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ABSTRACT

The study was set out to examine organizational citizenship behaviours, by relating it to supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment among users of IT companies in the capital city Kampala. The researcher developed a conceptual model, which illustrates the relationship between supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment and organizational citizenship behaviours. The research objectives set out to determine the significance of the correlation between the independent variables and dependent variables.

A cross-sectional survey design was adopted to take a snapshot of events as they existed at that particular point in time. The development of instruments to capture the constructs of wear out was done. A sample size of 180 respondents was randomly selected 125 respondents representing 69.4% were realized and considered satisfactory.

The results indicate strong significant positive correlations between supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors. Testing the strength of the relationship indicated that all independent variables predict 38% of the variance in organizational citizenship behaviors. The study concludes that the greatest predictor of the variation in organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to the magnitude of the Beta co-efficient is Supervisory-related climate.
The study therefore, recommends that when supervisors adequately guide their subordinates, a right environment is created, where there are no barriers to performance, their true value to the organization can be fully realized.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM.

Most Information technology companies in Uganda are involved in providing IT services to both the private and government institutions. However, despite their importance, most IT companies do have institutional weaknesses in the organizational climate including the supervisory and job related climate which negatively affects their performance and derails ability to cope with the ever changing needs of the IT environment.

For example, in relation to the supervisory related climate, the majority of officers in charge of hiring new staff and heads of departments are ignorant about labour laws. This limits them to adequately carry out disciplinary measures (Communications commission quarterly report to MDs 2003).

In addition employees complain about assessment of training needs. Supervisors hardly consult them on courses they need to cope with the ever changing needs of the IT industry. This weakens carrier development of staff. (Communications commission quarterly report to MDs 2003).

The job related climate has some shortcomings. For example, appointment letters and other employment contracts are most of the time not given to newly
recruited staff. With the old staff, employment terms are rarely formalized (Communications commission quarterly report to MDs 2005).

Outline of responsibilities hardly exists, even among head of departments, which brings about conflict of roles. For example, when a customer needs information, operations and marketing manager usually send different price lists or quotation for goods to be sold (Memos. Staff contracts 2004).

Such an environment creates low levels of trust between employees and their supervisors. So a high rate of staff turnover exists especially those employed on temporary and commission basis (Memos: Staff contracts 2005).

Commitment to prepare work plans on time is rarely done. Most staff rarely give input, during preparation of business proposals that are sent to both private and government institutions, seeking for contracts like servicing of computers and installing new software (Minutes of meeting July 2004).

Absenteeism, and habitual late coming to office is common. Staff, who manage to report on time, disappear from office for long hours during the day. Most employees supplement their pay with money illegally acquired from inside dealings with clients. Failure to honour appointments with customers without notice or apologizing is common. (Minutes of meetings July 2006).
1.2 Problem Statement
Perceptions of unfairness in the supervisory and job related climate exist in most IT companies. This may cause low levels of trust between managers and staff. It also partly creates low levels of commitment amongst employees and demonstration of poor discretionary effort (organizational citizenship behaviour) in the organization.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The study sought to establish the relationship between the supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment and organizational citizenship behaviours.

1.4 Objectives of the Study
1) To establish the relationship between supervisory and job related climate and trust.
2) To determine the relationship between supervisory and job related climate and commitment.
3) To determine the relationship between trust and commitment.
4) To determine the relationship between supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment and Organizational Citizenship behaviour.

1.5 Research Questions
The study was guided by the following research questions.
1) What is the relationship between supervisory and job related climate and trust?
2) What is the relationship between supervisory and job related climate and
commitment?

3) What is the relationship between trust and commitment?

4) What is the relationship between supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment and Organizational Citizenship behaviour?

1.6 Scope of the Study

1.6.1 Areas of Study:
The study was carried out at the headquarters of these IT companies in the capital city Kampala. Given a total population of 200, the optimal sample size was 180. The sample size was arrived at using Simple Random Sampling.

1.6.2 Content Scope:
The study established the relationship between supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors.

1.7.0 Significance of the Study
1. The study will add to the existing literature on the relationship between supervisory and job related climate trust, commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour with specific reference to IT companies in Uganda.

2. This study will create knowledge about supervisory and job related climate, trust, commitment and organizational citizenship behaviours.

3. Policy makers in IT companies would use the findings to enhance performance of the organizations.
1.8 Conceptual Framework:

Figure I: Relationships between organizational climate (job and supervisory), trust, organizational commitment and how these affect OCBs.

Source: Developed by self, from the literature survey of scholars such (Nikandrou et al., 2000). Shield et al. (2002)

Description of the Model:

The conceptual model explains that when Supervisory and job related climate is supportive, trust by most employees within the organization is strengthened. This leads to Commitment and thus a good work behavior. Additional research has suggested that job and supervisory related climate, impact commitment to organizational tasks and positive organizational citizenship behaviors amongst workers. Shield et al. (2002) study revealed that a focus on maintaining trust has a direct impact on the commitment.
1.9 Organization of the Study

The study is presented in five chapters. Chapter one comprises of the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, the scope and significance of the study, and the conceptual framework.

Chapter two reviews independent variables focusing on organizational climate, trust organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior and the relationships between them.

Chapter three explains the methodology used in the study. The research design, study area, sampling design and procedures, sample size, data collection, measurement of variables, field investigation, data processing and analysis, and reliability testing are given.

Chapter four presents the data analysis and discusses the findings of the study in accordance with the research objectives.

Chapter five contains the conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW
This Chapter is devoted to the review of literature on the key variables of the study. Relational literature is also discussed under the objectives of the study guided by the conceptual framework. The review begins with organizational climate (Job and Supervisory related climate), its followed by a review on trust, organizational commitment and OCBs. The review brings out the relationship between organizational climate, trust, organizational commitment and OCBs. The relation literature of organizational climate, trust organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior is then reviewed.

2.1 Organisational Climate
Organizational climate is the atmosphere that employees perceive in their organizations through practices, procedures and rewards (Schneider and Brief, 2004). According to West et al. (2005), Organizational climate refers to the “perceptions that organization members share, which are fundamental elements of their organization”. They further argue that the holistic nature of climate perceptions is such that perceptions function as a frame of reference for the attainment of some congruity between behavior and the system’s practices and procedures.

The foregoing quoted scholars submit that most productivity results will be obtained when management creates conditions which workers perceive as beneficial to them. The context within which the worker carries out his/her duties and responsibilities is called the job-related climate. Gardner (2000)
reveals that organisational climate is the atmosphere that employees perceive in their organisations by practices, procedures and rewards. Stated simply, people respond to work environment in terms of how they perceive this environment and a key substantive concern in perception is the degree to which individuals perceive themselves as being personally benefiting as opposed to being personally hindered by their environment (Adler and Kwon, 2002).

Moran and Volkwien (2000) also support this view by contending that an organisation is heavily influenced by the juniors’ perception of organisational practices by managers within the organisation. Employees cluster their organisational experiences and events into meanings, and this forms the basis of organisational climate. Climate is therefore dependent on organisational policies and procedures. Indeed, climate researchers argue that climate is heavily influenced by management attitudes and behaviours. The priorities set by management lead to organisational climates as understood and interpreted by employees.

Falkenberg (2001) augments this view by asserting that organisational climate is influenced by the amount of power and access to resources that each group has. He contends that climates are affected by equal opportunities in the organisation and by how individuals and groups view those policies. The above scholars described organizational climate as an enduring characteristic of an
organisation comprising of members’ collective perceptions about their organisation across a range of dimensions. This characteristic is produced by interactions between employees and reflects prevalent norms and acts as a source of influence for shaping behaviour.

Furthermore, organisational climate is viewed as a characteristic of an organisation which distinguishes it from other organisations and (a) it embodies members collective perceptions about their organisation with respect to such dimensions as autonomy, trust, cohesiveness, support, recognition, innovation and fairness, (b) it involves member interaction, (c) serves as a basis for interpreting the situation, (d) reflects the prevalent norms, values and attitudes of the organisation’s culture (e) acts as source of influence for developing behaviour (Kanzira, 2004).

