37	SA	3.36	SA
5. Every member listens to suggestions of others.	3.06	A	3.01	A	2.60	A	2.89	A



6. The institution shares up-to-date information with employees about competitors, industry trends and directions.	2.74	A	2.96	A	2.67	A	2.79	A
7. The institution makes its lessons learned available to all employees	2.69	A	2.89	A	2.91	A	2.83	A
Category Mean	3.04	A	3.08	A	2.57	A	2.90	A

For **Administrators**, rated highest by the respondents is item number 4 which states that “I use the information from others to develop and grow.” with a mean of 3.37 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrators listen to their colleagues and other stakeholders in the performance of their jobs. It also means that they recognize the value of others for they listen to suggestions and recommendations. Rated lowest is item number 7 “The institution makes its lessons learned available to all employees.” with a mean of 2.69 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators believe that important information are available anytime. It also means that the institution is open and find ways to make sure administrators are informed on things relevant to their department/unit/office. The category mean of 3.04 or “Agree” implies that administrators are aware on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to Feedback dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 “I use the information from others to develop and grow.” with a mean of 3.34 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that faculty listen to other stakeholders. It also means that they are open to suggestions for them improve. Rated lowest is item number 7 “The institution makes its lessons learned available to all employees “, with a mean of 2.89 or “Agree”. This shows that faculty see that the institution makes information available to employees, but see that such still has room for improvement. The category mean of 3.08 or “Agree” implies that faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to feedback dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 “I use the information from others to develop and grow.” with a mean of 3.37 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that personnel are conscious of how they work and listen to suggestions to improve and grow. It also means that they are open-minded. Rated lowest is item number 5 “Every member



listens to suggestions of others.” with a mean of 2.60 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel are open to suggestions and are willing to improve, however, improvements can still be made on inter-personnel communication. The category mean of 2.57 or “Agree” implies that personnel agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to feedback dimension.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 4 “I use the information from others to develop and grow.” with a mean of 3.36 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents value the importance of their colleagues and their fellow employees when it comes to feedbacking and providing positive criticism. They listen to suggestions and recommendations for them to improve. Rated lowest is item number 6 “The institution shares up-to-date information with employees about competitors, industry trends and directions”, with a mean of 2.79 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents find the school relatively open in terms of sharing information regarding the current state of the organization. Whatever plans the institution is pursuing or undertaking, they are given advice as to how things are done or may be done. Personnel are informed about the expectations of the institution and possible consequences when these expectations are not met. It also means that the institution may opt to provide a more innovative way to provide feedback to the employees. The overall category mean is 2.90 or “Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to feedback dimension.

1.3. Communication

Table 2c: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Communication Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS



1. I generally feel informed about the changes that affect me within the institution.	2.83	A	2.88	A	2.57	A	2.76	A
2. The institution uses two-way communication on a regular basis, such as suggestion systems, electronic bulletin boards and open meetings.	2.91	A	2.89	A	2.65	A	2.82	A
3. My boss is available to me whenever I have questions or need help.	3.63	SA	3.32	SA	3.40	SA	3.45	SA
4. Written and verbal communications made are delivered clearly.	3.17	A	3.13	A	3.03	A	3.11	A
5. Each member of the institution knows who is responsible for what, who needs to be informed and who has the capability to accomplish a certain task.	2.77	A	2.95	A	2.85	A	2.86	A
6. The institution enables people to get needed information at any time quickly and easily.	2.86	A	2.81	A	2.68	A	2.78	A
Category Mean	3.03	A	2.88	A	2.86	A	2.92	A

For **Administrators**, rated highest by the respondents is item number 3 which states that “My boss is available to me whenever I have questions or need help.” with a mean of 3.63 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the superiors or administrators are readily available when they are needed by their subordinates. It also means that these middle level managers are willing to lend a hand if there are concerns that may need their attention and support. Rated lowest by the administrator-respondents is item number 5, “Each member of the institution knows who is responsible for what, who needs to be informed and who has the capability to accomplish a certain task.” with a mean of 2.77 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators function as expected from their designation. It also means that the institution can institute a clearer way of imposing a responsibility based on the job description of the administrators. The category mean is 2.88 or “Agree”. This implies that



administrators agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to communication dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 “My boss is available to me whenever I have questions or need help.” with a mean of 3.32 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that faculty assessed their supervisors as always ready to accommodate them whenever needed. It also means that their supervisors show readiness to show guidance when there are issues that need to be resolved. Rated lowest is item number 6 “The institution enables people to get needed information at any time quickly and easily.” with a mean of 2.81 or “Agree”. This implies that information needed by the faculty are readily available. It is also assessed by the faculty that the institution provides desired information when possible, but that the information availability mechanisms of the institution can still be improved. The category mean of 3.08 or “Agree” implies that faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to feedback dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 “Written and verbal communications made are delivered clearly” with a mean of 3.03 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel find that information and communication delivery systems are successfully implemented. This further means that the personnel are aware of what is happening in the organization. Rated lowest is item number 1 “I generally feel informed about the changes that affect me within the institution” with a mean of 2.57 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel are aware of what is going-on in the organization. More importantly, it shows that personnel perceive that they are made aware of changes that affect them, but such could still be improved. Ultimately, it also means that they are involved and feel that they belong. The category mean of 2.86 or “Agree” implies that personnel agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to communication dimension.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 3 “My boss is available to me whenever I have questions or need help.” with a mean of 3.45 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents see highly that the administrators are ready to answer whatever questions a subordinate has and are always available when they are needed by their



subordinates. Also, it means that administrators are willing to lend a hand whenever there are concerns that need their attention and support. Rated lowest is item number 1 “I generally feel informed about the changes that affect me within the institution” with a mean of 2.76 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are concerned of their status, position and roles in the organization, and of information that may affect them. It also means that the organization may consider improving how information can be delivered appropriately to all employees. The overall category mean is 2.92 or “Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to communication dimension.

1.4. Resources/Procedures

Table 2d: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Resources/Procedures Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I have all the tools and equipment to do my job well.	2.97	A	2.64	A	2.97	A	2.86	A
2. Procedures necessary to do my job do not involve unnecessary steps.	3.03	A	2.86	A	3.03	A	2.97	A
3. I get the training I need to do my job well.	2.97	A	2.8	A	2.97	A	2.91	A
4. I participate in training and development opportunities that are available to me.	3.06	A	3.07	A	3.06	A	3.06	A
5. My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.	3.40	SA	3.37	SA	3.40	SA	3.39	SA
6. The institution maintains an up-to-date database of employee skills.	2.51	A	2.79	A	2.51	A	2.60	A
7. The institution gives people control over the resources they need to accomplish their work.	2.83	A	2.76	A	2.83	A	2.81	A
8. The institution creates systems to measure gaps between current and expected performance.	2.74	A	2.77	A	2.74	A	2.75	A
Category Mean	2.94	A	2.88	A	2.94	A	2.92	A

For **Administrators**, rated highest by the respondents is item number 5 which states that “My job makes good use of my skills and abilities” with a mean of 3.40 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrators believe that the organization makes use of their full potential and are tasked to perform roles that provide opportunities to grow and develop.



In fact, they are appointed to positions in line with their talents and educational qualifications. Rated lowest is item number 6 “The institution maintains an up-to-date database of employee skills.” with a mean of 2.51 or “Agree”. This implies that the institution keeps records of employees and can be readily available when needed. These records are kept in the office of the Human Resource office, although employees keep their own individual records. The category mean of 2.94 or “Agree” implies that administrators agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to resources/procedures dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 5 which states that “My job makes good use of my skills and abilities” with a mean of 3.37 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the faculty-respondents are appropriately assigned to teach courses based on their specialization. This appropriate assignment means that they are fit, capable and proficient to teach the courses they are assigned. Rated lowest is item number 1 which states that “I have all the tools and equipment to do my job well” with a mean of 2.64 or “Agree”. This implies that the institution provides a faculty facilities room, equipped with computers and gadgets to make their work easier and faster. It also means that the institution provides state of the art facilities in the different laboratories to make students learning more meaningful. The category mean is 2.88 which implies that the faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to resources/procedures dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 5 “My job makes good use of my skills and abilities” with a mean of 3.4 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that personnel are assigned to tasks they are capable of doing. Also, the institution hires employees suitable to jobs required. Rated lowest is item number 6 “The institution maintains an up-to-date database of employee skills.” with a mean of 2.51 or “Agree”. This implies that the institution keeps records which are readily available upon request. The category mean of 2.94 implies that the personnel agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to resources/procedures dimension.



As a whole, rated highest by the three groups of respondents is item number 5 “My job makes good use of my skills and abilities” with a mean of 3.39 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the institution is cognizant of the capabilities and competencies of the employees. It also means that the institution hires employees based on their line of specialization and employees are assigned to task that they can do. Rated lowest by the three groups of respondents is item number 6 “The institution maintains an up-to-date database of employee skills.” with a mean of 2.60 or “Agree”. This shows that the current record-keeping of the institution is adequate. In fact, profile of the students including their grades, accounts and other information are all kept in the students’ information assessment system. These are maintained by the registrar’s office accounting and finance office in coordination with the Educational Management or Information System or System Development. The overall category mean is 2.92 or “Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to resources/procedures dimension.

