# HRD Climate and Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector of Ethiopia: An Empirical Study in Amhara and Benishangul-Gumuz Regions

## Mulatu Takele Babushe, Professor K. Narendranath

*Research Scholar, Osmania University, College of Commerce and Business Management, Department of Business Management, Hyderabad*
*Senior Faculty, Institute of Public Enterprise, Hyderabad*

**Abstract:** *The purpose of this study is to examine employees' perception about HRD climate in relation to job satisfaction in the public sector (civil service organizations) of Ethiopia based on the selected Bureaus in two regional states viz., Amhara and Benishangul-Gumuz.*
*The data was collected from 615 employees (both executives and non-executives) using self-administered questionnaire. The final response rate was 87.5% (539); based on this the analysis is carried out. The findings revealed that the extent HRD climate and the HRD climate elements are all below average, i.e., they are indicating the existence of very poor HRD climate in the selected bureaus or in the public sector of Ethiopia. The tested hypotheses suggested that the correlation between HRD climate and job satisfaction is statistically significant, and there is significant impact of HRD climate on job satisfaction. The HRD climate variables correlate strongly, positively and significantly with job satisfaction at the 0.01 significance level. Besides, HRD climate influences the job satisfaction of employees.*
**Key Words:** *HRD climate, the General climate, the OCTAPACE culture, HRD mechanism, and Job satisfaction*

## I. Introduction

Any nation is developed only when its human resource is developed; and underdeveloped if its people are undeveloped. Developing human asset enhances productivity and competitiveness which in turn leads to faster growth (Bahar Bayrakter, 2004; Gupta, 2009). Developed human resource is the greatest asset of every nation as well as organization, because, as Rao (1996) noted, it creates dynamic people, and dynamic people create dynamic organizations as well as a dynamic country.

Human resource development is a 'people-oriented concept rather than technology-oriented' (Solkhe and Chaudhary, 2011) that brings about greater commitment, efficiency, and growth to individuals. Therefore; managing and developing human resource is managing all other resources.

These days business organizations give substantial attention and importance to human resource compared to civil service organizations. Public sector organizations, especially the government (the civil service), to make difference should continuously ensure dynamism, competency, motivation, satisfaction and effectiveness of its employees (Tosi, Rizzo & Carroll, 1986, Barney, 1991), if the government wants, to realize the real development of individuals, organizations and a community. Besides, as Hota (2010) noted, the future civil servant should be much more professionally competent, sensitive, proactive, and action-oriented, so that, the government has to give considerable emphasis to HRD and HRD climate as that of contemporary private organizations.

The effectiveness HRD depends on the prevailing developmental climate. Hence, public service organisations have to ensure the existence of an optimal level of HRD climate to enable their employees to discover the hidden potentials; to improve their current skills and acquire new, relevant ones; and to utilize them according to the interest of their organisations. As Akinyemi (2011) mentioned, conducive HRD climate plays a major role in enhancing the knowledge, skills, abilities and other attributes needed by employees to carry out current job and be prepared for future challenges.

Government, a huge entity performing multidimensional tasks, plays a leading role in a country's development by acting as a planner, regulator, facilitator, controller and investor because its policies and practices determine the nature and direction of HRD activities in organisations (Mathur and Athreya 1989). These days, Ethiopia, to enhance the country's socio-economic development that uplifts the living standards of its citizens, has developed policies and strategies as well as implementing reengineering processes by utilizing the existing large number of employees (civil servants). Therefore; to accomplish these tasks successfully, it is vital to create and inculcate congenial HRD climate in the civil service organization.

## II.    Theoretical Concepts

### HRD and HRD Climate

Since the concept of 'Human Resource Development' was introduced by Loard Nadler in 1969, it is growing as an influential discipline or professional field of practice; increasingly becoming critical to the survival and success of all organizations (Wilson, 2005). HRD is not synonymous with training, (Nayak, Ganihar, and Shivanand, 2007) but beyond training.

Various management scholars defined HRD, but Rao (1991) provided a clear and comprehensive definition based on organizational and national contexts.

