HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES AND JOB SATISFACTION: A CASE STUDY OF TANZANIA PUBLIC SERVICE COLLEGE

MOHAMED ABBASI BALOZI

UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA

2011

PERMISSION TO USE

In permission this project paper in partial fulfillment of the requirement for Post Graduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), I agree that the Library of this university may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copyright this project paper in any manner, in whole or part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor or in their absence, by the Assistant Vice Chancellor of the College of Business where I did my project paper. It is understood that any coping or publication or use of this project paper or parts of it for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM) in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my project paper.

Request for permission to copy or to make other user of materials in this project paper in whole or part should be addressed to:

> Dean Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School College of Business Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM) 06010 Sintok Kedah Darul Aman

DISCLAIMER

The author is responsible for the accuracy of all opinion, technical comment, factual report, data figures, illustrations and photographs in this dissertation. The author bears full responsibility for the checking whether material submitted is subject to copyright or ownership right. Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM) does not accept any liability for the accuracy of such comment, report and other technical and factual information and the copyright or ownership rights claims.

The author declares that this dissertation is original and his own expect those literatures, quotations, explanations and summarization which are duly identified and recognized. The author hereby granted the copyright of this dissertation to College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM) for publishing if necessary.

Student Signature:

Date:

ABSTRACT

This study explored the influence of HR practices on job satisfaction. In this cross-sectional study, six dimensions of HR practice namely career development, staffing, training and development, performance appraisal, incentives and employee relations were tested against job satisfaction. A total of 100 respondents, both academics and non-academic staffs from Tanzania Public Service College (TPSC) participated in this study. The objectives of this study were answered using correlation and regression analysis, and results are also presented using descriptive statistics. All the six dimensions of HR practices were positively related to job satisfaction, with training and development showing the strongest contribution to job satisfaction. Suggestions are made for further research on ways to increase job satisfaction among the employees.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, the most gracious and most merciful, I praised to Allah for the completion of this project paper. Without the dedication and support from these people, the completion of this project would not have been possible. I would like to thank Government of Tanzania, for sponsoring my study and to College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia for the invaluable support throughout my candidature.

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Siti Zubaidah Othman, my supervisor for all the energy, care and enthusiasm she devoted to this effort. Without her professional guidance and support, I would not be where I am today.

To my beloved parents, thank you for all your prayers, patience, support, and word of encouragement for me to keep going till the final end of this journey.

I also would like to thank my wonderful friend, Mr Abdirahim Ibrahim, for providing me with many discussions, constructive comments and suggestions during this journey.

Finally yet importantly, I would like to express my gratitude to all staffs of Tanzania Public Service College, for their involvement in my study. Without their sincere participation, this study will not be as successful as today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| PERMISSION TO USE ii |
|---|
| DISCLAIMER iii |
| ABSTRACTiv |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSv |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS vi |
| LIST OF TABLES ix |
| LIST OF FIGURESx |
| CHAPTER 11 |
| INTRODUCTION1 |
| 1.1 Background of the Study1 |
| 1.2 Problem Statement2 |
| 1.3 Research Questions4 |
| 1.4 Research Objectives4 |
| 1.5 Significance of the Study4 |
| 1.6 Organization of Chapters5 |
| CHAPTER TWO |
| LITERATURE REVIEW7 |
| 2.1 Introduction |
| 2.2 Understanding Job Satisfaction |
| 2.3 Factors that Influence Job satisfaction10 |
| 2.4 Human Resource Practices and Job Satisfaction12 |
| 2.4.1 Career Development and Job Satisfaction |
| 2.4.2 Staffing and Job Satisfaction14 |
| 2.4.3 Training and Development and Job Satisfaction14 |
| 2.4.4 Performance Appraisal and Job Satisfaction15 |
| 2.4.5 Incentives and Job Satisfaction |
| 2.4.6 Employee Relations and Job Satisfaction17 |
| CHAPTER THREE |
| METHOD |
| 3.1 Introduction |

| 3.2 Research Framework | 19 |
|---|----|
| 3.3 Research Design | 20 |
| 3.4 Operational Definition and Measurement | 20 |
| 3.5 Data Collection | 23 |
| 3.5.1 Background of the Organization | 23 |
| 3.5.2 Population and Sampling | 25 |
| 3.5.3 Survey Materials | 25 |
| 3.5.4 Data Collection Procedure | 25 |
| 3.6 Techniques of Data Analysis | 26 |
| 3.7 Conclusion | 26 |
| CHAPTER 4 | 27 |
| FINDINGS | 27 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 27 |
| 4.2 Demographic Characteristics of the Participants | 27 |
| 4.3 Correlation Analysis | 29 |
| 4.3.1 HR Practices and Job Satisfaction | 31 |
| 4.4 Regression Analysis | 32 |
| 4.5 Conclusion | 33 |
| CHAPTER 5 | 34 |
| DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 34 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 34 |
| 5.2 HR Practices and Job Satisfaction | 34 |
| 5.2.1 Career Development and Job Satisfaction | 35 |
| 5.2.2 Staffing and Job Satisfaction | 35 |
| 5.2.3 Training and Development and Job Satisfaction | 36 |
| 5.2.4 Performance Appraisal and Job Satisfaction | 36 |
| 5.2.5 Incentives and Job Satisfaction | 36 |
| 5.2.6 Employee Relations and Job Satisfaction | 37 |
| 5.3 Factors with the Strongest Contribution on Job Satisfaction | |
| 5.4 Limitations and Direction for Future Research | 38 |
| 5.5 Conclusion | 39 |
| REFERENCES | 40 |
| APPENDICES | 46 |

| APPENDIX A | 47 |
|------------|----|
| APPENDIX B | |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table 3.1: | Operational definition and measurements | 21 |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 4.1: | Demographic characteristics of the participants | 28 |
| Table 4.2: | Descriptive statistics, scale reliabilities, and correlations of variables | 30 |
| Table 4.3: | Regression analysis | 33 |

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1: Research framework

20

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Job satisfaction has been defined as the overall evaluative judgment of a combination of psychological and environmental circumstances that make a person happy with the work performed and creates a positive emotional state regarding the experiences, attitudes and beliefs about the work (Han & Kakabadse, 2009). Currivan (2000) defined job satisfaction simply as the degree of positive emotions an employee has toward his job. On the other hand, Goris et al. (2000) have identified five main facets of job satisfaction which include the work itself, quality of supervision, relationships with co-workers, promotion opportunities and pay.

Job satisfaction has been one of the major areas of interest in both fields of organizational behavior and human resource management practice as it reflects employees' attitudes towards their job and commitment to an organization. Hence, today's managers are compelled to consider the job satisfaction of their subordinates. Also the managers have a moral responsibility to provide the employees with a satisfying work environment and they are made to believe that satisfied workers make positive contributions in terms of higher productivity, quality of products and services and less wastage to the organization (Ramayah, Jantan & Tadisina, 2001).Therefore, it would be prudent to investigate the impact of HR practices as a whole on job satisfaction. This research investigates the influence of HR practices on job satisfaction using Tanzania Public Service College as a case study.

1.2 Problem Statement

The State of the Public Service Report (2005) published by the President's Office of Public Service Management of the United Republic of Tanzania reveals glaring issues in the delivery of public services in Tanzania. Though the Tanzanian government has undertaken several projects and reform programs to modernize and improve the quality of Tanzanian public service, the public service itself has shown very little improvement. The report further states that several sectors in the public service lag behind the general expectation of customers. According to the report, most citizens had reported alarming rates of dissatisfaction with the services they receive. Citizens have also complained about long service delivery times and the main reason for the delay has been identified as the absence of the key service provider indicating high level of absenteeism in the public sector. According to Malhotra and Mukherjee (2004), job satisfaction and organizational commitment have a significant impact on service quality delivered. Thinking along the same line, Bishay (1996) also believed that employees who were satisfied with their work would show greater commitment.

Over the past years, several researches have been carried out on job satisfaction and their contributing factors. Sylvia and Hutchinson (1985) for example, have carried out a study on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among high school teachers. They found that job satisfaction depends on the gratification of higher order needs. In other study, Maehr (1989) and Rosenholtz (1989) found that the personal investment in employees at all levels is necessary for an effective organization.

Harmer and Findlay (2005) have investigated the effect of workplace relationship on job satisfaction among younger workers and found that an individual's relationship with co workers can be considered as the strongest predictors of job satisfaction. Khan (2007) who studied on the relation between the performance appraisal and the productivity and job satisfaction found that effective performance appraisal leads to better job satisfaction while the opposite would lead to unsatisfied workers. In other study, Naeem, Sentosa, Nejatian and Piaralal (2011) who have carried out research on the relationship between job satisfaction and salary, supervision and coworkers on 377 Maldivian civil servants found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and the three independent variables, namely the salary, supervision and coworkers. Sahinidis and Bouris (2000) have studied employee perception on training effectiveness on job satisfaction and based on the responses of 134 employees and lower managers in a large Greek organization, they found a significant correlation between employee perceived training effectiveness and job satisfaction. Chen, Chang and Yeh (2004) who carried out a study on the relationship between career development and job satisfaction, found a strong relationship between the career development needs and job satisfaction. In other study, Lundgren, Nordholm and Segesten (2005) have researched on the effect of changes in staffing practices on job satisfaction. Through a study carried out on nurses at a university hospital over a period of 3 years, they found no significant correlation between the staffing practices and job satisfaction.

From the above discussion, it can be concluded that HR practices may have an influence on employees' job satisfaction. Since past studies have studied few dimensions of HR practices and the study was carried out separately, it would be interesting to investigate the influence of HR practices as a whole on job satisfaction. Thus, this research is carried out to fill this gap by carrying out an in depth study on the relationship between the HR practices as whole and job satisfaction. Since

Tanzanian public service is facing problems related to job satisfaction, Tanzanian Public Service College, a government agency under the Ministry of Public Service Management is chosen for this study.

1.3 Research Questions

Based on the problems discussed above, the central question of this study would be "*what factors influence job satisfaction?* Specifically,

- 1. Do HR practices related to job satisfaction?
- 2. Which one of the HR practices has the strongest relationship with job satisfaction?

1.4 Research Objectives

Generally, this study aims to examine factors that influence job satisfaction among academic and non-academic staff at Tanzania Public Service College. Therefore, to answer the research questions posted above, the following research objectives were formulated:

- 1. To investigate the relationship between HR practices and job satisfaction;
- 2. To determine which of HR practices (career development, staffing, training and development, performance appraisal, incentives and employee relations) have the strongest contribution on job satisfaction; and
- 3. To examine the impact of HR practices on job satisfaction.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The main aim of this study is to investigate the impact of HR practices on job satisfaction. Generally, this study will produce a useful finding for empirically analyzing the HR practices needed to enhance employees' job satisfaction. The outcome of this study can be used by the management of the Tanzania Public Service College to plan necessary improvement on their HR practices.

Apart from that, this research can also make an effective contribution in understanding the best way to increase employees' job satisfaction in educational context. This is a broader contribution that extends beyond the Tanzania Public Service College context. This study should benefit both scholars and practitioners regarding ways to increase the employees' job satisfaction in the organization.

1.6 Organization of Chapters

This is the first of five chapters in this project paper. Chapter 2 reviews the literature on job satisfaction, explaining their definition and factors that influence one's job satisfaction.

Chapter 3 describes the research method for the study. The chapter reports the research design and procedure, the selection of respondents, sample types and size, the development of the questionnaire for the research, the survey process and data collection procedure. Chapter 3 ends with a brief description of the strategies and procedures that were used to analyze data collected from the survey.

Chapter 4 discusses the interpretation of the research findings. There are reports of the descriptive statistical analysis, correlation analysis, and regression analysis. The results are summarized in a number of tables to facilitate interpretation.

Chapter 5, the final chapter, discusses the interpretation of the research findings for the study. The findings are compared to those found in the past research reviewed in Chapter 2. New findings are also discussed. Chapter 5 concludes with a discussion on limitations of the study, the implications for both researchers and practitioners and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses issues related to job satisfaction as presented and discussed in the management literatures. The chapter begins by describing the meaning of job satisfaction. It then follows with a discussion on HR practices. The chapter concludes by reviewing findings from past studies on HR practices and job satisfaction.