1.5. Opportunities for Growth

Table 2e: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole

Relative to Opportunities for Growth Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. There is a variety of ways for me to develop my career at school/college/office where I belong.	3.03	A	3.11	A	2.85	A	3	A
2. There is equal opportunity for advancement.	2.63	A	2.79	A	2.45	A	2.62	A
3. Someone at work encourages my development.	3.11	A	3.15	A	3.02	A	3.09	A
4. Senior members of the institution do not allow emotions to interfere with the performance of others.	2.86	A	2.91	A	2.82	A	2.86	A
5. There are opportunities for promotion in my role.	2.8	A	2.77	A	2.52	A	2.7	A
6. The institution encourages people to think from a global perspective.	2.83	A	3.02	A	2.72	A	2.86	A
7. The institution recognizes people for taking initiative.	2.8	A	2.79	A	2.7	A	2.76	A
Category Mean	3.03	A	2.93	A	2.72	A	2.89	A



For **Administrators**, rated highest by the respondents is item number 3 which states that “Someone at work encourages my development” with a mean of 3.11 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators have colleagues who support them. It also means that they have established a good working relationship with other employees in the organization. Rated lowest is item number 2 “There is equal opportunity for advancement” with a mean of 2.63 or “Agree”. This means that the institution provides opportunities to administrators to improve themselves professionally. It also recognizes the importance of providing avenues to hone their managerial skills and capabilities. The category mean of 3.03 implies that administrators agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to opportunities for growth dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that “Someone at work encourages my development” with a mean of 3.15 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty-respondents have developed a smooth working relationship with their colleagues and as such have contributed to their professional growth. They also get support from their fellow employees, ensuring a healthy workplace, where collegiality and solidarity reign. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 5 “There are opportunities for promotion in my role” with a mean of 2.77 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty are aware they can improve their teacher classification anytime because there is an open ranking system at any time of the school years. The category mean is 2.93 or “Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to opportunities for growth dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 “Someone at work encourages my development” with a mean of 3.02 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents assessed that the institution has provided meaningful opportunities for workplace solidarity, and that employees are given the freedom to collaborate in order to achieve their tasks. It means that they are always reminded to upgrade themselves professionally. Rated lowest is item number 2 “There is equal opportunity for advancement” with a mean of 2.45 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents see the institution as an organization that



recognizes the importance of providing capability-building seminars and trainings to hone their skills in the performance of their duties and responsibilities. The category mean of 2.72 or “Agree” implies that the personnel agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to opportunities for growth dimension.

As a whole, the three groups of respondents all rated highest item number 3 “Someone at work encourages my development” with a mean of 3.09 or “Agree”. This implies that the university provides professional development by sending employees to seminars, trainings, and conferences to upgrade themselves. Incentives are also provided for employees who desire to upgrade themselves academically. Rated lowest is item number 2 “There is equal opportunity for advancement” with a mean of 2.62 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents find the university as an organization that recognizes the importance of affording meaningful opportunities for advancement and career growth. It also acknowledges the fact that as member of an institution of learning, one has to continuously upgrade and to keep abreast of the new technologies and innovations relevant in the performance of duties and responsibilities. The overall category mean is 2.89 or “Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to opportunities for growth dimension.

1.6. Compensation

Table 2f: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Compensation Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I am paid fairly for the work I do.	2.51	A	2.76	A	2.27	D	2.51	A
2. I am satisfied with my benefit package.	2.40	D	2.59	A	2.25	D	2.41	D
3. I understand the criteria used to decide my compensation.	2.71	A	2.68	A	2.50	A	2.63	A
4. Benefits available are appropriate for my needs and those of my family.	2.43	D	2.52	A	2.27	D	2.41	D
Category Mean	2.51	A	2.63	A	2.32	D	2.49	D



For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that “I understand the criteria used to decide my compensation” with a mean of 2.71 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators are aware of the basis of their salaries and benefits. It also means that the administration is open as to how the compensation is computed, and the rationale for how employees are compensated. Rated lowest is item number 2 “I am satisfied with my benefit package” with a mean of 2.40 or “Disagree”. This means that the administrators are not given a fair benefit package. It also means that the administrators are not pleased with the pay and benefit package given by the university, since they are administrators who are paid on the basis of negotiated scheme. The category mean is 2.51 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators are only satisfied on school climate innovativeness relative to compensation dimension.

For **the faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which states that “I am paid fairly for the work I do” with a mean of 2.76 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty consider their compensation as something just enough. It also means that the institution is giving what is considered as an average compensation scheme and a reasonable pay for the faculty based from faculty ranked. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 4 “Benefits available are appropriate for my needs and those of my family” with a mean of 2.52 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty believes that the organization is giving them compensation commensurate to their needs. They feel that the compensation allows them safety and comfort for their families, although some work may be exerted to further improve this aspect. The category mean is 2.63 or “Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to compensation dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 “I understand the criteria used to decide my compensation” with a mean of 2.50 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents are aware of how their salaries and benefits are computed. It also means that the organization exerts efforts in informing personnel of information relevant to salaries and benefit package. Rated lowest is item number 2 “I am satisfied with my benefit package” with a mean of 2.25 or “Disagree”. This implies that personnel-respondents are



not satisfied, since there are those who are paid on a daily basis. They are not contented in the compensation given by the University. The category mean of 2.32 or “Disagree” implies that the personnel disagree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to compensation dimension.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 3 “I understand the criteria used to decide my compensation.” with a mean of 2.63 or “Agree”. This implies that the employees in the university are made aware of how salaries, benefits, and compensation are computed or arrived at, which ensures that they understand how the university views and treats them as human resources.

As a whole, rated lowest are items number 2 and number 4 “I am satisfied with my benefit package” and “Benefits available are appropriate for my needs and those of my family” both with a mean of 2.41 or “Disagree”, respectively. This implies that the three groups of respondents are not satisfied with their pay and benefit package. It means that there is discontentment and dissatisfaction when it comes to pay and benefit package.

The overall category mean is 2.49 or “Disagree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents disagree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to compensation dimension.

1.7. Work/Life Balance

Table 2g: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Work/Life Balance Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. My workload is appropriate.	2.80	A	3.01	A	2.73	A	2.85	A
2. I have the opportunity to do what I do best everyday.	3.20	A	3.23	A	2.97	A	3.13	A
3. I perform assigned work at my best everyday.	3.54	SA	3.41	SA	3.38	SA	3.44	SA
4. I know what is expected of me in my job.	3.66	SA	3.43	SA	3.35	SA	3.48	SA
5. The institution helps employees balance work and family.	3.00	A	2.92	A	2.82	A	2.91	A
Category Mean	3.24	A	3.20	A	3.05	A	3.16	A



For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “I know what is expected of me in my job” with a mean of 3.66 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrators are conscious of their functions. They believe that they are doing their job and cognizant of their roles as heads. More importantly, they know the role they play in achieving the goals and plans of the university. This is so since, their functions are attached to their appointment, which they acknowledge upon receipt of their appointments. Rated lowest is item number 1 “My workload is appropriate” with a mean of 2.80 or “Agree”. This means that the administrators are given the proper amount and kind of work corresponding to their expertise. It also means that the administrators are particular on the responsibilities assigned to them and find it fitting for their capabilities. The category mean of 3.24 implies that administrators agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to Work/Life Balance Dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “I know what is expected of me in my job” with a mean of 3.43 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the faculty are aware of their roles as educators and function based on their mandate. It also means that they put their attention to their work and perform their duties and responsibilities as expected. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 5 “The institution helps employees balance work and family” with a mean of 2.92 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty recognize the value of a balance work and family. It also means that they find the school as a workplace that values family and work. They believe that the university helps keep their work and family needs balanced and stable. The category mean is 3.20 or “Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to work/life balance dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 “I perform assigned work at my best everyday” with a mean of 3.38 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents are motivated to work. They are driven to accomplish their task as they are evaluated by their immediate supervisors either monthly or quarterly. Rated lowest is item number 1 “My workload is appropriate” with a mean of 2.73 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents find their work fitting to their capabilities. It also means that their assigned task are considered just reasonable. The category mean of 3.05 or “Agree implies



that the personnel agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to work/life balance dimension.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 4 “I know what is expected of me in my job” with a mean of 3.48 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the employees in the university are conscious of the role they play in the performance of their jobs. They view themselves as performers based on their mandate and are aware of their duties and responsibilities. As a whole, rated lowest is item number 1 “My workload is appropriate” with a mean of 2.85 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents find their assigned task as reasonably fitting. They believe that they are assigned jobs that are commensurate to their abilities, their compensation, and the overall part they play in the attainment of the university’s plans. The overall category mean is 3.16 or “Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to work/life balance dimension.

1.8. Fairness and Security

Table 2h: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Fairness and Security Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I believe everyone is treated fairly in my school/college/office.	2.89	A	2.63	A	2.28	D	2.6	A
2. I have a sense of security in my job.	2.89	A	2.91	A	2.72	A	2.84	A
3. The institution values diversity.	3.14	A	3.09	A	2.82	A	3.02	A
4. Job promotions are fair and equitable.	2.60	A	2.63	A	2.42	D	2.55	A
5. Favouritism is not a problem in my institution.	2.43	D	2.58	A	2.32	D	2.44	D
Category Mean	2.79	A	2.77	A	2.51	A	2.69	A

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that “The organization values diversity” with a mean of 3.14 or “Agree”. This implies that the administrators see the university as an organization that understands differences. It also



means that the university is open to all kinds of people, being true to its philosophy and sustains its purpose being the school for the masses. Rated lowest is item number 5 “Favoritism is not a problem” with a mean of 2.43 or “Disagree”. This means that the administrators believe that there is favoritism in the university as there are employees who are hired on the basis of negotiated employees. The category mean is 2.79 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to fairness and security Dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “The institution values diversity” with a mean of 3.09 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty see the university being non-discriminatory as it allows unity in diversity. It also means that there is an atmosphere of acceptance and tolerance. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 5 which states that “Favouritism is not a problem” with a mean of 2.58 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty believes that there is favoritism present in the organization. There is dissatisfaction on the basis of workload. They believe that there are teachers who are assigned more teaching loads as the others. The category mean of 2.77 implies that faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to fairness and security dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “The institution values diversity” with a mean of 2.82 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents assessed that they belong, and everyone has a role to play. It also means that the organization has maintained its calling as school for the masses. Regardless of status in life, affiliations, and previous background, the school finds its way to be considerate and transformative. Rated lowest is item number 1 “I believe everyone is treated fairly in my school/college/office” with a mean of 2.28 or “Disagree”. This implies that personnel-respondents find the school/college/office environment as unfair. They are not satisfied with how they are treated. They believe that there are “sacred cows” in the organization. The category mean is 2.51 which implies that the personnel agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to fairness and security dimension.



As a whole, rated highest is item number 3 “The institution values diversity” with a mean of 3.02 or “Agree”. All the three groups of respondents have the same highest item. They all agree that the university values diversity. They all find the university as an institution that is open for all kinds of people, regardless of race, status in life and affiliations. As a whole, rated lowest is item number 5 which states that “Favouritism is not a problem” with a mean of 2.44 or “Disagree”. The three groups of respondents believe that there is favoritism in the organization. They believe that fairness is not observed.

The overall category mean of 2.69 implies that the three groups of respondents agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to fairness and security dimension.

