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ABSTRACT

This study examines how the academic work environment influences lecturers’ job performance and organizational commitment among private university academicians in Thailand. The paper presents that the perception of organizational climate has a significant effect on some academics’ job performance, revealing that the perception of organizational climate is positively related to the job performance of many senior academics and junior academics than those with middle level of experience and academic ranks. It also presents a strong relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment. Climate dimensions, such as coworkers’ behavior, the job itself, and freedom are significantly related to organizational commitment. It also presents that supervisors' behavior, facilities, academic environment, teaching and research, job security, and administration duties are not significant factors influencing lecturers' positive attitude toward the respective organization. Thus, findings and implications can provide valuable insights for educational policymakers and university administrators in Thailand. University administrators can focus more on academic freedom, workload, and conflict among coworkers to improve lectures’ educational practices and related positive outcomes.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The higher education policy of Thailand has encouraged the opening of private universities. As a result, at present, out of 150 universities, 72 are privately operated [1]. These universities have a good reputation because the quality of education offered by these institutions is under the supervision and control of the government. These policies and interventions help the government reduce the outflow of foreign currency that would otherwise have been spent on overseas education. It assists high school graduates to enter higher education, especially those who are not eligible to get admission to state universities. However, besides these benefits, today's private university system has caused many problems, especially job performance and high employee (academician) turnover.

The lack of involvement and application of research and publications among university academics has continued to plague higher educational institutes in recent years despite an increase in investigations into factors affecting such behavior [2]. It is observed that university academics' contribution to the country's development utilizing research and publications seems substandard. Many academics are away from research and publications and limit their services only to teaching. Surprisingly, almost all of them are highly qualified but are complacent in their job performance, i.e., most do not do whatever they can. It is reasonable to assume that most of their potential is untapped and underutilized. Thus such lecturers are distanced from providing a service par excellence. The gap between what they are capable of and what they are not doing might affect the quality of teaching and innovation [3]. Draper & Kamnuansilpa [2] indicate that less than five percent of research is from social science doctrine, and most research is focused on natural science. According to the Global Innovation Index [4], Thailand's university research collaboration ranks 31 only with a 54.1 score out of 100. Lack of professional growth as a result of overwork load has affected lecturers' commitment [5]. The academic environment of universities in Thailand influence lecturers' organizational commitment.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

In recent years, organizational climate and job performance have been identified as more critical factors for commitment. It is widely recognized that an organization's informal norms and perceived atmosphere may make some individuals feel accepted and wanted, and others marginalized or not recognized as necessary. In this sense, the organizational environment can be one of the influencing factors of employee commitment to a given work environment.

2.1 Demographic Factors and Job Performance

Lecturers' publication performance depends on academic rank, education, and the university where the lecturer received his degree. In addition, gender and administrative positions have a significant effect, while age and experience do not influence publication performance [7]. Prior research evidence indicates that lecturers' low levels of confidence in their research, perceiving that it is time-consuming for publication with no adequate reward, significantly impact Indonesian lecturers' publication in reputed journals [8]. Lecturers' low interest in publications is mostly due to securing tenure and get promotions [9]. However, due to lack of research mentors, a large number of students in a module and spending more time marking student assessments, and lack of guidance for publication, their overall performance has impaired. The gender of lecturers is not related to lecturers' performance [10]. Sa'adatu [11] discovered that teacher educators in the age group of 46-55 years, with six years' work experience and with Masters/Ph.D., especially those holding above the minimum educational qualifications required for academicians, are more active in carrying out their jobs than other categories. Thus, hypothesis 01 is;

$H_1$: Demographic factors of university lecturers make differences in the perception of job performance.

2.2 Organizational Climate and Commitment

Organizational commitment is defined in the present context regarding the strength of an
individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Such commitment can generally be characterized by at least three factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; (c) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership [12]. AlKahtani, [13]; Setiawati, & Ariani [14]; Al-Fakeh, [15] supported the finding that there is a relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Most of these studies related to job performance and organizational climate were conducted in manufacturing sector organizations. However, some limited studies pay attention to job satisfaction among school teachers. Some evidence in the literature indicates that the climate-performance relationship has already been examined about university academics. Adhan [16] asserted that organizational commitment has a significant impact on the job performance of lectures. Another study revealed that organizational culture significantly impacts organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and lecturer trust in the university environment [17]. Other than these, no specific studies proved that a relationship exists between job performance and organizational commitment. Farid [18] claimed that quality of work-life and organizational commitment has a significant relationship. Thus the hypothesis 02 is;