2.2 Understanding Job Satisfaction

Many definitions have been given in describing job satisfaction in the literature. For example, Locke (cited in Sempane et al., 2002) defines job satisfaction as a pleasurable or a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. Job satisfaction can be viewed as an employee's observation of how well their work presents, those things which are important to them. Other authors, describe job satisfaction as an attitude people have about their jobs (Chelladurai, 1999); feelings a worker has about his or her job or job experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations, or available alternatives (Balzer, 1997); the attitude of workers toward the company, their jobs, their fellow workers and other psychological objects in the work environment (Beers, 1997); a specific beliefs about one's job, behavior tendencies (intentions) with respect to it, and feelings about it (Isen & Baron, 1991); and Spector (1997) a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of the job (Spector, 1997). On the other hand, Camp (1994) defines job satisfaction with reference to the needs and values of individuals and the extent to which these needs and values are satisfied in the workplace. In conjunction with this, Robbins (1998) surmises that job satisfaction is based on the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive.

Buitendach and de Witte (2005) relate job satisfaction individual's perceptions and evaluations of a job, and this perception is in turn influenced by their circumstances, including needs, values and expectations. Individuals therefore evaluate their jobs on the basis of factors which they regard as being important to them (Sempane, Rieger & Roodt, 2002).

Maslow, Herzberg and Alderfer have focused on the needs of employees with respect to job satisfaction and performance (Luthans 1998; Robbins, Odendaal & Roodt, 2003; Smith & Cronje, 1992). Maslow believed that people, who come out of an environment which does not meet their basic needs, tend to experience psychological complaints later in life. Based on the application of this theory to organizational settings, it can be argued that people who do not meet their needs at work will not function efficiently. Maslow's theory is based on two assumptions, that is:

i. people always want more; and

ii. people arranged their needs in order of importance

Practicing managers have given Maslow's need theory wide recognition, which they ascribe to the theory's intuitive logic and ease of understanding. However, Robbins et al. (2003), argue that research does not validate the theory, since Maslow does not provide any empirical substantiation, and a number of studies that were seeking validation for the theories have similarly not found support for it.

In terms of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, factors that make employees feel good about their work, are different from factors that make them feel bad about their work. According to Herzberg (cited in Schulz et al., 2003), employees who are satisfied at work attribute their satisfaction to internal factors, while dissatisfied employees ascribe their behavior to external factors. Factors that play a role in contributing to the satisfaction of employees are called motivators, while hygiene factors contribute to job dissatisfaction. These two factors are also called the intrinsic (internal) and extrinsic (external) factors.

It can be argued that if the hygiene factors are removed, that it is unlikely workers will be satisfied. Both the hygiene factors and motivators play an important role in the performance of the individual. Criticism against Herzberg's theory is that the relationship between motivation and dissatisfaction is too simplistic as well as the relationship between sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Smith et al. 1992).

Alderfer revised Maslow's theory to align work with more empirical research (Robbins et al., 2003). Alderfer's theory is referred to as ERG theory and is based on the following three needs; existence, relatedness and growth. Existence is involved with providing individuals with their basic existence requirements and it subsumes the individual's physiological and safety needs. Relatedness is the desire to keep good interpersonal relationships, which Maslow labeled social and esteem needs. Growth needs are an intrinsic desire for personal development based on the self-actualization needs of Maslow.

The ERG theory pivots around the axial point that more than one need is in operation at the same time. When the aspiration to satisfy a higher need is subdued, the desire to satisfy a lower order level need increases. Alderfer (1972) mentions two forms of movement which will become important to a person. The first one is referred to as satisfaction-progression. The second movement is the frustration-regression, which provides additional insight about motivation and human behavior. According to Alderfer (1972), when a person's needs are frustrated at higher level, it leads to movement down the hierarchy.

2.3 Factors that Influence Job satisfaction

In the literature, there are various factors that can influence job satisfaction. Dormann and Zapf (2001) for example found that job satisfaction has been significantly influenced by a wide variety of task characteristics including responsibility, task variety and communications/feedback mechanisms. Similar finding was also found in the study conducted by Hunjra, Ahmad, Rehman and Safwan (2010). They found that among the most important ingredients of job satisfaction include interesting, challenging work and a job that provides status. In other words, the content of the work itself is a major source of satisfaction.

In other study, Heller, Judge and Watson (2002) found wages and salaries are significant, but a complex and multidimensional factor in job satisfaction. Money not only helps people to attain their basic needs, but it also is an instrumental in providing upper level need satisfaction. This is because employees often consider salary as a reflection of how management views their contribution to the organization (Akerlof, 1984). Study conducted on compensation, indicates that if employees are allowed flexibility in choosing the type of benefits they prefer within a total package, called a flexible benefits plan, there is a significant increase in both benefit satisfaction and overall job satisfaction (Steijin 2002).

Career growth and promotional opportunities were also believed to have a varying effect on job satisfaction. This is because promotions take different forms and include a variety of rewards. For example, individuals who are promoted on the basis of seniority often experience job satisfaction but not as much as those who are promoted based on their performance (Worrell, 2004).

Supervision is another factor that could contribute to job satisfaction. According to Cumbey and Alexander (1998) there are two dimensions of supervisory style that affects job satisfaction. One is employee-centeredness, which is measured by the degree to which a supervisor takes personal interest in the welfare of the employees. The other dimension is participation or influence, as illustrated by managers who allow their people to participate in decisions that affect their own jobs. This second approach, generally, leads to higher job satisfaction (Thobega, 2007). This shows that a participative environment created by the supervisor has a more substantial effect on worker's satisfaction than participation in a specific decision. In addition, Harmon et al. (2007) found that the control over work practice through supervision has significantly correlated with increased job satisfaction among the workers.

Having a friendly, co-operative co-workers have been considered as a modest source of job satisfaction (Hunjra, Chani, Aslam,Azam & Rehman, 2010). This is because he work group serves as a source of support, comfort, advice, and assistance to the individual. A 'good' work group makes the job more enjoyable. On the other hand, if this factor is not considered with care, then it may have reverse effects, meaning thereby, that the people are difficult to get along with. This in turn will have a negative effect on job satisfaction (Absar, Azim, Balasundam, & Akhter 2010).

Another modest effect of job satisfaction involved work environment and working conditions. If the working conditions are good and clean, with attractive surroundings, employees will find it easier to carry out their job (Lawson, 1996). Most people do not give working conditions a great deal of thought unless they are extremely bad. But this is crucial because it has a direct effect on job satisfaction. On the contrary, if working conditions are given importance, productivity and accomplishment of objectives are enhanced (Heller, Judge and Watson 2002).

In essence, if these formulas are taken care of then certainly there will be job satisfaction and employees will be more productive and creative (Robbins & Judge, 2009). Employees are regarded to be satisfied with his or her job if he / she continue his or her association with the organization and considerable effort to achieve organizational goals.

2.4 Human Resource Practices and Job Satisfaction

Many scholars and practitioners believed that appropriate HR practices should influence job satisfaction and hence lead to the better performance, lower turnover, lower absenteeism and quality of products and services (Absar et al., 2010). Gonzalez and Garazo (2006) believed that human resource management practices can have a positive effect on employee job satisfaction. In order to find out the relationship between HR practices and job satisfaction, the influence of each HR practices on job satisfaction are discussed next.

2.4.1 Career Development and Job Satisfaction

Career development is an going and formalized effort that focuses on developing and enrich more capable workers (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2010). It is not a one short training program or career planning workshop. Rather, it is an ongoing organized and formalized effort that recognizes people as a vital resource. Career development is a lifelong process that occurs in stages (Hutchinson, 2008).

According to Super and Hall (1978), individuals experience approximately five stages of career development. The teens and twenties are a period of exploration and trial, in an attempt to establish and settle down with a job. As an individual enters his/her thirties, they begin to experience growth, establishing and advancing their career within an organization. By mid-forties, the third stage of career development presents three different paths an individual's career may follow. From this point, a career can continue to experience growth, plateau, or begin its decline. Ultimately, decline will be the final stage of development, as individuals conclude their occupational career and begin to prepare for retirement.

Despite the uncertain business environment, career development remains an important activity. It can play a key role in helping managers recruit and retain the satisfied and skilled, committed work force an organization needs to succeed (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2010). Baruch (1996) argued that career development systems should fit the needs of the individuals within the organization. The intention is to ensure job satisfaction among employees. According to the study conducted by Chen, Chang and Yeh (2004) on a career needs, career development programs, job satisfaction and turnover intentions among R&D personnel found that the gaps between career needs and career development programs are significant predictors of job satisfaction.

2.4.2 Staffing and Job Satisfaction

Staffing is the process of recruiting applicants and selecting of prospective employees remains a key strategic area for human resource management (Mello, 2006). Generally the process comprised two processes such as recruitment and selection. Recruitment is the process of generating a pool of qualified candidates for a particular job which is the first step in hiring process. While selection of making a hire or no hire decision regarding each applicant for a job, this is the second step in hiring process (Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2010). Both determine the decisions as to which candidates will get employment offers. The aim of this practice is to improve the fit between employees and the organization, teams, and work requirements, and thus, to create a better work environment (Absar, Azim, Balasundam, & Akhter, 2010). The effectiveness of the recruitment and selection processes will enhance individuals to be fitted with the organization requirement and demands which obvious will lead job satisfaction to the individuals who have been fitted with organizational requirement (Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2010). In other study, Belzen (2009) found that recruitment and selection are among the buddle of HR practices that have significant correlation with the job satisfaction.

2.4.3 Training and Development and Job Satisfaction

Training is the process of providing employees with specific skills or helping them to correct deficiencies in their performance, while development is an effort of providing employees with the abilities the organization will need in the future (Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2010). Since training and development help to reduce performance deficiency by improving job performance, it has the potential to influence job satisfaction. Training and development on related skills and knowledge which regarded as necessary to the organization and are required to be acquired by the employees to achieve organizational goals, training has got significant relationship with the employee motivation, commitment and job satisfaction (Sahinids and Bouris,2007).

In other studies, training and development have been found to have a significant impact on job satisfaction, since the imparted skills and knowledge help to perform tasks effectively and efficiently (Absar, Azim, Balasundam, & Akhter, 2010; Sahinidis & Bouris, 2008; Schmit, 2007).

2.4.4 Performance Appraisal and Job Satisfaction

Performance appraisal is the periodic evaluation of an employee's performance measured against the job's stated or presumed requirements. It is systematic and objective way of evaluating both work related behavior and potential of employees. It is a process that involves determining and communicating to an employee how he or she is performing the job and ideally establishing a planning of improvement (Rao, 2000).

Khan (2005) found that performance appraisal has significant relationship with job satisfaction. The evaluation process reflects organization appreciation of what the employees have performed, and thus lead to feeling of satisfaction among the employees. According to Absar, Azim, Balasundam & Akhter (2010), performance appraisal enhances pay raise, promotion and training, which in turn lead to the employees' job satisfaction. Workers with low quality performance appraisal experiences (relative to those with mixed and high quality performance experiences) were more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs, be less committed to the company and more likely to have intention to leave the company (Brown, Hyatt & Benson, 2009).

Furthermore, a study on the effect of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention showed that employees who perceived performance ratings to be manipulated because of raters' personal bias and intent to punish subordinates, results in low job satisfaction (Pon, 2003). Similar finding was also found in Ahmed and Akhbar's (2010) study where feeling of dissatisfaction with the performance appraisal process leads to feeling dissatisfaction with the job.

2.4.5 Incentives and Job Satisfaction

Incentives are what employees receive in exchange for their contribution to the organization (Rao, 2000). Generally employees offer their services for three types of rewards. First is the base compensation. It refers to the fixed pay an employee receives on regular basis in the form of salary or as an hourly wage. Second is pay incentive which is designed to reward employees for good performance. Third is indirect compensation or benefits. There are wide varieties of indirect benefit offered and these include health insurance, vocations and unemployment compensation (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2010).