1.9. Innovative Work Behavior

Table 2i: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Innovative

Work Behavior Dimension

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I create new ideas for difficult issues	3.37	SA	3.12	A	3.03	A	3.17	A
2. I make important members of the organization enthusiastic for innovative ideas	3.29	SA	3.08	A	2.98	A	3.12	A
3. I mobilize support for innovative ideas	3.43	SA	3.13	A	3.00	A	3.19	A
4. I search out new working methods or instruments to improve my work	3.46	SA	3.24	A	3.07	A	3.26	SA
5. I transform innovative ideas into useful applications	3.43	SA	3.16	A	3.07	A	3.22	A
6. I introduce innovative ideas into the work environment in a systematic way.	3.43	SA	3.17	A	3.13	A	3.24	A
7. I evaluate the utility of innovative ideas.	3.34	SA	3.14	A	3.08	A	3.19	A
8. I acquire approval when I come up with something new.	3.47	SA	3.14	A	3.20	A	3.27	SA
Category Mean	3.40	SA	3.15	A	3.07	A	3.21	A

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that “I acquire approval when I come up with something new” with a mean of 3.47 or “Strongly Agree”. This means that administrators have initiative and value authority. They feel the need to



ensure that higher ups are aware of any initiatives and ideas that are being implemented in the workplace. Rated lowest is item number 2 “I make important members of the organization enthusiastic for innovative ideas” with a mean of 3.29 or “Strongly Agree”. This means that administrators value inclusivity and goal-orientedness. It also means that being the head in their unit/office/department they have the responsibility to lead, achieve and improve their unit/office/department. They convey to the staff that everyone has an important contribution in the success of the organization. The category mean is 3.40 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrators agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to innovative work behavior dimension.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “I search out new working methods or instruments to improve my work” with a mean of 3.24 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty-respondents take initiative to be more relevant in what they teach. Also, they find ways to improve, be adept at what they are expected to provide. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 2 which states that “I make important members of the organization enthusiastic for innovative ideas” with a mean of 3.08 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty are averagely motivated to tell their colleagues about their discoveries, about what they know and are capable of. They see that members need to be encouraged to think innovatively. The category mean is 3.15 or “Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to innovative work behavior dimension.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “I introduce innovative ideas into the work environment in a systematic way” with a mean of 3.13 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents follow processes and ensure an orderly work environment. It also means that they value innovative ideas that can be implemented efficiently. It further implies their willingness and readiness to innovate. Rated lowest is item number 2 “I make important members of the organization enthusiastic for innovative ideas” with a mean of 2.98 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents are motivated to push others towards having innovative ideas. More needs to be done in order to make innovativeness more collaborative for everyone. The category



mean is 3.07 or “Agree” as assessed by the personnel-respondents. This implies that the personnel agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to innovative work behaviour dimension.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 8 “I acquire approval when I come up with something new” with a mean of 3.27 or “Strongly Agree”. This means that employees in the university have initiative yet value authority. It shows that the university’s employees look for the guidance and input of their superiors when crafting innovations. As a whole, rated lowest is item number 2 which states that “I make important members of the organization enthusiastic for innovative ideas” with a mean of 3.12 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are motivated to communicate to their colleagues about their discoveries, about what they know and are capable of. More importantly, they make efforts in ensuring that innovative behavior is something that needs to be encouraged in the workplace among colleagues. The overall category mean is 3.21 or “Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree on the level of school climate innovativeness relative to innovative work behaviour dimension.

1.10. Summary on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole

Table 2j: Summary Table on the Level of School Climate Innovativeness of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole

Dimension	As a Whole							
	Administrators		Faculty		Personnel		Overall	
	CM	DS	CM	DS	CM	DS	CM	DS
1 Mission, Vision and Purpose	3.46	SA	3.34	SA	3.28	SA	3.36	SA
2. Feedback	3.04	A	3.08	A	2.57	A	2.90	A
3. Communication	3.03	A	2.88	A	2.86	A	2.92	A
4. Resources and Procedures	2.94	A	2.88	A	2.94	A	2.92	A
5. Opportunities for Growth	3.03	A	2.93	A	2.72	A	2.89	A
6. Compensation	2.51	A	2.63	A	2.32	DA	2.49	A
7. Work/Life Balance	3.24	A	3.2	A	3.05	A	3.16	A
8. Opportunities for Growth	2.79	A	2.77	A	2.51	A	2.69	A
9. Innovative Work Behavior	3.40	SA	3.15	A	3.07	A	3.21	A
Over-all Mean	3.02	A	2.98	A	2.79	A	2.93	A



As presented in the table, Administrators, faculty and personnel, and as a whole, rated highest on mission, vision and purpose dimension with a category mean of 3.46, 3.34, 3.28 and 3.36 or “Strongly Agree” respectively. This implies that the three groups of respondents are aware of their roles and are mindful of the mission, vision and values of the institution as they perform their duties and responsibilities. Rated lowest by the administrators, faculty and personnel and as a whole is on compensation with a mean of 2.51, 2.63, 2.32 and 2.49 or “Agree” respectively. This implies that the three groups of respondents assessed compensation as an important consideration that the university has to look into. It further implies that employees’ innovativeness can be attributed to compensation. When employees receive a competitive compensation package the more employees are motivated to work and come up with innovative ideas. These findings is parallel to the findings from the study of Swargiary, J. (2018) “The School Organizational Climate of Government and Private Secondary Schools of Barpeta”. The study showed the importance of the dimensions of organizational climate like communication flow, reward system, motivational level and support system which makes the school climate conducive as well as encouraging. The overall mean rating of administrators, faculty, and personnel and as a whole is 3.02, 2.98, 2.79 and 2.93 or “Agree” respectively. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree on school climate innovativeness.

2. Comparison among the Assessment of the Three Groups of Respondents on the Extent to which they assess their School Climate Innovativeness

Table 3a: Test of Difference among the Assessment of the Three groups of respondents on the Level of School

Climate Innovativeness

Dimension	Fc	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
Mission, Vision and Purpose	1.631	.198	Accept Ho
Feedback	1.594	.206	Accept Ho
Communication	1.261	.286	Accept Ho
Resources/Procedures	2.302	.103	Accept Ho
Opportunities for Growth	2.873	.059	Accept Ho
Compensation	3.146	.045	Reject Ho



Post Hoc			
Faculty & Personnel		.034	
Work/Life Balance	2.131	.122	Accept Ho
Security	3.369	.036	Reject Ho
Post Hoc			
Faculty & Personnel		.045	
Innovative Work Behaviour	5.416	.005	Reject Ho
Post Hoc			
Administration & Faculty		.021	
Administration & Personnel		.004	

$\alpha = 0.05$

As shown in the table, there is a significant difference among the assessment of the three (3) groups of respondents on the school climate innovativeness on Compensation, Security and Innovative Work Behaviour dimensions, hence, the rejection of the null hypothesis at .05 level of significance. This means that the assessments of the three (3) groups of respondents on the stated dimension vary. Further interpretation based from post Hoc analysis reveal that the difference along compensation and security are between faculty and personnel, while for innovative work behaviour, the difference is between administration and faculty and between administration and personnel. The difference is due to their nature of work. The other dimensions did not show difference, hence the acceptance of the null hypothesis at .05 level of significance.

3. Administrators, faculty, and personnel Assessment on the Level of Organizational Effectiveness

Table 4: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Organizational Effectiveness as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. The organization communicates the academic vision of the school.	3.37	VE	3.21	E	2.92	E	3.17	E
2. Helps create a positive learning environment for students.	3.20	E	3.14	E	2.85	E	3.06	E
3. Responds to employee needs.	2.86	E	2.77	E	2.63	E	2.75	E
4. Implements solutions to university-wide problems	2.97	E	2.84	E	2.68	E	2.83	E
5. Manages resources of the university (budget, facilities, faculty,	2.97	E	2.77	E	2.67	E	2.80	E



staff)								
6. Advocates for the needs of the University.	3.17	E	2.98	E	3.2	E	3.12	E
7. Maintains accessibility to employees.	3.03	E	3.04	E	2.82	E	2.96	E
8. Treats employees with fairness and respect.	2.89	E	2.95	E	2.70	E	2.85	E
9. Promotes a positive work environment that fosters morale.	2.97	E	3.07	E	2.73	E	2.92	E
10. Communicates clear policies and procedures.	3.03	E	3.09	E	2.73	E	2.95	E
11. Mediates conflicts.	3.09	E	3.07	E	2.75	E	2.97	E
12. Supports academic computing, information and technical needs of the employees.	3.09	E	3.11	E	2.82	E	3.01	E
13. Responds to student academic computing and technical needs.	3.11	E	3.13	E	2.93	E	3.06	E
Category Mean	3.06	E	3.01	E	2.80	E	2.96	E

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which states that “The organization communicates the academic vision of the school” with a mean of 3.37 or “Very Effective”. This means that the organization is clear on what it wants to become. The organization provides direction to all the employees which is geared towards the attainment of the vision of the university. Most importantly, the organization keeps reminding everyone that the priority of the school is to provide quality education to every learner. In fact, administrators craft these in their 5 year and annual development plans, which are likewise communicated to their subordinates. Rated lowest is item number 3 “Responds to employee needs” with a mean of 2.86 or “Effective”. This means that administrators find the organization as sensitive to the needs of the employees to a certain extent only. It also implies that the organization have its priorities though administrators do find the organization effective, and that the organization responds to employee needs, though the approval of requisitions based on priority needs. The category mean is 3.06 or “Effective”. This implies that administrators see the level of organizational effectiveness as effective.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which state that “The organization communicates the academic vision of the school” with a mean of 3.21 or “Effective”. This implies that the faculty-respondents also find the organization as transparent in its vision for the future of the organization. It also implies that the organization considers the faculty as partners in the realization of its vision, hence are mandated to provide quality education to their students. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 3 “Responds to employee needs” and item number 5 “Manages



the resources of the university” both with a mean of 2.77 or “Effective”, respectively. The faculty have the same observation with administrators when it comes to responsiveness to employee needs. The faculty finds that the university responds to the needs of its employees and is able to manage the resources of the university. This means that they see that the university cares for its employees and ensures that resources are spent wisely in order to address these needs. The category mean is 3.01 or “Effective” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty see the level of organizational effectiveness as effective.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 6 which states that “Advocates for the need of the university” with a mean of 3.20 or “Effective”. This implies that the personnel-respondents find the organization’s first priority is for the improvement of the school as an educational institution. This is evident in the continuous accreditation of program offerings relevant to the changing times, budget appropriation to provide up-to-date and state of the -art facilities and ISO certification of the quality management system of the University. Rated lowest is item number 2 “Responds to employee needs” with a mean of 2.63 or “Effective”. This implies that the personnel-respondents also see that the institution shows that it addresses the needs of employees. The category mean is 2.80 which implies that the personnel see the level of organizational effectiveness as effective.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 1 “The organization communicates the academic vision of the school” with a mean of 3.17 or “Effective”. The three groups of respondents have the same which is on the provision on quality education. As a whole, rated lowest is item number 2 which states that “Responds to the needs of the employees” with a mean of 2.75 or “Effective”. This implies that aside from the provision of quality education, employees need ought to be attended since they are the frontliners in any organization. There cannot be equality education without the employees who provide them for the learners. The overall category mean is 2.96 which implies that the three groups of respondents see the level of effectiveness of the organization of the school as effective.