In organizational context as a process by which the employees of an organization are continuously helped in a planned way to:-

- acquire or sharpen capabilities required to perform various functions associated with their present or expected future roles;
- develop their general capabilities as individual and discover and exploit their own inner potentials for their own and/or organizational development purposes; and,
- develop an organizational culture in which supervisor–subordinate relationships, team work, and collaboration among subunits are strong and contribute to the professional wellbeing, motivation and pride of employees.

In the National context as a process by which the people in various groups are held to acquire new competencies continuously so as to make them more and more self-reliant and simultaneously develop a sense of pride in their country. Such self-reliance and sense of pride could be developed through a variety of interventions taken at national, regional and organizational levels, where government departments play an important role as agents of HRD at the national level; and the HRD department at organizational levels.

The conventional implication with which the term 'climate' has been used in literature is 'organizational climate', but the concept of climate with specific reference to the HRD context (i.e. HRD climate) was introduced by Rao (1996). Since then, HRD climate as concept has gained greater significance and now it is viewed as an important tool of motivating and developing employees in an organization.

HRD climate is an integral part and a component of the prevailing wider organizational climate, (Rao and Abraham, 1986; Akinyemi and Iornem, 2012) that refers to perceptions about the prevailing conditions within an organization which affects the life of employees (work and personal life) and the activities within the organization (Sharma and Purang, 2000, and Srimannarayan, 2009). It is the perception of employees about an organization's developmental environment that contributes to the organizations wellbeing and self-renewing capabilities resulting in increasing the enabling capabilities of individuals, team and the entire organization.

In an organization the extent to which the HRD climate exists can be assessed based on HRD climate elements called the General climate, the 'OCTAPACE' culture; and the HRD mechanisms. The General climate items deal with the importance given to HRD in general by top management. The OCTAPACE culture deals with the extent to which openness, confrontation, trust, autonomy, pro-action, authenticity, collaboration and experimentation are valued and promoted in an organization. HRD mechanisms facilitate favorable HRD climate in an organization, and they measure the extent to which HRD techniques are implemented seriously, (Rao and Abraham, 1986; Rao, 1991; Nayak, Ganihar and Shivanand, 2007).

### Job Satisfaction

Without people organizations are simply empty buildings and unused equipments. It is people who give them life, purpose, and meaning. Healthy and vibrant organizations are those with healthy and vibrant workers. Happy and vibrant workers are productive workers; and productive organizations are those with satisfied workers and conducive environment.

Job satisfaction is an important ingredient for evaluating organization's success. It is an individual matter and the result of various specific attitudes possessed by an employee. These attitudes are related to the job. Satisfaction in one's job means increased commitment in the fulfillment of formal requirements; and is deemed as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience, (Locke, 1969). Job satisfaction measures the employee's satisfaction with specified the dimensions of job, such as the work itself, his immediate supervisors, pay, co-workers, and opportunity for promotion (Smith et al. 1965 and Kendall and Hulin, 1969).

## III.    Empirical Studies

Recently, studies conducted to reveal the HRD climate's contribution to the organizations overall health. The overall research results showed that HRD climate affected the performance of the employees as well as organizations.

Using the instrument developed at the Center for HRD, Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI, India), Rao and Abraham (1986) surveyed HRD climate among 41 organizations in India and found that HRD climate in the organizations appears at average level. Similarly, Rao (1985) in his study of 52 organisations found an average level (54%) of HRD climate in the organisations.

Bhardwaj and Mishra (2002) in their study of HRD climate on senior, middle and lower level managers in one of India's largest multi-business companies concluded that managers in general show a favorable attitude towards HRD policies and practices of the organization as well as satisfied with the developmental policies of the top management and happy with the prevailing HRD climate in the organization.

Ray (1997) in his study of HRD climate in service organizations (focusing on public and private in New Delhi) concluded that public organizations compared to private organizations perceived less efficient because of nepotism, arbitrariness in union management relations, inexperienced managers, lacking adequate management system, and influence by the government and political forces. Similarly, Purang (2008) in her study of HRD Climate concluded that a favorable HRD climate influences directly the behavior of managers in an organization that creates sense of belongingness in them and that enables them to perform well. Sharma and Purang, (2000) in their study of Value institutionalization and HRD climate: A case study of Public sector organization, surveyed middle level highlighted a better and more ethical environment of the organization shall lead to a better HRD climate for the organization.