Compared to other types of reward, incentives are more significant and were believed to be the main reasons why people work. This is because incentive that is in a form of bonuses, commissions and profit sharing plans are designed to encourage employees to produce results beyond normal expectation. This, according to Rao, 2000) indicates a significant relationship with the job satisfaction. Employees' living status in the society, satisfaction, loyalty, and productivity are also influenced by the incentives (Absar, Azim, Balasundam & Akhter, 2010). Mello (2006) argued that, incentive is important in the organization because it can attract applicant, retain employees and ensure optimal level of performance from employees in meeting the strategic objectives of an organization. In a study conducted by Petrescu and Simons (2008), the unequal pay structure has been found to influence both non-union members' overall job satisfaction and their satisfaction with pay. In other study, Rose and Manley (2010) found that financial incentives that have been promoted as a valuable contract option can exert a positive influence on project success. They found that employees who are satisfied by the financial incentives tend to have a successful project.

2.4.6 Employee Relations and Job Satisfaction

Employee relations refer to the relationships between management and labor or among employees and their organizations that grow out of employment (Mello, 2006). Employee relations deal with either the relationships between the state and the employers and the employees' organization or the relation between the occupational organizations themselves. Employee relations have a strong relationship with job satisfaction. It can enhance the economic status of the workers, and to provide an opportunity to the employees to have a say in the management and decision making which in turn enhances job satisfaction to the employees (Rao, 2000). Khan and Taher (2008) found a significant relationship between employee relations and job satisfaction. In their study, employee relations have been perceived to be able to create appropriate and conducive environment for all employees that ultimately influences job satisfaction. In other study, Absar, Azim, Balasundam and Akhter (2010) also found employee relations to be a significant determinant of job satisfaction. Similarly, Luddy (2005) also found employee relation to be related with job satisfaction. This is because when employees are able to get along with other employees within organization which fulfills psychological need of human being.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research method for the study. In this chapter, the research design, the sources of data, the population frame, the sample and sampling techniques, the measurement, the collection and administration of data and the technique of data analysis are presented. A brief explanation on Tanzania Public Service College is also provided.

3.2 Research Framework

The research framework for this study is shown in Figure 3.1. The independent variable is the HR practices with dimensions such as career development, staffing, training and development, performance appraisal, incentives, and employee relations. The dependent variable for this study is job satisfaction.



Figure 3.1. Research Framework

3.3 Research Design

Quantitative research design was used to examine the relationship between HR practices and employees' job satisfaction. The study was cross-sectional. The study was conducted in the natural environment of the organization where the researcher interference is minimal.

3.4 Operational Definition and Measurement

Table 3.1 shows the operational definition of the variable and their measurement. All items in this study were adapted from Seray, (2004), Rad & Yarmohammadian (2006), and Cho &Woods (2005), Sang (2005). In this study, each of the adapted question asked how strongly the respondents agreed or disagreed with the statement given on a five-point scale whereby 1 = strongly disagree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Table 3.1

Operational definition and measurements

| Variables (Dependent and Independent) | Operational Definition | Items | Authors |
|---|---|--|--|
| Independent) Job satisfaction Career Development | A pleasurable or a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience Ongoing and formalized effort that focuses on developing enriched and more capable workers | I think my personal morale is high right now The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction I feel fairly well- satisfied with my current job. I feel the training that I receive is an important part of my job. My job makes good use of my skills and abilities I work in a "family friendly" atmosphere My organization considers employee developmental programs Career development focuses on specific group My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development My organization conducts My organization | Rad & Yarmohammadian (2006) Seray, Bolumu & Sumer (2004) |
| Staffing | A process that starts with the corporation's strategy and structure and flows through HR planning and development to recruitment, selection, career and success planning and ends | potential There is formal employment planning in my organization My organization uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired Job applicants take | Cho & Woods (2005) |

| | with termination. | formal pre- |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | employment tests |
| | | before being hired |
| Training and Development | The process of providing employees with specific skills or helping them to correct deficiencies in their performance, while development is an effort of providing employees with the abilities the organization will need in the future | Extensive training programs are provided for employees in my organization Employees normally go through training programs every year My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted |
| Performance appraisal | Periodic evaluation of an employee's performance measured against the job's stated or presumed requirements. | promotedCho & Woods1. Employees regularly (at least once a year) receive a formal evaluation of their performance(2005)2. Performance appraisals are based on objective results |
| Incentives | Is what employees receive in exchange for their contribution to the organization | My organization has favorable incentive practices to encourage employees to pursue the company objectives My organization has very fair incentive practices, aimed at rewarding people who accomplish the organization goals My organization has favorable incentive practices to encourage people to reach the organization goals My organization has |

| | | incentive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Employee relations | Concern with maintaining employer- employee relationships that contribute to satisfactory productivity, motivation, and morale. | Employees have a reasonable and fair complaint-resolution process Employees are involved in formal participation processes such as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete an attitude survey. Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done |

3.5 Data Collection

3.5.1 Background of the Organization

Tanzania Public Service College ((TPSC) was established in 1997. It is a government agency that collaborates with the Ministry of Public Services Management. Its' main activity is to conduct training, research and consultancy to both Public and Private sector. TPSC was established on the basis of the concept of a virtual college. In order to cope with the changing needs of the public service, the college has a flexible strategy on harness and using its resources to deliver services in terms of qualified and experienced manpower, on one hand, and training facilities on the other. TPSC has a core of full-time, highly qualified and motivated staff. They have specialists in Management, Human Resources, Finance, Records, Economists, Accounting, Social Scientists, Engineers and Computer Analysts. A list of core faculty members is in this prospectus. TPSC maintains a pool of highly qualified and experienced associated consultants with a wide range of expertise Collaboration with Other Training and Consulting Providers.

However, TPSC is made up of two campuses: the former Civil Service Training Centre (CSTC) at Magogoni, Dar es Salaam, and the former Tabora Secretarial College (TSC) in Tabora. On the other hand it has a wide area of land comprising of five blocks of training facilities, administrative block and library/staff room block and functional hall, students' halls of residence and a Staff Housing estate.

In addition, TPSC in Dar es Salaam has fully furnished computer laboratories equipped with modern computers connected to the internet. TPSC views co-operation with other management training and development institutions as a long-term strategic choice to which it will be able to achieve those results which are otherwise unachievable.

In this regard, TPSC has partnerships with other training and consulting providers. Together they jointly design, produce and deliver training programs for the Tanzanian market. They also prepare joint bidding technical proposals for training and consulting jobs as and when they occur. Furthermore, TPSC is working in collaboration with other training and consulting providers.

24

Vision

To become a Centre of Excellence in delivering the highest quality, practical, responsive and competence-based training and development services to both Public and Private Sectors at all levels.

Mission

To become a Centre of Excellence in delivering the highest quality, practical, responsive and competence-based training and development services to both Public and Private Sectors at all levels.

3.5.2 Population and Sampling

The sampling frame for this study includes all academic and non-academic staff at Tanzania Service College. Following Sekaran (2003) suggestion, out of 135 staffs, 100 staffs were randomly chosen as a sample for this study.

3.5.3 Survey Materials

The questionnaire was prepared in English. The five page questionnaire consisted of three sections. Section 1 asked about the HR practices. There are twenty four items in this section. Section 2 which consists of six items asked respondents' job satisfaction. The last section, section 3 of sought the demographic characteristics of the participating staff and their respective organization.

3.5.4 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection was conducted from April 15 until April 28 2011. The process begins by obtaining permission from Tanzania Public Service College to conduct the study. Once permission was obtained, the survey question is distributed through respondents' email. During that period, 100 questionnaires were distributed. Respondents were given two weeks to answer the survey before sending back the completed questionnaire to the researcher through email. A follow-up email reminder was used to remind respondents about returning the questionnaire.

3.6 Techniques of Data Analysis

All the 100 questionnaires distributed were returned and are potentially available for analysis. To answer the study objectives, an analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics and the relationship of independent and dependent variables were tested using correlation analysis. Regression analysis was also conducted to test the ability of the six dimensions of HR practices to predict the level of job satisfaction. The analysis was conducted using SPSS Program Version 16.0 for Windows.

3.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the method and the analysis strategy for the study have been described, including the research framework, the sample of the study, and the selection of respondents, the development of questionnaire, the research materials and the survey procedure. This chapter also briefly explains the adoption of correlation analysis, regression analysis and descriptive statistics. The results of these tests are reported in the next chapter, Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 reports results of the study. The chapter begins by reporting the demographic characteristics of the respondents. It then presents the bivariate relationship between the research variables. The chapter concludes with the regression analysis.

4.2 Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Detailed descriptive statistics of the participants' demographic characteristics are presented in Table 4.1. It is noted that 52% of the 100 respondents in this survey were male. The average age of respondents was 33 years old. 60% of the respondents were married. In terms of highest academic qualification, the highest percentage of respondents (30%) had a master degree. Tutor made up 14% of the total respondents. This follows by lecturer and tutorial assistant (11%). On average, the respondents had been in their present position for 5 years and had served their organization for more than 6 years.

| Description | Frequency | % | Mean | Std. Dev | Median | Min | Max |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|----------|--------|-----|-----|
| Gender | | | | | | | |
| Male | 52 | 52.0 | | | | | |
| Female | 48 | 48.0 | | | | | |
| Total | 100 | 100 | | | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | |
| Total response | 100 | 100 | 33.49 | 8.03 | 32 | 21 | 55 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | |
| Single | 31 | 31.0 | | | | | |
| Married | 60 | 60.0 | | | | | |
| Divorce | 9 | 9.0 | | | | | |
| Total | 100 | 100 | | | | | |
| Academic Qualifi | cation | | | | | | |
| High School | 4 | 4.1 | | | | | |
| Certificate | 7 | 7.0 | | | | | |
| Diploma | 17 | 17.0 | | | | | |
| First Degree | 26 | 26.0 | | | | | |
| Master | 30 | 30.0 | | | | | |
| PhD | 16 | 16.0 | | | | | |
| Total | 100 | 100 | | | | | |
| Position | | | | | | | |
| Consultant | 4 | 4.0 | | | | | |
| Assoc. Professor | 8 | 8.0 | | | | | |
| Senior Lecturer | 9 | 9.0 | | | | | |
| Lecturer | 11 | 11.0 | | | | | |
| Assist. lecturer | 10 | 10.0 | | | | | |
| Tutor | 14 | 14.0 | | | | | |
| Tutorial Assist | 11 | 11.0 | | | | | |
| Coordinator | 1 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| Librarian | 2 | 2.0 | | | | | |
| Marketing | 2 | 2.0 | | | | | |
| manager | 2 5 | 2.0 | | | | | |
| Accountant | | 5.0 | | | | | |
| HR Computer | 3 | 3.0 | | | | | |
| technician | 2 | 2.0 | | | | | |
| Secretary | 8 | 8.0 | | | | | |
| Office Attendant | 10 | 10 | | | | | |
| Total | 100 | 100 | | | | | |
| No. of years in pr | esent position | | | | | | |
| Total response | 100 | 100 | 5.22 | 4.10 | 4 | 1 | 21 |
| No of years with p | present organiz | ation | | | | | |
| Total response | 100 | 100 | 6.40 | 4.59 | 5 | 1 | 22 |

Table 4.1 Demographic characteristics of the participants

4.3 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.2 presents the means, standard deviations and Pearson correlations of variables for the 135 participants. The internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) of the research measures are reported in parenthesis along the diagonal of the correlation tables. As shown in Table 4.2, the Cronbach's alpha for HR practices was .96. The six-subscale of the 30 item HR practices scale (career development, staffing, training and development, performance appraisal, incentive and employee relations) also have satisfactory reliability values ranging from .69 to .76. The Cronbach's alpha for dependent variable, job satisfaction, was .68.

