

Factors Influencing Organizational Climate among Active Facebook Users

Jandryle U. Trondillo

Author(s) Biography

Jandryle U. Trondillo is a Ph.D. Schola at University of Southeastern Philippines Obrero, Davao City, Philippines & Adjunct Faculty at University of the Immaculate Conception Fr. Selga St. Davao City, Philippines 8000

ABSTRACT: *This study was conducted to develop a construct to assess organizational climate and explore the characteristics of the respondents' profile in relation to organizational climate. Data was gathered utilizing a structured online survey form from selected 162 online Facebook users. Exploratory factor analysis was done to develop construct for perceived organizational climate and ordinal logistic regression was carried out to explore the profile's characteristics in relation to the response in the scale used. From the original 40-item questionnaire, 16 items were extracted utilizing orthogonal rotation with five new factors that served as new construct for simulation of organizational climate ($KMO = .903$, Bartlett's test of Sphericity = 4045.991, $p = 0.000, < 0.01$). Empirical model was statistically significant at 95% ($p = 0.035, < 0.05$), chi-square of 17.998 which can explain 5.4% to 10.5% of the variation in respondents' perceptions. Organizational climate vary in between age groups and number of hour spent in social media. The odds of perceiving organizational climate is higher in 20 years old and below among the different age group and respondents with average of 12 to 16 hours of social media use among the five groups.*

Keywords: Factor analysis, ordinal regression, organizational climate, social network, social media

The study or organizational climate can be traced back to 1970's wherein people tried to understand what are the factors involving productivity at work, job satisfaction and even customer satisfaction. It was found out that organizational climate can be one of the important factors why workers intend to stay in an organization, deliver efficient service as expected and most importantly, clients are satisfied.

Several published articles and researches link organizational climate to job satisfaction (Churchill, Ford and Walker Jr., 1976; Johnson and McIntye, 1998; Lawler III, Hall, and Oldham, 1974; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Payne, Fineman, and Wall, 1976; Schneider and Snyder, 1975). Studies suggest that to be able to achieve organizational VMG, organizations should insure that employees are satisfied with their roles in the organization. This means that organizations should create an organizational environment conducive for workers.

On the other hand, several studies also link organizational climate to work productivity. For organizations to sustain, top management should insure that tasks are appropriately carried out, delegated accordingly and effectively monitored. Several studies cited the important role of organizational climate to productivity (Johannsen, Johnson and Stinson, 1976; Neal, West and Patterson, 2005; Patterson, Warr and West, 2004). Consequently, organizational climate is also linked to customer satisfaction (Davidson et al, 2001; Mathis et al, 2009; Rogg et al, 2001). This suggest that enable to effectively satisfy customers or products or services in an organization, a good organizational climate is prerequisite.

Many more studies wanted to develop several theories that would best describe phenomenon in an organization specially in achieving their respective VMGs. However, few studies were published regarding developing a construct to measure organizational climate. In today's modern world, social media use is evident even during working hours. A number of organizations doesn't have a clear guideline on social media use during working hours. The researcher believe that organizational climate is almost similar in almost all setting. That is why, this study was conducted to develop a certain construct that would help future researchers to assess organizational climate and at the same time develop a probabilistic model that would estimate the likelihood of having a positive outlook towards organizational climate with regards to age and number of hours spent in social media use in a day.

METHOD

Sample

The data in this study was drawn from online active Facebook friends of the researcher who consented to participate in the study. A total of 162 active Facebook

users consented to participate in this study which distribution in terms of profile and percentage is discussed in table 2 in results section. The data was gathered utilizing a researcher structured research instrument consisting two parts. Sample validity utilizing factor analysis vary in several literature. Gorsuch (1983) and Kline (1979, p. 40) recommended at least 100 (MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang & Hong, 1999). No sample should be less than 100 even though the number of variables is less than 20 (Gorsuch, 1974, p. 333; Arrindell & van der Ende, 1985, p. 166). Hatcher (1994) recommended that the number of subjects should be the larger of 5 times the number of variables, or 100. Even more subjects are needed when communalities are low and/or few variables load on each factor (in David Garson, 2008). On the other hand, Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999) recommends at least 150 - 300 cases, more toward the 150 end when there are a few highly correlated variables, as would be the case when collapsing highly multicollinear variables (Garson, 2008). In the context of this research undertaking, sample used is assumed valid based on the above mentioned literatures.