Schneider, Brief and Guzzo (2004) also posit that some firms are more successful than others because they are more effective in managing the three aspects of climate (nature of interpersonal relationships, the nature of the hierarchy and the focus on support and rewards) simultaneously. The need is to establish a climate that fosters innovation, customer service and citizenship behaviour, which in turn allows both high quality service and enhances organisational performance and success (Schneider et al 1994). In agreement with the above, Cox (2003) contends that organisations that develop a climate that encourages
and supports all employees and in which all have equal opportunities will be better positioned than its competitors and employees will be more motivated and creative.

Since employees cluster their organisational experiences and events into meanings and these form the basis for organisational climate, climate is therefore heavily dependent on organisational policies and procedures. A supportive organisational climate involves leader facilitation and support for accomplishment of work goals, interpersonal relationship, being aware of employee needs and providing job feedback as reiterated by Smith, (2002). This supportive climate also encompasses openness of expression and allows for upward interaction (Moran and Volkwein, 2000). Climate also widens its scope by encompassing other aspects such as opportunity for growth, deals with job standards, consistent application of organisational policies, confidence, trust, looks at interdepartmental co-operation, organisational communication, fairness and objectiveness of the reward process (Smith, 2002). The goals of an organisation and how an organisation goes about attaining them are key components by which the members of an organisation perceive the climate (Kanzira, 2004).

This has also been the case for the dimensions of climate and its measurement. Cox (2003) argues that developing universal set of dimensions was often the central issue of the climate researchers so that comparative studies could be made possible in different organizational settings. He compared this approach to
that of the culture research that examined the qualitative aspects of individual social contexts where each culture that was examined was seen as unique and was not expected to have general qualities which had become central to climate research.

It is possible that the dependence on the use of climate surveys as the research method of choice led those working in the climate area to seek views across settings. Gardner (2000) argued that one of the assumptions of the climate literature is that a relatively limited number of dimensions could characterise a wide cross-section of social settings.

Schnieder et al. (2004) emphasize that climate entails such sub-variables as role conflict and quality of supervision; whereas Falkenberg (2001) believes task difficulty, work overload and task ambiguity are its key aspects. For purposes of this study however, focus was put on investigating the perceptions about role conflict and quality of supervision at Radio West.

Role conflict is reflected through perceived conflict in organisational goals and objectives, individual differences in expectations, values and proposed courses of action (Bennet, 2002). Quality of supervision is demonstrated when managers are willing to supervise a variety of duties, including dealing with other people. The supervisory climate should be seen as providing autonomy and feedback to employees (Kangis and Williams, 2000).

Supervisory related climate is reflected by supervisory competence and openness in the supervisory process. The researcher believes that supervisory competence
of the managers is shown by the extent to which the leader is seen as helping others to accomplish goals through adequate consultation with subordinates as well as timely provision of feedback on employee performance to support their career development. Falkenberg, (2001) dissect supervisory competence to include openness in the supervisory process such as perception of an open atmosphere to express one’s feelings and thoughts.

All the above foregoing scholars demonstrate that working conditions affect employee attitudes towards their jobs and the researcher follows suit.

It’s also important to note that the climate of the workplace is a fundamental factor in the provision of quality services (Davidson, Manning, Bronson and Timo, 2002). They have also found out that there is a direct positive correlation between good organisational climate and organisational performance. Climate is also affected by the amount of empowerment/training, and operating procedures/resources (Bennet, 2002). These elements provide employees with the necessary tools to do their job well and react to individual customer requirements, thus enhancing the quality of service. This is reinforced by Gardner (2000) who urged service managers to understand their organisation’s climate in order to operate a successful service.

When discussing the role of organisational climate and its links to the provision of high quality service, it is necessary to understand first the operational environment of the industries (Smith, 2002). The provision of high quality service has become essential to survival, and many organisations are attempting
to implement various quality management schemes (Kangis and Williams, 2000; Adler and Kwon, 2002). They also argue that firms wishing to be successful in the 1990’s must have a quality management programme in place and that quality has become a strategic imperative.

In a study of the Banking Industry, Schneider et al. (1996) isolated 8 dimensions of a climate for service, many of which showed a significant correlation with customer perceptions of service quality in the organisation. They are part of the overall climate framework and link with the climate dimensions identified by James and Jones (1979). The service dimensions are shown below with the employee perceptions of each dimension

**Climate for Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Climate Dimensions</th>
<th>Employee Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic orientation to service</td>
<td>Following all rules &amp; procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing the job in a routine fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic orientation to service</td>
<td>Keeping a sense of family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designing new ways to serve the customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial behaviour</td>
<td>Planning and goal setting for service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service rewards</td>
<td>Incentives and other rewards for service excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer retention</td>
<td>Active attempts to retain customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not giving special treatment to major Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations support</td>
<td>Easy access to customer records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error free records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing support</td>
<td>Understanding of customer care in introducing new products and service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/supply and support</td>
<td>Equipment is available and up operating necessary supplies available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 1:** Service Climate Dimensions and corresponding employee perceptions for service organizations. Adapted from Schneider et al. (1990), creating the climate and culture of success, organizational dynamics Pg 23.

Whilst this study was conducted in the banking industry, it has application across all service organizations. There are obvious advantages in understanding the forces that are involved in the creation of the organizational climate; it is the linking of that understanding to the day-to-day activities that hold major significance for management. The effect of managerial action and leadership factors on the climate of the organization are now well known and documented (Davidson, 2001). Davidson further asserts that supportive management is essential, where subordinates may try and fail without any fear of reprimand. Organizations need to recognize the climate for employee well being in their organizations as a basis for the development of a climate for innovation and service quality enhancement. So management should emphasize building climate dimensions such as customer retention, operations support, service rewards so as to strengthen organizational productivity.

**2.3 Job-related Climate**
Job related climate refers to the context within which the worker carries out his/her duties and responsibilities (Falkenberg, 2001). A supportive Job related climate involves leader facilitation and support for accomplishment of work goals,
interpersonal relationship, being aware of employee needs and providing job feedback as reiterated by Smith, (2002).

2.4 Supervisory-related climate.
If a good supervisory climate exists, it simply provides the best possible conditions for quality service (William and Hazer, 2006). Key aspects include supervisors consulting the employees and subordinate, openness on and feedback by supervisor. The provision of quality supervision has become essential to survival, and many service organizations are attempting to implement various quality supervision management schemes that enhance service provision (Bennet, 2004).

2.5 Trust
Trust is the belief or willingness to believe that one can rely on the goodness, strength and ability another person or group or persons (Lin, 2001). It is the confidence in the honesty, integrity, reliability and justice of another person. Hence organizational members who manifest trustworthiness and place extensive trust in one another will be able to accomplish much more than a comparable team lacking that trustworthiness and trust. “It is necessary not only to trust others before acting co-operatively, but also to believe that one is trusted by other.” (Kanzira 2004). Trust as a form of social capital is the most encompassing factor in facilitating voluntary co-operation. Repetitive interaction among individuals provides incentives to individuals to build a reputation of being trustworthy. Trust is therefore the expectation that arises within a community of
regular, honest and co-operative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community. It is a multifaceted concept and is mostly conceived as rational response to trustworthy behaviour by others (Babiha, 2001).

Mcgum (2003) argues that trusting people are more likely to volunteer their time, to give to charity, be tolerant of others and to support policies that both promote economic growth and that provide support for the less fortunate. An organization whose members place extensive trust in one another will be able to accomplish much more than a comparable group lacking that trustworthiness and trust.

Trust is central to both institutional and interpersonal relationships (McAllister 1995). A manager's ability to develop and nurture a long-term trusting relationship with his juniors is considered a critical skill for the success of the organization (Strutton, Pelton, and Lumpkin 1993). In fact, research suggests that in the new organisational environment, trust has replaced the hierarchical model of control that was prevalent in the traditional organizations (Anderson 1996; Dirks and Ferrin 2001).