Table 4.2 Descriptive statistics, scale reliabilities, and correlations of variables

| Variables | Ν | Mean | S.D. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
|-----------------------------------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|-------|-------|----|-------|-----|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Gender | 100 | 1.48 | .50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Age | 100 | 33.49 | 8.03 | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Marital Status | 100 | 1.78 | .60 | .02 | .56** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Education | 100 | 4.19 | 1.32 | 08 | .69** | .38** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 Position | 100 | 5.99 | 3.84 | 03 | 06 | 00 | 14 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Tenure in present position | 100 | 5.22 | 4.10 | 14 | .74** | .30** | .54** | 04 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Tenure in present organization | 100 | 6.40 | 4.59 | 07 | .76** | .37** | .52** | 08 | .70** | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Career development | 100 | 3.25 | .74 | 03 | 02 | .00 | .05 | 13 | .15 | .02 | (.74) | | | | | | | |
| 9. Staffing | 100 | 3.25 | .74 | 03 | 02 | .00 | .06 | 12 | .15 | .02 | .99** | (.73) | | | | | | |
| 10. Training & development | 100 | 3.23 | .74 | 08 | 04 | 02 | .03 | 16 | .11 | .02 | .89** | .90** | (.69) | | | | | |
| 11. Performance appraisal | 100 | 3.25 | .74 | 01 | 03 | 01 | .04 | 14 | .16 | .01 | .99** | .98** | .88** | (.73) | | | | |
| 12. Incentives | 100 | 3.23 | .76 | 01 | 05 | .01 | .04 | 12 | .13 | 00 | .99** | .99** | .90** | .97** | (.76) | | | |
| 13. Employee relations | 100 | 3.27 | .75 | 08 | .03 | .03 | .08 | 04 | .16 | .05 | .94** | .93** | .81** | .90** | .92** | (.71) | | |
| 14. HR practices - overall | 100 | 2.60 | .58 | 04 | 02 | .00 | .05 | 12 | .15 | .02 | 1.00** | .99** | .92** | .98** | .99 | .94** | (.96) | |
| 15. Job satisfaction | 100 | 3.11 | .69 | 11 | 02 | .00 | 04 | 13 | .09 | 02 | .79** | .79** | .85** | .78** | .78** | .78** | .82** | (.68) |

Note: Coefficient alpha reliability estimates are in parentheses on the diagonal of the correlation table *Correlation is significant at p < 0.05 and **Correlation is significant at p < 0.01

4.3.1 HR Practices and Job Satisfaction

Overall, HR practices were significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction(r =.82, p<.01). This result implies that, the more effective the HR practices, the more satisfied the employees were toward their job.

4.3.1.1 Career Development and Job Satisfaction

Table 4.2 revealed significant positive relationship between career development and job satisfaction(r =.79, p<.01). The result suggests that participant who received higher career opportunities, have higher job satisfaction.

4.3.1.2 Staffing and Job Satisfaction

Table 4.2 also indicated that staffing was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction (r = .79, p<.01). The result indicates that the more efficient the staffing process the more satisfied the participant feels towards the job.

4.3.1.3 Training and Development and Job Satisfaction

Training and development was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction (r = .85, p<.01). The finding indicates that participants who received more training and development are more satisfied with their job.

4.3.1.4 Performance Appraisal and Job Satisfaction

Table 4.2 indicates that performance appraisal was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction (r =.78, p<.01). The result implies that the more effective the performance appraisal the more satisfied the participants feel toward the job.

4.3.1.5 Incentives and Job Satisfaction

Incentives were significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction(r = .78, p < .01). The result shows that the more incentives were provided to employees the more they were satisfied with the job.

4.3.1.6 Employee Relations and Job Satisfaction

Employee relations was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction (r =.78, p<.01). This result indicates that participants with higher relationship with the employer have higher feeling of satisfaction.

4.4 Regression Analysis

Multiple regression was used to assess the ability of six control measures (career development, staffing, training and development, performance appraisal, incentives and employee relations) to predict level of job satisfaction. The result shows in Table 4.3 indicates that 75.9% of the variance in job satisfaction had been significantly explained by the six dimensions. In the model, only two control measures were statistically significant, with training and development recording a higher beta value ($\beta = .795$, p<.001) than employee relations recording ($\beta = .505$, p<.05).

Table 4.3Regression Analysis

| | Beta | Sig. |
|--|------|---------|
| Career Development | 006 | .994 |
| Staffing | 717 | .120 |
| Training and Development | .795 | .000*** |
| Performance Appraisal | .433 | .322 |
| Incentives | 098 | .803 |
| Employee Relations | .505 | .010* |
| *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 | | |
| $r^2 = .759$ Nilai F = 48.80 Sig. F = .000 | | |

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter described the demographic characteristics of the 135 participants and the results of correlation and regression analyses. The results indicate that all six of HR dimensions have a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. Among these six dimensions of HR practices, training and development make the strongest contribution to explain employees' job satisfaction. These research findings are discussed in the next chapter, Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the study in light of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, and the objectives developed in Chapter 1. This study provides identification of factors that related to job satisfaction. The findings, as presented in Chapter 4, are discussed in the section below. The chapter ends with limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.

5.2 HR Practices and Job Satisfaction

The first objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between HR practices and job satisfaction. In this study, HR practices were related to job satisfaction. This finding is in accordance with previous studies conducted by Absar, Azim, Balasundam and Akhter (2010) and Gonzalez and Garazo (2006). The finding shows that employees tend to be more satisfied with their job when HR practices are effective and efficient. The result is not surprising as HR practices normally influence all facet of one's job. Therefore, management of Tanzania Public Service College (TPSC) should ensure that all its HR practices are conducted effectively, by allowing employees to participate in decision making, providing development activities, providing employees with fair rewards and acknowledging the contributions of employees to the organization. In this way TPSC will be in a position of ensuring job satisfaction of its staffs, which in return leads to retention and attraction of key talented employees

5.2.1 Career Development and Job Satisfaction

The present study shows that career development was associated with job satisfaction. This finding supported previous studies conducted by Chen, Chang & Yeh (2004) and Baruch (1996). In this study, participants who were given high career opportunities were more satisfied with their job. This is not surprising as promotion is often regarded as appreciation and acknowledgement from the management towards the employees' contribution. If Tanzania Public Service College decided to enhance job satisfaction through career development, they must continue enriching and developing their workers as career development is a lifelong process. Apart from that, the management must also pay serious attention to the job fit issues when planning for employees' career. Baruch (1996) believed that employee who fit with the job tend to be more committed with the job given to them.

5.2.2 Staffing and Job Satisfaction

In this study, staffing process was related with job satisfaction. This result supported previous studies (Belzen, 2009; Azim, Balasundam & Akhter, 2010). Since staffing has been found to have strong association with job satisfaction, the management of Tanzania Public Service College needs to consider having a proper staffing procedure such as formal human resource planning, a systematic screening process, pre-employment test and a structured interview before the final hiring process take place. This is because a good staffing system will ensure the right person with the right experience, knowledge, skills and ability is hired to fit with the job demand. When the abilities of a person match with the demands of the job, it will improve the person's job satisfaction.

5.2.3 Training and Development and Job Satisfaction

The present study shows that training and development related to job satisfaction. This finding is in accordance with previous studies by Sahinids and Bouris (2007), Schmit (2007) and Azim, Balasundam and Akhter (2010). One possible explanation for this may be because the skills and knowledge that employees receive through training program is perceived beneficial to them in achieving better performance. Training and development is any effort to improve current of future employees' skills, abilities and knowledge. Thus, to increase job satisfaction, the management should continuously conducting training on related skills and knowledge which are necessary to the organization and are required to be acquired by the employees to achieve organizational goals.

5.2.4 Performance Appraisal and Job Satisfaction

In this study, performance appraisal was also found related with job satisfaction. This finding supported previous studies conducted by Azim, Balasundam and Akhter, (2010) and Ahmed and Akbar (2010). Performance appraisal is a systematic process to evaluate the performance of an employee after certain period of time. Since performance appraisal often leads to pay raise, promotion and training, it is not surprise to find why performance appraisal influence employee job satisfaction. However, to use performance appraisal as a way to improve employee job satisfaction, the management must ensure the performance appraisal system is fair and measured relevant parts of the job.

5.2.5 Incentives and Job Satisfaction

The study showed that incentives associated with job satisfaction. This finding supported past studies on the relationship between incentives and job satisfaction (Rao, 2000; Azim, Balasundam & Akhter, 2010). This is not surprising as incentives are often regards as the acknowledgment from the management towards the contribution made by the employees. Compared to other types of rewards, Rao (2000) argued that incentives are more significant and were believed to be the main reason why people work. In other words, employees will be more motivated and satisfied with their job when the management recognized and rewarded them for their achievement.

5.2.6 Employee Relations and Job Satisfaction

The results showed that employee relations were associated with job satisfaction. This finding is similar to what has been reported in the previous studies (Khan & Taher, 2008; Azim, Balasundam & Akhter, 2010). This study implies that good relationship between management and employees can create appropriate and conducive environment for all employees that ultimately leads to greater job satisfaction. Logically, employees will feel more satisfied with their job when they perceived their management to be opened and honest and flexible in accommodating employee's issues, allowing employee involvement in decision making and allowing employees to have life outside work.

5.3 Factors with the Strongest Contribution on Job Satisfaction

The second objective of this study was to determine which among the six dimensions of HR practices contribute the most to job satisfaction. In this study, training and development has been found to have the strongest influence on job satisfaction. One possible explanation for this may be because training provides the basis for achievement in the organization. For example, knowledge and skills that were acquired through training help the employees to perform their daily task. High job performance will then be translated into their performance appraisal. High rating in performance appraisal means high chances of being promoted or receiving greater incentives. Therefore, training that help to reduce performance deficiency may have the potential to influence job satisfaction.

Since the finding shows training and development contribute the most to job satisfaction, the management of Tanzania Public Service should continue to invest in training and development. However, careful training plan must be conducted to ensure that relevant training was provided to the employees. This is because relevant training will increase the chances for transfer of learning to occur.

5.4 Limitations and Direction for Future Research

There are limitations in the design of this study that might influence the interpretations and generalizations of these findings. These issues are discussed next.

The study is limited by the number of variables tested. The study only tested six dimensions of HR practice (career development, staffing, training and development, performance appraisal, incentives, employee relations) on job satisfaction among college staffs. There could be other factors such as leadership style, nature of the job, culture of the organization, organization and job fit that could affect employees' job satisfaction in the organization.

Another limitation of this study is that the data provided is from a single organization. The study was carried out at one college in Tanzania. Thus, the findings cannot be generalized to other colleges or universities in the country. In future research, it would be desirable to have samples from other colleges in Tanzania so that the similarities and differences in terms of factors that may have influence the job satisfaction in the organization can be examined. In summary, while there are some limitations associated with the approach used here and given the exploratory nature of the study, the results of this research provide useful findings that should be of interest to both researchers and practitioners.

5.5 Conclusion

The current chapter has discussed results of the study in light of the literature and limitations. The aim of this study was to examine the factors that influence job satisfaction. The results indicate that all six HR practices were related to job satisfaction. However, since the study was conducted at one organization only, the findings must be interpreted with cautious and cannot be generalized to represent other organizations. It is hoped that through the examination of the HR practices that contribute to job satisfaction, a more complete understanding of the needed to enhance job satisfaction will be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Absar, M., Azim, M., Balasundam, N., & Akhter, S. (2010). Impact of human resources practices on job satisfaction: Evidence from manufacturing firms in Bangladesh. *Economic Sciences Series*, 62(2), 31–42.
- Ahmed, A., Ahmed, S., & Akbar, M. (2010). Performance appraisals Impact on attitudinal outcomes and organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(10), 62-68.
- Akerlof, G. (1984). Gift exchange and efficiency wage theory: Four views. *American Economic Review*, 74, 79–83.
- Alderfer, C.P. (1972). Existence, relatedness and growth: Human needs in organizational settings. New York: Free Press.
- Artz, B. (2010). Fringe benefits and job satisfaction. International Journal of Manpower, 31(6), 626-644.
- Balzer, W.K., Khim, J.A., Smith, P.C., Irwin, J.L., Bachiochi, P.D., Robie, C., et al. (1997). User's manual for the job descriptive index and job in general scales. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University.
- Baruch, Y. (1996). Organizational career planning and management techniques and activities in use in high-tech organizations. *Career Development International*, I(1), 40-9.
- Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study employing the experience sampling method. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences*, *3*, 147-154.
- Brown, M., Hyatt, D., & Benson, J. (2010). Consequences of the performance appraisal experience. *Personnel Review*, 39(3), 375-396.
- Buitendach, J., & de Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment of maintenance workers in a parastatal. *South African Journal of Business Management*, *36*(2), 27-37
- Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lawler, E.E., & Weik, K.E. (1970). *Managerial* behavior, performance, and effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Chen, T., Chang, P., & Yeh, C. (2004). A study of career needs, career development programs, job satisfaction and the turnover intentions of R&D personnel. *Career Development International*, 9(4), 424-437.
- Cho, S., Woods, R., & Mayer, K. (2005). Examining the impact of human resources management on organizational performance. *Proceedings of Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, Honolulu, HI, USA, 1-7.