Level of Job Satisfaction of the Administrators, Faculty and Personnel as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole

5.1. Supervision Factor

Table 6a: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Supervision Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help.	3.66	SA	3.37	SA	3.58	SA	4	SA
2. My immediate supervisor praises good output.	3.60	SA	3.24	A	3.35	SA	3.4	SA
3. My immediate supervisor provides assistance for improving instruction.	3.66	SA	3.26	SA	3.4	SA	4	SA
4. I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.	3.49	SA	3.18	A	3.27	SA	1	SA
5. My immediate supervisor backs me up.	3.63	SA	3.23	A	3.57	SA	8	SA
6. My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me.	3.37	SA	3.54	SA	3.63	SA	1	SA
7. My immediate supervisor is willing to listen to suggestions.	3.66	SA	3.25	SA	3.43	SA	5	SA
8. My immediate supervisor treats everyone equally.	3.54	SA	3.23	A	3.17	A	1	SA
9. My immediate supervisor makes me feel comfortable.	3.63	SA	3.24	A	3.47	SA	5	SA
10. When I do a good job, my immediate supervisor notices.	3.63	SA	3.22	A	3.32	SA	9	SA
11. My immediate supervisor offers suggestions to improve my work.	3.60	SA	3.31	SA	3.42	SA	4	SA
12. My immediate supervisor makes available the material I need to do my best.	3.60	SA	3.22	A	3.43	SA	2	SA
13. My immediate supervisor do not turn one employee against another.	3.54	SA	3.28	SA	3.47	SA	3	SA
14. I receive too many meaningful instructions from my immediate supervisor.	3.6	SA	3.21	A	3.35	SA	9	SA
Category Mean	3.59	SA	3.27	SA	3.42	SA	3.4	SA



For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest are items number 1 which states that “My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help”, item number 3 “My immediate supervisor provides assistance for improving instruction” and item number 7 “My immediate supervisor is willing to listen to suggestions” with a mean of 3.66 or “Strongly Agree”, respectively. This means that top management of the organization are willing to provide support, assistance and ready to listen to suggestions from the administrators. Taken together, all three show a very collaborative workplace for administrators, as well as more open relationships between heads and subordinates. Rated lowest is item number 3 “My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me” with a mean of 3.37 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the organization is confident that administrators assigned in the different units/office/department are capable of performing their duties and responsibilities. It also implies that the organization provides freedom for the administrators to decide what is best in their unit/office/department given that administrators are designated based from their expertise. Also, the strong agreement to this statement further reinforces the aforementioned notion of a collaborative workplace and open top-down relationships. The category mean is 3.59 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrator-respondents are satisfied in their job relative to supervision factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 6 which states that “My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me” with a mean of 3.54 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that faculty-respondents are given proper direction and expectations are clear at their end. It further implies that deans and program heads conduct regular meetings that adequately outline the work assignments and workplace targets. Besides faculty members are guided by the provision in the Faculty Guide, given to them at the start of the School Year. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 4 “I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.” with a mean of 3.18 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty-respondents are recognized for a job well done. It further implies performance of the faculty are appreciated by their immediate supervisors. Recognitions for outstanding administrators, faculty and personnel are usually awarded during faculty-administrator-personnel day or employees’ night. The category mean is 3.27 or “Strongly



Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty are satisfied relative to supervision factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 6 which states that “My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me” with a mean of 3.63 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents are given proper orientation on their roles as staff. It also implies that personnel are properly directed by the personnel manual and performance commitments of their superiors. Rated lowest is item number 2 “Responds to employee needs” with a mean of 2.63 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents see the organization as responsive to what the employee needs even though rated lowest. It means a positive implication that the university is providing a fair compensation package and addresses most of the other needs of employees. The category mean is 3.42 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the personnel are satisfied relative to supervision factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 1 “My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help” with a mean of 3.54 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are given assistance when needed by their immediate supervisors. It further implies that they are provided with support and attention. It shows that the university as a whole fosters open and clear communication among leaders and subordinates, leading to better coordination in the completion of plans. As a whole, rated lowest is item 4 which states that “I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor” and item number 8 “My immediate supervisor treats everyone equally” with a mean of 3.31 or “Strongly Agree”, respectively. This implies that, though, both were rated lowest, it is still considered a positive assessment because they strongly agree that their supervisors recognize their efforts and are treated equally by them. This shows a positive work environment conducive to cooperation and communication. The overall category mean is 3.43 or “Strongly Agree” which implies that the three groups of respondents are satisfied relative to supervision factor.



5.2. Colleagues Factor

Table 6b: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Colleagues Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I like the people with whom I work.	3.49	SA	3.35	SA	3.33	SA	3.39	SA
2. I prefer to work with people whom I share common likes.	3.63	SA	3.40	SA	3.40	SA	3.48	SA
3. My colleagues do not seem unreasonable to me.	3.29	SA	3.26	SA	2.97	A	3.17	A
4. I get along well with my colleagues.	3.46	SA	3.47	SA	3.37	SA	3.43	SA
5. I get cooperation from the people I work with.	3.63	SA	3.36	SA	3.35	SA	3.45	SA
6. My colleagues stimulate me to do better work.	3.49	SA	3.30	SA	3.27	SA	3.35	SA
7. My colleagues are not highly critical of one another.	3.31	SA	3.26	SA	3.17	A	3.25	SA
8. I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues.	3.57	SA	3.39	SA	3.43	SA	3.46	SA
9. My interests are similar to those of my colleagues.	3.31	SA	3.23	A	3.08	A	3.21	A
10. My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my work.	3.37	SA	3.30	SA	3.10	A	3.26	SA
Category Mean	3.45	SA	3.34	SA	3.25	SA	3.35	SA

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is items number 2 which states that “I prefer to work with people whom I share common likes” and item number 5 “I get cooperation from people I work with” both with a mean of 3.63 or “Strongly Agree”, respectively. This implies that administrator-respondents are comfortable working with one another and like what they do because they share a common goal. This also means that they get support from their fellow administrators and the staff they work with. Rated lowest is item number 3



“My colleagues do not seem unreasonable to me” with a mean of 3.29 or “Strongly Agree”. This means that administrators have a good working relationship with one another. This also implies that they work professionally and have no personal issues. There is a high level of collaboration and cooperation between administrators, and they have mutual professional respect with each other. The category mean is 3.06 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators are satisfied with respect to their job on the colleague’s factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “I get along well with my colleagues”, with a mean of 3.47, which translates to “Strongly Agree”. This means that relations among faculty members are strong, that among the faculty there is a good working relationship. This relationship and trust among faculty means that collaboration is high for these respondents. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 9, “My interests are similar to those of my colleagues”, with a mean of 3.23 which translates to “Agree”. This means that among faculty, there is a homogeneity when it comes to professional and personal interests. However, this is not so high, indicating a more diverse group of people. This inference is in line with the earlier conclusion of a diverse group and a university open to diversity. The category mean is 3.34 or “Strongly Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty are strongly satisfied with respect to their job on the colleagues’ factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 8, “I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues”, with a mean of 3.43 or “strongly Agree”. This shows a tight-knit bond between personnel that transcends professional relationships. This means that they work harder given a safe environment surrounded by friends. Rated lowest is item number 3, “My colleagues do not seem unreasonable to me” with a mean of 2.97 or “Agree”. This shows that the personnel agree that their colleagues are friendly with each other. Seeing each other getting along well is the first step to collaboration and cooperation among employees. The category mean is 3.25 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the personnel are strongly satisfied with respect to their job on the colleague’s factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 2, “I prefer to work with people whom I share common likes”, with a mean of 3.48 or “Strongly Agree”. This shows that the three groups



see that common preferences is important among colleagues in the university's workplaces. A premium is given to homogenous preferences since such ensures a more stable work environment where everyone can draw on commonalities. As a whole, rated lowest is item number 3, "My colleagues do not seem unreasonable to me", with a mean of 3.17 or "Agree". The three groups find that their colleagues are easy to get along with, level-headed, and cooperative. These gestures are vital in building trust and camaraderie among colleagues. The overall category mean is 3.35 or "Strongly Agree". This implies that the three groups of respondents are strongly satisfied with respect to their job on the colleague's factor.

5.3. Working Conditions Factor

Table 6c: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Working Conditions Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. Working conditions in my school are good.	3.09	A	3.17	A	3.02	A	3.09	A
2. Working conditions in my school are comfortable.	3.11	A	3.12	A	2.92	A	3.05	A
3. Physical surroundings in my school are pleasant.	3.06	A	3.05	A	2.90	A	3.00	A
4. The administration in my school clearly define its policies.	3.06	A	3.14	A	3.27	SA	3.16	A
5. The administration in my school communicates its policies well.	2.91	A	3.15	A	2.82	A	2.96	A
6. Working conditions in my school could not be worse.	3.09	A	3.05	A	2.93	A	3.02	A
7. Working conditions in my school can be improved.	3.31	SA	3.18	A	3.10	A	3.20	A
Category Mean	3.09	A	3.12	A	2.99	A	3.07	A

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 7 which states that "Working conditions in my school can be improved" with a mean of 3.31 or "Strongly Agree". This means that administrators would like to see more improvement in the working conditions of the school. It also means that the university needs to invest more to improve the workplace facilities and increase workplace resources.