2.6. Organizational Commitment

Greenberg and Baron (2005) view it as the strength of an individual’s identification and involvement with a particular organization, characterized by a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals on two factors: (a) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organizational values;
(b) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership. This definition combines both a psychological and an attitudinal dimension, in the “belief and acceptance” part, with an applied dimension, in the “willingness to exert considerable effort” part (Carmeli and Freund 2005)

2.61. Antecedents of organisational commitment

“Antecedents of organizational commitment are quite diverse in their nature and origins” (Steers, 2004, p. 53). Because of the range of theories and diversity of antecedents, categories are useful. Four categories of antecedents are influential: personal characteristics, job- or role-related characteristics, work experiences (Steers, 2004), and structural characteristics (Nijhof et al., 2003). This paper concentrates on job/role-related characteristics and work experiences, as these are the categories that are the most flexible in the service industry. In addition, they are the characteristics over which senior managers arguably have the most influence in their services. Therefore, job/role characteristics and work experiences may be the most important characteristics in encouraging organisational commitment.

2.6.1.1 Job/role characteristics

The first set of antecedents to organisational commitment concern job characteristics and employee roles. Job scope, role conflict and role ambiguity are key elements of job/role-related characteristics. Each of these is outlined.
Many researchers contend that commitment is higher when employees have a broad job scope (Steers, 2004; Stevens et al., 2005). The argument is that a wider range of duties and responsibilities means employees experience more challenges, hence become more committed. The notion of exchange is important here as the individual swaps their commitment for a satisfying work experience. Job scope, however, is finely balanced in that work overload, which is not by any means unusual in the service industry, especially for managers, has been found to have a negative effect on commitment (Stevens et al., 2005). Role conflict refers to uncertainty over which tasks have priority. It is consistently argued in the theory that experience of role conflict will inevitably lead to a reduction in commitment (e.g. Morris and Sherman, 2002), although there is a lack of practical evidence of this. Role ambiguity refers to how clearly job tasks are identified. Opinion on the effects of role ambiguity is apparently more divided than on role conflict. Some researchers believe that role ambiguity is not “a significant independent predictor of commitment” (Morris and Sherman, 2002, p. 519). In contrast, a study by Steers (2005) concluded that task identities were very significantly identified with commitment.

In short, the theory on job/role characteristics suggests that:

- job scopes that allow some challenges but do not involve work overload are important to encouraging commitment; and
- avoiding role conflict, and possibly role ambiguity, is important to generating commitment.
However, as many service jobs are organized by department, it is possible that role conflict and ambiguity are potential issues for managers. This problem may be exacerbated by managers having broad job remits. So job scope, role conflict and role ambiguity as features of work for managers in services may, in the way they are typically organized, act to discourage commitment.

2.6.2 Work experiences

The second set of characteristics that precede organisational commitment centre on individuals’ work experiences. It has been argued that “commitment is influenced by the nature and quality of an employee’s work experience during his or her tenure in an organization” (Steers, 2005, p. 47). Rewards, organisational dependability, employee importance and social involvement are key aspects of work experiences explored in turn here.

If employees receive rewards, say promotion, for example, after overcoming some obstacles, then commitment is likely to be higher than if the rewards are automatically received (Grusky, 2003). Pay – in the absolute amount and relative to others’ pay – is also important in rewards. Grusky (2003) found, perhaps unsurprisingly, that high levels of pay encourage higher levels of commitment. This presents an obvious challenge to the low-paid service industry. In addition, it has been found that, if an employee sees that a colleague is being paid more than themselves for the same work, the employee is likely to be disillusioned and therefore less committed (Rhodes and Steers, 1981).
Organisational dependability refers to “the extent to which employees feel the organization could be counted on to look after employee interests” (Mowday et al., 1982, p. 34). Clearly, the higher the experience of dependability, the more positive the impact on commitment. Interpersonal trust is closely aligned to organisational dependability. If the work environment is not seen as friendly or co-operative, and the relationship between employees is generally not amicable, then individuals are unlikely to feel committed to the organisation (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 2002). Further, an individual’s experiences of their co-workers’ commitment can have an effect on their own commitment (Steers, 2005). Where the majority of employees are highly committed, it is likely this will encourage individual commitment. The opposite effect, where generally low commitment will reduce individuals’ commitment, is also likely. Thus building commitment can have a reinforcing effect.

The extent to which employees feel they are important to the organization is posited to be significant in its influence on commitment (Steers, 2005). As a result, individual experiences of people management and employee relations are important in securing and maintaining commitment. In the people-oriented service industry this notion offers an opportunity, especially when linked with the reinforcing effects of general commitment outlined above.

Social involvement too has been found to increase commitment (Sheldon, 2001). Steers (2005) used the term “optional interaction” for the same characteristic, arguing that, if an employee makes personal friendships within, and personally
associates with people in, an organization, then they will be more committed to the organization. Again, this offers an opportunity for commitment in the labour-intensive, teamwork-based service industry.

So, in sum, the theory on work experiences offers several considerations for improving the organisational commitment of managers in services. Managers’ commitment may be encouraged by:

- high levels of (equal) pay;
- individual managers feeling that the employer looks after their interests and that they are important to the organisation;
- co-operation and trust between employees (or groups of employees like managers);
- an atmosphere of generally high commitment; and
- opportunities to engage in social activities through work.

### 2.7 Outcomes of commitment

The consequence of understanding the antecedents of commitment and managing them to secure employee commitment in specific sectors and organisations is, ultimately, improved organisational performance. It has long been argued that for an organization to function properly it relies on employees to behave in such a manner that they exceed their role prescriptions (Katz, 2004). In the dynamic, service-oriented service industry in particular it is not sustainable for employees to operate without flexibility. As has been pointed out, achieving organisational goals often relies on individual committed behaviors
such as co-operation and unrewarded help (Smith et al., 2003). Many different outcomes of commitment have been researched. Principal among them are adoption of the organization’s norms and goals, and employee performance, both of which are explored below.

2.7.1 Adoption of the organisation’s norms and goals

A significant effect of organisational commitment is that individuals “tend to adhere to its (the organisation’s) norms” (Salancik, 2007, p. 27). This outcome reflects the first of the three aspects of Porter et al.’s (1974) definition of commitment outlined earlier. Following the organization’s norms is very important in the service sector, as its labour intensity means that employees play a vital role in determining success (Rogers et al., 2004). For highly branded services especially, conforming with the organization’s norms and goals is demonstrably important. Salancik (2007) also makes the valuable point that socializing – inducting – individuals to the norms and values of the organization is important because employers cannot control the nature of the people they employ. Further, in services the performance of employees is often largely unsupervised, so, where employees work to, not against, the norms and standards of service behavior, supervision is not necessarily needed as employees can be trusted to work in the interests of their employer. Therefore work becomes cost-effective and directed towards the goals of the organization.
In the particular context of service work, the theory on adoption of the organization’s norms and goals points in brief to this being a valuable outcome of commitment. It implies:

- Induction training covering the norms, goals, values and standards of the organization is critical; and
- work effort will be channeled towards maximizing revenues if employees are committed.

### 2.7.2 Employee performance

From an organisational perspective, effective employee performance is the ultimate outcome and purpose of commitment. Basically:

... the main reason why commitment has been one of the most popular research subjects ... over the past 30 years is its assumed impact on performance (Benkhoff, 2007, p. 701).

Yet the effect of commitment on performance is still only largely assumed and not conclusive. Lack of practical evidence is one factor that makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions; the number of variables affecting employee performance is another. To put it bluntly, “researchers have not been able to come up with evidence that commitment and performance go hand in hand” (Benkhoff, 1997, p. 702). This is not to diminish the value of investigating employee performance and commitment, but instead to establish the complexity of the relationship between the two. A number of authors testify that there is
some relationship between employee performance and commitment (e.g. Benkhoff, 2007). The difficulty is that the relationship is neither consistent (Steers, 2005) nor direct (Mathieu and Zajac, 2000).