H₂: Higher the level of satisfaction with organizational climate, the higher the commitment to the job.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND JOB PERFORMANCE

During the early decades, structure, technology, strategy, and environmental condition have been examined to predict organizational performance [19], [20], [21], [22]. Later, the study of organizational climate, participants' perception of their work environment has been a long-standing interest among organizational researchers. This interest has been especially inspired by the documented efforts of organizational climate on employee attitudes, behavior, and performance [23]. This approach is called a high-performance management system, and many scholars found out a significant relationship between a high-performance work system and employees performance [24], [25], [26], [27]. Researchers have identified different competing approaches to the high-performance management system, such as the Human Relations Approach and the Rational Goal Approach [28]. The Human Relation Approach emphasizes a high value of employee well-being [23]. This approach pays close attention to the importance of employee morale, commitment, and satisfaction.

Winter & Sarros [29] identify that work environment is among the significant factors of job performance. Some other researchers have justified this finding by carrying out similar research focusing on selecting organizations in which skilled employees were available [30], [31], [32]. Ahmad & Abdurahman [33] believed that workers who perceived the organizational environment as supportive had demonstrated higher performance than those who perceived otherwise.

The effects of organizational climate on job performance and satisfaction have a positive correlation [37]. Evidence exists that individuals highly committed to an organization's goals and willing to devote a great deal of energy achieve organizational objectives [34], [35]. In addition, considerable research evidence indicates a significant relationship between organizational climate and job performance. Kaya, Koc, & Topcu [36] asserted that workers who perceived their climate as supportive had higher performance than those who perceived otherwise. However, they found out that the organizational climate is highly related to employees' job satisfaction than their job performance.

Organizational climate refers to the perceived social milieu in which individual-organizational expectations are met [38], [39], [40], [41], [42]. Organizational culture refers to the sum of shared realities, values, symbols, and rituals held in common by an organization that contributes to creating norms and expectations of behavior [42]. The perception of this atmosphere, which is "how it feels to be a member of the organization," is often referred to as organizational climate [43]. While organizational climate can influence individuals' expectations, behavior, and performance, the effect of the organizational context naturally may vary across organizations. It may affect individuals or groups in the same organization differently [32]. It has been described as a "perception of organizational policies, practices, and procedures that individuals share within organizations" [44]. James, James & Ashe (1990) refer to individuals'
values for their well-being as a "psychological climate." However, if most of the workplace accepts and shares those values concerning "psychological climate," these function as the "organizational climate."

Several researchers have tested organizational climate. Surprisingly, most of those studies refer only to the "psychological climate," which mainly benefits or disturbs employees' well-being. However, there is strong evidence to support a given climate that employees perceive to be beneficial to personal well-being is associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment [32,43,45].

In addition, considerable research evidence indicates that there is a significant relationship between organizational climate and performance. Similar to the finding mentioned under organizational commitment, employees who perceived their climate as supportive had higher performance than those who perceived otherwise [46]. Many researchers highlighted that perceived climate to be significantly related to measures of organizational performance and job satisfaction [47,48,49]. Powerlessness and tolerance at the workplace in public universities, financial, coworker relationships, and workplace tolerance in private universities significantly and positively affect performance [50]. Thus, hypothesis 03 is:

$H_3$: University Lecturers’ job performance is influenced by perceived organizational climate
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4. SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

The scope of the present study entailed considering the influence of organizational participants’ perception of the academic environment on organizational commitment in a sample of university academics in Thailand. After reviewing the literature, a conceptual model has been developed. The organizational climate and demographic factors are considered independent variables, and organizational commitment and job performance are dependent variables. The conceptual framework of the study is shown in Fig. 1.