Rated lowest is item number 5 “The administration in my school communicates its policies well” with a mean of 2.91 or “Agree”. This means that information where policies are concerned are not well communicated. It also implies that policies are not properly communicated to administrators hence miscommunication with the other members of the administration and staff as to how policies are to be implemented are at stake. The category mean is 3.09 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators are satisfied in their job relative to working conditions factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 7 which states that “Working conditions in my school can be improved” with a mean of 3.18 or “Agree”. This implies the need to enhance the working conditions in the university. It must really reflect a university status. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 3 “Physical surroundings in my school are pleasant” and item number 6 “Working conditions in my school could not be worse” with a mean of 3.05 or “Agree”, respectively. This implies that faculty are mindful of their surroundings. They need to have pleasant surroundings where they can perform their duties and responsibilities to the maximum. There is a need to maintain and enhance the physical condition of the school so that the vision of quality education can be achieved. Also, there is a need to have a better working environment coupled with a state-of-the-art facility. The category mean of 3.12 implies that faculty are satisfied relative to working condition factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “The administration in my school clearly define its policies” with a mean of 3.27 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents understand the policies of the university. Personnel are clear as to how the policies are being implemented by the school. Rated lowest is item number 5 “The administration in my school communicates its policies well” with a mean of 2.82 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents are not properly informed about policies that affect their daily routine. While the highest rated item for personnel is that the university is clear as to the policies being implemented, it has to improve the information dissemination regarding these policies. The category mean is 2.99



or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel are satisfied in their job relative to working conditions factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 4 “The administration in my school clearly define its policies.” with a mean of 3.16 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are fully aware of the policies of the school. The administration does a good job at making the policies being implemented clear to everyone. As a whole, rated lowest is item 2 which states that “The physical surroundings in my school are pleasant” with a mean of 3.00 or “Agree”. This means that the school need to improve more on the physical surroundings of the school. The respondents find the surroundings of the school adequate, but believe that more can be done in order to create a better environment. The overall category mean is 3.07. This implies that the three groups of respondents are satisfied on their job relative to working conditions factor.

5.4. Pay Factor

Table 6d: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Pay Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. Income is enough to live on.	2.40	D	2.49	D	2.13	D	2.34	D
2. Income is adequate for normal expenses.	2.49	D	2.59	A	2.27	D	2.45	D
3. My work provides me with financial security.	2.40	D	2.82	A	2.27	D	2.50	A
4. I am well paid in proportion to my ability.	2.49	D	2.65	A	2.40	D	2.51	A
5. My income is less than I deserve.	2.63	A	2.66	A	2.50	A	2.60	A
6. Sufficient income keeps me from living the way I want to live.	2.69	A	2.67	A	2.38	D	2.58	A
7. Receives same pay with similar jobs in other school districts.	2.14	D	2.28	D	2.18	D	2.20	D
Category Mean	2.46	D	2.59	A	2.30	D	2.45	D

For Administrator-respondents, rated highest is item number 6 which states that “Sufficient income keeps me from living the way I want to live” with a mean of 2.69 or “Agree”. This means administrators find their income enough to be able to live how they want it to be.



The income they receive is sufficient for their current living standards as they believe that they only live according to their means. Rated lowest is item number 7 "Receives same pay with similar jobs in other school districts" with a mean of 2.14 or "Disagree". This means that administrators are not convince that they receive the same compensation compared to other schools nearby. They find their compensation low and are not comparable with other schools. The category mean is 2.16 or "Disagree". This implies that administrators are not satisfied in their job relative to pay factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that "My work provides me with financial security" with a mean of 2.82 or "Agree". This implies that the faculty-respondents feel secured with their monthly income received. Faculty believe they have financial security with the current compensation they have. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 7 which states that "Receives same pay with similar jobs in other school districts." with a mean of 2.82 or "Disagree". This implies that the faculty just like the administrators are not convince that they pay is comparable with other schools nearby and are not happy with the compensation package. The category mean is 2.59 or "Agree". This implies that faculty are satisfied in their job relative to pay factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 5 which states that "My income is less than I deserve" with a mean of 2.50 or "Agree". This implies that the school is giving a minimal compensation package to personnel. Personnel believes that they deserve more from the university. They see a need for better compensation to be provided to them. Rated lowest is item number 1 "Income is enough to live on" with a mean of 2.13 or "Disagree". This implies that the personnel-respondents are not contented with the income they are receiving. It also implies that the school is only giving them a meager salary. Personnel believe that the current compensation they receive is not enough in order to have their living expenses met. The category mean of 2.3 or "Disagree" implies that the personnel are not satisfied relative to pay factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 5 "My income is less than I deserve" with a mean of 2.60 or "Agree". It implies that the three groups of respondents believe that the salary



that the school is giving is not commensurate as to the work the employees are rendering. It also means that the pay is low. As a whole, they see a need for better compensation relative to the amount of work they put out. As a whole, rated lowest is item 7 which states that "Receives same pay with similar jobs in other school districts." with a mean of 2.2 or "Disagree". This implies that the three groups of respondents are not receiving the same salary compared with other schools. They believe that other teachers in other school have better pay than them. This can have a detrimental effect where employees leave the institution because of seemingly better conditions elsewhere. The overall category mean is 2.45 or "Disagree" as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents are not satisfied in their job relative to pay factor.

5.5. Responsibility Factor

Table 6e: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Responsibility Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I get along well with my colleagues.	3.37	SA	3.40	SA	3.23	A	3.33	SA
2. I try to be aware of the policies of my school.	3.41	SA	3.40	SA	3.27	SA	3.36	SA
3. I am interested in the policies of my school.	3.31	SA	3.30	SA	3.57	SA	3.73	SA
4. I do have enough responsibility.	3.46	SA	3.73	SA	3.19	A	3.46	SA
5. My staff/ students/co-employees respect me as a dean/head/teacher/personnel.	3.49	SA	3.37	SA	3.27	SA	3.38	SA
6. I am responsible for planning my daily work.	3.57	SA	3.48	SA	3.35	SA	3.47	SA
7. My work provides me the opportunity to help my colleagues and other stakeholders.	3.49	SA	3.38	SA	3.38	SA	3.42	SA
8. I am responsible for my actions.	3.57	SA	3.44	SA	3.42	SA	3.48	SA
9. I have too much responsibilities.	3.31	SA	3.3	SA	3.27	SA	3.29	SA
Category Mean	3.44	SA	3.42	SA	3.44	SA	3.43	SA

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 6 which states that "I am responsible for planning my daily work" and item number 8 "I am responsible for my actions" with a mean of 3.44 or "Strongly Agree", respectively. This means that the administrators are performing their job as expected from them. It also means that they are serious about their job and are efficient when it comes to work. They take a personal hand



in ensuring that work is properly carried out and that they take personal responsibility for the consequences of their actions. Rated lowest are items number 3 "I am interested in the policies of my school" and item number 9 "I have too much responsibilities" both with a mean of 3.31 or "Strongly Agree". This means that administrators are particular in the policies of the school. They find that school policies have a direct impact on their work, thus they maintain interest in them. Also, they believe that they are given tasks that are excessive for them to handle. They find that they have heavy workload, which calls a need for more employees or better training in order to improve the ability to handle them. The category mean is 3.44 or "Strongly Agree". This implies that administrators are satisfied relative to responsibility factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that "I do have enough responsibility" with a mean of 3.73 or "Strongly Agree". This implies that the faculty-respondents are given tasks outside of their teaching loads, such as research and extension, and advisement for student's concerns. They find that there is enough meaningful work to be done, and that their skills are not being put to waste by the institution. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 3 "I am interested in the policies of the school" and item number 9 "I have too much responsibilities" both with the same mean of 3.30 or "Strongly Agree". Similar to administrators, they see school policies as relevant to their work, and make themselves aware of them. Also, faculty are given tasks beyond their expectations. This also means that they are exhausted of their job because of too much responsibilities. The category mean is 3.42 or "Strongly Agree" as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty are satisfied in their job relative to responsibility factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that "I am interested in the policies of my school" with a mean of 3.57 or "Strongly Agree". Similar to administrators and faculty which is they find relevance in the policies of the school. Personnel-respondents are concerned of what is happening in school and are willing to contribute more to the welfare of the school. Personnel are mindful of their responsibilities and are bounded to follow policies of the university. Rated lowest is item number 4 "I do



have enough responsibility” with a mean of 3.19 or “Agree”. The respondents believe that they have enough to do and enough tasks to accomplish. They believe that they are given enough challenging and stimulating work. The category mean of 3.34 or “Strongly Agree” implies that the personnel are satisfied in their job relative to responsibility factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 3 “I am interested in the policies of my school.” with a mean of 3.73 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are mindful of the policies of the organization. They believe that school policies are relevant and worthy of their interest as these are very vital in the operation of the organization. As a whole, rated lowest is item 9 which state that “I have too much responsibilities” with a mean of 3.29 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the employees of the school are given too much responsibilities and that they are fully utilized. They see a need to either lessen the workload or improve their personal capability to handle the rigors of the job. The overall category mean is 3.43 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are satisfied in their job relative to responsibility factor.