- Cleveland, J. N., Mohammed, S., Skattebo, A. L., & Sin, H. P. (2003). Multiple purposes of performance appraisal: A replication and extension. Paper presented at the 18th Annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, Florida
- Cob, B. (2004). Assessing job satisfaction and emotional intelligence in public school teachers, Education Specialize Thesis, Western Kentucky University, KY, USA.
- Currivan, D.B. (2000). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4), 495-524.
- Cumbey, D. A., & Alexander. J. W. (1998). The relationship of job satisfaction with organizational variables in public health nursing. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 28(5), 39-46.
- Gonzalez, J., & Garazo, T. (2006). Structural relationships between organizational service orientation, contact employee job satisfaction and citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 17(1), 23-50.
- Gomez-Mejia, L., Balkin, D., & Cardy, R. (2010). *Managing human resources* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Goris, J., Vaught, B. & Pettit, J. (2000). Effects of communication direction on job performance and satisfaction: A moderated regression analysis. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 37(4), 348-368.
- Gurbuz, S. (2009). The effect of high performance HR practices on employees' job satisfaction, Istanbul University. *Journal of the School of Business Administration*, 38(2), 1303-1732.
- Han, Y., & Kakabadse, N. K. (2009). Job satisfaction: What is its true meaning in Greater China? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 1(2), 155-164.
- Harmer, R. & Findlay, B. (2005). The effect of workplace relationships on employee job satisfaction for 25 to 35 year olds. Proceedings of the 5th Annual Conference of the APS on the Psychology of Relationships Interest Group, Melbourne, Australia.
- Harmon, J., Scotti, D. J., Behson, S., Farias, G., Petzel, R., Neuman, J. H., & Keashly, L. (2007). Effects of high-involvement work systems on employee satisfaction and services costs in veterans healthcare. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 48(6), 1-14.
- Heller, D., Judge, T. A., & Watson, D. (2002). The confounding role of personality and trait affectivity in the relationship between job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 815-835

- Hunjra, A. I., Chani, M. I., Aslam, S., Azam, M., & Rehman, K. (2010). Factors effecting job satisfaction of employees in Pakistani banking sector. African *Journal of Business Management*, 4(10), 2157-2163
- Hunjra, A.I, Ahmad, H.,Rehman, K., & Safwan,N. (2010). Factors influencing intention to create new venture among young graduates, *Africa Journal of Business Management*, 5(1), 121-127.
- Hutchinson, N.L., Versnel, J., Chin, P., & Munby, H. (2008). Negotiating accommodations so that work based education facilitates career development for youth with disabilities, *WORK*, *30*, 123-136.
- Jackson, S., & Schuler, R. (1990). Human resource planning: Challenges for industrial/organizational psychologists. American Psychological Association, 45(2), 223-239.
- Kayalar, M., & Ozmutaf, N. (2009). The effect of individual career planning on job satisfaction: A comparative study on academic and administrative staff. *Journal of Faculty of Economic and Administrative Science*, *14*(1), 239-254.
- Kafetsios, K., & Zampetakis, L. (2008). Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: Testing the mediatory role of positive and negative affect at work. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 712–722.
- Kelly, K., Ang, S., Chong, W., & Hu, W. (2008). Teacher appraisal and its outcomes in Singapore primary schools, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(1), 39-54.
- Khan, A. A., &Teacher, M. A. (2008). *Human resource management and industrial relations*. Dhaka: Abir Publications.
- Khan, A. (2007). Performance appraisal's relation with productivity and job satisfaction. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 1(2), 99-114.
- Kovack, K.A. (1977). Organization size, job satisfaction, absenteeism and turnover. Washington D.C.: University Press of America.
- Lundgren, S.M., Nordholm, L., & Segesten K. (2005). Job satisfaction in relation to change to all-RN staffing. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 13(4), 322-328.
- Lawson, J. (1996). A framework of risk assessment and management for older people in H. Kemshall & J. Pritchard (Eds.), *Good practice in risk assessment and risk management* (pp. 51-67), London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction, In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *The handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Maehr, M. (1989). Thoughts about motivation. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education, 3,* (pp. 221-267). New York: Academic Press
- Malhotra, N., & Mukherjee, A. (2004). The relative influence of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on service quality of customer-contact employees in banking call centres. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 18(3), 162-174.
- Mello, A. (2006). *Strategic human resource management* (2nd ed.). Tampa, FL: Thomson Publishing.
- Ooi, K., Bakar, N., Arumugam, V., Vellapan, L., & Loke, A. (2007). Does TQM influence employees' job satisfaction? An empirical case analysis, *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 24(1), 62-77.
- Osman, I., Ho,T., & Galang, M. (2011). The relationship between human resource practices and firm performance: An empirical assessment of firms in Malaysia. *Business Strategy Series*, 12(1), 41-48.
- Petrescu A.I., & Simmons R. (2008). Human resource management practices and workers' job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(7), 651-667.
- Poon, M. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, 33(3), 322-334.
- Ramayah, T., Jantan, M., & Tadisina, S. (2001). Job satisfaction: Empirical evidence for alternatives. *National Decision Sciences Conference*, 1-16.
- Rad, A., & Yarmohammadian, M. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. *Leadership in Health Services*, 19(2), 11-28
- Rao, V. (2000). Human resource management (1st ed.). New Delhi: Excel Book.
- Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the athlete satisfaction questionnaire (ASQ): a theoretical perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13(4), 280-297.
- Robbins, S. (2005). *Organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2009). *Organizational behavior* (13th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education International.
- Rose, T., & Manley, K. (2010). Client recommendations for financial incentives on construction projects. *Engineering, construction and architectural management*, 17(3), 252-267.

- Rosenholt, A. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Longman.
- Robbins, S.P., Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. (2003). Organizational behavior: Global and southern African perspectives. Cape Town: Pearson Education.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998). Organizational behavior (8th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Sahinidis, A., & Bouris, J. (2000). Employee perceived training effectiveness relationship to employee attitudes. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(1), 63-76.
- Sang, C. (2005). Relationship between HRM practices and the perception of organization performance, roles of management style, social capital, and culture: Comparison between manufacturing firms in Cambodia and Taiwan. MBA Thesis, *National Cheng Kung University*, 1-181.
- Schultz, H., Bagraim, J., Potgieter, T., Viedge, C., & Werner, A. (2003). Organizational behavior: A contemporary South African perspective. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Schmidt, S. (2007). The relationship between satisfaction with workplace training and overall jobs satisfaction. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *18*(40), 35-57.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). Research methods for business: A skill building approach (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sempane, M., Rieger, H., & Roodt, G., (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organisational culture. SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 28(2), 23-30.
- Seray, S. (2004). An evaluation of current human resource management practices in the Turkish private sector. MSc thesis, *Middle East Technical University*, Turkey.
- Smith, P.J., & Cronje, G.J. (1992). *Management principles: A contemporary South African edition*. Kenwyn: Juta & ltd.
- Smucker, M. K., & Kent, A. (2004). Job satisfaction and referent comparisons in the sport industry. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 5(3), 262 - 280.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Steijn, B. (2002). HRM and job satisfaction in the Dutch public sector: Study Group on Public. *Personnel Policies*, 1-15.
- Strumpfer, D.J.W., Danana, N., Gouws, J.F., & Viviers, M.R. (1998). Personality dispositions and job satisfaction. South African Journal of Psychology, 28(2), 92-100.

- Sylvia, R.D., & Hutchison, T. (1985). What makes Ms. Johnson teach? A study of teacher motivation. *Human Relations*, *38*(9), 841-856.
- Super, D.E., & Hall, D.T. (1978). Career development: Exploration and planning. Annual Review of Psychology, 29, 333 – 372.
- Thobega, M. (2007). Relationship of supervision job satisfaction and retention of high school agriculture teachers. Iowa State University, Iowa.
- Whiting, H., Kline, T., & Sulsky, L. (2008). The performance appraisal congruency scale: An assessment of person-environment fit. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 57(3), 223-236.

Worrell, G.T. (2004). School psychologists' job satisfaction: Ten years later. PhD Thesis.

Yousef, D. (2002). Job satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between role stressor and organizational commitment: A study from Arabic cultural perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *17*(4), 250-266.

http://www.utumishi.go.tz

http://www.tpsc.go.tz/tpsc_brochure.pdf

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE OF THE SURVEY MATERIALS

This appendix contains copy of the survey materials provided to respondents, namely the cover letter and the questionnaire.



A STUDY ON JOB SATISFACTION

Dear Participant,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research.

I would appreciate it very much if you could answer the questions carefully as the information you provide will influence the accuracy and the success of this research. It will take no longer than 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire. All answers will be treated with strict confidence and will be used for the purpose of the study only.

If you have any questions regarding this research, you may address them to me at the contact details below.

Thank you for your cooperation and the time taken in answering this questionnaire.

Yours sincerely,

Mohamed Abbasi Balozi Master Candidate College of Business Universiti Utara Malaysia Sintok, 06010 Kedah Mobile phone: +60169836386 Email: <u>balozyjunior@yahoo.com</u>

| | tion 1: Using the following scale, please resents your most appropriate answer. | tick (V |) the gi | iven bo | x that | |
|----|--|----------------|----------|---------|--------|-------------------|
| | | Stron Disag | | | | Strongly Agree |
| 1 | My organization considers employee developmental programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | Career development focuses on specific group | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high career potential | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | There is formal employment planning in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | Job applicants take formal pre- employment tests before being hired | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9 | Extensive training programs are provided for employees in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | Employees normally go through training programs every year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11 | My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12 | My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | Employees regularly (at least once a year) receive a formal evaluation of their Performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| 14 | Performance appraisals are based on objective results | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16 | Employees receive performance feedback on a routine (at least twice a year) basis. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17 | My organization has favorable incentive practices to encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18 | My organization has very fair incentive practices, aimed at rewarding people who accomplish the organization goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19 | My organization has favorable incentive practices to encourage people to reach the organization goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20 | My organization has incentive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21 | Employees have a reasonable and fair complaint-resolution process | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22 | Employees are involved in formal participation processes such as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23 | Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete an attitude survey. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24 | Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| | Section 2: Using the following scale, please tick ($$) the given box that represents your most appropriate answer. | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|------------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Strongly S | Strongly | | | | | | | | |
| | | Disagree | Agree | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | I think my personal morale is high right now | 1 2 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | 1 2 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | I feel fairly well-satisfied with my current job. | 1 2 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | I feel the training that I receive is an important part of my job. | 1 2 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | 1 2 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | I work in a "family friendly" atmosphere | 1 2 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | | | |

| | Section 3: Please tick ($$) the given box or fill in the blank that represent your answer | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | I am: | | | | | | | | |
| | Male Female | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | My age is years | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | My marital status: | | | | | | | | |
| | Single Married Divorce | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | My highest education level: | | | | | | | | |
| | High school education Diploma Master | | | | | | | | |
| | Certificate First Degree PhD | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | My position in this organization: | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Number of years in present position: | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Number of years with present organization: | | | | | | | | |

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY

APPENDIX B

SPSS OUTPUT

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=Gender Age Marital Education Position No.pp No.PO /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN MEDIAN /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

Frequencies

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

| | | | | Statistics | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------|-------|------------|-----------|----------|-------|-------|
| | | Gender | Age | Marital | Education | Position | No.pp | No.PO |
| N | Valid | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mean | 1.48 | 33.49 | 1.78 | 4.19 | 5.99 | 5.22 | 6.40 |
| | Median | 1.00 | 32.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 6.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 |
| | Std. Deviation | .502 | 8.026 | .596 | 1.316 | 3.839 | 4.096 | 4.592 |
| | Minimum | 1 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Maximum | 2 | 55 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 22 |

Frequency Table

| | Gender | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | | | | | | | |
| Valid | Male | 52 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Female | 48 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | ကၝပ | | |
|-------|----|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 21 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| | 22 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 |
| | 23 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| | 24 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 10.0 |
| | 25 | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 19.0 |
| | 26 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 23.0 |
| | 27 | 5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 28.0 |
| | 28 | 7 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 35.0 |
| | 29 | 6 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 41.0 |
| | 30 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 42.0 |
| | 31 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 43.0 |
| | 32 | 8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 51.0 |
| | 33 | 8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 59.0 |
| | 34 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 61.0 |