This problem would be interpreted through data analysis based on the perceptions of academics currently employed in private universities in Thailand. The targeted respondents, i.e., university academics, are considered suitable because they are primarily involved in academicians’ performance in these private universities.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

This cross-sectional study uses a deductive approach to conduct the research. The researcher has selected the mono method as this research collect and analysis data quantitatively and the research paradigm is objectivist according to the Ontological, Epistemological, and Axiological stances. Ontological stance can be defined as the reality of the existing status of the research problem. Epistemological stance can be defined as the researcher's assumptions by investigating the problems related to the study. This research's epistemological stance is why lecturers do not pay much attention to scholarly practices, even though it is one of the job tasks. The reality of this research is that most lecturers are in the private universities in Thailand have less attention to scholarly works. The axiological stance of this research demonstrates to determine which factors influence their commitment and job performance.

6. POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population for this study is an academician who is currently employed in 72 private universities in Thailand. The sample size is determined at a 95% confidence level with a 6% margin of error and 50% of the population proportion. Since the population is unknown, the sample size was approximately 275. A simple random sampling method has been used to collect data from academicians in all private universities in Thailand. Approximately 189 university lecturers responded to the questionnaire. However, questionnaires with missing data were eliminated; hence, 154 (or 56 percent) were selected for the statistical analysis.

7. VARIABLE MEASUREMENT

Under primary data collection, a questionnaire was used to obtain data leading to measure three variables; perception of organizational climate, academics’ organizational commitment, and academics’ accomplishment of job performance. The questionnaire was pre-tested with a small group of lecturers. Further improvements on the wording and some additional clarifications were made. The questionnaire consists of four main demographic items; age, gender, academic rank, and length of service. Two items are related to job performance; leadership and Administrative positions, publications in indexed journals, and non-index journals. The nine main dimensions of perceived organizational climate are: supervisors' behavior, coworkers' behavior, the job itself, working condition and facilities, academic environment, job security, teaching and research, administrative duties, freedom, and eleven items relating to organizational commitment.

8. ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study presents data, firstly in the form of percentages. Secondly, it presents the results of the statistical techniques. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to examine the levels of satisfaction/agreement and dissatisfaction/ disagreement. The reactions of all 154 respondents to each item were aggregated. Each of these aggregated scores has been used for the multiple regression analysis.

The ANOVA was employed to test the significance of differences in the job performance by leadership and Administrative positions, research publications in indexed journals, research publications in non-indexed journals, and demographic factors; age, gender, academic rank, and length of service (hypothesis 01). To test hypothesis number three, organizational climate is considered an independent variable, while job performance is considered a dependent variable. A 0.05 level of significance was applied.
in testing the null hypotheses, which used the F ratio values with the appropriate number of degrees of freedom. If the analysis shows significant differences, Multiple Classification Analysis is carried out to identify the pair or pairs that have or have significant difference(s).

To test the hypothesis two, job performance considers as the dependent variable, and organizational climate considers as an independent variable. Research hypothesis two was tested by using analysis of variance and Multiple Regression Analysis.

9. VALIDITY

The variables included in the questionnaire have been derived through the literature review, which is related to organizational climate and job performance theories and practices. Several scholars have proved the content validity of the measurement, which has been selected for this study. Many variables in this study are concepts or factors with multiple attributes or qualities, and composite indexes have been used to measure these variables. Therefore, some measurement scales have been adopted with modifications, while others are developed based on the underlying concepts, as evident in previous studies. The validity and reliability of these measurement scales need to be evaluated to determine their appropriateness.

10. RELIABILITY

A pilot study has been conducted to test the reliability of the questionnaire. The raw data were coded, and computations were carried out. Reliability tests are helpful for two purposes. The calculated reliability coefficient, Cronbach's alpha, helps determine the acceptability of the measure. The test procedure also yields a reliability coefficient calculated when each of the items is excluded. If the computed alpha had a value greater than .7, these items were included, and the rest were excluded from the scale. Modifications in this fashion are made to improve the internal consistency of the measurement scales. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability of this study ranges from .7440 to .9036. Therefore, all the variables in the study are reliable to be used in the present study.

11. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

11.1 Background of Respondents

Table 1 shows that 21 percent of the respondents are below 30 years old and 44 percent between 30 and 39 years old, 16 percent are between 40 and 49 years old, and 12 percent between 50 and 59 old. Nearly 7 percent are more than 60 years old. This indicates that the majority of respondents are 30 and 49 years old. It was observed that 41 percent of respondents are male, and 59 percent are female. It was indicated that the attitudes of respondents might not vary according to gender. The majority of respondents were lecturers, 83 percent. Only about 7 percent are Assistant professors, and 7 percent are Associate Professors. Only one professor was responded to the questionnaire.