Despite the complex relationship between commitment and employee performance, several theoretical positions can be established. One is that commitment influences performance as committed people will be persistent in tasks set and achieve set goals, whereas uncommitted people will not (Salancik, 2007). Second, the first likely outcome of commitment is service quality (Iverson et al., 2006). The importance of service quality for the service industry cannot be understated, while the nature of service offered in services is becoming increasingly intangible (Lashley, 2000). Third, acceptance of organisational change can be a direct consequence of commitment (Iverson et al., 2006), as an employee who is committed to their employer is likely to trust them and accept change affecting them. However, there is a limit to a productive level of commitment in respect of accepting change: too high a level of commitment can actually lead to resistance to change (Salancik, 2007). Fourth, committed individuals may assume extra role responsibilities (O’Reilly and Chatman, 1986).

An alternative way of considering commitment and employee performance is examining the effects of not encouraging commitment but instead relying on employee compliance. This line of inquiry has, however, been rebutted. The grounds for rebuttal are that employees whose performance is based on compliance only may not display higher levels of absenteeism but they will
certainly not be as productive or as likely to remain with the organization in the longer term as those who have deeper levels of commitment (Bennett and Durkin, 2000).

It seems therefore, on balance, that investigation of organisational commitment is worthwhile in individual and organisational terms due to the potential, if not guaranteed, outcomes. With regard to the outcome of employee performance, commitment may be expressed in:

- persistence in completing tasks and achieving goals;
- service quality;
- acceptance of change; and
- assumption of extra job tasks.

2.8 **Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCBs)**

Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) describe actions in which employees are willing to go above and beyond their prescribed role requirements. Prior theory suggests and some research supports the belief that these behaviors are correlated with indicators of organizational effectiveness. According to Podsakoff *et al.* (2000) “OCB is understood as an individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization. By discretionary, we mean that the behavior is not an enforceable requirement of the role or job description, that is, the clearly specifiable terms of the person's
employment contract with the organization; the behavior is rather a matter of personal choice, such that the omission is not generally understood as punishable (Chang. 2002).

Furthermore, the rapid growth of research and theory on organisational citizenship behaviour has resulted in some conceptual confusion about the nature of the construct, and made it difficult for all but the most avid readers to keep up with developments in this domain. Although the rapid growth in theory and research undoubtedly has been gratifying to those interested in organisational citizenship behaviour, it also has produced some unfortunate consequences.

Van Dyne, Cummings and Parks (1995) have noted that much of the empirical research on organisational citizenship behaviour and the related concepts has focused more on what (Schwab, 1980) called substantive validity, rather than on construct validity. That is, the literature has focused more on understanding the relationships between organisational citizenship behaviour and other constructs, rather than carefully defining the organisational citizenship behaviour itself. Schwab (1980) warned that unless additional attention is directed toward more comprehensive theoretical explications of the constructs and its measures, we are in danger of developing a stream of literature that may prove to be of little value to the field in the long run.
It has been pointed out that, even though there has been dramatic growth of organisational citizenship behaviour research into other related management domains, such as human resources management, industrial and labor relations, strategic management, international business and leadership, one unfortunate outcome of this diversification is that it has become increasingly difficult for all but the most avid readers to keep up with developments in the literature (Schwab, 1980). Moreover, as interest in organisational citizenship behaviour continues to expand to other disciplines (like marketing, hospital and health administration, community psychology, economics, and military psychology) it will become even more difficult to keep up with the theoretical and empirical developments in this area, and to assimilate the literature into a coherent whole (Williams and Anderson, 1991).

The findings from early research efforts on employee characteristics in organizations by Bateman and Organ (1983) focused on two main causes of organisational citizenship behaviour. The first of these is a general affective "morale" factor, which Ryan (1995) viewed as the underlying perceptions of fairness and leader supportiveness. Thus, those variables comprising employee "morale" do appear to be important determinants of organisational citizenship behaviour.

Organ and Ryan (1995) argue that various organisational dispositional factors, such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, positive affectivity, and negative
affectivity, "predispose people to certain orientations vis-à-vis co-workers and managers. And those orientations might well increase the likelihood of receiving treatment that they would recognise as satisfying, supportive, fair, and worthy of commitment." Thus, these dispositional variables could be seen as indirect contributors to organisational citizenship behaviour, rather than direct causes. Role perceptions have also been found to have significant relationships with at least some of the organisational citizenship behaviour dimensions, although the size of these relationships is not very substantial. Both role ambiguity and role conflict are significantly negatively related to organisational citizenship behaviour (Wayne, Shore and Liden, 1997).

Task feedback and intrinsically satisfying tasks were positively related to organisational citizenship behaviour, and ultimately citizenship behaviour, while task routinisation was negatively related to organisational citizenship behaviour (Williams and Anderson, 1991).

In a nutshell, job attitudes, task variables, and various types of leader behaviours appear to be more strongly related to organisational citizenship behaviour than the other antecedents. Supportive behaviour on the part of the leader was strongly related to organisational citizenship behaviour and may even underlie the effects of perceived organisational support on organisational citizenship behaviour. Transformational leadership behaviour also had consistent effects on
every form of organisational citizenship behaviour. Perhaps this should not be surprising, since the heart of transformational leadership is the ability to get employees to perform above and beyond expectations (Bass, 1985), and this extra effort may show up in the form of organisational citizenship behaviour. Leader-member exchange behaviour also was strongly related to organisational citizenship behaviour. Thus, it appears that organisational citizenship behaviour plays a role in the reciprocal social exchange process as hypothesized by Wayne, Shore and Liden (1997).

When employees are not indifferent to the rewards made available by their organization or when they perceive that their leaders control those rewards, and/or when their leaders administer rewards contingent upon performance, organisational citizenship behaviour increases. This suggests at least two possibilities. First, it is possible that managers (either implicitly or explicitly) have a relatively broad conception of performance and view organisational citizenship behaviour as a part of it. Consequently, they administer rewards contingent upon performance, organisational citizenship behaviour as well as in-role aspects of performance.

Thus, when employees value organizational rewards, and believe that their leader administers them contingent upon good performance, they engage in citizenship behaviour as a means of obtaining rewards. This line of reasoning is
consistent with Ryan (1995) who found that employees often view organisational citizenship behaviour as an expected part of their job.

Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) have argued that dispositional variables are important antecedents of organisational citizenship behavior, although it is important to recognise that only a limited set of dispositions have been examined in the literature as pointed out by Organ and Ryan (1995).

It is important to note that the majority of the early research efforts focused on the antecedents of organisational citizenship behavior. More recent research however, has devoted an increasing amount of attention to the consequences of organisational citizenship behavior.

Despite the intuitive plausibility of the assumption that organisational citizenship behavior contributes to the effectiveness of work teams and organisations, this issue has received little empirical attention. In fact the first study to explore whether organisational citizenship behavior is related to group or organizational effectiveness was by Mackenzie et al (1999). They found that employees in high performing work units exhibited more organisational citizenship behavior than employees in low performing work units.
To date, only a few studies by Allen and Rush (1998), Park and Sims (1989) have investigated the effects of organisational citizenship behaviour and contextual performance on these types of managerial decisions. Moreover, when investigating the effects of organisational citizenship behaviour and contextual performance on these managerial judgments, prior research suggests that it is important to examine not only the main effects, but also the interactive effects of in-role and extra-role behaviour.

Studies have examined the interactive effects of in-role and extra-role behaviour, the impact of extra-role behaviour on managerial judgments which changes depending upon the level of in-role behaviour. Unfortunately, the specific nature of this interaction was not reported in most of these studies, and in the one study in which it was reported (Park and Sims, 1989), the interaction effect varied across criterion variables.