Age

| Age | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | | | | | | | |
| Valid | 35 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 65.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 36 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 67.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 37 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 69.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 38 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 71.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 39 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 72.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 40 | 7 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 79.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 42 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 82.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 43 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 84.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 44 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 88.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 45 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 91.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 46 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 94.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 48 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 96.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 49 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 99.0 | | | | | | | |
| | 55 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | | | |

Marital

| | | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-------|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Γ | Valid | Single | 31 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| | | Married | 60 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 91.0 |
| | | Divorce | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| | | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Valid | High school education | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| | Certificate | 7 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 11.0 |
| | Diploma | 17 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 28.0 |
| | First Degree | 26 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 54.0 |
| | Master | 30 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 84.0 |
| | PhD | 16 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| | Position | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|----|------|------|------|--|--|--|
| | Cumulative Frequency Percent Valid Percent Percent | | | | | | | |
| Valid | Lecturer | 11 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | | | |
| | Tutor | 14 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 25.0 | | | |
| | Accountant | 5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 30.0 | | | |
| | Assistant lecturer | 10 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 40.0 | | | |

Education

| | Position | | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | | | |
| Valid | Senior lecturer | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 49.0 | | | |
| | Totorial Assistant | 11 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 60.0 | | | |
| | Office attendant | 10 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 70.0 | | | |
| | Associate professor | 8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 78.0 | | | |
| 1 | Librarian | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 80.0 | | | |
| | HR | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 83.0 | | | |
| | Secretary | 8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 91.0 | | | |
| | Marketing manager | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 93.0 | | | |
| | Computer technician | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 95.0 | | | |
| | Cordinator | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 96.0 | | | |
| | Consultant | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 | | | |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | |

| No. | DD |
|-----|-----|
| | РΡ. |

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Valid | 1 | 5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| | 2 | 26 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 31.0 |
| | 3 | 12 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 43.0 |
| | 4 | 8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 51.0 |
| | 5 | 17 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 68.0 |
| | 6 | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 77.0 |
| | 7 | 6 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 83.0 |
| | 8 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 84.0 |
| | 9 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 86.0 |
| | 10 | 5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 91.0 |
| | 12 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 94.0 |
| | 15 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 97.0 |
| | 18 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 98.0 |
| | 20 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 99.0 |
| | 21 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

| No. | 20 |
|-----|----|
|-----|----|

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|---|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Valid | 1 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| | 2 | 18 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 19.0 |
| | 3 | 15 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 34.0 |
| | 4 | 6 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 40.0 |
| | 5 | 18 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 58.0 |

| No.PO | | | | | | |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | |
| Valid | 6 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 62.0 | |
| | 7 | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 71.0 | |
| | 8 | 5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 76.0 | |
| | 9 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 79.0 | |
| | 10 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 83.0 | |
| | 11 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 86.0 | |
| | 12 | 2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 88.0 | |
| | 13 | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 92.0 | |
| | 14 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 93.0 | |
| | 15 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 96.0 | |
| | 20 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 99.0 | |
| | 22 | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

.

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=CD1 CD2 CD3 CD4 /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR /SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excludeda | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| .735 | .732 | 4 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|--|------|----------------|-----|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | 2.84 | .950 | 100 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | 3.10 | 1.010 | 100 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | 3.56 | .935 | 100 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | My organization considers employee developmenta l programs | Career development focuses on specific group | My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | 1.000 | .290 | .199 | .272 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .290 | 1.000 | .622 | .475 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .199 | .622 | 1.000 | .578 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .272 | .475 | .578 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .406 | .199 | .622 | .422 | 3.118 | .028 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 4 |

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | 10.14 | 6.344 | .301 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | 9.88 | 4.895 | .620 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | 9.50 | 4.737 | .624 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | 9.42 | 5.297 | .584 |

Item-Total Statistics

Item-Total Statistics

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | .109 | .792 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .427 | .618 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .490 | .614 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .373 | .644 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 12.98 | 8.686 | 2.947 | 4 |

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=Staf1 Staf2 Staf3 Staf4 /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR /SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|------|----------------|-----|
| There is formal employment in my organization | 2.94 | .897 | 100 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|------|----------------|-----|
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | 3.10 | 1.010 | 100 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | 3.47 | 1.029 | 100 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | There is formal employment in my organization | My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | Job applicants take formal pre- employment tests before being hired |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| There is formal employment in my organization | 1.000 | .163 | .085 | .217 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .163 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .085 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .217 | .576 | .649 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .385 | .085 | .649 | .565 | 7.678 | .060 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 4 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| There is formal employment in my organization | 10.05 | 7.098 | .179 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | 9.89 | 4.927 | .627 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| There is formal employment in my organization | .059 | .828 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .442 | .597 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | 9.51 | 4.778 | .628 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | 9.52 | 4.697 | .673 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .519 | .594 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .488 | .566 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 12.99 | 8.757 | 2.959 | 4 |

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=TD1 TD2 TD3 TD4 /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA

/STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR

/SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

Scale: ALL VARIABLES
Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| .692 | .689 | 4 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|------|----------------|-----|
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | 2.88 | .946 | 100 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | 3.17 | .985 | 100 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | 3.37 | 1.152 | 100 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | 3.48 | 1.010 | 100 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | Employees normal go through training programs every year | My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | 1.000 | .250 | .329 | .336 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .250 | 1.000 | .353 | .313 |

| | Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | Employees normal go through training programs every year | My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .329 | .353 | 1.000 | .558 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .336 | .313 | .558 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .356 | .250 | .558 | .308 | 2.234 | .010 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 4 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | 10.02 | 6.040 | .392 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | 9.73 | 5.896 | .395 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | 9.53 | 4.615 | .569 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | 9.42 | 5.175 | .558 |

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | .155 | .676 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .158 | .676 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .361 | .562 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .347 | .575 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 12.90 | 8.758 | 2.959 | 4 |

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=PA1 PA2 PA3 PA4 /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR /SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| .734 | .730 | 4 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|------|----------------|-----|
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | 2.84 | .950 | 100 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | 3.13 | .991 | 100 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | 3.52 | 1.020 | 100 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | 3.49 | 1.020 | 100 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | Performance appraisals are base on objective results | Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | 1.000 | .237 | .191 | .321 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .237 | 1.000 | .582 | .476 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .191 | .582 | 1.000 | .617 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .321 | .476 | .617 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .404 | .191 | .617 | .426 | 3.231 | .030 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 4 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | 10.14 | 6.485 | .297 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | 9.85 | 5.260 | .568 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | 9.46 | 4.958 | .623 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | 9.49 | 4.919 | .634 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | .115 | .791 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .369 | .649 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .490 | .615 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .436 | .608 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 12.98 | 8.828 | 2.971 | 4 |

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=INC1 INC2 INC3 INC4 /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR /SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| .755 | .749 | 4 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|------|----------------|-----|
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | 2.87 | .939 | 100 |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | 3.10 | 1.010 | 100 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | 3.47 | 1.029 | 100 |

| | My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | 1.000 | .259 | .187 | .273 |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .259 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .187 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .273 | .576 | .649 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .428 | .187 | .649 | .462 | 3.473 | .040 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 4 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | 10.05 | 7.098 | .277 |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | 9.82 | 5.341 | .644 |

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Aipha if Item Deleted |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | .091 | .828 |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .448 | .646 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | 9.44 | 5.178 | .647 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | 9.45 | 5.179 | .668 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .514 | .642 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .484 | .630 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 12.92 | 9.367 | 3.061 | 4 |

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=ER1 ER2 ER3 ER4

/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL

/MODEL=ALPHA

/STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR

/SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| .714 | .711 | 4 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|--|------|----------------|-----|
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | 2.90 | .980 | 100 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | 3.20 | 1.025 | 100 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | 3.50 | 1.030 | 100 |

| | Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvement s in the way things are done |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | 1.000 | .342 | .126 | .260 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .342 | 1.000 | .511 | .411 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .126 | .511 | 1.000 | .636 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .260 | .411 | .636 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .381 | .126 | .636 | .510 | 5.053 | .030 |

| | Summary | ltem | Statistics | |
|---|---------|------|------------|--|
| _ | Summary | ltem | Statistics | |

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 4 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Squared Multiple Correlation |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | 10.18 | 6.553 | .293 | .158 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | 9.88 | 5.278 | .564 | .342 |

| | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|--|
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | .765 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .613 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Squared Multiple Correlation |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | 9.60 | 5.152 | .574 | .493 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | 9.58 | 5.155 | .592 | .439 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|--|
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .606 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .595 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 13.08 | 8.983 | 2.997 | 4 |

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=JS1 JS2 JS3 JS4 JS5 JS6 /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL

/MODEL=ALPHA

/STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR /SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| .677 | .675 | 6 |

| ltem | Statistics |
|------|------------|
|------|------------|

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|--|------|----------------|-----|
| l think my personal morale is high right now | 2.87 | 1.031 | 100 |
| The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | 3.12 | 1.085 | 100 |
| l feel fairly well satisfied with my current job | 3.34 | 1.224 | 100 |
| I feel the training that I receive is important part of my job | 3.40 | 1.163 | 100 |
| My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | 2.85 | 1.048 | 100 |
| I work in a "family friendly" atmosphere | 3.07 | 1.094 | 100 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | l think my personal morale is high right now | The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | l feel fairly well satisfied with my current job | l feel the training that l receive is important part of my job |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| I think my personal morale is high right now | 1.000 | .005 | .195 | .128 |
| The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | .005 | 1.000 | .364 | .186 |
| I feel fairly well satisfied with my current job | .195 | .364 | 1.000 | .414 |

| | My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | l work in a" family friendly" atmosphere |
|--|---|--|
| l think my personal morale is high right now | .561 | .250 |
| The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | .016 | .529 |
| I feel fairly well satisfied with my current job | .166 | .389 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | l think my personal morale is high right now | The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | l feel fairly well satisfied with my current job | I feel the training that I receive is important part of my job |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| I feel the training that I receive is important part of my job | .128 | .186 | .414 | 1.000 |
| My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | .561 | .016 | .166 | .249 |
| I work in a"family friendly" atmosphere | .250 | .529 | .389 | .271 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | l work in a" family friendly" atmosphere |
|--|---|--|
| I feel the training that I receive is important part of my job | .249 | .271 |
| My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | 1.000 | .133 |
| I work in a"family friendly" atmosphere | .133 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .257 | .005 | .561 | .556 | 111.016 | .027 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 6 |

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| l think my personal morale is high right now | 15.78 | 13.305 | .344 |
| The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | 15.53 | 13.039 | .350 |
| l feel fairly well satisfied with my current job | 15.31 | 11.347 | .498 |
| I feel the training that I receive is important part of my job | 15.25 | 12.351 | .398 |
| My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | 15.80 | 13.273 | .339 |
| l work in a"family friendly" atmosphere | 15.58 | 11.903 | .511 |

Item-Total Statistics

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| l think my personal morale is high right now | .370 | .656 |
| The relationships in my job are important to my job satisfaction | .332 | .654 |
| l feel fairly well satisfied with my current job | .295 | .601 |
| I feel the training that I receive is important part of my job | .223 | .639 |
| My job makes good use of my skills and abilities | .350 | .658 |
| l work in a"family friendly" atmosphere | .378 | .600 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 18.65 | 16.957 | 4.118 | 6 |

```
GET
FILE='F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav'.
RELIABILITY
/VARIABLES=CD1 CD2 CD3 CD4 Staf1 Staf2 Staf3 Staf4 TD1 TD2 TD3 TD4 PA1 PA2
PA3 PA4 INC1 INC2 INC3 INC4 ER1 ER2 ER3 ER4
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA
/STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
```

/SUMMARY=TOTAL CORR.

Reliability

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

Warnings

The determinant of the covariance matrix is zero or approximately zero. Statistics based on its inverse matrix cannot be computed and they are displayed as system missing values.