The distribution of respondents' length of service shows that most of them are newcomers (53 percent) who spent less than five years in the university. The second-largest majority of respondents are in between five to ten years' service in the university. Only 5 percent have more than twenty years of service in a university system.

About 50 percent of the respondents held management positions ahead of the department or dean, and about 23 percent held other management positions. Surprisingly, 92 percent were not published a single research article in an indexed journal. About 5 percent have published less than five articles. It was observed that about 68 percent were not published any article in a non-indexed journal. However, 23 percent has at least less than 5 article publications in the non-indexed journal.

These demographic data indicate that most of these respondents are below 39 years old, lecturers, and have less than ten years of service in a university. The majority of them held management positions but were very poor in research and publications.

Table 2 summarizes the mean scores of respondents' ratings on the satisfaction or dissatisfaction derived from aspects of perceived organizational climate. It gives the percentages of satisfied, dissatisfied, or indifferent respondents to various aspects of perceived organizational climate. The mean scores for each of the ten perceived organizational climate aspects identified range from 5.73 supervisor behavior to 3.2 facilities. It can be observed that there is a high correlation between the mean scores of respondents and the percentages of respondents who were satisfied or dissatisfied with various/different aspects of the perceived organizational climate.
It is observed that lecturers are generally satisfied with their organizational climate; the mean scores in 9 of the ten identified aspects of climate are greater than 3.5. More than 50 percent of respondents also indicated that they were satisfied with each of the following aspects of their organizational climate: Supervision, Coworkers’ Behavior, Job Itself, Physical Conditions, Teaching and Research, Job Security. The percentage of respondents satisfied with Coworkers’ Behavior, Job Itself, and Job Security were as high as 90 percent.

However, there are aspects of the perceived organizational climate where the respondents indicated that they were not satisfied; facilities, academic environment, and freedom. For each of these, the mean score was less than four or slightly higher than 4. For facilities, only 15 percent were satisfied, and 61.7 percent are dissatisfied. Approximately 22.7 percentages nearly 1 out of each five respondents were indicated indifference. It would appear that lecturers are the least satisfied with the existing facilities that private universities provide. In addition, the mean value of freedom is 4.10. More than 56 percent of the respondents indicated that they were indifferent to freedom, while 18 percent expressed dissatisfaction with their freedom from private universities.

### Table 1. Demographic profile

| Personal Background                  | No. of Respondents | %    |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|------|
| **Age**                              |                    |      |
| below 30                             | 33                 | 21   |
| 30 - 39                              | 67                 | 44   |
| 40 - 49                              | 25                 | 16   |
| 50 - 59                              | 19                 | 12   |
| over 60                              | 10                 | 7    |
| **Gender**                           |                    |      |
| Male                                 | 63                 | 41   |
| Female                               | 90                 | 59   |
| **Academic Rank**                    |                    |      |
| Assistant Lecturer                   | 4                  | 3    |
| Lecturer                             | 128                | 83   |
| Assistant Professor                  | 10                 | 7    |
| Associate Professor                  | 10                 | 7    |
| Professor                            | 1                  | 0.6  |
| **Length of Service in the present university** |                    |      |
| Below Five years                     | 81                 | 53   |
| Five to ten years                    | 51                 | 33   |
| Eleven to Fifteen years              | 13                 | 8    |
| Sixteen to Twenty years              | 2                  | 1    |
| More than Twenty years               | 7                  | 5    |
| **Leadership or Management Responsibility** |                    |      |
| Head, Director, Dean etc             | 77                 | 50   |
| Holding other managerial posts       | 35                 | 23   |
| Not currently in charge of academic unit or group | 26           | 17   |
| **Publications in index Journal**    |                    |      |
| None                                 | 141                | 92   |
| 1 - 5                                | 8                  | 5    |
| 6 - 10                               | 3                  | 2    |
| 11 - 15                              | 0                  | 0    |
| More than 15                         | 2                  | 1    |
| **Publications in the non-indexed journal** |                    |      |
| None                                 | 104                | 68   |
| 1 - 5                                | 38                 | 23   |
| 6 - 10                               | 6                  | 4    |
| 11 - 15                              | 1                  | 0.6  |
| More than 15                         | 3                  | 2    |
Table 2. Overall satisfaction with aspects of organizational climate