5.6. Work Itself Factor

Table 6f: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Work Itself Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. My work encourages originality.	3.37	SA	3.34	SA	3.15	A	3.29	SA
2. My work is very interesting.	3.34	SA	3.37	SA	3.13	A	3.28	SA
3. My work encourages me to be creative.	3.37	SA	3.47	SA	3.08	A	3.31	SA
4. My work provides me the chance to develop new methods.	3.46	SA	3.46	SA	3.11	A	3.34	SA
5. The work consists of routine activities. *	3.31	SA	3.30	SA	3.23	A	3.28	SA
6. It provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills.	3.37	SA	3.39	SA	3.06	A	3.27	SA
7. I am interested in my work	3.34	SA	3.50	SA	3.25	SA	3.36	SA
8. I have the freedom to make my own decisions.	3.32	SA	3.16	A	3.17	A	3.22	A
9. The work is very pleasant.	3.35	SA	3.32	SA	3.23	A	3.30	SA
Category Mean	3.36	SA	3.37	SA	3.16	A	3.30	SA



For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 4 which states that “My work provides me the chance to develop new methods.” with a mean of 3.46 or “Strongly Agree”. This means that administrators are given free hand in the performance of their job. It also implies that the university encourages new ideas. Administrators are given challenging work that allows them to be innovative and creative in their approaches in accomplishing their tasks. Rated lowest is item number 8 “I have the freedom to make my own decisions” with a mean of 3.32 or “Strongly Agree”. This means that administrators, though they find this the lowest, still, see it as positive in the sense that they are given freedom to do what is best in their office/unit/department. They believe they have the autonomy to do and act as they deem necessary in order to accomplish tasks. The category mean is 3.36 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that administrators are satisfied in their job relative to work itself factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that “My work encourages me to be creative” with a mean of 3.47 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the faculty-respondents are using different methods, strategies and technology that make teaching-learning more fun, easier and more inspiring. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 8 “I have the freedom to make my own decisions” with a mean of 3.16 or “Agree”. This implies that faculty have some freedom to perform their teaching tasks, but are still monitored and regulated in this performance. They are follow policies, protocols and are mindful of their being a faculty and being a faculty, they have an immediate supervisor whom they could refer things related to their job as teachers. The category mean is 3.37 or “Strongly Agree” which implies that faculty are satisfied in their job relative to work itself factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 7 which states that “I am interested in my work” with a mean of 3.25 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents are happy in their work. It also implies that they are given tasks which are appropriate to their ability. They find their work interesting and engaging. Rated lowest is item number 6 “It provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills.” with a mean of 3.06 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents use several strategies in performing their tasks. They see to it that methodologies utilized by them are within the interest and



ability of learners. The category mean of 3.16 or “Agree” implies that the personnel are satisfied in their job relative to work itself factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 7 “I am interested in my work” with a mean of 3.36 or “Strongly Agree”. This implies that the employees of the university are given task commensurate with their abilities. It means that they are happy with their assigned task. As a whole, rated lowest is item 8 which states that “I have the freedom to make my own decisions” with a mean of 3.22 or “Agree”. This implies that the employees of the university do not have a full control of their job. They are bound to follow and cannot freely make decisions on their own. The overall category mean is 3.30 or “Strongly Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups are satisfied in their job relative to work itself factor.

5.7. Advancement Factor

Table 6g: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Advancement Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. The organization provides a good opportunity for advancement.	3.09	A	2.92	A	2.81	A	2.94	A
2. My work provides an opportunity for promotion.	2.89	A	2.81	A	2.75	A	2.82	A
3. It provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally.	3.09	A	2.93	A	2.77	A	2.93	A
4. The organization provides equal opportunities for advancement.	2.91	A	2.85	A	2.68	A	2.81	A
5. I am getting ahead in my present position.	3.06	A	2.83	A	2.66	A	2.85	A
Category Mean	3.01	A	2.87	A	2.74	A	2.87	A

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which states that “The organization provides a good opportunity for advancement.” and item number 3 “It provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally” with a mean of 3.01 or “Agree”, respectively. Administrators find that there is ample opportunity for career growth. They find that there is enough opportunity to build up personal skills. Also, administrators have



sufficient trainings and seminars that upgrade their knowledge and skills as administrators. It also means that the university provides a budget for trainings and seminars for the administrators. Rated lowest is item number 2 “My work provides an opportunity for promotion” with a mean of 2.89 or “Agree”. This means that the school provides a limited opportunity for promotion. It also implies that administrators, though, they occupy a position already, do not find the school to continuously provide opportunities for promotion although the appointment states that 3 years is the maximum number for an administrators in a position, so that rotation can be done, just like in other institutions. The category mean is 3.01 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators are just satisfied in their job relative to advancement factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that “It provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally” with a mean of 2.93 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty-respondents are given opportunities to further their professional and personal skills. It also means that that the university is giving the faculty sufficient trainings to upgrade themselves. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 2 “My work provides an opportunity for promotion” with a mean of 2.81 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty find themselves a limited chance to go for a higher career progression. It also means that the university offer a limited opportunity for faculty to occupy a higher position because deans stay long in their positions. The category mean is 2.87 or “Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty are only satisfied in their job relative to advancement factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which states that “The organization provides a good opportunity for advancement” with a mean of 2.81 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents find the university to be providing opportunity to grow and develop in their career however, there are scares items for promotion. It also implies that personnel are given seminars, trainings and the school is appropriating an amount for such. Rated lowest is item number 5 “I am getting ahead in my present position” with a mean of 2.66 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel find themselves limited to the confines of their jobs. They believe that there is a need to create more options for



advancement inside the institution. The category mean of 2.74 or “Agree” implies that the personnel – respondents are just satisfied in their job relative to advancement factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 1 “The organization provides a good opportunity for advancement” with a mean of 2.94 or “Agree”. This implies that employees in the university are given opportunity to grow and develop in their career. Career growth is something that is addressed by the school. Rated lowest is item 4 which states that “The organization provides equal opportunities for advancement” with a mean of 2.85 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents find the organization not being fair in providing the employees the opportunity to grow and develop. There may be biases and unfair treatment when it comes to who advances up the corporate ladder. The overall category mean is 2.87 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are only satisfied in their job relative to advancement factor.

5.8. Security Factor

Table 6h: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Security Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I am afraid of losing my job.	2.77	A	2.92	A	2.6	A	2.76	A
2. The organization provides for a secure future.	2.63	A	2.74	A	2.53	A	2.63	A
3. I feel secure in my job.	2.69	A	2.72	A	2.66	A	2.69	A
Category Mean	2.70	A	2.8	A	2.6	A	2.70	A

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which state that “I am afraid of losing my job” with a mean of 2.77 or “Agree”. This means that administrators are alarmed of not being able to continue as an administrator. They want to stay in the job and so they cling on to their designations. There is a belief among administrators that they could easily be removed from their positions, although in their appointments, it states that unless revoked. Rated lowest is item number 2 “The organization provides for a secure future” with a mean of 2.63 or “Agree”. This means that in general, there is a belief among administrators that the university helps in ensuring security. This is done through the policy of being made as a regular employee, once employees the probationary period and is



recommended for regularization. The category mean is 2.70 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators are satisfied in their job relative to security factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which state that ““The organization provides for a secure future” with a mean of 2.92 or “Agree”. The faculty-respondents believe that the organization provides security of tenure based on the policies on regularization, determined through number of years in service and recommendation from immediate supervisor. They comparable salary scheme and the school is relatively following the provisions of the Department of Labor. Rated lowest for faculty-respondents is item number 3 “I feel secure in my job” with a mean of 2.72 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty are confident of what the school is providing. The faculty-respondents believe that they are relatively secure in their jobs provided they do not violate provision contained in the Faculty Manual. The category mean is 2.80 or “Agree” which means that the faculty are satisfied in their job relative to security factor.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 3 which states that “I feel secure in my job” with a mean of 2.66 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents are confident of their job for as long as they do their job well and don’t violate school policies. They do not feel that there are threats to their job and that they could be arbitrarily removed. Rated lowest is item number 2 “The organization provides a secure future” with a mean of 2.53 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents feel that the school is ensuring that they have economic, personal, and other kinds of security. This may be because of adequate compensation, good job security, benefits, or other such measures. The category mean of 2.60 or “Agree” implies that the personnel are satisfied in their job relative to security factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 1 “I am afraid of losing my job” with a mean of 2.76 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are fearful of the possibility of losing their jobs and see such as a legitimate threat. They are aware of the importance of their job and feel threatened by the prospect of losing such. This is because of their age; they can no longer enter government services. As a whole, rated lowest is item



2 which states that “The organization provides for a secure future” with a mean of 2.63 or “Agree”. This means that the three respondents believe that they have security of tenure in the organization. The overall category mean is 2.70 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are satisfied in their job relative to security factor.

5.9. Recognition Factor

Table 6i: Mean and Descriptive Scale Distribution of Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on the Level of Job Satisfaction as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole Relative to Recognition Factor

Items	ADMIN		Faculty		Personnel		As a Whole	
	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1. I receive full recognition for my successful work.					2.5			
	2.63	A	2.84	A	3	A	2.67	A
2. Everyone tells me that I am good.					2.7			
	2.77	A	2.82	A	0	A	2.76	A
3. I receive recognition for my good performance.					2.6			
	2.77	A	2.82	A	2	A	2.74	A
Category mean					2.6			
	2.72	A	2.82	A	2	A	2.72	A

For **Administrator-respondents**, rated highest are items number 2 which states that “Everyone tells me that I am good” and item number 3 “I receive recognition for my good performance” both with a mean of 2.77 or “Agree”. This means that administrators are appreciated when they are doing a good job. They see that their efforts are recognized by others. Rated lowest is item number 1 “I receive full recognition for my successful work” with a mean of 2.63 or “Agree”. This means that the organization is appreciative of the good performance of the administrators. The category mean is 3.06 or “Agree”. This implies that administrators are satisfied in their job relative to recognition factor.

For the **faculty-respondents**, rated highest is item number 1 which state that “I receive full recognition for my successful work.” with a mean of 2.84 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty-respondents are appreciated by their immediate supervisors because of a good teaching performance. They also received outstanding evaluation from their students. Rated



lowest for faculty-respondents are items number 2 “Everyone tells me that I am good” and item number 3 “I receive full recognition for my good performance” both with a mean of 2.82 or “Agree”. This implies that the faculty as a part of human need also needs to be provided with need to love, be loved, and need for recognition. These are also incentives for outstanding performance. The category mean is 2.82 or “Agree” as assessed by the faculty-respondents. This implies that faculty are satisfied in their job relative to recognition.

For the **personnel-respondents**, rated highest is item number 2 which states that “Everyone tells me that I am good” with a mean of 2.7 or “Agree”. This implies that personnel-respondents are appreciated when they display good performance by their immediate supervisors. Their incentives are in the form of deminimis. Rated lowest is item number 1 “I receive full recognition for my successful work.” with a mean of 2.53 or “Agree”. This implies that the personnel-respondents are recognized in their exemplary which are reflected in their efficiency rating. The category mean of 2.80 or “Agree” implies that the personnel are satisfied in their job relative to recognition factor.

