



THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAGAYAN VALLEY AND ITS EFFECTS TO EMPLOYEES JOB SATISFACTION

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

ABSTRACT: *Job satisfaction is a worker's sense of achievement and success on the job. It is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal well-being. Job satisfaction implies doing a job one enjoys, doing it well and being rewarded for one's efforts. Job satisfaction further implies enthusiasm and happiness with one's work. Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that lead to a feeling of fulfillment (Kaliski,2007). This study attempted to assess the organizational effectiveness of the University of Cagayan Valley and their influence to employees' job satisfaction. This study made use of the descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive design was used to describe the respondent's existing organizational effectiveness as perceived by themselves. The correlational design was used to describe the results of the correlational tests such as test of difference between the assessment of the three groups of respondents on organizational effectiveness and correlated with the employees' mean job satisfaction. The respondents of the study are employees of the University with one (1) year residency. These are the administrators, faculty and personnel. Excluded are the top management and maintenance group. To assess the organizational effectiveness, a tool with a 13-item questionnaire developed and utilized in the Faculty Survey of Administrative Effectiveness (2015) was used. The tool used in assessing the teachers' job satisfaction was 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 is comprised of sixty-six items with four- point scale format assessing the nine facets of job satisfaction. To ensure a school interpersonal relationship among employees' compensation, working conditions, programs and policies of the school have yet to be optimized, in order 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 in order to ensure that the university performs at its maximum efficiency. Having arrived at*



the findings, the researcher recommends that 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, 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 and top management must consider a more competitive compensation package to ensure employees are motivated to work and come up with innovative ideas.

KEYWORDS: *organizational effectiveness, job satisfaction, incentives, promotion, compensation, trainings, seminars, human resource, good working conditions, descriptive correlation design*

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.

One of the things a school administrator has to monitor in this regard is job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is primarily concerned with the level of approval an employee feels towards the work he or she is engaged in. Many factors affect job satisfaction, including mentally challenging work, equitable rewards, conducive working conditions and supportive colleagues, as well as the ability of the work to fulfill social and self-actualization needs. It also affects and is affected by emotional and psychological well-being.

Monitoring and fostering good job satisfaction are important since it affects the effectiveness of instructional staff and the resulting student achievement gains. Higher



productivity and better performance are linked with satisfaction regarding factors such as pay and school policies.

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 work place (Davis et al.,1985).

Job satisfaction is a worker's sense of achievement and success on the job. It is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal well-being. Job satisfaction implies doing a job one enjoys, doing it well and being rewarded for one's efforts. Job satisfaction further implies enthusiasm and happiness with one's work. Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that lead to a feeling of fulfillment (Kaliski,2007).

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).

Another research by Kumah et al. (2017) entitled "Teacher Job Satisfaction as a Motivational Tool for School Effectiveness: An Assessment of Private Basic Schools in Ghana" was conducted where they employed a survey research method among private school teachers in Ghana. Four hundred fifty teachers were randomly selected from thirty-one private schools in Ashanti Region of Ghana. Self-compiled questionnaire was used to collect data on demographic information such as gender, age, marital status, school area, teaching



experience, qualifications, and rank whereas Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to measure the job satisfaction of employees. The results showed reasonable large levels of dissatisfaction in relation to intrinsic factors of work. There was a significant dissatisfaction factors in mutual relationship with demographic variables of school area and rank. A reasonable large relationship between levels of diminished interest and job satisfaction was also identified, specifically, in respect of consumption of sentimental resources and emotional detachment, which were shown to be in mutual relationship with low levels of job satisfaction.

Another factor that creates desired outcomes is organizational effectiveness. Organizational effectiveness is a concept that bears no introduction or even formal definition; quite simply, it is how effective an organization is. However, many authors and researchers have disagreed over an exact definition of organizational effectiveness, due to the breadth and the scope of what can be seen as “effective”. There is effectiveness in delivery of desired products, effectiveness in resource management, effectiveness in managing employees, etc. Organizational effectiveness can take on many and plenty of meanings, depending on the area being studied and analyzed.

High organizational effectiveness can have a transformative effect in an organization such as a school. High student achievement, good employee performance, and other positive school developments can all arise from organizational effectiveness.

Many factors inside the school can be credited to creating different levels and kinds of organizational effectiveness: school supervisor’s leadership styles, information culture employed, and other factors. Indeed, it is a confluence of many actions taken over periods of time which spell the overall organizational effectiveness of a school.

According to Pedraza, J., (2014) organizational effectiveness can be defined as the efficiency with which an association is able to meet its objectives. This means an organization that produces a desired effect or an organization that is productive without waste. Organizational effectiveness is about each individual doing everything they know how to do and doing it well; in other words organizational efficiency is the capacity of an organization



to produce the desired results with a minimum expenditure of energy, time, money, and human and material resources. The desired effect will depend on the goals of the organization, which could be, for example, making a profit by producing and selling a product. An organization, if it operates efficiently, will produce a product without waste. If the organization has both organizational effectiveness and efficiency, it will achieve its goal of making a profit by producing and selling a product without waste. In economics and the business world, this may be referred to as maximizing profits.