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

| | | N | % |
|-------|-----------------------|-----|-------|
| Cases | Valid | 100 | 100.0 |
| | Excluded ^a | 0 | .0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| .959 | .959 | 24 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|------|----------------|-----|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | 2.84 | .950 | 100 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | 3.10 | 1.010 | 100 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |

| ltem | Stat | isti | cs |
|------|------|------|----|
|------|------|------|----|

| | Moon | - | NI |
|---|--------------|------------------------|----------|
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | Mean 3.56 | Std. Deviation .935 | N 100 |
| There is formal employment in my organization | 2.94 | .897 | 100 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | 3.10 | 1.010 | 100 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | 3.47 | 1.029 | 100 |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | 2.88 | .946 | 100 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | 3.17 | .985 | 100 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | 3.37 | 1.152 | 100 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | 3.48 | 1.010 | 100 |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | 2.84 | .950 | 100 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | 3.13 | .991 | 100 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | 3.52 | 1.020 | 100 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | 3.49 | 1.020 | 100 |
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | 2.87 | .939 | 100 |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | 3.10 | 1.010 | 100 |

Item Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|--|------|----------------|-----|
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | 3.47 | 1.029 | 100 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | 2.90 | .980 | 100 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | 3.20 | 1.025 | 100 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | 3.48 | 1.049 | 100 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | 3.50 | 1.030 | 100 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | My organization considers employee developmenta l programs | Career development focuses on specific group | My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | 1.000 | .290 | .199 | .272 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .290 | 1.000 | .622 | .475 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .199 | .622 | 1.000 | .578 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .272 | .475 | .578 | 1.000 |

| | There is formal employment in my organization | My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | Job applicants take formal pre- employment tests before being hired |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | .865 | .290 | .199 | .315 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .163 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .085 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .293 | .475 | .578 | .930 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | Employees normal go through training programs every year | My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | .653 | .170 | .230 | .323 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .351 | .754 | .515 | .477 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .323 | .536 | .713 | .648 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .259 | .356 | .509 | .771 |

| | Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | Performance appraisals are base on objective results | Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | 1.000 | .237 | .191 | .321 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .290 | .955 | .557 | .540 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .199 | .619 | .954 | .609 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .272 | .465 | .602 | .948 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | .950 | .290 | .199 | .315 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .259 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .187 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .222 | .475 | .578 | .930 |

| | Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvement s in the way things are done |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | .894 | .241 | .199 | .258 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | .214 | .839 | .622 | .544 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | .126 | .511 | 1.000 | .636 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | .227 | .367 | .578 | .912 |

| | My organization considers employee developmenta l programs | Career development focuses on specific group | My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| There is formal employment in my organization | .865 | .163 | .085 | .293 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .290 | 1.000 | .622 | .475 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .199 | .622 | 1.000 | .578 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .315 | .576 | .649 | .930 |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | .653 | .351 | .323 | .259 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .170 | .754 | .536 | .356 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .230 | .515 | .713 | .509 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .323 | .477 | .648 | .771 |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | 1.000 | .290 | .199 | .272 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .237 | .955 | .619 | .465 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .191 | .557 | .954 | .602 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .321 | .540 | .609 | .948 |
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | .950 | .259 | .187 | .222 |

| inter-Item | Correlation | Matrix |
|------------|-------------|--------|
|------------|-------------|--------|

| | | | | <u> </u> |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| | There is formal employment in my organization | My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | Job applicants take formal pre- employment tests before being hired |
| There is formal employment in my organization | 1.000 | .163 | .085 | .217 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .163 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .085 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .217 | .576 | .649 | 1.000 |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | .611 | .351 | .323 | .359 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .092 | .754 | .536 | .379 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .100 | .515 | .713 | .602 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .266 | .477 | .648 | .840 |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | .865 | .290 | .199 | .315 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .168 | .955 | .619 | .514 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .123 | .557 | .954 | .602 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .242 | .540 | .609 | .981 |
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | .878 | .259 | .187 | .273 |

| | Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | Employees normal go through training programs every year | My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| There is formal employment in my organization | .611 | .092 | .100 | .266 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .351 | .754 | .515 | .477 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .323 | .536 | .713 | .648 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .359 | .379 | .602 | .840 |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | 1.000 | .250 | .329 | .336 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .250 | 1.000 | .353 | .313 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .329 | .353 | 1.000 | .558 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .336 | .313 | .558 | 1.000 |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | .653 | .170 | .230 | .323 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .329 | .763 | .462 | .472 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .264 | .484 | .703 | .589 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .323 | .338 | .601 | .799 |
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | .630 | .101 | .222 | .311 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | Performance appraisals are base on objective results | Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| There is formal employment in my organization | .865 | .168 | .123 | .242 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .290 | .955 | .557 | .540 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .199 | .619 | .954 | .609 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .315 | .514 | .602 | .981 |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | .653 | .329 | .264 | .323 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .170 | .763 | .484 | .338 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .230 | .462 | .703 | .601 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .323 | .472 | .589 | .799 |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | 1.000 | .237 | .191 | .321 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .237 | 1.000 | .582 | .476 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .191 | .582 | 1.000 | .617 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .321 | .476 | .617 | 1.000 |
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | .950 | .203 | .177 | .278 |

| | My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| There is formal employment in my organization | .878 | .163 | .085 | .217 | | |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .259 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 | | |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .187 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 | | |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .273 | .576 | .649 | 1.000 | | |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | .630 | .351 | .323 | .359 | | |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .101 | .754 | .536 | .379 | | |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .222 | .515 | .713 | .602 | | |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .311 | .477 | .648 | .840 | | |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | .950 | .290 | .199 | .315 | | |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .203 | .955 | .619 | .514 | | |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .177 | .557 | .954 | .602 | | |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .278 | .540 | .609 | .981 | | |
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | 1.000 | .259 | .187 | .273 | | |

| inter-item | Correlation | Matrix |
|------------|-------------|--------|
|------------|-------------|--------|

| | Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvement s in the way things are done | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| There is formal employment in my organization | .867 | .156 | .085 | .219 | |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | .214 | .839 | .622 | .544 | |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | .126 | .511 | 1.000 | .636 | |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | .197 | .360 | .649 | .958 | |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | .554 | .181 | .323 | .332 | |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | .154 | .726 | .536 | .373 | |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | .096 | .305 | .713 | .541 | |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | .243 | .287 | .648 | .826 | |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | .894 | .241 | .199 | .258 | |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | .159 | .789 | .619 | .480 | |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | .113 | .441 | .954 | .587 | |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | .201 | .321 | .609 | .938 | |
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | .842 | .206 | .187 | .214 | |

| Inter-Item C | Correlation | Matrix |
|--------------|-------------|--------|
|--------------|-------------|--------|

| | My organization considers employee developmenta l programs | Career development focuses on specific group | My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .290 | 1.000 | .622 | .475 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .199 | .622 | 1.000 | .578 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .315 | .576 | .649 | .930 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | .894 | .214 | .126 | .227 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .241 | .839 | .511 | .367 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .199 | .622 | 1.000 | .578 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .258 | .544 | .636 | .912 |

| | There is formal employment in my organization | My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | Job applicants take formal pre- employment tests before being hired |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .163 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .085 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .217 | .576 | .649 | 1.000 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | .867 | .214 | .126 | .197 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .156 | .839 | .511 | .360 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .085 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .219 | .544 | .636 | .958 |

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

| | Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | Employees normal go through training programs every year | My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .351 | .754 | .515 | .477 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .323 | .536 | .713 | .648 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .359 | .379 | .602 | .840 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | .554 | .154 | .096 | .243 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .181 | .726 | .305 | .287 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .323 | .536 | .713 | .648 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .332 | .373 | .541 | .826 |

| | Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | Performance appraisals are base on objective results | Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .290 | .955 | .557 | .540 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .199 | .619 | .954 | .609 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .315 | .514 | .602 | .981 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | .894 | .159 | .113 | .201 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .241 | .789 | .441 | .321 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .199 | .619 | .954 | .609 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .258 | .480 | .587 | .938 |

| | My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .259 | 1.000 | .622 | .576 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .187 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .273 | .576 | .649 | 1.000 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | .842 | .214 | .126 | .197 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .206 | .839 | .511 | .360 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .187 | .622 | 1.000 | .649 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .214 | .544 | .636 | .958 |

| | inter | Item Correlation | Matrix | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvement s in the way things are done |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | .214 | .839 | .622 | .544 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | .126 | .511 | 1.000 | .636 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | .197 | .360 | .649 | .958 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | 1.000 | .342 | .126 | .260 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | .342 | 1.000 | .511 | .411 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | .126 | .511 | 1.000 | .636 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | .260 | .411 | .636 | 1.000 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Maximum / Minimum | Variance |
|-------------------------|------|---------|---------|-------|----------------------|----------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | .492 | .085 | 1.000 | .915 | 11.822 | .067 |

Summary Item Statistics

| | N of Items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Inter-Item Correlations | 24 |

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | 75.01 | 284.212 | .520 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | 74.75 | 274.391 | .788 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | 74.37 | 272.639 | .809 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | 74.29 | 277.865 | .738 |
| There is formal employment in my organization | 74.91 | 288.648 | .404 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | 74.75 | 274.391 | .788 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | 74.37 | 272.639 | .809 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | 74.38 | 273.228 | .807 |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | 74.97 | 284.332 | .518 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | 74.68 | 281.129 | .595 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | 74.48 | 275.161 | .662 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | 74.37 | 275.912 | .740 |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | 75.01 | 284.212 | .520 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | 74.72 | 276.224 | .745 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | 74.33 | 274.951 | .762 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | 74.36 | 274.374 | .780 |

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| My organization considers employee developmental programs | | .959 |
| Career development focuses on specific group | | .957 |
| My organization uses employee assessment programs before acting for career development | | .957 |
| My organization conducts promotability forecast to identify employees with high potential | | .957 |
| There is formal employment in my organization | | .960 |
| My company uses internal recruiting sources extensively to fill open positions | | .957 |
| Job applicants undergo structured interviews before being hired | | .957 |
| Job applicants take formal pre-employment tests before being hired | | .957 |
| Extensive training programs are provided foremployees in my organization | | .959 |
| Employees normal go through training programs every year | | .959 |
| My organization provides formal training to promote skills to new hires | | .958 |
| My organization provides formal training for employees who are promoted | | .957 |
| Employees regularly (at least oncea year) receive formal evaluation of their performance | | .959 |
| Performance appraisals are base on objective results | | .957 |
| Performance appraisals are based on quantifiable results | | .957 |
| Employees receive performance feedback on routine (at least twice a year) basis | | .957 |

| | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | 74.98 | 285.636 | .480 |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | 74.75 | 274.391 | .788 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | 74.37 | 272.639 | .809 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | 74.38 | 273.228 | .807 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | 74.95 | 286.715 | .425 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | 74.65 | 279.381 | .623 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | 74.37 | 272.639 | .809 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | 74.35 | 274.189 | .777 |

| | Squared Multiple Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| My organization has favorable incentive practiceto encourage employees to pursue the company objectives | | .960 |
| My organization has very fair incentive practices aimed at rewarding people who accomplish organizational goals | | .957 |
| My organization has favorable incetive practices to encourage people to reach organization goals | | .957 |
| My organization has incetive practices which really recognize people who contribute the most to organization | | .957 |
| Employees have reasonable and fair complaint resolution process | | .960 |
| Employees are involved in formal participation processes suc as quality improvement groups, problem solving groups, or suggestion systems | | .958 |
| Employees regularly (at least once a year) complete attitude survey | | .957 |
| Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done | | .957 |