As a whole, rated highest is item number 2 “Everyone tells me that I am good” with a mean of 2.76 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are appreciated of their good performance. Colleagues and peers show appreciation for exemplary work. Rated lowest is item 1 which state that “I receive full recognition for my successful work” with a mean of 2.67 or “Agree”. This implies that the three groups of respondents are aware of the importance of performing well and appreciation is an innate value that everyone can employ to be motivated to work and be inspired to do well. The overall category mean is 2.70 or “Agree” as assessed by the three groups of respondents. This implies that the three groups of respondents are satisfied in their job relative to recognition factor.



5.10. Summary on the Level of Job Satisfaction of the Administrators, Faculty and Personnel

Table 6j: Summary Table on the Level of Job Satisfaction of the Administrators, Faculty and

Dimension	Admin		Faculty		Personnel		As A Whole	
	CM	DS	CM	DS	CM	DS	CM	DS
1. Supervision Factor	3.59	SA	3.27	A	3.42	SA	3.43	SA
2. Colleagues Factor	3.45	SA	3.34	SA	3.25	SA	3.35	SA
3. Working Conditions Factor	3.09	A	3.12	A	2.99	A	3.07	A
4. Pay Factor	2.46	D	2.59	A	2.30	D	2.45	A
5. Responsibility Factor	3.44	SA	3.42	SA	3.44	SA	3.43	SA
6. Work Itself Factor	3.36	SA	3.37	SA	3.16	A	3.30	SA
7. Advancement Factor	3.01	A	2.87	A	2.74	A	2.87	A
8. Security Factor	2.70	A	2.80	A	2.60	A	2.70	A
9. Recognition Factor	2.72	A	2.82	A	2.62	A	2.72	A
Overall Mean	3.09	A	3.07	A	2.94	A	3.03	A

Personnel as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole

As reflected in the table, rated highest by the administrators is “Supervision factor” with a mean of 3.59 or “Strongly Agree”. This means that administrators are motivated to work because their immediate supervisors are willing to listen to suggestions and provide assistance when needed. The school officials designated are performing good management and supervision practices. For the faculty, personnel and as a whole, rated highest is “Responsibility Factor” with a mean of 3.42, 3.44 and 3.43 or “Strongly Agree” respectively. This implies that for the faculty and the personnel, and for the respondents as a whole, their job gives them a sense of responsibility which motivates them to have a personal stake at ensuring a good job is done. Rated lowest by administrators, faculty, personnel and as a whole is “pay factor” with a mean of 2.46, 2.59, 2.3, 2.45 or “Disagree”. This means that the three groups of respondents are not receiving a good salary from the university as compared to other schools nearby. The respondents believe that their income is not sufficient to provide them financial security. This is supported by the university’s average attrition rate of 35% for the last five years. The overall mean rating by the administrators,



faculty personnel and as a whole is 3.09, 3.07, 2.94 and 3.03 or “Agree” respectively. This implies that the three groups of respondents agree and are satisfied in their job. Generally speaking, therefore, employees of the University are only satisfied with their jobs. Only in the pay factor that the university has to improve. With the prevailing compensation package provided by the government, the school has to revisit the current salary scale and benefits of employees in order to keep employees, make them stay and be satisfied with their pay and jobs.

6. Comparison among the Assessment of the Three Groups of Respondents on their Level of Job Satisfaction

Table 7: Test of Difference among the Assessment of the Three Groups of Respondents on their Level of Job Satisfaction

Dimension	Fc	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
Supervision Factor	3.681	.027	Reject Ho
<i>Post Hoc</i>			
<i>Administrators & Faculty</i>		.025	
Colleagues Factor	2.017	.136	Accept Ho
Working Conditions Factor	.831	.437	Accept Ho
Pay Factor	2.821	.062	Accept Ho
Responsibility Factor	.023	.977	Accept Ho
Work Itself Factor	2.545	.081	Accept Ho
Advancement Factor	33.263	.000	Reject Ho
<i>Post Hoc</i>			
<i>Administrators & Personnel</i>		.000	
<i>Faculty & Personnel</i>		.000	
Security Factor	1.262	.285	Accept Ho
Recognition Factor	1.888	.154	Accept Ho

$\alpha=0.05$

As shown in the table, supervision and advancement factors showed a significant difference on the respondents' level of job satisfaction, hence, the rejection of the null hypothesis at .05 level of significance. This means that there is a significant difference among the



assessments of the three (3) groups of respondents on their level of job satisfaction. The three groups have different levels of job satisfaction, which may mean that they have different experiences and awareness that shape their job satisfaction. A post Hoc analysis shows that for supervision factor the difference is between administration and faculty and for advancement factor the difference is between administration and personnel and faculty and personnel. This difference is due to the nature of supervision provided wherein administrators are supervised by top management while faculty are supervised by their deans, principals, and department chairs. For advancement factor, the difference is due to the nature of needs as required by their job description. The other dimensions did not show any difference in assessment, hence the acceptance of the null hypothesis at .05 level of significance.

7. Correlation between the School Climate Innovativeness as Assessed by the Three Groups Of Respondents and their Level Of Job Satisfaction

Table 8: Test of Relationship among Administrators, Faculty and Personnel on their Level of Job Satisfaction

School Climate Innovativeness/ Satisfaction Level		Super - vision	Colleag ues	Working Conditio ns	Pay	Respon- sibility	Work Itself	Advance- ment	Securit y	Recog- nition
Mission, Vision and Purpose	Pearson Correlation	.240*	.278*	.221*	.171*	.214*	.351*	.178*	.273*	.248*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.002	.017	.003	.000	.013	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Feedback	Pearson Correlation	.364*	.345*	.356*	.268*	.259*	.251*	.171*	.396*	.456*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.017	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Commu- nication	Pearson Correlation	.276*	.386*	.399*	.267*	.280*	.267*	.258*	.410*	.393*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194



Resource s/Proce- dures	Pearson Correlation	.249*	.335*	.342*	.287*	.204*	.292*	.307*	.476*	.413*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.004	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Opportu- nities for Growth	Pearson Correlation	.180*	.302*	.318*	.336*	.180*	.248*	.296*	.458**	.454*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.000	.000	.000	.012	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Compen- sation	Pearson Correlation	.078	.185*	.356*	.480*	.135	.211*	.266*	.507*	.395*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.283	.010	.000	.000	.060	.003	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Work/ Life Balance	Pearson Correlation	.197*	.342*	.358*	.283*	.277*	.363*	.214*	.262*	.270*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Security	Pearson Correlation	.210*	.336*	.354*	.340*	.234*	.280*	.272*	.462*	.418*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
Innovativ e Work Behavior	Pearson Correlation	.267*	.296*	.218*	.063	.323*	.362*	.148*	.144*	.236*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002	.383	.000	.000	.040	.045	.001
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in the table, the dimensions on mission, vision and purpose, feedback, communication, resources/procedures, opportunities for growth, work/life balance, security and innovative work behavior are significantly related to supervision factor, colleagues factor, working conditions factor, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security factor, and recognition factor, hence, the rejection of the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. On the other hand, there are dimensions of school climate innovativeness which are not significantly related to the factors of job satisfaction. As reflected in the table, compensation dimension is not significantly related to supervision factor and responsibility factor, hence, the acceptance of the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. Also, innovative work behaviour dimension is not significantly related to pay factor, hence, the



acceptance of the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the general assessment is that the dimensions of school climate innovativeness are significantly related to factors of job satisfaction. This implies that school climate innovativeness greatly influence job satisfaction. This finding supports with the study of Kanten and Ulker (2013) who investigated the "Impact of Organizational Climate on Counterproductive Behaviors". The study revealed a significant relationship between counterproductive behaviors and dimensions of organizational climate such as reward, warmth, support/commitment, organizational structure and organizational standards. The result of the study showed that warmth relationship environment, support/commitment and organizational dimensions have a high impact on counterproductive behaviors. Thus, a positive organizational climate stimulates a positive behavior among employees which will result to job satisfaction.

CONCLUSIONS

Human resources can be a powerful tool that propels any organization to the height of its potential. More so in a school setting, where the human element is the most critical in delivering its services. Based on the findings of the study, there is a high level of school climate innovativeness influences employees job satisfaction. This therefore explains the interrelationship between and among school climate innovativeness and job satisfaction. Thus, a positive organizational climate, stimulates positive behavior among employees which ultimately results to job satisfaction. To ensure a school interpersonal relationship among employees' compensation, working conditions, programs and policies of the school have yet to be optimized, to avoid factions, confusions, and communication gap in the organization. Therefore, if the school desires to get the best from its human resources, then it must reflect on what it offers to ensure that the university performs at its maximum efficiency.

Thus, it is important that the school take note of the identified improvement areas and recommendations, to ensure that UCV will be the best that it can be.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Having arrived at the findings, the researcher recommends the following:



1. The school should do something to increase the level of job satisfaction of the employees.
2. Team building activities must be conducted among administrators, faculty, and personnel to encourage collaboration and teamwork.
3. Recognition of outstanding performance of employees should be conducted and rewarded. Top management must provide a recognition and reward system to increase job satisfaction and devise a way to motivate employees.
4. Information availability mechanisms of the institution should be improved.
5. The institution may opt to introduce a more technology-driven capability in keeping employee database.
6. Additional opportunities may be provided to ensure that administrators feel that they are in a path of constant advancement if they perform according to expectations.
7. There must be a greater effort at ensuring that compensation keeps employees happy or that administrators are made to feel that the current compensation is fulfilling.
8. To avoid dissatisfaction, effort must be expended in ensuring that there is a level playing field for all, ensuring that employees feel that all are equal in the organization.
9. Top management must exert efforts in ensuring that innovative behavior is something that is encouraged in the workplace among colleagues and make work more collaborative for everyone.
10. Top management must consider a more competitive compensation package to ensure employees are motivated to work and come with innovative ideas.
11. The proposed action plan must be implemented to address the dimension needed to be enhanced.
12. Similar studies must be conducted using other variables of school climate innovativeness.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. New York, NY: General Learning Press.

Etzioni, Amitia. (1964). Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Herzberg, F., Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland, World Publishing Company, 1966.

Luthans, F., Organisational Behaviour (6th Edition). New York, McGraw-Hill, 1992.