The main measure of organizational effectiveness for a business will generally be expressed in terms of how well its net profitability compares with its target profitability. Additional measures might include growth data and the results of customer satisfaction surveys.

Highly effective organizations exhibit strengths across five areas: leadership, decision making and structure, people, work processes and systems, and culture. For an organization to achieve and sustain success, it needs to adapt to its dynamic environment. Evaluating and improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency is one strategy used to help insure the continued growth and development of an organization.

Organizational effectiveness is the measure of how successfully (or not) organizations are achieving their missions and advancing their visions through their core strategies. Organizational Effectiveness requires that Human Resource and Organizational Development efforts tie directly to the desired business outcomes. That means: measuring what matters!

I-Chao Lee and Kao Yuan (2011) conducted a study entitled "The Influences of School Supervisors' Leadership Styles upon Organizational Effectiveness: Using Organizational Commitment and Organizational Change as Mediators". A questionnaire-based survey was conducted on full-time teachers holding lecturer or higher-level positions at a Taiwanese technological university. After using simple random sampling to yield knowledge from the population and sending out copies of questionnaire via mail, convenience sampling was adopted to avoid excessively low response rates. The overall model's goodness-of-fit effect concerning the structural and measurement models were verified using linear Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). Regarding the path coefficients for implicit/unobservable



variables in the structural model, the MacKinnon PRODCLIN 2 program was employed to test how significant the model's total effect, specific mediation effects and direct effects were. Research results showed that: (1) the overall model had a statistically significant total effect; (2) supervisors' leadership styles exerted a significantly direct effect on organizational effectiveness; (3) both organizational commitment and organizational change exerted significant specific mediation effects, although the former was greater than the latter.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study attempted to assess the organizational effectiveness of the University of Cagayan Valley and their influence to employees' job satisfaction. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. How do the three groups of respondents assess the level of organizational effectiveness of the school?

2. Is there a significant difference among the assessment of the three groups of respondents on the level of organizational effectiveness of the school?

3. To what level are the three groups of respondents satisfied in their job relative to the following factors:

- 3.1. Supervision Factor
- 3.2. Colleagues Factor
- 3.3. Working Conditions Factor
- 3.4. Pay Factor
- 3.5. Responsibility Factor
- 3.6. Work Itself Factor
- 3.7. Advancement Factor
- 3.8. Security Factor
- 3.9. Recognition Factor



4. Is there a significant difference among the assessment of the three groups of respondents on their level of job satisfaction relative to the above factors?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the organizational effectiveness of the school as assessed by the three groups of respondents and their job satisfaction level?
6. What program interventions may be proposed to address the dimensions that least influenced the job satisfaction of the employees?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study made use of the descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive design was used to describe the respondent's existing organizational effectiveness as perceived by themselves. The correlational design was used to describe the results of the correlational tests such as test of difference between the assessment of the three groups of respondents on organizational effectiveness and correlated with the employees' mean job satisfaction. The respondents of the study are employees of the University with one (1) year residency. These are the administrators, faculty and personnel. Excluded are the top management and maintenance group.

To assess the organizational effectiveness, a tool with a 13-item questionnaire developed and utilized in the Faculty Survey of Administrative Effectiveness (2015) was used. The tool used in assessing the teachers' job satisfaction was 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 is comprised of sixty-six items with four-point scale format assessing the nine facets of job satisfaction.

The following statistical tools were used to treat the data gathered.



The weighted mean was used to find the level of organizational effectiveness of the respondents.

The level of organizational effectiveness was analyzed and interpreted using the following scale:

Numerical Scale	Mean Rating	Qualitative Equivalent
4	3.25-4.00	Very Effective
3	2.50-3.24	Effective
2	1.75-2.49	Ineffective
1	1.00-1.74	Insufficient Knowledge

The teachers' 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 level of organizational effectiveness of respondents' mean job satisfaction. Likewise, the F-test was used to compare the assessment of the three groups of respondents on their demonstrated level of organizational effectiveness. The F-test was used again to compare the assessment of the respondents on their job satisfaction.



RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

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

Table 1

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, staff)	2.97	E	2.77	E	2.67	E	2.80	E
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 state 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.



2. Comparison among the Assessment of the Three Groups of Respondents on the Level of Organizational Effectiveness of the School

Table 2: Test of Difference among the Assessments of the Three Groups of Respondents on the Level of Organizational Effectiveness

Dimension	Fc	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision
Organizational Effectiveness	3.349	.037	Reject Ho

$\alpha = 0.05$

As shown in the above table, there is a significant difference among the assessment of the three (3) groups of respondents on organizational effectiveness of the school, hence, the rejection of the null hypothesis at .05 level of significance. This means that the assessments of the three (3) groups of respondents vary. It further means that although most of the items were assessed as extensive, the quantitative value differs, hence the difference in assessment.