| Aspects of climate       | Mean Score | Percentage satisfied | Percentage dissatisfied | Percentage indifferent |
|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Supervision              | 5.73       | 85.1                 | 4.5                     | 10.4                   |
| Coworkers' Behavior      | 5.63       | 94.8                 | 0.6                     | 4.5                    |
| Job Itself               | 5.71       | 91.6                 | 0.6                     | 7.8                    |
| Physical Condition       | 4.69       | 57.8                 | 18.2                    | 24.0                   |
| Teaching and Research    | 3.20       | 15.6                 | 61.7                    | 22.7                   |
| Administrative Duties    | 4.42       | 51.3                 | 27.9                    | 20.8                   |
| Academic Environment     | 4.37       | 46.1                 | 16.8                    | 37.0                   |
| Freedom                  | 3.59       | 27.3                 | 46.8                    | 26.0                   |
| Job Security             | 4.10       | 15.3                 | 18.1                    | 65.6                   |
| **Overall Satisfaction** | **5.47**   | **92.9**             | **1.3**                 | **5.8**                |

While it is probably accurate to state that university lecturers appear to be generally satisfied with their current organizational climate as they perceived it, the information in Table 2 shows some aspects of their organizational climate with which they are dissatisfied. Therefore, it was indicated that overall, university lecturers are satisfied with their academic climate.

The distribution of respondents' length of service shows that most of them are newcomers (53 percent) who spent less than five years in the university. The second-largest majority of respondents are in between five to ten years' service in the university. Only 5 percent have more than twenty years of service in a university. The majority of them held management positions but were substantially inadequate in their involvement in research and publications.

Table 3 shows the performance of academics in terms of administrative duties, publications in indexed journals, and non-indexed journals. The performance of leadership and management responsibility is good, while publications show inferior performance. It can be seen that about 92 percent of academics have not published any research article in an indexed journal. In comparison, 68 percent have not published an article in a local journal or non-indexed journal.

11.2 Results of Correlation Analysis

Results of the correlation analysis of the independent variables are presented in Table 4. The correlation between the academic environment and working facilities or environment is .688 at the .001 level of significance. Therefore, items related to lecturers’ working facilities were eliminated from the model to measure regression analysis. All other correlation coefficients are very low, indicating a lack of multi-co linearity. There is no issue regarding multi-co linearity when using all independent variables in multiple regression analyses other than physical conditions or work-related facilities.
Table 4. Correlation

|             | Supervisor | Coworker | Job itself | Physical | Teaching | Admin duties | Academic environment | Freedom | Security |
|-------------|------------|----------|------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------------------|---------|----------|
| Supervisor  | 1          |          |            |          |          |              |                      |         |          |
| Coworker    | .404       | 1        |            |          |          |              |                      |         |          |
| Job itself  | .476       | .475     | 1          |          |          |              |                      |         |          |
| Physical    | .377       | .346     | .435       | 1        |          |              |                      |         |          |
| Teaching    | -.245      | -.048    | -.185*     | -.229    | 1        |              |                      |         |          |
| Admin duties| -.218      | -.178*   | -.398      | -.393    | .476     | 1            |                      |         |          |
| Academic Environment | .494 | .370* | .517 | .688 | -.281 | -.454 | 1 |         |         |
| Freedom     | .161*      | .134     | .176*      | .191*    | -.172*   | -.221        | .380     | 1        |          |
| Security    | -.179*     | .078     | .067       | -.037    | .190*    | .051         | .023     | .147     | 1        |

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

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Table 5. Analysis of Variance of Job Performance by Demographic Variables

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | DF | Mean Square | F     | Sig. F |
|---------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|--------|
| Main Effects        | 1.630          | 12 | .136        | .757  | .694   |
| Age                 | .517           | 4  | .129        | .720  | .579   |
| Gender              | .013           | 1  | .013        | .073  | .788   |
| Rank                | .433           | 3  | .144        | .805  | .493   |
| Service             | .751           | 4  | .188        | 1.046 | .389   |
| Explained           | 1.630          | 12 | .136        | .757  | .694   |
| Residual            | 24.781         | 138| .180        |       |        |
| Total               | 26.412         | 150| .176        |       |        |