Solkhe and Chaudhary (2010) in their study of the relationship and impact of HRD climate on job satisfaction in selected public sector organizations based on the managers (junior and middle level executives) from various departments, revealed that managers in general showed a favorable attitude towards HRD Policies and practices of the organization; satisfied with the developmental policies of the top management as well. Besides, HRD climate has a definite impact on job satisfaction which in turn leads to the increased organizational performance.

Studies conducted by Kumar and Patnaik (2002), about HRD climate and job satisfaction, attitude towards work and role efficacy of teachers reported that better HRD climate and higher role efficacy leads to developing a positive attitude towards work and higher job satisfaction. Similarly, the studies of Forhand and Gilmer, (1988); Litwin and Stringer, (1968), and Srivastava (1984) reported the existence of positive/ significant relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction; Jain, Singhal and Singh, (1997) also concluded that HRD climate correlate positively with organizational effectiveness and productivity. Rohmetra (1998) concluded job satisfaction is positively associated with HRD Climate; Kumar and Patnaik, (2002) noted the existence of positive relationship between HRD climate, job satisfactory attitude towards work, and role efficiency. Ravi (2009) also in his research of HRD climate and Job satisfaction pinpointed that all the dimensions of HRD climate yield a positive and significant correlation with job satisfaction value.

## IV.    The Statement of the Problem

In view of the changing business scenario in Ethiopia, the researcher addressed the issue by setting the problem statement as "What is the extent of HRD climate perceived by employees and its relationship with Job satisfaction in the public sector at the selected bureaus in Amhara and Benishangul-Gumuz regional states of Ethiopia?" In line with this, the study attempts to answer the following research questions:

- What is the extent of the perceived HRD climate and its elements by employees in the public sector?
- Is there a correlation between HRD climate and job satisfaction? and
- What is the effect or influence of HRD climate on job satisfaction?

## V.    Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are:
- To examine the extent of HRD climate perceived by the employees within the selected bureaus.
- To examine the level of HRD climate elements prevailing within the bureaus.
- To assess the relationship between perceived HRD climate and job satisfaction within the bureaus, and
- To examine the impact of HRD climate on job satisfaction in the bureaus.

## VI.    The Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses the study are:

$Ho_1$: Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about HRD climate within the Bureaus.

$Ho_2$: Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about the General climate within the Bureaus.

$Ho_3$: Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about the HRD Mechanisms within the Bureaus

Ho$_4$: Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about the OCTAPACE culture within the Bureaus.

Ho$_5$: There is no significant relationship between HRD climate and job satisfaction in the public sector Bureaus

Ho$_6$: There is no significant impact of HRD climate on job satisfaction.

## VII. The Scope of the Study

This study is conducted in the two regional states of Ethiopia, i.e., Amhara region (at Bahir Dar) and Benishangul-Gumuz region (at Assosa). It is delimited to the government employees/ civil servants (both executives and non-executives) working regularly at the regional level bureaus in these two regions. The study mainly focuses on the employees' perception about HRD climate and the relationship between HRD climate and job satisfaction in the public sector (the civil service).

## VIII. The Research design and Methodology of the Study

### Sources and Tools for Data Collection

Since survey is a widely used technique in social science to collect data, (Saxena and Mishra, 2007), based on the literature review as well as the nature of the research problems, objectives and hypotheses set for this study, the survey method or descriptive-analytical research design is used in this study. Data are collected from two sources, primary and secondary; and both are used in the study. The primary data is collected through personally administered questionnaire from respondents (civil servants).

The HRD Climate Survey instrument (tool) developed and standardized by Rao (1986) at the Centre for HRD, Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI, India) is used to assess HRD climate. This tool consists of 38 items and scaled based on Likert's 5-point scale ranging from 5 (always almost true) to 1 (not at all true). These items assess the elements of HRD climate such as the General Climate (13 items), the OCTAPACE Culture (10 items), and the HRD mechanisms (15 items). Similarly, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) instrument developed by Spector (1994) is used to assess the job satisfaction. This instrument comprises of 36 items and scaled based on Likert's 5 - point scale.