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

3.1. Supervision Factor

Table 3a

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	3.5	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	3.4	4	SA
4. I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.	3.49	SA	3.18	A	3.27	SA	3.3	1	SA
5. My immediate supervisor backs me up.	3.63	SA	3.23	A	3.57	SA	3.4	8	SA
6. My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me.	3.37	SA	3.54	SA	3.63	SA	3.5	1	SA
7. My immediate supervisor is willing to listen to suggestions.	3.66	SA	3.25	SA	3.43	SA	3.4	5	SA
8. My immediate supervisor treats everyone equally.	3.54	SA	3.23	A	3.17	A	3.3	1	SA
9. My immediate supervisor makes me feel comfortable.	3.63	SA	3.24	A	3.47	SA	3.4	5	SA
10. When I do a good job, my immediate supervisor notices.	3.63	SA	3.22	A	3.32	SA	3.3	9	SA
11. My immediate supervisor offers suggestions to improve my work.	3.60	SA	3.31	SA	3.42	SA	3.4	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	3.4	2	SA
13. My immediate supervisor do not turn one employee against another.	3.54	SA	3.28	SA	3.47	SA	3.4	3	SA
14. I receive too many meaningful instructions from my immediate supervisor.	3.6	SA	3.21	A	3.35	SA	3.3	9	SA
Category Mean	3.59	SA	3.27	S A	3.42	SA	3.4	3	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.



3.2. Colleagues Factor

Table 3b: 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 colleagues 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.

3.3. Working Conditions Factor

Table 3c: 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.	3.0 9	A	3.17 A	A	3.02 A	A	3.09 A	A
2. Working conditions in my school are comfortable.	3.1 1	A	3.12 A	A	2.92 A	A	3.05 A	A
3. Physical surroundings in my school are pleasant.	3.0 6	A	3.05 A	A	2.90 A	A	3.00 A	A
4. The administration in my school clearly defines its policies.	3.0 6	A	3.14 A	A	3.27 SA	SA	3.16 A	A
5. The administration in my school communicates its policies well.	2.9 1	A	3.15 A	A	2.82 A	A	2.96 A	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’s 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.

3.4. Pay Factor

Table 3d: 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 2.28 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.



3.5. Responsibility Factor

Table 3e: 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 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.

3.6. Work Itself Factor

Table 3f: 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 following 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.

3.7. Advancement Factor

Table 3g: 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 administrator 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 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 state 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.

3.8. Security Factor

Table 3h: 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 states 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.

3.9. Recognition Factor

Table 3i: 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.	2.63	A	2.84	A	2.53	A	2.67	A
2. Everyone tells me that I am good.	2.77	A	2.82	A	2.70	A	2.76	A
3. I receive recognition for my good performance.	2.77	A	2.82	A	2.62	A	2.74	A
Category mean	2.72	A	2.82	A	2.62	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 states 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. As a whole, 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.



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

Table 3j: Summary Table on the Level of Job Satisfaction of the Administrators, Faculty and Personnel as Assessed by Themselves and as a Whole

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

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.

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

Table 4: 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.

5. Correlation Between the Organizational Effectiveness as Assessed by the Three Groups of Respondents and their Job Satisfaction level

Table 5: Test of Relationship between the Organizational Effectiveness as Assessed by the Three Groups of Respondents and their Job Satisfaction level

		Supervi- sion	Colleag ues	Workin g Condi tions	Pay	Respon -sibility	Work Itself	Advanc e- ment	Sec urit y	Recogn ition
Organizational Effective- ness	Pearson Correlatio n	.175*	.382*	.536*	.393*	.217*	.296*	.257*	.334*	.386*
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.015	.000	.000	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194	194

As shown in the table, organizational effectiveness is significantly related to supervision, colleagues' factor, working conditions factor, pay factor, responsibility factor, work itself, advancement factor, security factor and recognition factor, hence, the rejection of the null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance.



Thus, having high organizational effectiveness means high job satisfaction level. Organizations that are effective have a high chance of having employees who are satisfied with their jobs.

This finding is in congruence with the findings of the study conducted by Nyamubi (2017) entitled "Determinants of Secondary School Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Tanzania". The results indicated that teachers were satisfied by both monetary and non-monetary incentives. They were pleased with fair remuneration packages that are related to their labor input, opportunities for career development, a well-defined individual appraisal system, timely promotion, and requisite workplace conditions. The study also showed that teachers' friendship and cooperation with co-workers and students as well as the respect of community members also enhanced their satisfaction in teaching. This is a real manifestation that effectiveness of an organization have a positive effect on 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. To ensure a school interpersonal relationship among employees' compensation, working conditions, programs and policies of the school have yet to be optimized, in order 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 in order 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, in order to ensure that UCV will be the best that it can be.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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.

Additional opportunities may be provided in order to ensure that administrators feel that they are in a path of constant advancement if they perform according to expectations.

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.

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.

Top management must consider a more competitive compensation package to ensure employees are motivated to work and come up with innovative ideas.

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 meta-analytic 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. Ligen, & 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](https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450902909840). hdl:[1854/LU-626335](https://hdl.handle.net/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 Emprical 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](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9540-7). PMID [20428933](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/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](https://doi.org/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