Table 6. Multiple Classification Analysis of Job Performance by Demographic Factors (Grande Mean = 4.5709)

| Variable and category | No | Unadjusted Deviation | Adjusted for independents deviation |
|-----------------------|----|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
|                       |    | Eta                  | Beta                               |
| Age                   |    | .136                 | .156                                |
| below 30              | 32 | -.0490               | -.0704                              |
| 30 - 39               | 66 | -.0345               | -.0239                              |
| 40 - 49               | 25 | .0771                | -.1139                              |
| 50 - 59               | 19 | .0976                | .0735                               |
| over 60               | 9  | .0069                | -.0460                              |
| Gender                |    | .042                 | .024                                |
| Male                  | 62 | .0211                | .0122                               |
| Female                | 89 | -.0147               | -.0085                              |
| Academic Rank         |    | .081                 | .137                                |
| Assistant Lecturer    | 4  | .0541                | .0788                               |
| Lecturer              | 172| -.0016               | .0115                               |
| Assistant Professor   | 10 | -.0909               | -.2110                              |
| Associate Professor   | 10 | .0891                | .0336                               |
| Professor             | 2  |                      |                                     |
| Length of Service in present university |    | .170                 | .192                                |
| Below Five years      | 80 | .0129                | .0261                               |
| Five to ten years     | 50 | -.0409               | -.0590                              |
| Eleven to Fifteen years | 13 | -.0862               | -.1299                              |
| Sixteen to Twenty years | 2  | .2291                | .2535                               |
| More than Twenty years | 6  | .2791                | .2724                               |

Table 7. Regression analysis of organizational climate and organizational commitment

| Variable                        | B    | T    | Significance T |
|---------------------------------|------|------|----------------|
| Overall Satisfaction of Organizational Climate (Constant) | .479 | 6.736 | .000 |
| R = .479                        | 1.671| 2.948| .004 |
| Std. Error = .63796            |      |      |                |
| R² = .230                      | Adjusted R² = .225 | F = 45.373 | Sig F = .000 |

11.3 Results of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: Demographic factors of university lecturers' make differences in the perception of job performance

0.05 level of significance. It shows that the demographic factors' main effect does not significantly affect the job performance at the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, hypothesis 01 is rejected.

Table 5 shows the analysis of variance of demographic factors and job performance at the
demographic factors. Job performance of lecturers' is measured by administrative positions and the number of scholarly works. The analysis results show that university lecturers in a retirement age have a favorable perception of publications. Regarding gender, women lecturers have a favorable perception of publications while male lecturers do not. Concerning the length of service, employees who have less than five years and more than 15 years had a significantly higher perception of publications than others. Regarding academic rank, other than assistant professors, all other lecturers have a favorable perception of publications.

Available limited research evidence tested how demographic factors influence lecturers' job performance. The finding of this study is supported by Gunawan [7], explaining that age and experience do not influence job performance. Findings of Hi, [10] confirmed those of this study, which also supports Sa'a'datu's [11] discoveries. However, Gunawan [7] revealed that gender and administrative positions have a significant impact, which is supported by Arsyad [8] and Chinamasa [9].

Hypothesis 2: Higher the level of satisfaction with organizational climate, higher the commitment to the job

Multiple regression analysis has been run to test hypothesis 02 in two ways. Firstly, it has been determined whether there is any significant relationship between organizational commitment and overall satisfaction of organizational climate. Secondly, it has been tested with dimensions of perceived organizational climate with organizational commitment [51].

The results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 7. From Table 7, regression analysis results show a significant correlation between organizational climate and organizational commitment at the 0.05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination, R^2, is 0.230. The F value is 45.373, and its p-value is smaller than the alpha level. This independent variable is explained by 23 percent of the university lecturers' perception of organizational climate with a significant positive correlation. The total contribution of this independent factor towards the variability of the organizational commitment in this study is, therefore, statistically significant. Thus, hypothesis two is supported.

This finding is supported by the previous finding also. Adhan [16] concluded that accepting a favorable work climate may be the key to encouraging employees who have the skills to do their job. Organizational climate is more highly related to employees' job satisfaction than their job performance [18]. Employees who perceived their climate as supportive had higher performance than those who perceived otherwise [17]. Moreover, many researchers revealed that when employees are satisfied with the organizational environment influences their performance [12], [13], [14], [15].