Instrument

The first part is composed of sets of questions that respondents need to fill out in relation to their demographic profile like age, gender, present employment status, and hours in a day of social media use. The researcher believed that these parameters for the respondent's profile are essential in establishing analysis in relation to organizational climate.

The second part of the questionnaire is an adopted and modified set of questions from the study of Smith (2009). The researcher modified and excluded some questions to come up with 40 item Likert-scale questionnaire that tackles all four determinant variables for organizational climate as supported by different theories to create a construct.

Organizational environment is a multi-dimensional concept. "Organizational Environment refers to a contextual situation at a point in time and its link to the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of organizational members."(Bock et al., 2005, 89) Environment exist for various desirable behaviors and may be considered as the manifestation of higher organization cultural values – including of course management theories.

"These environments represent employees' perceptions of organizational co-worker relationship, communication pattern, job satisfaction, and top management trust including subsequent patterns of interactions and behaviors that support creativity, innovation, safety, or service in the organization."(Patterson et al., 2005, 381). The concepts are frequently described as "structural assurances."

The selection of different scales to come up with the questionnaire about organizational environment was carefully examined and assessed by the previous researcher. Several recent and well-validated measures are available. The selection involved careful choices. Ones used should be those accounting for the most variance while being consistent with the theoretical perspective. The list below shows the range of potentially applicable published scales considered and does not reflect an attempt to use many of them.

One choice was the set of Patterson, M. G. et al. (2005) which centers on the relationship of an individual to their co-worker. Their complex list consists of autonomy, integration, involvement, supervisory support, training, welfare, formalization, tradition, innovation & flexibility, outward focus, reflexivity, clarity of organizational goals, efficiency, effort, performance feedback, pressure to produce and quality. While the scales have support in the literature, the focus appeared to be too broad.

Another choice was Bock et al., (2005), from which the communication within the organization was taken. Other variables in that research but not used include fairness, affiliation, innovativeness, attitude toward knowledge sharing, anticipated reciprocal relationships, subjective norm – on sharing and sense of self-worth. Those are all reasonable choices but they came from a different theoretical approach. Janz & Prasarnphanich (2003) have another good model perhaps somewhat specialized to software development. Climate variables in that research include reward, warmth, support, risk (tolerance) and autonomy.

Since work satisfaction was also examined as a predictor of productivity within the organization contributing to the organizational environment, the variable was added as well since it was an important justification for examining the overall aspect of an organizational environment that could be affected with the social media practices of companies. Items were taken from Janz & Prasarnphanich (2003).

The last and most appropriate choice for this paper was Collins & Smith (2006) because of its direct theoretical fit and parsimony. In addition to the trust scales mentioned above, the items for cooperation were used as were shared codes and language. There are many trust measures in use. The challenge was to select one set which has the best balance between validity, reliability, and brevity. Serva et al. (2005) focused on reciprocal trust between development and management teams. It was built on good theory but would require significant rewriting. Lee & Choi (2003) was another good set. The Mayer and Davis (1999) measures for management were also used. Similarly the respective trust scales for top management are TMBSS, TMCSS and TMISS for benevolence, competence and integrity trustworthiness respectively.

In this study, each variables were internally validated utilizing Cronbach's coefficient alpha which details are found in table 1.1.