Meyer, J. and Allen, N. (1997). Commitment in the workplace. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications

Mowday et al. (1982). Employee organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment. New York: Academic Press

Spector, P.E., (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences, London: Sage Publications,

Journals

Adebayo, A.S. and Gombakumba, T. (2013). Dimensions of teachers' job satisfaction in primary schools in Gweru district, Zimbabwe: A factor analysis. European Scientific Journal, 9(25), 316-317.

Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 1-18.



Aydina, A. et.al. (2013) "The Effect of School Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction". Osmangazi University

Baer, M. and Frese, M. (2013). Innovation Is Not Enough: Climates for Initiative and Psychological Safety, Process Innovations, and Firm Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 24, No. 1, Pp. 45-46.

BhuyanBindia; *International Journal of Advance Research and Development* (Volume3, Issue8)

Bryant, V. C.; Shdaimah, C.; Sander, R. L.; Cornelius, L. J. (2013). "School as haven: transforming school environments into welcoming learning communities". Children and Youth Services Review. 35: 848–855.

Celebi et al. (2016). Teachers loyalty to their supervisors and organizational commitment. *Academic Journals*, 11(12), 1161-1167.

Chamundeswari, S. (2013). Job Satisfaction and Performance of School Teachers. N.K.T. National College of Education for Women. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* May 2013, Vol. 3, No. 5 ISSN: 2222-6990

Choi, D., Oh, I.-S., & Colbert, A. (in press). Understanding commitment at work: A metaanalytic examination of the roles of the Five-Factor Model of personality and culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. (2015)

Cogaltay, Nazim. (2015). Organizational commitment of teachers: A meta- analysis study for the effect of gender and marital status in Turkey. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 15(4), 911-924.

Cohen, A. and Liu, Y. (2011). Relationships between in-role performance and individual values, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior among Israeli teachers. *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(4), 631-637.



Cohen, J.; McCabe, E. M.; Michelli, N. M.; Pickeral, T. (2009). "School Climate: Research, Policy, Practice, and Teacher Education". *Teachers College Record*. **111**: 180–213.

Colak, I., Altinkurt, Y., & Yilmaz, K. (2014). The Relationship between Teachers' Teacher Leadership Roles and Organizational Commitment Levels. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 3 (1-2), 35-51.

Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2003). What do students say about their motivational goals? Toward a more complex and dynamic perspective on student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28(1), 91-113.

Dressler, Gary (1999). "How to Earn Your Employees' Commitment" (PDF). *Academy of Management Executive*. **13** (2): 58–67. [JSTOR 4165540](#). Retrieved 2014-04-15.

Freinerg, H. J. (1999). School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press. p. 11.

Garipagaoglu, Burcak C. (2013). Examining organizational commitment of private school teachers. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 3(2), 25-28.

Ghosh, Smritakara Mitra. (2015). Job satisfaction among government and private school teachers. *The International Journal Indian Psychology*, 2(2), 90-92.

Gittelsohn, J.; Merkle, S.; Story, M.; Stone, E. J.; Steckler, A.; Noel, J.; Ethelbah, B. (2003). "School climate and implementation of the pathways study". *Preventive Medicine*. **37**: S97–S106.

Griffith, J. (1999). "School climate as "social order" and "social action": A multi-level analysis of public elementary school student perceptions". *Social Psychology of Education*. **2**: 339–369.



Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R., 'Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey', Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 1975, pp. 161.

Herman, Robert D., & Renz, David O. (2008). Advancing Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness Research and Theory: Nine Theses. Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 18(4), 399-415.

Hsiao, H.C., Chang, J.C., Sung, H.Y. and Chen, S.C., (2009). A study of constructing evaluation indicators for organizational innovation in junior colleges. J. of Technological and Vocational Educ., 3, 1, 75-106

Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Liden, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Hulpia, H.; Devos, G.; Rosseel, Y. (2009). "The relationship between the perception of distributed leadership in secondary schools and teachers' and teacher leaders' job satisfaction and organizational commitment". *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. **20** (3): 291. doi:10.1080/09243450902909840. hdl:1854/LU-626335.

Ice, M.; Thapa, A.; Cohen, J. (2015). "Recognizing community voice and a youth-led school-community partnership in the school climate improvement process"(PDF). *School Community Journal*. **25**: 9–28.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2000). Turnover among mathematics and science teachers in the U.S. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century.

Ingersoll, R.M., & Smith, T.M. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? NASSP Bulletin, 88, 28-40.



Int. J. Business Innovation and Research, Vol. 12, No. 4, 2017 465

International Journal of Humanities and Social Science
5; March 2013

Vol. 3 No.

Kalleberg, A.L. (1977). "Work values and job rewards—Theory of job satisfaction". *American Sociological Review*. **42**(1): 124–143. doi:[10.2307/2117735](https://doi.org/10.2307/2117735). JSTOR [2117735](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2117735).

Kantin, Pelin and Funda Er Ulker (2013). The Effect of Organizational Climate on Counterproductive Behaviors: An Empirical Study on the Employees of Manufacturing Enterprises. *The Macrotheme Review: A Multidisciplinary Journal of Global Macro Trends*. Summer 2013.

Khaliq et al. (2016). A study of factors affecting organizational commitment among bank officers in Pakistan. *Journal of Business and Financial Affairs*, 6, 80-81.

Khan, Sadia. (2015). Organizational commitment among public and private school teachers. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(3), 65-66.

Kim, H., & Cho, Y. (2014). Preservice teachers' motivation, teacher efficacy, and expectation of reality shock. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. 42(1), 67-81.

Kumah, Aaron and Boachie, W. (2017). Teacher job satisfaction as a motivational tool for school effectiveness: An assessment of private basic schools in Ghana. *International Journal of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Research*, 1(12), 29-44.

Kumari, S. and Jafri, S. (2011). Level of organizational commitment of male and female teachers of secondary schools. *Journal of Community Guidance and Research*, 28(1), 37-47.

Lalita, R. (2013). Level of job satisfaction among private and government school teachers. *International Journal of Social Science and Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(9), 5-8.



Langguyuan-Kadtong, M. (2013). "Work Performance and Job Satisfaction among Teachers" Notre Dame University, Cotabato City Teacher Tamontaka Central School, Cotabato City Philippines

Lee J.E., (2005). The relationship between organizational innovation and school efficiency. J. of Mei Ho Institute of Technology, 24, 1, 223-241

Lizote et al. (2017). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction: A study with municipal civil servants. Revista de Administracao Publica, 51(6), 10-15.

Locke, E.A., 'The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction'. In Dunnette, M.P. (Ed.) Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, pp. 1297-1350.

Lu, H., Barriball, K. L., Zhang, X. & While, A.E.. 'Job satisfaction among hospital nurses revisited: A systematic review', International Journal of Nursing Studies, 49, 2012, pp. 10-17.

McGuire, J. K.; Anderson, C. R.; Toomey, R. B.; Russell, S. T. (2010). "School climate for transgender youth: a mixed method investigation of student experiences and school responses". Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 39 (10): 1175–1188. doi:10.1007/s10964-010-9540-7. PMID 20428933.

McLaughlin, John A., & Jordan, Gretchen B. (2010). Using Logic Models. In Joseph S. Wholey, Harry P. Hatry & Kathryn E. Newcomer (Eds.), Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, George E. (2012). The Construct of Organizational Effectiveness: Perspectives from Leaders of International Nonprofits in the United States. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.



Mitra, Sauli. (2018). Job Satisfaction: A comparative study among government and private school teachers. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 3(2), 583-585.

Moorman, R.H. (1993). *"The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior"*. *Human Relations*. 6 (6): 759–776. doi:10.1177/001872679304600604.

Mousa, Mohaamed and Alas Ruth. (2016). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: A study on the public school teachers in Manoufia. *African Journal of Business Management*, 10(10), 247-255.

Natherusain, A. (2015). Analytical study on job satisfaction of school teachers in Tiruchiraparalli town. *Shanlax International Journal of Commerce*, 3(1), 112-113.

National School Climate Council (2007). The School Climate Challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy, practice guidelines and teacher education policy. www.schoolclimate.org/climate/policy.php: National Center for Learning and Citizenship, Education Commission of the States.

Nyamubi, Gilman Jackson. (2017). Determinants of secondary school teachers' job satisfaction. *Education Research International*, 45, 1-5.

Pedrycz, W. et.al. (2011). A model of job satisfaction for collaborative development processes. *Journal of Systems and Software* Volume 84, Issue 5, May 2011, Pages 739-752

Pihie, L. et.al. (2013) Entrepreneurial leadership practices and school innovativeness. Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia



Rahmawati, A., Haerani, S., Taba, M., & Hamid, N. (2016). Measures of Organizational Effectiveness: Public Sector Performance. *IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences* (ISSN 2455-2267), 5(2), 203-214

Richard et al. (2009): Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological Best Practice. *Journal of Management*.

Shafi, M. (2016). Job satisfaction in college teachers: A survey based study of government colleges of Hyderabad, Pakistan. *Journal of Hotel and Business Management*, 5(1), 2-5.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.

Suki, N.M. and Suki, N.M. (2011). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: The effect of gender. *International Journal Psychology Research*, 6(5), 1-15.

Taber, T.D. & Alliger, G.M., 'A task-level assessment of job satisfaction', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 16, 2, 1995, pp. 101.

Tanner, C. K. (2000). "The influence of school architecture on academic achievement". Journal of Educational Administration. 38 (4): 309–330.

Taştan, S. et. Al. (2017) The Relationship between organisational climate and Organisational innovativeness: testing the moderating effect of individual values of power and achievement"

Thapa, A.; Cohen, J.; Guffey, S.; Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). "A Review of School Climate Research". *Review of Educational Research*. 83: 357–385.

Usop et al. (2013). The significant relationship between work performance and job satisfaction in the Philippines. *International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research*, 3(2), 9-16.



Electronic Resources

<http://highlandconsultinggroupinc.com>

<http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/02/01/0899764011434589.abstract>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2010.12.018>Get rights and content

[https://education.cu-portland.edu/blog/curriculum-teaching-strategies/improve-teacher-
efficacy/](https://education.cu-portland.edu/blog/curriculum-teaching-strategies/improve-teacher-
efficacy/)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2013.855999>

<http://www.ed.gov/americaaccounts/glenn/compapers.html/>

<https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov>

<https://www.educationworld.com>

<https://www.questionpro.com/>

www.edam.com.tr/estp

www.ijarnd.com

www.iejee.com