Secondly, it has been analyzed sub-dimensions of perceived organizational climate with lecturers' organizational commitment. The result of the regression analysis is presented in Table 8.

The result of the multiple regression analysis of satisfaction of organizational climate is presented in Table 8. The coefficient of determination, R^2, is .278. The interpretation is that perception of organizational climate explains only 28 percent of the variance in university lecturers' organizational commitment.

The F value is 4.512 at the .05 level of significance. Other than the supervisor behavior, teaching and research, administrative duties, academic environment, and job security, all other significance t values of the variables are less than 0.05. There is no relationship between these variables on organizational commitment. The variables related to the job itself, freedom, and coworkers' behavior variables are significantly correlated with university lecturers' organizational commitment at the 0.05 level of significance. This means that these variables positively correlated with organizational commitment.

Overall, these results indicate that satisfaction with coworkers' behavior positively affects the perception of the university lecturers' organizational climate in private universities in Thailand. As anticipated by hypothesis two, satisfaction with coworkers' behavior is positively related (Beta =.228) to organizational commitment. The higher the satisfaction with behaviors of coworkers, the higher the organizational commitment is among university lecturers. When the university lecturers are satisfied with coworkers' behavior, which is needed to enhance a friendly atmosphere, they work happily. They expect friendly and supportive behavior from coworkers to work in an excellent academic environment.
Table 8. Regression analysis of satisfaction of organizational climate

| Variable                      | B     | T     | Significance T |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| Superior Behavior             | .021  | .256  | .798          |
| Coworkers' Behavior           | .228  | 2.890 | .004          |
| Job Itself                    | .326  | 4.104 | .000          |
| Physical Condition            | .123  | 1.450 | .776          |
| Teaching and Research         | -.048 | -.665 | .507          |
| Administrative Duties         | .078  | 1.015 | .312          |
| Academic Environment          | -.052 | -.591 | .556          |
| Freedom                       | .008  | 2.126 | .035          |
| Job Security                  | .150  | -2.08 | .835          |
| (Constant)                    | 2.226 | 4.969 | .000          |
| R = .527                      | R² = .278 | Adjusted R² = .264 |
| Std. Error = .62177           | F = 4.512 | Sig F = .035 |

Table 9. Analysis of variance of organizational climate by job performance

| Source of variation           | Sum of squares | DF | Mean square | F   | Sig. F |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-----|--------|
| Main Effects                  | 3.887          | 17 | .229        | 1.309 | .199   |
| Leadership                    | .497           | 2  | .249        | 1.424 | .245   |
| Indexed Journal               | .204           | 3  | .068        | .389  | .761   |
| Non-indexed journal           | 1.887          | 4  | .472        | 2.701 | .034   |
| Explained                     | 3.887          | 17 | .229        | 1.309 | .199   |
| Residual                      | 20.437         | 117 | .175       |      |        |
| Total                         | 24.324         | 134 | .182       |      |        |

Table 10. Multiple Classification Analysis of Organizational Climate by Job Performance (Grande Mean = 4.5733)

| Variable and category          | No | Unadjusted Deviation | Adjusted for Independents Deviation | Eta | Beta |
|-------------------------------|----|----------------------|------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Leadership                    |    |                      |                                    |     |      |
| Head/Dean                     | 75 | .0467                | .0715                              | .132| .190 |
| Other                         | 26 | -.0322               | -.1034                             |     |      |
| None                          | 34 | -.0926               | -.0710                             |     |      |
| Publication in Indexed Journals |    |                      |                                    |     |      |
| None                          | 124| .0113                | .0128                              | .103| .112 |
| 1-5                           | 7  | -.1733               | -.1952                             |     |      |
| 6-10                          | 2  | -.1233               | -.1011                             |     |      |
| 11-15                         |   |                      |                                    |     |      |
| more than 15                  | 2  | .0267                | -.0066                             |     |      |
| Publication in Non-Indexed Journals |    |                      |                                    | .236| .311 |
| None                          | 93 | .0052                | .0060                              |     |      |
| 1-5                           | 32 | -.0733               | -.0149                             |     |      |
| 6-10                          | 6  | .2600                | .0553                              |     |      |
| 11-15                         | 1  | -.6733               | -.14095                            |     |      |
| more than 15                  | 3  | .3267                | .3331                              |     |      |

The findings reveal that when the level of satisfaction with the job itself of university lecturers increases, the level of organizational commitment also increases. Satisfaction with the job itself positively affects (Beta = .326) the organizational commitment among university lecturers in the private universities in Thailand. When lecturers have the freedom to use their full potential for their job, it is fitted with their abilities and knowledge, can use the ability to enhance
knowledge or helpful for their career development. The perception of the organizational climate is increased positively, and they tend to remain on the job and do well in their career.