Factor Analysis

While several studies suggest that principal components analysis is an attempt to reduce the number of items in a scale utilized in a certain study, the purpose of employing EFA in this study was to develop construct out of the structured questionnaire. After obtaining the constructs that describe the organizational climate of the respondents, the characteristics of the respondents were evaluated to establish relationship with the scale choice threshold obtained from the EFA. According to Field (2000: 434) strong feelings exist concerning the choice between factor analysis and principal component analysis. Theoretically, factor analysis is more correct, but also more complicated. Practically, however, "the solutions generated from principal component analysis differ little from those derived from factor analysis techniques" (Field 2000: 434). In Rietveld & Van Hout (1993: 268) this is further specified: "the difference between factor analysis and principal component analysis decreased when the number of variables and the magnitudes of the factor loadings increased". In an attempt to resolve problems related to reliability and to generate a better findings and utilizing, exploratory factor analysis was employed.

Based upon a criterion of eigenvalues greater than one, five factors were defined for the analysis, with 65.69% of the cumulative variance accounted for by these five orthogonal factors (KMO=0.903, $p < 0.01$). Orthogonal rotation was performed using Varimax for ease of interpretation since factors generated in the factor extraction is difficult to interpret. Also, this type of factor rotation restricts the factor to be uncorrelated.

The loading of each item on each factor, eigenvalue and percent of variance accounted for are presented in Table 5 in the appendices section. Scree plot is also available in the appendices section under figure 1. No item generated more than one factor at .70 or greater. 14 items did not load on any factor on the .70 criterion. Factors were examined for a common theme underlying the items loading on each, and a theme was assigned to the new factors accordingly. The new themes for the eight newly developed variables are top management trust, co-worker communication, co-worker trust, job satisfaction and co-worker relationship, which are presented in Table 1, factor eigenvalues and the variance accounted for together with the item statements of the newly developed scale.

Internal Validity Analysis of the New Scale

Internal consistency of the interpreted factors was determined using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. As can be

seen from Table 1.3, coefficients ranged from .760 to .957.

Ordinal Regression Model

The application of the ordinal logistic regression model is dependent, in large part, on the measurement scale in the outcome variable used in this study and the underlined assumptions. Since the measurement scale of the outcome variable organizational climate is ordered, (1 is poor organizational climate and 5 is excellent organizational climate) the ordinal regression model is the preferred modeling tool in this study. Also, the modeling tool does not assume normality of the data or constant variance, it just require the assumption of parallel lines across all levels of the outcome. The ordinal regression model may take the following form if the logit link is applied:

Where $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, $x_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ are the covariates $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$, $y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ are the scale choice threshold labels. The approach can be extended to multiple ordinal labels of a single weight vector of the segment in the real line of l sections. Rennie (2005) employed $l - 1$ thresholds, where the $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{l-1}\}$ represents the segment. The θ_0 and θ_l denote $-\infty$ in that order and the label $k \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ corresponding to the segment $\{\theta_{k-1}, \dots, \theta_k\}$. This this study, the segment refers to the degree of perceived organizational climate of the respondents. Same equation was also used in the study of Tamayo (2011).

The logistic regression model or the logit model as it is often referred to, is a special case of generalized linear model and analyzes models where the outcome variable is a categorical variable. In the common practice, the outcome variable, which is denoted as Y , is a categorical variable and that since this study utilizes the ordinal logistic regression model, the categorical representation of the scales in terms of numbers have meanings. In the case of this research study, as the number increases, the response going towards positive (excellent organizational climate).

For logistic regression analysis, the model parameter estimates $(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p)$ should be obtained and it should determine how well the model fits the data (Agresti, 2007). In this study, the potential explanatory variables were examined to determine whether or not they are significant enough to generate a probabilistic estimation of organizational climate.

To make the ordinal regression applicable in this study, the researcher ensured that the assumption of the parallel lines of all levels of the categorical data is satisfied since the model does not assume normality and constant variance (Bender and Benner, 2000). Logistic Regression does not also assume presence of linear relationship among the explanatory and the outcome variable. The outcome variable does not need to be normally distributed. Homogeneity of variance among

variables is not needed also, which means that variances across the categories are not needed to be the same or close to each other. Normally distributed error terms are not assumed also in this kind of probabilistic model and the explanatory variables are not assumed to be interval or unbounded (Wright, 1995).