There is need to move beyond managerial decisions and judgments, and examine an even broader range of subordinate criterion variables. For example, recent research by Chen et al. (1998) and Mackenzie et al. (1998) has shown that organisational citizenship behaviour is negatively related to turnover. Although we are not aware of any similar research on the relationship between organisational citizenship behaviour and other forms of withdrawal behaviour,
like employee absenteeism, lateness, and tardiness, we would expect a similar pattern of effects.

Research on the theory of organisational citizenship behaviour has dramatically increased over the past decade. However, this rapid growth in research has resulted in the development of several problems, including the need to better understand the conceptual similarities and differences between various forms of organisational citizenship behaviour, as well as their antecedents and consequences. In this research, we have tried to address these issues, as well as identify useful avenues for future research.

Finally, in view of the overlapping conceptual definitions of the different forms of organisational citizenship behaviour, it is essential for future research to test rigorously for the discriminate validity of the construct and its measures. Future research needs to provide evidence not only of whether the measures of each form of citizenship behaviour/contextual performance are reliable and valid, but also whether they are distinct from measures of closely related constructs. This probably is done best through confirmatory factor analysis and the test of discriminate validity (Fornell and Larker, 1981).

Overall, this is an exciting and dynamic field of research, and the researcher is hopeful that her findings will help to speed up progress in this area by
highlighting several key issues that need attention such as the impact of organisational climate on organisations in these IT companies.

2.9 Job/Supervisory-Related Climate and Trust:
There is general realization on the part of most scholars that an employee, whose work conditions do not support task achievement, will also derail employee trust (Falkenberg, 2001). The pursuit of desirable outcomes calls for working together for mutual benefit. Poor facilitation or supervisory competence details social cohesion and must ultimately effectiveness of workers (Chang. 2005).

2.9 Job/Supervisory-Related and Commitment.
It is established that the job/supervisory-related climate of individual employees of an organizational goals (Falkernberg, 2001). Therefore, it becomes essential that management on a continual basis should monitor employees’ attitudes towards their jobs. A conducive job role requirement for accomplishment of organizational goals. Salient organizational behaviors such as commitment to organizational tasks and citizenship are seen as intervening between the climate of the organization and the ultimate outcomes (Gardner, 2004).

2.10 Supervisory-related Climate and Ocbs
Savey (1982), cited by Maicibi (2003), observed that the immediate managers supervisory behaviour is a major influence on supervisee organisational
citizenship behaviour because the former is present and around all the time. Organisational citizenship behaviour is also influenced by the extent to which individuals feel their managers are open about decisions which affect them. Poor supervisory competence derails social cohesion and ultimately, effectiveness of workers. When discussing the role of supervisory climate and its links to the provision of high quality service, it is first necessary to understand the operational environment of the service industry. The provision of high quality supervision has become essential to survival, and many service organisations are attempting to implement various quality supervision management schemes that enhance organisational citizenship behaviour (Hicksclarke, 2000).

If a good supervisory climate exists, it simply provides the best possible conditions for organisational citizenship behavior and thus quality service will take place. Of course it is management’s responsibility to ensure that the supplies, equipment and resources needed are there to support the service operations (William and Hazer, 1986). Indeed, from the researcher’s own practical experience, most of the above scholar’s assertions are true but they forget to emphasise that empowerment of employees, that is, giving them the latitude to make and own decisions should continuously be built as a value in the supervisory-subordinate relationship.
2.11 Job-related Climate and Organisational citizenship behavior

Job related climate perceptions, include perceptions such as role conflict and role ambiguity. Role conflict and ambiguity have been found to be negatively related to organisational citizenship behavior (Podasakof, Scott, Mackenzie, Julie and Daniel, 2000). Falkenberg (2001) argues that one of the most significant strengths of an effective leader is his or her ability to create a positive work climate with quality supervision backed up by clear roles. Role conflict occurs when an individual engages in inconsistent behavior as a result of receiving contradictory demands resulting from lack of unity of command (Podasakof, Scott, Mackenzie, Julie and Daniel, 2000). The foregoing scholars further posit that conflict can also occur when an individual engages in inconsistent behavior resulting from contradictory demands between a firm’s customers and its management.

Falkenberg (2001) further demonstrated that as role conflict increases, role clarity and job tension increase and organisational citizenship behavior decreases. In attempts to cope with this conflict, individuals may engage in a variety of psychological reactions such as withdrawal and avoiding contact or communications with those causing the conflict. Job performance has also been shown to suffer from role conflict. Role clarity has been defined as the degree to which individuals receive and understand information needed for them to perform their jobs. Clear job roles minimize conflicts among employees.
Kimes (2001) found out that a climate that offers clear roles is an important factor in the provision of quality services as defined by the customer. Within the wider quality movement, there is evidence to show that without role conflict and ambiguity in the environment, there is good support for the objectives of management.

The researcher agrees with the foregoing quoted scholars that the extent to which a supervisor is perceived as facilitating interpersonal relationships and providing personal support is a key ingredient in the quality of supervision. However, the researcher also believes that supervisors should also mentor their subordinates to effectively take on their roles in case they are not in position to do so.

2.13 Trust and Commitment
Many management consultants agree that to attract and retain committed professional employees their needs to be trust by employees to engage each other intellectually in organizational activities (Willense, 2002). In addition strong interpersonal relations at the workplace create highly committed employees and consequently organizational productivity is boosted (Bennet, 2004). Thus is a quality that helps to restrict opportunism cheating or fraud in business.
2.14 Organizational Commitment and OCBs

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are a special type of work behavior that are defined as individual behaviors that are beneficial to the organization and are discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system. These behaviors are rather a matter of personal choice, such that their omission are not generally understood as punishable. OCBs are thought to have an important impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of work teams and organizations, therefore contributing to the overall productivity of the organization.

Basically increased commitment (i.e. where employees adopt the company's goals as their own and, therefore, desire to remain with the organization to help it achieve its goals was found to reduce absence behavior, and/or turnover as well as increase job performance (Carmeli and Freund, 2001). Committed employees are likely to persist in accomplishing set tasks and achieving set goals, and accept change and additional role responsibilities (Kim and Mauborgne, 2003).

2.15 Trust and OCBs.

Strong interpersonal relationships within an organization ultimately facilitate it success (Shah, 2000). Kaye (2006) argue that firms trust comprise a critical source of sustainable organizational advantage. Based on their work, citizen ship behavior enhances firm functioning by contributing to the development of trust
in organizations. Thus the execution of organization activities may be more efficient when employees working within a company trust each other (Coyle Shapiro, 2004).
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents methodological aspects that were used in executing the study on Job and Supervisory related climate, Trust, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in selected IT companies. It describes the research design, target population, sample size and selection, measurement of variables, reliability and validity of the research instrument, data collection processing and analysis.

3.2 Research Design

This was a cross sectional survey design that takes a snapshot of events as they exist now. It was quantitative, with a correlation bias because it was suspected that interrelationships exist between organizational climate (job and supervisory), Trust, commitment, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). It focused on quantitative issues only.

3.3 Target Population and Sample Size

The study was carried out in all departments of ICT companies whose employee population is 200; as based on employee registers of 2006.
The sample was stratified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Optimal Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior level</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. II: Target population and corresponding optimal sample size based on Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination model of 1970. Sekaran (2005: 2007).

3.4 Sampling Design and Procedure

The researcher used a stratified sampling method because there are three identifiable sub groups of elements within the population. The stratum was developed from available IT companies employee register 2006. Following the above stratification, the researcher applied a simple random method to select the respondents in each sub-group. The simple random method has the least bias and offers the most generalisability (Sekaran, 2000).

Therefore, the researcher derived the final sample of 180 using a combination of stratified and simple random sampling methods. For, example, to select the actual top management, 20 pieces of paper for Top management are selected are put in a box. This is then shaken and 19 pieces are picked out randomly. The 19 selected respondents are then given questionnaires to respond to. The same is procedure is done for the middle management and junior level management.
3.5 Measurement of Variables
A standard questionnaire using a likert scale with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to get quantifiable primary data from individual respondents. This particular type of attitude scale, has been chosen among others because its flexible and can be constructed more easily than the other types of attitude scales (Amin, 2005). In addition, a four likert point scale will be adopted to reduce non-response as is common in a five-point likert scale which has an option of of “not sure”. The questionnaire is attached as appendix II.