### Reliability

Though the survey tools used are standard, the reliability of the final questionnaire when computed based on the pilot study and the main data, they yield the coefficient of Cronbach alpha for HRD climate 0.905 and for job satisfaction .831. These indicate a very high internal consistency based on average inter-item correlation.

### Sampling and Sample Size

This study examines the prevailing condition of HRD climate and job satisfaction perceived by employees in the selected bureaus within two regions in Ethiopia. The bureaus are selected by judgmental (non probability) sampling method based on the magnitude and primacy of their roles and contributions for development in the regions. Twelve (12) identical bureaus are selected from each region (totally 24 from both regions) for this study.

The target population comprises of all civil servants (executives and non-executives) working within the selected bureaus in both regions (Amhara and Benishangul-Gumuz). The samples are the civil servants those selected in each bureau by systematic sampling (probability) technique based on the employees' list obtained.

Accordingly, using Toro Yemane's (1973) formula, the total sample size determined is 615, and the response rate of the self-administered questionnaires is 87.5 % (539). Based on 539 usable responses the data analysis for the study is carried out.

### Statistical Tools

The raw data gathered from primary sources is first processed (edited, classified, coded, tabulated) and then analyzed using statistical techniques such as means, standard deviation, percentage, frequency, and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to explain or describe the characteristics of respondents, and to determine the significant mean differences between and among respondents' views on HRD climate as well as job satisfaction. All the above mentioned quantitative techniques are computed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (IBM SPSS statistics) version 20.

## IX. Analysis

In the analysis to make the interpretations understandable, the mean scores are converted into percentage scores using the formula, (Rao and Abraham, 1991): *Percentage score = (Mean value-1) x 25*; where the score 1 corresponds to 0%, 2 represents 25%, 3 corresponds to 50%, 4 represents 75% and 5 represents 100%. The percentage indicates the degree at which the particular dimension exists in that bureau out of the ideal 100.

Since the HRD climate questionnaire is designed based on Likert's 5-point scale, the values 1 indicates 'extremely poor' whereas 5 indicates 'extraordinarily good'; 2 indicates very poor; 4 indicates a good degree; and 3 indicates 'average' or 'moderate level' of HRD climate that is existing in the bureaus.

It is certainly desirable for the bureaus to have percentage scores at least above 50% (average) on each item to say the bureau has moderate HRD climate. As Rao (1991) noted, if the bureaus score 60% and above they reasonably do have a good developmental climate, and if they score 75% and above there is a good degree of improvement desirable in the bureaus and presumed that at this level there are conducive HRD policies and practices and most employees have positive attitudes towards their work and the bureau.

## Perception of HRD Climate and its Elements

In this section, the extents of HRD climate perceived by employees are examined for item-to-item (for each 38 items), cumulative (total sum) and the elements of HRD climate based on the data collected from the respondents as presented in annexure 1.

*In the case of item-to-item analysis*, as shown in Annexure 1, among the total 38 HRD climate items only four items score above 3 (50%) mean value. The items mean values range between 3.4 (60.11%) and 1.76 (18.92%). The above average values registered are 3.4 (60.11%); 3.06 (51.44%); 3.06 (51.62%); and 3.04 (51.02%'. Even these mean values except 3.4 (60.11%) the remaining are around the average mean score, (i.e. 3.0) and indicating the moderate level. The remaining items scored below average. Even among them, 16 items score below 40% values.

*Table 1: The Analysis HRD climate and its elements*

| HRD Climate | N | Descriptive | | | ANOVA | | | | | |
| | | | | | HRD Climate | | | | | |
| | | Mean | St. dev | % | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall HRD Climate | 539 | 2.68 | 1.23 | 41.95 | Between Groups | 15.911 | 11 | 1.446 | 2.755 | 0.002 |
| | | | | | Within Groups | 276.65 | 527 | 0.525 | | |
| | | | | | Total | 292.561 | 538 | | | |
| General climate | 539 | 2.64 | 1.217 | 40.98 | Between Groups | 21.236 | 11 | 1.931 | 2.591 | 0.003 |
| | | | | | Within Groups | 392.691 | 527 | 0.745 | | |
| | | | | | Total | 413.927 | 538 | | | |
| OCTAPACE culture | 539 | 2.74 | 1.224 | 43.49 | Between Groups | 14.953 | 11 | 1.359 | 2.489 | 0.005 |
| | | | | | Within Groups | 287.857 | 527 | 0.546 | | |
| | | | | | Total | 302.81 | 538 | | | |
| HRD Mechanisms | 539 | 2.67 | 1.245 | 41.76 | Between Groups | 14.469 | 11 | 1.315 | 2.798 | 0.001 |
| | | | | | Within Groups | 247.732 | 527 | 0.47 | | |
| | | | | | Total | 262.201 | 538 | | | |