RESULTS

Profile of the Respondents

Most of the respondents came from the 21 to 30 years old age group accounting to 77.8 percent of the total respondents. The remaining 22% came from 31 to 40 years old age group, followed by 4.9 percent from 41 to 60 years old and 1.2% from each of the age groups below 20 years old, 51 to 60 years old and beyond 60. Lastly, with regards to the hours spent in using social media, 43.2% or 70 of the respondents spent 1 to 4 hours in social media in a day, 40.1 percent or 65 of the respondents spent a minimum of 5 to 8 hours per day in social media while the remaining 8.6%, 6.2% and 1.9% are respondents who spent at least 9 to 12 hours, 13 to 16 hours and 21 to 24 hours in social media in a day.

Parametric Estimation utilizing Ordinal Logistic

Regression: The scale choice must be tested for parallel lines. The test for parallel lines showed no statistical difference ($p=0.802 > 0.05$) which means that we reject the null hypothesis that the location parameters are the same across the response categories as shown in table 4.1. The model is statistically significant at 95% (chi-square = 17.988, $df = 9$, $p = 0.035$) as shown in Table 3.1, Model fitting information. Findings also show a measure of error (-2 Log Likelihood of 97.817 for Intercept only and 79.828 including the explanatory variables) in the final model. This values show how the model improve the outcome.

This is further supported by the findings presented in Table 3.2, Goodness of fit which shows how the data fits the proposed model. A probability value of 0.527 (Pearson) and 0.768 (Deviance) suggest that we reject the null hypothesis that the data does not fit the model. This suggests that Age and Hours Spent in Social Media fits the model. This implies that the two explanatory variables can serve as probabilistic measures to organizational climate.

Also, the model can attribute 5.4% to 12% of the total variation in the perceived organizational climate. Although the variation is low, there is still a substantial amount of variance that the explanatory variables can explain in the model. Findings also revealed that individually, there is a variation in the organizational climate in the age groups ($p=0.023, < 0.05$). The odds of perceiving the organizational climate higher by one number is lower in respondents who belong to 20 years old and below. Lastly, the odds of perceiving the

organizational climate higher by one number is lower in the respondents with average of 12 to 16 hours of social media use. This suggest that the respondent's personal characteristics signify effect on the perceived organizational climate.

DISCUSSION

From the original four components explaining organizational climate in a 40-item Likert scale adopted survey questionnaire, five factors were extracted through exploratory factor analysis with threshold of 0.7 and where assigned themes namely top management trust, co-worker communication, co-worker trust, job satisfaction and co-worker relationship.

This suggest that organizational climate is being influenced by how an individual perceived top management trust, co-worker communication, co-worker trust, job satisfaction and co-worker relationship. The higher the perception in the individual factor, the better the organizational climate as it reaches excellent in the scale used in this study.

It was also found out in this study that organizational climate vary between age group and average time of social media use. The odds of having a response of higher by one number in their organizational climate is lower in individuals who are 20 years old and below with average social media use of 12 to 16 hours in a day.

This realization can be anchored to the fact that most of the individuals below 20 years of age might not be working yet. Although this is not true to all, it is assumed that individuals will come professionals at the age of 21 in the normal academic scenario in this country. On the other hand, individuals who spends most time in social media use will have lower likelihood of having a higher by one number response rate in their organizational climate. The researcher believe that spending more hours in the social media specially during work hours will decrease focus towards work that can influence perception towards organizational climate.

Theoretical and Methodological Limitations

This study was conducted to develop a construct for organizational climate and at the same time explore the probabilistic measures of age and number of hours spent using social media in a day. In terms of the theoretical limitation, it was mentioned in the introduction that there is a scarcity of published materials which talks about a standardization of tool used to assess organizational climate. That is why the researcher adopted a structured questionnaire from an unpublished source which construct validity was carefully examined and explained in the methodology section.