- Job-related and supervisory related climate was measured using Munene’s 2000 local measure.
- Trust, was measured using Bullen and Onyx measure of (1989) measure, and
- Commitment was measured using Allen and Meyers measure of 1989).

These will be the primary sources of data. The secondary sources comprised of journals on all variables to determine what has been done before.

- Organizational citizenship was measured using Kagga’s 2000 measure of 22 items developed from Organ’s 1988 measure of OCBs

3.6 Data Collection Instrument
The quantitative measure on the variables was administered by a structured questionnaire. The structured questionnaire was adopted because it elicits specific responses that are easy to analyze. It’s also economical in terms of time,
because it is easy to fill in, which takes little of the respondent’s time and that of the researcher in administering and analyzing them.

Interviews was used to get qualitative data. The interviews helped to elicit free response and get personal opinions of the key informants about the institutional weaknesses in the variables under study.

3.7 Reliability and Validity of the instrument

For quality control, a pre-test of the research instrument to test its validity and reliability was done. Finally the questionnaire was checked for accuracy and completeness basing on an alpha cronbach test of more than 0.7. This coefficient, tests whether all questions testing perceptions about a particular variable, hang together as set. In other words it tests for internal consistency. That is do they all tease out the institutional weaknesses in that specific variable? If the reliability was below 0.7 then we looked out for questions that were ambiguous or where non-response was high and improved or deleted them. It was done by giving questionnaires to a section of the target respondents, i.e. 20%. The responses were coded and analyzed and reliability tests run. We then improved our instrument then carried out full blown data collection. The following are the reliability tests.
### Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Alpha-Cronbach Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job-related climate</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory-related climate</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.8 Data Collection Procedure**

Heads of departments in selected IT companies assisted in randomly selecting potential respondents. Interviews were conducted in places convenient to individual respondents to avoid interruption from other people. The instrument was edited to make sure they are well completed. All data was then coded.

**3.9 Data Processing and Analysis**

At the end of each working day, data collection was coded and reviewed by the researcher so as to have the required quality, accuracy, consistency and completeness. A quantitative analysis was adopted for data analysis because the information collected contains quantitative data. A computer statistical package SPSS (Statistical package for social scientists) was used to describe the sample. For inferential statistics, pearson’s rank correlation was applied to establish relationships. Regression was also carried out to establish which of the predicator variables has the highest influence on the dependent variable (OCBs). T. tests and ANOVA-test was also carried out to establish the different perception of the various breakdown demographic variables on the various constructs.
3.10 Problems to be encountered by the researcher.

Workers were suspicious and not willing to answer questionnaires. Workers were reluctant to fill questionnaires feeling that it was time consuming. However, these challenges were overcome by the researcher involving herself in the research directly.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the results of a crossectional survey design (snapshot of events as they existed at that particular point in time) as pointed out in the methodology. It comprises the responses to the closed-ended items and the open bio data questions in the questionnaire. The findings from the open questions highlight the respondents’ profile while the findings from the closed items represent the study variables. Therefore, the chapter has three sections. The first includes descriptive data of the sample such as cross-tabulations which strictly helps you to know the nature of the sample. These statistical outputs do not in any way answer the research objectives, though an attempt is done to link them with the variables under study.

Since in the research design a quantitative method was adopted with a qualitative bias, the third section provides inferential statistics relationships including Pearson’s rank correlation used to establish the relationships between the variables in the conceptual model as illustrated in chapter one. These statistical tests are also known as inferential statistics. They were guided by the following research objectives as shown in chapter one (1.3).

4.1 Objectives of the Study:
1) To establish the relationship between supervisory and job related climate and trust.
2) To determine the relationship between supervisory and job related climate and commitment.

3) To determine the relationship between Trust and commitment.

4) To determine the relationship between supervisory and job related climate, Job-related climate, Trust, commitment and Organizational Citizenship behaviour.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

4.3 Cross Tabulations

**Explanation of the Chi-square Test ($X^2$):** The $X^2$ test of significance helps us to see whether or not two nominal variables are related. It can also be used for multiple levels of two nominal variables as in table 2 below. The basis of interpretation is the level of significance of 0.05 (Sig), also known as the probability value. If it is equal to or less than 0.05, then there is a significant relationship between the two nominal variables. Focus is on where the majority of respondents in relation to the break down nominal variables lie. In table 2, the break down nominal variable is sex. The table shows that the majority of have worked 6-10 years. Since there is no difference on where the majority lie in terms of sex, this indicates that sex does not vary with the length of time. Whenever that difference seems not to emerge the corresponding Sig or P-value has to be more than 0.05. The $X^2$ value is also given but it has no threshold. However, the smaller the $X^2$ value, the weaker the relationship.
Table 1: Sex by Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>More than five</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X²-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

There is no significant difference in sex in relation to the number of children. \((X^2 = .29, \text{ Sig .86})\). The majority of males and females have children. This point to a fact there are low levels of domestic responsibility among most of the respondents.

Table 2: Sex by length of time of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11 and above years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X²-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

There is no significant difference in sex in relation to the length of time as employee \((X^2 = .02, \text{ Sig .99})\). The majority of males and females have been employees for 6-10 years. This point to a fact there possibly high level of
employee stability in their jobs. But its also necessary to point out that if the majority are fresh from school then are likely to be comfortable with their jobs since they have less external demands.

Table 3: Sex by satisfied with the Reward system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$X^2$-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Row%</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

There is no significant difference in sex in relation to the reward system ($X^2=2.31$, Sig .13). The majority of males and females are not satisfied with the reward system.

4.4 Results of the Research Questions

4.4.1 Inferential Statistics

These refer to findings related to the research objectives under study. For all statistical tests the corresponding level of significance (Sig. or P-value) of 0.05 or 0.01 (depending on the predetermined level of significance) is used in business research, especially for Pearson’s correlation coefficient. The basis of interpretation has to be 0.05/0.01, which is the generally accepted conventional
level in business research. If the Sig. or P-value is 0.05 this indicates that 95 times out of 100, we can be sure that there is a relationship between the two variables and there is only a 5 percent chance that the relationship does not truly exist. As it tends towards 0.00 the relationship becomes stronger, while any P-value above 0.05 means the relationship between the two variables is weak. Similarly, if Sig. or P-value is equal to 0.01 then there is only a 1 percent chance that the relationship does not truly exist and in 99 percent of the time we would expect it to exist. As it tends towards 0.00 the relationship becomes stronger, and it becomes weaker beyond 0.01.

4.4.2 Pearson Correlation Test

This test is used to establish significance of the relationships using Pearson’s rank-coefficients and a level of significance of 0.01 as the basis for interpretation. It was specifically used to find out the relationships between the variables under study. Only strongly significant relationships were considered. The results are interpreted under the sub-sections that follow table 4 below, which indicates the bi-variate relationships existing between the study variables.
Table 4: Correlations (Zero-Order Matrix): N=125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job-related climate</th>
<th>Supervisory-related climate</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Organizational commitment</th>
<th>Ocbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job-related climate</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory-related climate</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocbs</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level.

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level.

1) To determine the relationship between (Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate), and Trust.

Supervisory-related climate (r= 0.62**, p<0.01) showed a strong positive correlation with Trust. This indicates that if the perceptions about Supervisory-related climate among employees are increased, then Trust is strengthened.

2) To assess the relationship between (Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate) and Organizational commitment.

Job-related climate (r= 0.34**, p<0.01) and Supervisory-related climate (r= 0.56**, p<0.01) showed a strong positive correlation with Organizational commitment. This indicates that if the perceptions about Job-related climate and
Supervisory-related climate among employees are boosted then Organizational commitment is strengthened.

3) To investigate the relationship between Trust and Organizational commitment.