*In the case of the overall (cumulative) HRD climate*, as shown in table 1 above, the mean value accounts 2.68 (41.95%), and it is below average value.

Similarly, *for HRD climate elements*, as illustrated in table 1 above, the cumulative General Climate accounts the mean score of 2.64 (40.98%); the cumulative OCTAPACE culture registers the mean score of 2.74 (43.49%), and the cumulative HRD mechanism accounts the mean score of 2.67 (41.76%).

All the mean values registered for cumulative HRD climate and its elements are below average score (3.0). Among HRD climate elements the lowest value is recorded for the General climate, i.e. the most failures arise as results of the inefficiencies and lack of the top managements' commitment, supportive HR policies and positive attitude towards work and people.

Summing up, the analysis results of the overall HRD climate and its elements reveal that almost all the respondents agree on the existence of a very poor HRD climate in their respective bureaus in both regions. This implies there is lack of attention to inculcate and maintain HRD climate as an important tool within the bureaus in both regions in particular and in the public sector in general. Thus, there is an urgent need to improve HRD climate elements in the bureaus/ public sector (civil service organizations) in both regions. So that, the top management's relentless effort is very crucial to bring dynamic change.

The hypotheses set for overall HRD climate and for each HRD climate elements are verified accordingly.

As shown in table 1 above, for overall HRD climate the computed F-value (F = 2.755; df = 11 and P = .002) suggests that the variation in the mean scores is ***statistically significant*** at the 0.05 significance levels. This indicates the null hypothesis is ***rejected*** and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, it is concluded as 'employees differ in their perception about HRD climate within the public sector.

Similarly, for HRD climate elements as shown in table 1 above, the F-statistics corresponding to:

- the General climate (F = 2.591; df = 11 and P = .003) suggests that the variation in the mean scores is **statistically significant** at the 0.05 significance levels. Therefore, the null hypothesis is **rejected** and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means 'there is significant difference in the perception of employees about the General climate with respect to the bureaus'.

- the HRD mechanism (F = 2.798; df = 11 and P = .001) reveals that the variation in the mean scores is **statistically significant** at the 0.05 significance level. Hence, the null hypothesis is **rejected** and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This implied 'there is significant difference about the perception of HRD mechanisms by employees within the bureaus in which they belong'.

- the OCTAPACE culture (F = 2.489; df = 11 and P = .005) suggests that the variation in the mean scores is **statistically significant** at the 0.05 significance level. Hence the null hypothesis is **rejected** and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means, 'the OCTAPACE culture differs within the bureaus'.

## The Job Satisfaction Analysis:- Item-wise and Cumulative

In order to job satisfaction level prevailing in the selected bureaus assess based on 36 items. In this part, the mean values of job satisfaction for the item-to-item and the overall (cumulative) are analyzed as shown in annexure 2 below.

The item-wise analysis indicates that among 36 items of the job satisfaction, 16 items score above average (3 or 50%). The mean scores registered range between 3.74 (68.55%) and 2.1 (27.46%).

The highest mean score is registered for the item stated 'I am happy with the way my co-workers get along with each other', i.e., 3.74 (68.55%), and the least one for 'when I do a good job, I receive recognition', i.e. 2.1 (27.46%). Similarly, the cumulative mean vale of job satisfaction is 2.93 (48.23%) and it is below average. all these values indicate the existence of a poor job satisfaction level in the bureaus in both regions (in the public sector organizations).