The researcher suggests to future researchers who would like to expand this study to have the initial

construct be validated by an authority. Also, there were no theories mentioned for the model. The age and number of hours was used just to explore if the characteristics have probabilistic measures towards organizational climate.

Next, with regards to method limitation, this study is only contained to the 162 respondents who participated to be part of this study. The inclusion criteria to be a respondent in this study are respondents who are employed or have an experience being employed. Future researches can expand the sampling selection to different industries.

REFERENCES

1. Agresti, A. (2007). An introduction to Categorical Data Analysis (2nd ed). Wiley-Interscience.
2. Arrindell, W. A., & van der Ende. J. (1985). An empirical test of the utility of the observations-to-variables ratio in factor and components analysis. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9, 165 - 178.
3. Bender, R. and Benner (2000). A. Calculating Ordinal Regression Models in SAS and S-Plus. *Biometrical Journal* 42, 6, 677-699.
4. Bock, G.W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y.-G., & Lee, J.-N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social -psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 87-111
5. Churchill, G., Ford, N., and Walker Jr, O., (1976). Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction in the Salesforce. *Journal of Marketing Research*. Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 323-332. doi: 10.2307/3151014 Available at http://www.jstor.org/stable/3151014?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents. Accessed September 15, 2015.
6. Collins, C. J., & Smith, K. G. (2006). Knowledge exchange and combination: The role of human resource practices in the performance of high-technology firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), pp 544-560.
7. Davidson, M. et al., (2001). Organizational Climate, Perceived Customer Satisfaction, and Revenue per Available Room in Four- and Five-Star Australian Hotels. *Tourism Analysis*. Volume 6, Issue 2, pp 123-137. doi. 10.3727/108354201108749782. Available at <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/cog/ta/2001/00000006/00000002/ta117>. Accessed September 21, 2015.
8. Field, A. (2000). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS for Windows*. London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi: Sage publications.
9. Garson, D. G. (2008). *Factor Analysis: Statnotes*. Retrieved March 22, 2008, from North Carolina State University Public Administration Program, <http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/factor.htm>.
10. Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale,NJ: Erlbaum.