Moreover, the results from testing hypothesis two indicate that lecturers’ satisfaction with freedom positively (Beta = .008) affects their organizational commitment. Most lecturers are concerned with how management treats them and allows them to work with much freedom. If the attitude of the management were positive, they would likely remain in their employment for a longer time.

**Hypothesis 3: University Lecturers’ job performance is influenced by perceived organizational climate**

Table 9 shows the analysis of variance of academic performance and the perceived organizational climate at the 0.05 level is not significant. It shows that the main effect of the job performance does not significantly affect the perceived organizational climate at the 0.05 level of significance.

However, when the variables of job performance are considered individually, it shows that lecturers' who have publications in non-indexed journals have a positive perception of the organizational climate of private universities in Thailand. Lecturers' leadership and publications in indexed journals do not affect the perceived organizational climate.

Table 10 shows the multiple classification analysis of the university lecturers' perception about organizational climate by the job performance. The analysis results show that university lecturers who hold administrative positions like head of the department or dean of the faculty have a significantly positive perception about organizational climate than lecturers who held other administrative positions or were not in any administrative position. After adjusting for other independent variables, lecturers who are heads or deans have a significantly positive perception about organizational climate than the other lecturers.

With respect of the publications in indexed journal, the results of the multiple classification analysis show that lecturers who do not have any publication and who had more than 15 publications had a significantly positive perception about organizational climate than who had at least one publication. However, after adjusting for the independent variables, lecturers who do not have any publication had a significantly positive perception of organizational climate than those with at least one publication.

Regarding job performance related to publications in non-indexed journals, the results of the multiple classification analysis showed that lecturers who have publications between 6 to 10 and more than 15 who do not have any publications have a significantly positive perception about organizational climate than lecturers who have a moderate level of publications. Even after adjusting for other independent variables, lecturers with publications between 6 to 10 and more than 15 who do not have any publications have a significantly positive perception of organizational climate than lecturers who have a moderate level of publications.

In summary, research hypothesis one was tested to determine whether there is any significant difference between job performance and the perceived organizational climate. The analysis of variance shows that the main effect of the job performance does not significantly affect the perception of organizational climate among university lecturers in private universities in Thailand at the 0.05 level of significance. On the contrary, the results of multiple classification analysis show that the positive perception of organizational climate significantly influences lecturers who have publications in non-indexed journals. Therefore hypothesis three is rejected.

Even though many past researchers [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36] claimed that positive perception of organizational climate influence employees’ job performance, this study discovered reverse results. Mohammadi & Karupiah [50] discovered that university lecturers' that can tolerate with existing environment show positive results. The findings of the present study do not confirm those of previous studies in this area of research. In other words, existing literature does not align with the results of this study.

**6. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational climate with academic job performance and
organizational commitment. The results of this study, too, do not vary significantly from the findings of other researchers who studied similar topics in diverse organizations. The findings of this study indicated a mixed response. Lecturers in an academic position and higher academic rank and new lecturers are committed to their job, while lecturers who have more teaching experience but fewer publications, lower-level academic rank, and non-administrative positions are not. Therefore, the positive perception of organizational commitment of lecturers in private universities in Thailand is influenced by the job performance of some academics while it is not for some others.

The correlation between climate dimensions and organizational commitment scores indicates that an organizational climate characterized by coworkers' behavior, the job itself, and freedom significantly affects favorable organizational commitment. Further, it is revealed that supervisors' behavior, job security, forced teaching and research, and academic environment have not significantly affected lecturers' organizational commitment. The priorities of private universities pertaining to academicians' commitment (with special reference to research and publications) can be enhanced through a collaboration of coworkers.

Thus, findings and implications can give valuable insights to obtain the holistic picture and devise policies and implement these for educational policymakers and university administrators in Thailand. To increase and improve lecturers' scholarly practices, university administrators can focus on academic freedom, workload and manage conflict among coworkers in the academic work environment.
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