## HRD Climate and Job Satisfaction

*Table 2: The aggregate response rates given for each option*

| Variables | Responses rate for each option or scale | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Not at all true** | **Rarely true** | **Sometimes true (neutral)** | **Mostly true** | **Almost always true** |
| *HRD climate items* | 123   (22.8%) | 127 (23.5%) | 142   (26.4%) | 96   (17.8%) | 51   (9.5%) |
| | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** | **Neither agree nor disagree (neutral)** | **Agree** | **Strongly agree** |
| *Job Satisfaction items* | 99   (18.3%) | 123 (22.9%) | 111   (20.7%) | 128 (23.7%) | 78   (14.4%) |

## The Response rate of each Option

The rate of responses for both HRD climate and job satisfaction items are assessed based on the rating scales as shown in table 2 above.

In the case of HRD climate, when both the 'above' and 'below' average values are compared 46.3% of the respondents replied for the below average ('not at all true' and 'rarely true' options) options, and 27.3% of respondents responded for the above average ('mostly true' and 'almost always true' options) options. Similarly, in the case of job satisfaction, 41.2% respondents reply for the 'below average' (both 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree') options and 38.1% of respondents respond for the 'above average' (agree and strongly agree) options.

These results indicate, for both HRD climate and job satisfaction, most of the replies given are for the 'below average' values than the 'above average' ones. Therefore, the response rates analysis suggests the existence of poor level of both HRD climate and job satisfaction within the selected bureaus or in the civil service organization.

## Correlation and Regression

This section examines the relationship between HRD climate and job satisfaction as well as the impact of HRD climate on job satisfaction of the employees within the bureaus.

***Table 3:- The Correlation between HRD climate and Job satisfaction***

| Correlations | | HRDC | GC | OCTAPAC | HRDM | JS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HRD Climate (HRDC)** | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .964** | .934** | .958** | .670** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | N | 539 | 539 | 539 | 539 | 539 |
| **Job Satisfaction (JS)** | Pearson Correlation | .670** | .694** | .578** | .577** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | N | 539 | 539 | 539 | 539 | 539 |
| **\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).** | | | | | | |

As shown in table 3, HRD climate correlates with job satisfaction by r = .670, p<.01 at the 0.01 level of significance. Similarly, job satisfaction correlates with the General climate dimension by (r = .694, p<.01), with the OCTAPAC culture (r = .578, p<.01) and with the HRD mechanism (r = .577, p<.01) at the 0.01 level of significance. These results reveal that all the study variables correlate strongly, positively and significantly with one another at the 0.01 significance level. Besides, the correlation between HRD climate and job satisfaction is *statistically significant* at the 0.01 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis is *rejected* and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means a significant, strong and positive correlation exists between HRD climate and job satisfaction.

In sum, HRD climate and its elements have significant contribution to overall job satisfaction of employees. The high score of HRD climate associates with the high Job satisfaction score. This finding is supports the study results of Jain, Singhal and Singh, (1997); Kumar and Patnaik, (2002); Rohmetra (1998); Krishnaveni and Ramkumar (2006); Ravi (2009); Saxena and Tiwari (2009), Solkhe and Chaudhary (2010). They reported the existence of positive relationship between organizational climate or HRD climate and job satisfaction, and HRD Climate correlates positively with job satisfaction, organizational effectiveness and productivity.

***Table 4:- The regression analysis table***

| **Coefficients** | Independent variables | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | *t* | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** | | |
| | (Constant) | 2.014 | 0.067 | | 29.903 | 0 |
| | HRD Climate | 0.342 | 0.024 | 0.52 | 14.091 | 0 |
| **Model Summary** | **R** | **R²** | **Adjusted R²** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** | **Durbin-Watson** | |
| | 0.627 | 0.478 | 0.474 | 0.41324 | 1.754 | |
| **ANOVA** | **Model** | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| | Regression | 34.155 | 1 | 34.155 | 198.548 | 0 |
| | Residual | 92.378 | 537 | 0.172 | | |
| | Total | 126.533 | 538 | | | |

*Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction; Predictors: (Constant), HRD Climate*

The regression analysis table 4 above reveals that the calculated F-value (F=198.548, P < .05) suggests the variations in the mean scores are *statistically significant* at the 0.05 significance levels. Thus, the null hypothesis *is rejected* and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means, the HRD climate variables do have a significant and positive impact on the job satisfaction in the public sector.