11. Hatcher, L. (1994). *A Step-by-Step Approach to Using the SAS® System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
12. Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist: Introductory statistics using generalized linear models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
13. Janz, B. D., & Prasarnphanich, P. (2003). Understanding the antecedents of effective knowledge management: the importance of a knowledge-centered culture.
14. Johannsen, R., Johnson, T., and Stinson, J., (1976). Organizational Climate and Productivity. *Journal of Management*. Volume 2, Issue 2, pp 65-70. doi: 10.1177/014920637600200209. Available at <http://jom.sagepub.com/content/2/2/65.short>. Accessed September 19, 2015.
15. Johnson, J. and McIntye, C., (1998). Organizational Culture and Climate Correlates of Job Satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*. Volume 82 pp 843-850. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1998.82.3.843. Available at <http://www.amsciepub.com/doi/abs/10.2466/pr0.1998.82.3.843>. Accessed September 13, 2015.
16. Kline, P. (1979). *Psychometrics and psychology*. London: Acaderric Press.
17. Lawler III, E., Hall, D., and Oldham, G., (1974). Organizational climate: Relationship to organizational structure, process and performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. Volume 11, Issue 1, pp 139-155. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(74)90010-5. Available at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0030507374900105>. Accessed September 21, 2015.
18. Lee, H., & Choi, B. (2003). Knowledge management enablers, processes and organizational performance: an integrative view and empirical examination. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20(1), 179-228.
19. Lenhart, A., et al, (2010). Social media and mobile internet use among teens and young adults. Pew Internet & American Life Project. <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2010/Social-Media-and-Young-Adults.aspx>. Accessed September 12, 2015.
20. MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 84-99.
21. Mathis, S., et al. (2009). Organizational climate configurations: Relationships to collective attitudes, customer satisfaction, and financial performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Volume 94, Issue 3, pp 618-634. doi. 10.1037/a0014365. Available at <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/apl/94/3/618/>. Accessed September 13, 2015.
22. Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: a field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 123-136.
23. Neal, A., West, M., and Patterson, M., (2005). Do Organizational Climate and Competitive Strategy Moderate the Relationship Between Human Resource Management and Productivity? *Journal of Management*. Volume 31, Issue 4 pp 492-512. doi: 10.1177/0149206304272188. Available at <http://jom.sagepub.com/content/31/4/492.short>. Accessed September 21, 2015.
24. Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., et al. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 379-408.
25. Rennie J (2005) Ordinal Logistic Regression. <http://people.csail.mit.edu/jrennie/writing/olr.pdf>, writing February 05.
26. Patterson, M., Warr, P., and West, M., (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: the role of employee affect and employee level. CEP Discussion Paper No. 626. Center for Economic Performance. London School of Economics and Political Science. Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE. Available at <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/19977/>. Accessed September 16, 2015.
27. Payne, R. and Fineman, S., and Wall, T., (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A Conceptual Synthesis. *Organizational behavior and Human Performance*. Volume 16, Issue 1, pp 45-62. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(76)90006-4. Available at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0030507376900064>. Accessed September 19, 2015.
28. Pritchard, R. and Karasick, B., (1973). The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and job satisfaction. *Organizational behavior and Human Performance*. Volume 9, Issue 1, February 1973, pp 126-146. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(73)90042-1. Available at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0030507373900421>. Accessed September 17, 2015.
29. Rietveld, T. & Van Hout, R. (1993). *Statistical Techniques for the Study of Language and Language Behaviour*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
30. Rogg, K. et al., (2001). Human resource practices, organizational climate, and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Management*. Volume 27, Issue 4 pp 431-449. doi: 10.1177/014920630102700403. Available at <http://jom.sagepub.com/content/27/4/431.short>. Accessed September 20, 2015.
31. Schneider, B. and Snyder, R., (1975). Some relationships between job satisfaction and organization climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol 60, Issue 3, pp 318-328. Available at

- <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/apl/60/3/318/>. Accessed September 17, 2015.
32. Serva, M. A., Fuller, M. A., & Mayer, R. C. (2005). The reciprocal nature of trust: a longitudinal study of interacting teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 625-648.
33. Smith, D. (2009). *Social Media Correlates of Organizational Climate*. Unpublished Dissertation.
34. Tamayo, A., (2011). Psychographic measure of service quality of fast food chain in Davao City. *African Journal of Marketing Management*. Volume 3, Issue 9, pp 219-225. Available at <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJMM>
35. Vance, K., Howe, W., and Dellavalle, R., (2009). Social Internet Sites as a Source of Public Health Information. *Elsevier, Dermatologic Epidemiology and Public Health*. Volume 27, Issue 2, April 2009, pp 133-136. doi:10.1016/j.det.2008.11.010. Available at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0733863508001083>. Accessed September 15, 2015.
36. Wright, R.E. (1995). "Logistic regression". In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold, eds., *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. A widely used recent treatment.
- women in the oil delta of Nigeria. *Oxford Development Studies*, 32(4), 605-617
- Zalik, A. (2004). The Niger Delta: 'Petro Violence' and 'Partnership Development'. *Review of African Political Economy*, 101, 401-424.