There was a positive significant correlation between trust and Organizational commitment ($r=0.47^{**}$, $P$-value$<0.01$). If Trust exists among employees then Organizational commitment will be increased and vice versa.

4) To determine the relationship and effects between (Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate), Trust, Organizational commitment and OCBs.

There was a strong significant positive correlation between all independent variables and OCBs. Job-related climate ($r=0.40^{**}$, $P$-value$<0.01$), Supervisory-related climate ($r=0.57^{**}$, $p<0.01$), Organizational commitment ($r=0.51^{**}$ $P$-value$<0.01$) and Trust ($r=0.39^{**}$, $P$-value$<0.01$).

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis:

Regression analysis is a statistical tool for the investigation of relationships between variables. Regression tools have long been central to the field of statistics. In this research, regression analysis was used to establish the strength of independent variables and the dependent variable which is OCBs. It is specifically used to establish combined effect of the independent variables on the
dependent variable. This is revealed by the adjusted R-square (Sekaran, 2004).

The findings are given in table below:

**Table 5. Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>R-square</th>
<th>Adjusted square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable. OCBs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related climate</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory-related climate</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data*

The Adjusted R-square results indicate that the Job-related climate, Supervisory-related climate, Trust, Organizational commitment predict 38% of the variance on Ocb. However, the greatest predictor of the variation in relation to the magnitude of the Beta co-efficient is Supervisory-related climate (Beta =0.34, t=3.17). (The F-static= 19.87, Sig 0.00) also shows that those variables are significant predictors of Ocb in the selected sample of 125.
4.3 Other Findings:
Further analysis was carried out to establish the difference in perception of the various breakdown nominal variables on the independent and dependent variables. The basis of interpretation is the pre-determined levels of significance or probability-values, which are equal to or below 0.05. The corresponding magnitude of the F-ratios and the mean scores is then used to assess which particular group has evaluated the institutional weaknesses in the construct more positively or negatively. An ANOVA test is most suitable for more that two groups.

Table 6: Age-group by variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age-group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job-related climate</td>
<td>26-25yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 and above yrs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory-related climate</td>
<td>26-25yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 and above yrs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>26-25yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 and above yrs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>26-25yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30yrs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 and above yrs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocbs</td>
<td>26-25yrs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Primary Data

In table 6, respondents of different age-group differ significantly on their perceptions about Trust (F=6.28, P-value<0.00) since the P-value was less than the 0.05 level of significance. It should be noted that those who were 20-25 years had the lowest mean scores. These are recently recruited, are at entry level and excited about their jobs. So they are likely not to be critical about trust since they are not yet so familiar with the organization. For the other variables, they have similar perceptions in their perception about variables, because their P-values are all more than 0.05 predetermined level of significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age-group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job-related climate</td>
<td>1-5years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 and above years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory-related climate</td>
<td>1-5years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 and above years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1-5years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 and above years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>1-5years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10years</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table 8, respondents of different length of service differed significantly on their perceptions about Trust ($F=7.61$, P-value<0.00) since the P-values were less than the 0.05 level of significance. It should be noted that those who were 1-5 years had the lowest mean scores. Similarly, these are recently recruited, are at entry level and excited about their jobs. So they are likely not to be critical about trust since they are not yet so familiar with the organization. For the other variables, they have similar perceptions in their perception about variables, because their P-values are all more than 0.05 predetermined level of significance.

**Table 8:** Professional studies by variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age-group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job-related climate</strong></td>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisory-related climate</strong></td>
<td>Technical staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data*
In table 8, respondents of different age-group did not differ significantly on their perceptions about all variables since the P-values are more than the 0.05 level of significance. This implies that they have similar perceptions about variables, because their P-values are all more than the 0.05 predetermined level of significance.

Source: Primary Data
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION
This chapter discusses the findings in chapter four in relation to the research objectives of the study and review of the related literature. It is sub divided into three sections. The first section presents the cross-tabulations; the second section discusses the Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate, Trust and Organizational commitment and OCBs among IT companies in the capital city Kampala. The third section presents the conclusion and recommendations. An area for further study is also suggested.

5.2 DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS.

5.2.1 To determine the relationship between Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate and Trust.

Result: The results indicate that Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate showed a strong positive correlation with Trust. This indicates that if the perceptions about Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate among employees are supportive, then Trust is strengthened.
Case: For example among most IT companies employees are complaining about assessment of training needs. Supervisors hardly consult them on courses they need to cope with the ever changing needs of the IT industry. This weakens trust in carrier development initiatives by companies. (Communications commission quarterly report to MDs 2003).

Lastly, the job related climate has some shortcomings. For example, appointment letters and other employment contracts are most of the time not given to newly recruited staff. With the old staff, employment terms are rarely formalized (Communications commission quarterly report to MDs 2005). Such a situation negatively affects employee trust in the company, which brings about high levels of employee exit.

This is in agreement with (Paul & Richard 2004; Achim et al. 2004) who assert that supervisory and Job-related climate impacts on Trust and retaining of employees. Employees can work better and get more done in an environment where they feel trusted, involved and respected.

5.2.2 To assess the relationship between Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate and Organizational commitment.

Result: The findings indicate that the Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate showed a strong positive correlation with Organizational commitment. This indicates that if the perceptions about Job-related climate
and Supervisory-related climate among employees are boosted then organizational commitment is strengthened.

**Case:** Among most IT companies, outline of responsibilities hardly exists, even among head of departments, which brings about conflict of roles. For example, when a customer needs information, operations and marketing manager usually send different price lists or quotation for goods to be sold which reduces employee commitment (Memos. Staff contracts 2004).

These findings are in line with Falkenberg (2001) who has found that role conflict and role ambiguity are negatively related to employee commitment. There is general realization on the part of most scholars that when employees’ work conditions and roles are harmonized, staff will be committed to organizational tasks.

**5.2.3 To investigate the relationship between Trust and Organizational commitment.**

**Result:** There was a positive significant correlation between Trust and Organizational commitment. If Trust exists among employees then Organizational commitment will be increased and vice versa.
Case: Among most IT companies, due to low levels of trust, commitment to prepare work plans on time is rarely done. Most staff rarely give input, during preparation of business proposals that are sent to both private and government institutions, seeking contracts like servicing of computers and installing new software (Minutes of meeting July 2004).

It has been argued by Hicks-Clarke, (2000), that a work environment that builds trusting relationships and meets employee expectations is able to enhance intrinsically motivated, self-directed commitment. One practical implication is that upholding trust is an important, but not sufficient condition for fostering subordinates' motivation to be committed to their Jobs.

5.2.4 To determine the relationship and effects between (Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate), Trust, Organizational commitment and OCBs.

Result: There was a strong significant positive correlation between all independent variables and Ocb's. Job-related climate, Supervisory-related climate, organizational commitment and Trust. The study also delivered interesting results concerning The Adjusted R square results indicates that Job-related climate, Supervisory-related climate, Organizational commitment and Trust predict 38% of the variance on Ocb's. However, the greatest predictor of
the variation in relation to the magnitude of the Beta co-efficient is Supervisory-related climate in the selected sample of 125.

**Case:** In most of these IT companies weaknesses in supervisory related climate creates absenteeism, and habitual late coming to office. Staff, who manage to report on time, disappear from office for long hours during the day. Most employees supplement their pay with money illegally acquired from inside dealings with employees. Failure to honor appointments with customers without notice or apologizing is common. (Minutes of meetings July 2006).

These results are in agreement with Savey (1982), as cited by Maicibi (2003), when he observed that the immediate managers’ supervisory behavior impacts on supervisee demonstration of discretionary effort. Extra role behavior is also affected by the extent to which individuals feel they are participating in decisions that affect them in tandem with their supervisors. Similarly, poor supervisory competence derails social cohesion and ultimately effectiveness of workers (William et al, 1986).
5.3 Conclusions and recommendations.

5.3.1 -To determine the relationship between and Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate and Trust.