The model summary also indicates 47.8% of the total variation of job satisfaction is explained by the HRD climate within the bureaus (civil service organizations).

In this analysis, the individual impact of HRD climate dimensions on job satisfaction is not interpreted because of the existence of multi-colinearity and high inter-item correlation, which may affect the results. However, it can be concluded that job satisfaction is very much influenced by the HRD climate elements, i.e., the General climate, HRD mechanism and OCTAPAC culture of the organization in general.

## X.    Discussion

*Table 5: Hypotheses Verification*

| Null Hypothesis | Statement | p value | | Result |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $H_{01}$ | Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about HRD climate within the Bureaus. | 2.755 | P<0.05 | Rejected |
| $H_{02}$ | Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about the General climate within the Bureaus. | 2.591 | P<0.05 | Rejected |
| $H_{03}$ | Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about HRD Mechanisms within the Bureaus. | 2.489 | P<0.05 | Rejected |
| $H_{04}$ | Employees do not significantly differ in their perception about OCTAPACE culture within the Bureaus. | 2.798 | p<0.05 | Rejected |
| $H_{05}$ | There is no significant relationship between HRD climate and job satisfaction in the public sector Bureaus | | p<0.05 | Rejected |
| $H_{06}$ | There is no significant impact of HRD climate on job satisfaction. | 198.548 | p<0.05 | Rejected |

**The overall HED climate:** There is significant difference by employees about the perception of HRD climate within the bureaus. 'Employees differ in their perception about HRD climate within the bureaus.

**The HED climate elements:** There is significant difference by employees about the perception of HRD climate elements, such as the General climate, the HRD mechanisms and the OCTAPACE culture with respect to the bureaus. In other words, the General climate, the HRD mechanisms and the OCTAPACE culture differ within the bureaus.

**Association between HRD climate and Job satisfaction:** There is significant relationship between HRD climate and job satisfaction in the public sector Bureaus. The HRD climate variables correlate strongly, positively and significantly with one another. HRD climate and its elements have significant contribution to overall job satisfaction of employees. This finding is supports the study results of Forhand and Gilmer, (1988); Litwin and Stringer, (1968); Jain, Singhal and Singh, (1997); Kumar and Patnaik, (2002); Rohmetra (1998); Kumar and Patnaik, (2002); Krishnaveni and Ramkumar (2006); Ravi (2009); Saxena and Tiwari (2009), Solkhe and Chaudhary (2010).

**Impact of HRD climate on Job satisfaction:** The HRD climate variables do have a significant and positive impact on the job satisfaction in the public sector.

## XI.    Conclusion

Ethiopia as well as its regional states (i.e. Amhara and Benishangul-Gumuz) are now giving emphasis to HRD by committing capacity building and civil service reform program, but the deep-rooted problems are still the bottlenecks to the pace of change. To overcome such problems and meet the ever increasing dynamic demands of the society, the future civil servant should be professionally competent, sensitive and proactive, and action-oriented; and this is ensured by creating conducive HRD climate in the public sector (the civil service). Because, improving HRD climate is improving job satisfaction, organizational performance and productivity.

As the findings revealed, HRD climate and its dimensions are at a very poor level in the selected regional bureaus (civil service organizations). Besides, the computed F-values suggested that there is a significant, strong and positive correlation exists between HRD climate and job satisfaction. Besides, the HRD climate variables do have a significant and positive impact on the job satisfaction in the public sector. Thus, the executives have to realize that creating congenial HRD climate enhances job satisfaction, organizational performance and productivity .within the bureaus/ public sector.

To improve HRD climate and job satisfaction in the civil service organization of the study area, the following suggestions are recommended.

- To improve the HRD climate in the public sector organizations (in civil service), employees (executives and non-executives) have to create close relationship, common understanding, trust, openness, belongingness, and commitment for the achievement of the objectives of the individuals, organization as well as the need of the society. According to changing environment, necessary changes should be introduced in HR policies and practices to encourage the employees contribute their best to the organization.
- The top management's commitment should be increased towards HRD and HRD climate in all endeavors because the mean score of the items dealing the General climate register is 2.64 (40.98%) which is below average, and indicating very poor level of the General climate within the bureaus.
- The management should explore the existing HRD mechanisms to improve the implementation because as seen the mean score is far below average, i.e., 2.67 (41.76%) for the items of HRD mechanisms.