Appendices

Table 1.1 Reliability Statistics

Component	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Relationship withg Co-workers	.867	10
Communication	.868	10
Job Satisfaction	.747	10
Top Management Trust	.953	10

Table 1.2. Factor Eigenvalues and the Variance Accounted for by Each

	Top Managem t Trust	Co-worker Communica tion	Co-worker Trust	Job Satisfaction	Co-worker Relationship
	1	2	3	4	6
Eigenvalues	13.582	3.617	2.361	1.608	1.310
Percent of variance explained by factor	33.955	9.043	5.901	4.020	3.274
Statements	1	2	3	4	6
Top management empowers employees.	.864				
Top management really looks out for what is important to employees.	.860				
Top management is very concerned with employee welfare.	.851				
Top management's words and actions are very consistent.	.830				
Top management is very capable of doing its job.	.828				
Top management is known to be successful in the things that it tries to do.	.792				
Top management tries to be fair in dealing with everybody.	.786				
The needs and desires of the employees are very important to the top management.	.771				
I feel very confident about top management's skills.	.758				
Employees in our company see the benefits from exchanging and combining ideas with one another.		.769			
Employees in our company are proficient at combining and exchanging ideas to solve problems and create opportunities.		.722			
I feel confident about my co-worker's skills			.727		
My co-workers are very capable of performing their jobs.			.726		
I think that my job is stressful but I do not feel it.				.772	
My co-workers really look out for what is important to me.					.799
My co-workers are concerned about my welfare.					.711

note: $KMO=0.903$, Bartlett's test of Sphericity ($chi-square$)= 4045.991, $p=0.000$, <0.01

Table 1.3 Reliability Statistics

Component	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Top Management Trust	.957	9
Co-worker Communication	.760	2
Co-Worker Trust	.857	2
Job Satisfaction		1
Co-worker Relationship	.763	2
Overall Scale for Organizational Climate	.926	16

Table 2. Profile of the Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cumulative
Age of the Respondents	less than 20 years old	2	1.2	1.2
	21-30 years old	126	77.8	77.8
	31-40 years old	22	13.6	13.6
	41-50 years old	8	4.9	4.9
	51-60 years old	2	1.2	1.2
	60 years old and above	2	1.2	1.2
	Total	162	100.0	100.0
Hours spent in social media in a day	Spent 1-4 hours in Social Media Daily	70	43.2	43.2
	Spent 5-8 hours in Social Media Daily	65	40.1	40.1
	Spent 9-12 hours in Social Media Daily	10	6.2	6.2
	Spent 13-16 hours in Social Media Daily	14	8.6	8.6
	Spent 21-24 hours in Social Media Daily	3	1.9	1.9
	Total	162	100.0	100.0

Table 3.1. Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	p-value
Intercept Only	97.817	17.988	9	.035
Final	79.828			

*Significant at 0.05 alpha

Table 3.2. Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	p-value
Pearson	41.705	43	.527
Deviance	35.956	43	.768

*Significant at 0.05 alpha

Table 3.3. Pseudo R-Square

Pseudo R-Square	
Cox and Snell	.105
Nagelkerke	.120
McFadden	.054

Table 4. Parameter Estimates

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	p-value
Threshold	Poor Organizational Climate	-7.836	2.185	12.865	1	.000
	Fair Organizational Climate	-5.909	1.947	9.210	1	.002
	Good Organizational Climate	-2.911	1.884	2.388	1	.122
	Very Good Organizational Climate	.198	1.861	.011	1	.915
Location	20 and Below	-4.812	2.121	5.149	1	.023
	21 to 30 years old	-.296	1.476	.040	1	.841
	31 to 40 years old	-.345	1.527	.051	1	.821
	41 to 50 years old	-.763	1.613	.224	1	.636
	51 to 60 years old	-6.860E-16	2.050	.000	1	1.000
	60 and Above	0 ^a			0	
	1 to 4 hours	-1.356	1.176	1.330	1	.249
	5 to 8 hours	-2.166	1.181	3.362	1	.067
	9 to 12 hours	-2.046	1.320	2.405	1	.121
	13 to 16 hours	-2.581	1.274	4.104	1	.043
21 to 24 hours	0 ^a			0		

Link function: Logit.

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

b. Significant at 0.05 alpha

Table 4.1 Test of Parallel Lines^a

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	79.828			
General	59.173	20.656	27	.802

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

note: n=162