Scale Statistics

| Mean | Variance | Std. Deviation | N of Items |
|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| 77.85 | 301.765 | 17.371 | 24 |

| | tion Position No.pp No.PO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------|--------|-------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|-------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|--------------|------------|----------|
| | /VARIABLES=Gender Age Marital Educa employrelate hrpractic e jobsatis | TVES | | F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav | itatistics | Std. Deviation | .502 | 8.026 | .596 | 1.316 | 3.839 | 4.096 | 4.592 | .737 | .740 | .740 | .743 | .765 | .749 | .579 | .686 |
| | VARIABLES=Gender Age M employrelate hrpractic e jobsatis | TAIL NOSIG S DESCRIPT AIRWISE. | S | :\balozi\d | Descriptive Statistics | Mean | ~ | 33.49 | 1.78 | 4.19 | 5.99 | 5.22 | 6.40 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.23 | 3.25 | 3.23 | 3.27 | 2.60 | 3.11 |
| CORRELATIONS | /VARIABLES= ve employrela e jobsatis | /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES /MISSING=PAIRWISE. | Correlations | [DataSet1] F | | | Gender | Age | Maritał | Education | Position | No.pp | No.PO | career | staffing | training | performance | incentive | employrelate | hrpractice | jobsatis |

| | | Gender | Age | Marital | Education | Position | No.pp | No.PO | career | staffing |
|------------|---|-----------------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|--------|--------|----------|
| Gender | Pearson Correlation | - | 154 | .019 | 078 | 029 | 135 | 071 | 034 | 031 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .126 | .852 | .439 | .775 | .179 | .483 | .734 | .762 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Age | Pearson Correlation | 154 | - | .557** | .693. | 059 | .737" | .765** | 018 | 018 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .126 | | 000 | 000 | .563 | 000 | 000 | .859 | .858 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Marital | Pearson Correlation | .019 | .557** | - | .376** | 005 | .301" | .368" | .003 | .004 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .852 | 000 | | 000 | .958 | .002 | 000 | .975 | .965 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Education | Pearson Correlation | 078 | .693" | .376" | - | 138 | .539 | .517. | .053 | .055 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .439 | 000 | 000 | | .172 | 000 | 000 | .600 | .587 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Position | Pearson Correlation | 029 | 059 | 005 | 138 | - | 037 | 083 | 128 | 116 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .775 | .563 | .958 | .172 | | .714 | .409 | .206 | .248 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No.pp | Pearson Correlation | 135 | .737" | .301" | .539** | 037 | - | .702** | .153 | .150 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .179 | 000 | .002 | 000 | .714 | | 000 | .129 | .136 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No.PO | Pearson Correlation | 071 | .765. | .368* | .517** | 083 | .702" | - | .019 | .025 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .483 | 000 | 000 | 000 | .409 | 000 | | .849 | .806 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| career | Pearson Correlation | 034 | 018 | .003 | .053 | 128 | .153 | .019 | - | .991 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .734 | .859 | .975 | .600 | .206 | .129 | .849 | | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| staffing | Pearson Correlation | 031 | 018 | .004 | .055 | 116 | .150 | .025 | .991* | - |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .762 | .858 | .965 | .587 | .248 | .136 | .806 | 000 | |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| **. Correl | **. Correlation is significant at the 0.0 | 0.01 level (2-tailed) | tailed). | | | | | | | |

| | | training | performance | incentive | employrelate | hrpractice | jobsatis |
|------------|---|----------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|------------|----------|
| Gender | Pearson Correlation | 076 | 014 | 008 | 620 | 041 | 108 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .452 | .892 | .940 | .432 | .682 | .283 |
| | Z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Age | Pearson Correlation | 036 | 028 | 047 | .028 | 021 | 023 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .721 | 677. | .643 | .781 | .839 | .821 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Marital | Pearson Correlation | 018 | 008 | .007 | .027 | .003 | .005 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .856 | .935 | .946 | .790 | 979. | .958 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Education | Pearson Correlation | .033 | .037 | .039 | .078 | .051 | 038 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .741 | .714 | .701 | .440 | .616 | .708 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Position | Pearson Correlation | 162 | 145 | 124 | 038 | 122 | 133 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .108 | .149 | .220 | .710 | .226 | .187 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No.pp | Pearson Correlation | .111 | .157 | .130 | .156 | .147 | .091 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .272 | .118 | .196 | .122 | .144 | .369 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| No.PO | Pearson Correlation | .019 | .007 | 003 | .053 | .021 | 022 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .849 | .943 | .973 | .598 | .839 | .825 |
| | Z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| career | Pearson Correlation | .887** | .988 | .987 | .939** | .995 | .793** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| staffing | Pearson Correlation | | .978** | .989 | .931** | .993** | .786** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 |
| | Ν | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| **. Correl | **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) | 0.01 level (2- | tailed). | | | | |

| | | Gender | Age | Marital | Education | Position | No.pp | No.PO | career | staffing |
|---------------|--|---------------------|------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|-------|--------|----------|
| training | Pearson Correlation | 076 | 036 | 018 | .033 | 162 | .111 | .019 | .887** | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .452 | .721 | .856 | .741 | .108 | .272 | .849 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| performance | Pearson Correlation | 014 | 028 | 008 | .037 | 145 | .157 | .007 | .988 | .978** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .892 | .779 | .935 | .714 | .149 | .118 | .943 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| incentive | Pearson Correlation | 008 | 047 | .007 | .039 | 124 | .130 | 003 | .987** | .989 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .940 | .643 | .946 | .701 | .220 | .196 | .973 | 000. | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| employrelate | Pearson Correlation | 620 | .028 | .027 | .078 | 038 | .156 | .053 | .939** | .931 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .432 | .781 | .790 | .440 | .710 | .122 | .598 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| hrpractice | Pearson Correlation | 041 | 021 | .003 | .051 | 122 | .147 | .021 | .995 | .993** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .682 | .839 | 979. | .616 | .226 | .144 | .839 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| jobsatis | Pearson Correlation | 108 | 023 | .005 | 038 | 133 | .091 | 022 | .793** | .786** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .283 | .821 | .958 | .708 | .187 | .369 | .825 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| ** Corrolatio | Correlation is significant at the 0.01 lev | 11 level (2-tailed) | | | | | | | | |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

| | | training | performance | incentive | employrelate | hrpractice | jobsatis |
|---------------|--|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------|----------|
| training | Pearson Correlation | 1 | | .895 | .812** | .921 | .848** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| performance | Pearson Correlation | .877** | - | 973" | .897** | .981** | .781** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 000 | | 000 | 000. | 000 | 000. |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| incentive | Pearson Correlation | .895 | .973** | - | .919** | **066 [.] | .783** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 000 | 000 | | 000 | 000 | 000 |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| employrelate | Pearson Correlation | .812** | .897 | .919** | - | .944** | .776** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 000 | 000. | 000 | | 000 | 000' |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| hrpractice | Pearson Correlation | .921** | .981** | 066 [°] | .944 | 1 | .819** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 000 | 000. | 000 | 000 | | 000' |
| | z | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| jobsatis | Pearson Correlation | .848** | .781** | .783 | .776** | .819* | - |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 | 000 | |
| | Ν | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| ** Correlatio | ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) | 1 laval (2-tail | ad) | | | | |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

REGRESSION

/MISSING PAIRWISE

/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI(95) R ANOVA COLLIN TOL ZPP

/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

/NOORIGIN

/DEPENDENT jobsatis

/METHOD=ENTER career staffing training performance incentive employrelate

/SCATTERPLOT=(*ZRESID ,*ZPRED)

/RESIDUALS NORM(ZRESID)

/CASEWISE PLOT(ZRESID) OUTLIERS(3)

/SAVE MAHAL COOK.

Regression

[DataSet1] F:\balozi\dataspss-100.sav

| Model | Variables Entered | Variables Removed | Method |
|-------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 1 | employrelate, training, performance, incentive, staffing, career ^a | | Enter |

Variables Entered/Removed

a. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .871ª | .759 | .743 | .348 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), employrelate, training, performance, incentive, staffing, career

b. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

ANOVAb

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-------------------|----|-------------|--------|-------|
| 1 1 | Regression | 35.391 | 6 | 5.898 | 48.800 | .000ª |
| 1 | Residual | 11.241 | 93 | .121 | | |
| - | Total | 46.632 | 99 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), employrelate, training, performance, incentive, staffing, career

b. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Coefficients^a

| | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|-------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------|------|
| Model | | В | B Std. Error | | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | .382 | .169 | | 2.264 | .026 |
| | career | 006 | .728 | 006 | 008 | .994 |
| | staffing | 665 | .424 | 717 | -1.570 | .120 |
| | training | .738 | .109 | .795 | 6.781 | .000 |
| | performance | .400 | .402 | .433 | .995 | .322 |
| | incentive | 088 | .350 | 098 | 251 | .803 |
| | employrelate | .462 | .177 | .505 | 2.614 | .010 |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Coefficients^a

| | | 95.0% Confidence Interval for B | | Correlations | | |
|---|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------|
| М | odel | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Zero-order | o-order Partial | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .047 | .717 | | | |
| | career | -1.452 | 1.440 | .793 | .000 | .000 |
| | staffing | -1.507 | .176 | .786 | 161 | 080 |
| | training | .522 | .954 | .848 | .575 | .345 |
| | performance | 399 | 1.199 | .781 | .103 | .051 |
| | incentive | 783 | .607 | .783 | 026 | 013 |
| | employrelate | .111 | .813 | .776 | .262 | .133 |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

| | | Collinearity Statistics | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------|--|--|
| Model | | Tolerance | VIF | | |
| 1 | career | .004 | 235.729 | | |
| | staffing | .012 | 80.546 | | |
| | training | .188 | 5.308 | | |
| | performance | .014 | 73.113 | | |
| | incentive | .017 | 58.716 | | |
| | employrelate | .070 | 14.370 | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis | | | | | |

Coefficients^a

Collinearity Diagnostics

| Model | Dimension | Eigenvalue | Condition Index | |
|-------|-----------|------------|--------------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | 6.942 | 1.000 | |
| | 2 | .041 | 13.040 | |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Collinearity Diagnostics

| | | Variance Proportions | | | | |
|-------|-----------|----------------------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Model | Dimension | (Constant) | career | staffing | training | performance |
| 1 | 1 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| | 2 | .89 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Collinearity Diagnostics

| | | Variance Proportions | | |
|------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|--|
| Mode | Dimension | incentive | employrelate | |
| 1 | 1 | .00 | .00 | |
| | 2 | .00 | .00 | |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Collinearity Diagnostics

| Model | Dimension | Eigenvalue | Condition Index |
|-------|-----------|------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 3 | .010 | 26.750 |
| | 4 | .005 | 36.458 |
| | 5 | .001 | 71.840 |
| | 6 | .000 | 120.308 |
| | 7 | .000 | 210.365 |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Collinearity Diagnostics

| | | Variance Proportions | | | | |
|-------|-----------|----------------------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Model | Dimension | (Constant) | career | staffing | training | performance |
| 1 | 3 | .01 | .00 | .00 | .68 | .00 |
| | 4 | .04 | .00 | .00 | .25 | .03 |
| | 5 | .05 | .00 | .04 | .06 | .21 |
| | 6 | .01 | .00 | .88 | .02 | .03 |
| | 7 | .00 | .99 | .08 | .00 | .74 |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Collinearity Diagnostics

| | | Variance Proportions | | |
|-------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|--|
| Model | Dimension | incentive | employrelate | |
| 1 | 3 | .00 | .10 | |
| | 4 | .01 | .35 | |
| | 5 | .30 | .05 | |
| | 6 | .52 | .05 | |
| | 7 | .17 | .46 | |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Casewise Diagnostics^a

| Case Number | Std. Residual | jobsatis | Predicted Value | Residual |
|-------------|---------------|----------|--------------------|----------|
| 84 | -4.044 | 2 | 2.91 | -1.406 |

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

| | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|-----|
| Predicted Value | 1.64 | 4.38 | 3.11 | .598 | 100 |
| Std. Predicted Value | -2.449 | 2.123 | .000 | 1.000 | 100 |
| Standard Error of Predicted Value | .035 | .344 | .070 | .060 | 100 |
| Adjusted Predicted Value | 1.41 | 6.42 | 3.14 | .696 | 100 |
| Residual | -1.406 | .850 | .000 | .337 | 100 |
| Std. Residual | -4.044 | 2.445 | .000 | .969 | 100 |
| Stud. Residual | -4.068 | 2.521 | 011 | 1.029 | 100 |
| Deleted Residual | -3.424 | 1.126 | 034 | .520 | 100 |
| Stud. Deleted Residual | -4.462 | 2.598 | 017 | 1.058 | 100 |
| Mahal. Distance | .034 | 95.979 | 5.940 | 15.661 | 100 |
| Cook's Distance | .000 | 13.572 | .169 | 1.365 | 100 |
| Centered Leverage Value | .000 | .969 | .060 | .158 | 100 |

Residuals Statistics^a

a. Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Charts









Dependent Variable: jobsatis

Regression Standardized Predicted Value