It can be concluded that Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate influence Trust. The findings of this research indicate that organisational climate (Supervisory and job related climate) is an important antecedent of trust in supervisor and that the combined effect of trust and ethical climate positively affects job satisfaction, leading to trust and organizational commitment and lowers turnover intentions. Specifically, this study has shown that trust in supervisor mediates the effect of organisational climate on turnover intention.

However, it should be noted, that improvements in organizational climate take time to accomplish. They require effective leadership, unity of purpose, commitment of resources, training and a strong underpinning of research. All of these should be carefully planned and implemented, in a way that is relevant to the organization as a whole.

From the researchers practical point of view, the issue of communication in any given Job-related climate needs to be explored in future studies. The organization should share with its members the good news as well as the bad news so as to gain their trust and commitment. Employees can work better and
get more done in an environment where they feel informed, involved and respected.

5.3.2 To assess the relationship between Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate and Organizational commitment.

A conclusion can be drawn that Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate impact on Organizational commitment. It is not only organisational factors that affect his/her commitment, but also non-organisational factors. Thus, managers’ roles should extend far enough to manage off-the-job life of employees. They need to be aware about the employee roles outside the organization so that they may help in balancing them with organisational tasks. This may lead to high commitment which will positively affect employees’ work outcomes.

5.3.3 To investigate the relationship between Trust and Organizational commitment.

The results provide conclusive evidence that Trust has a causal effect on Organizational commitment.

The firms should engage in more open sharing of ideas and learning from one another through informal forums to enhance trust. This will allow for a shared understanding of issues pertaining to company, and as such increase their productivity. Such a culture builds trusting relationships and establishment of employee commitment.
5.3.4 To determine the relationship and effects between (Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate), Trust, Organizational commitment and Ocb's.

From the results it can be concluded that the greatest predictor of the variation in relation to the magnitude of the Beta co-efficient is Supervisory-related climate.

In conclusion, when supervisors adequately guide their subordinates, a right environment is created, this leads to trust and with trust, commitment follows, the feeling of belonging to the organisation and consequently adequate OCB’s where there are no barriers to performance, their true value to the organization can be fully realized (Hicksclarke, 2000).

If a good supervisory climate exists, it simply provides the best possible conditions for discretionary effort and thus quality service will take place. Of course, it is management’s responsibility to ensure that the supplies, equipment and resources needed are there to support the service operations (William and Hazer, 1986).

5.4 Area for Further Studies.

To date, there are many of the studies investigating the link between investigating Job-related climate and Supervisory-related climate exists amongst employees, Trust and Organizational commitment among employees on Ocb’s in
developing countries. However very little is known about the possible impact of macro moderators such as national values or socio-economic conditions.

Future studies which use respondents from more than one country or sectors could be vital in gaining further insights.
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APPENDIX

**QUESTIONNAIRE** *(TO BE FILLED BY EMPLOYEES)*

Introduction
This survey is being undertaken to study and analyse the relationship between Supervisory and Job related climate and trust, commitment and organizational citizenship behaviours. Kindly spare your valuable time and respond to the following questions about your employment relationship. The findings of this research will be used to enhance your working conditions. Your answers will not be disclosed to any one and thus there is no need to write your name on the questionnaire.

**SECTION A**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

*(Tick the correct box)*

1. Sex
   - Male
   - Female

2. Age-group.
   - 20-25 years
   - 26-30 years
   - 31-35 years
   - 36-40 years
   - 41 and above years

3. Professional Training
   - Information technology
   - Accountancy
   - Social Sciences
   - Marketing
   - Others

4. Number of years you have worked in this organization.
   - 1-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11 and above years

5. Marital status.
   - Single
   - Married
   - Widow
   - Others

**EXTRANEOUS VARIABLES**

6. Number of children.
None 2-5 More than 5

7. I’m satisfied with the reward system in this organization.
   Yes No

8. Management Level
   Top management Middle management Junior management and below

SECTION B

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

JOB RELATED CLIMATE

Please state the extent to which you agree/disagree with the statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is clear what an officers or assistants work is.
   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

2. Our job descriptions include any other duty but don’t supervisors take advantage of that.
   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

3. We do less work than our supervisors and yet we are paid less.
   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

4. Sometimes information on what one must do is provided on time.
   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

5. Conflicts on our perceptions about our roles does not arise between staff that have deadlines and targets to meet.
   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
**SUPERVISORY RELATED CLIMATE**

1. Supervisors of low-grades do appreciate the work done by supervisees.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Sometimes supervisors take short to respond to workers requests.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. There is clear and direct reporting, one cannot be tossed between different offices.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. At times support from supervisors is good enough.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Our supervisors behave as democrats.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Some supervisors have good communication skills.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. We receive very little assignments from different people.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Some supervisors do give feedback.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Light workload delegated by supervisors makes it very easy for supervisees to achieve their goals.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Top management usually visits departmental offices.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Decision making is not reserved for the supervisor, as a result, work is quickly done.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Supervisors do go into the field to provide hands on supervision. They don’t stay at
offices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Supervision is fair as workers are treated in a manner which is adult to adult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TRUST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Your organization has a bright future and does not need attract better management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. I can expect my employer to treat me in a consistent and predictable manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Managers at work seem to do an efficient job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. I feel quite confident that the organization will try to treat me fairly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Our management would not be quite prepared to gain advantage by deceiving workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. I am sure that I truly trust my employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. My employers is open and up front with me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Management would not be ready to punish/or fire you if you tried to question the system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Management here is not a top-down affair, status is not very important and decisions
are not checked out through the entire chain of command

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I feel my energy is not wasted trying to work for this Organisation/company and if I had a chance to work else where where even with higher pay I would not do it

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I trust both my fellow employees and my employer

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Management does not use confidential information to take advantage of employees

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. We rarely use independent sources to verify most of management assertions

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT.**
Evaluate the following statements using these alternatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel like “part of the family” in my organisation.
2. I do feel “emotionally” attached to this organisation.
3. I really feel as if this organisation’s problems are my own.
4. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with this organisation.
5. I am proud of my organisation.
6. This organisation has a great deal of meaning for me.
7. I do feel a strong sense of belonging to my organisation.
8. Even if this organisation went down financially, I will still be reluctant to change to another organisation.
9. It would be too costly for me to leave this organisation now.
10. If I were offered a job in another organisation with a slight increase in pay, I would not change my job.
11. Too much in my life would be disrupted if, I decided to leave this organisation.
12. I feel that there are too few options to consider leaving this organisation.
13. It would be very hard for me to leave this organisation even if I wanted to.
14. Jumping from organisation to another does not seem at all ethical to me.
15. I believe in remaining royal to one organisation.
16. If, I got a better offer elsewhere, I would not feel it right to leave my organisation.
**ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR.**  
*(To be completed by Supervisor)*

**Please rate the worker by ticking the most descriptive rating as given in the alternatives below:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conscientiousness:**

1. Seeks and accepts responsibilities at all times

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

2. Performs competently under pressure

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

3. Gets a great deal done within a set time frame

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

4. Readily accepts more work

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

5. Could be expected to be in a position to start at the appointed time

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

6. Could be relied on to come on time every morning

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

7. Could be expected to maintain the work he/she is required to do

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

8. Could be expected to attend work regularly and be punctual

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

9. Does not take days off without previously asking for them

| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
10. Never deliberately works under below his/her best even without supervision

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

11. Anticipates problems and develops solutions in advance

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

12. Assists superior with his work

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

13. Makes innovative suggestions to improve the department/organization

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

14. Does only what is required of him/her and never volunteers for extra work

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

15. Helps other who have a heavy workload

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

16. He/she attends functions that are not required of him/her but are of help to the organization

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

17. The employee keeps with any new developments in the organization

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

18. The employee may stay at work for longer hours that the workday even without compensation

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

19. The employee is proud to tell others that he/she is part of the organization

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

20. The employee talks favorably about the organization to other people

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

21. When need arises the employee will help work mates to complete tasks without having to be told by management

|   | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

THANKS FOR YOUR COOPERATION