- The management should create and nurture HRD culture (OCTAPACE) within the bureau because the study reveals the OCTAPACE culture registered is 2.74 (43.49%) which is also below average indicating a very poor level within the bureaus.
- The management should establish cordial relationship between supervisors and subordinates; discourage the stereotypes and favoritism; treat all employees on equitable basis; encouraged and inculcated team spirit among the employees; provide feedbacks at fixed time intervals to know the weaknesses in the system and to help employee by consultations, and developed and implemented reward system to appreciate the contributions of employees.
- Managers have to pay attention that HRD climate and job satisfaction of employees are strongly and positively correlated; furthermore, job satisfaction is very much influenced by the HRD climate and its elements. As the findings revealed, both HRD climate and job satisfaction scored 2.68 (41.95%) and 2.93 (48.23%) respectively where the results are below average and indicating the existence of a poor level HRD climate and of job satisfaction level within the bureaus in both regions (in the public sector organizations).
- Employees should know that they are the key resources of any organization and bases to ensure congenial HRD climate in their organization so that they have to develop belongingness about their organization; trust among each other as well as with the organization; develop team spirit in their works within their bureaus; understand thoroughly their bureau's existing and future plans and make themselves aware and committed for significant contribution; be encouraged to experiment with new methods and try to come out with creative ideas; take initiative to do things without waiting for instructions from supervisors; whenever the problems arise discuss the problems openly and try to find the solutions together rather than accusing each other, and express and discuss the feelings with the superiors in a friendly manner without any fear and hesitation.

This study examines employees' perception of HRD climate and its elements in the selected bureaus as well as HRD climate relation to the demographic variables at bureau level in two selected regional states. Thus, there are wide scopes for further research in this area considering other layers of government administration, like Federal, regional, zonal and district level civil servants. There is also an opportunity for comparative studies between public and privet sector organizations in Ethiopia.

# References

[1]. Akinyemi, Benjamin and Iornem, David. (2012). Human Resource Development Climate and Employee Commitment in Recapitalized Nigerian Banks. International Journal of Business and Management, 7(5) accessed at www.ccsenet.org/ijbm.
[2]. Bhardwaj G. and Mishra, P. (2002). Human Resource Development Climate: An Empirical Study among Private Sector Managers. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 38(1): 66.
[3]. Bahar, Byarakter.  (2004). Human Resource Development In Oic Countries: Challenges and Setbacks, Journal of economic Cooperation, P 37. http://www.sesric.org/jecd/jecd_articles/ART03100102-2.pdf
[4]. Gupta C.B. (2009). "Human Resource Management", 11th edition, Sultan Chand and Sons Educational Publishers, New Delhi..
[5]. Hota, P.C. (2010). The Civil Service-Past, Present and Future. Indian Journal of Public Administration, VI(2): 189-201.
[6]. Jain, V.K, Singhal, K.C. and Singh, V.C. (1997). HRD Climate in Indian Industry. Productivity, 37(4), pp. 628-639.
[7]. Kumar, S. and  Patnaik, S.P. (2002). Human Resource Development Climate and Attributes of Teachers in JNVs. Indian Journal of Training and Development, 32: 31-37.
[8]. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and cause of Job satisfaction  M. D. Dunnette (ed ), Hand book of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Rand Mc Nally, Chicago.
[9]. Mathur, K.M. (1989). "Human Resource Development in Administration."  In B.L. Mathur (ed): HRD: Strategic Approaches and Experience, Jaipur: Arihant, pp.49-50. www.egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/ 123456789/35580/1/Unit-12.pd
[10]. Nadler, L (1969). The variety of Training Roles. Industrial & Commercial training, 1(1).
[11]. Nayak, V., Ganihar, N. and Shivanand, (2007). Human Resource development and Teacher Education. Discovery Printing House, New Delhi.
[12]. Purang, P. (2008). Dimensions of HRD Climate Enhancing Organizational Commitment in Indian Organizations. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 43(4): 324-333.
[13]. Rao, T. V. (1985). Integrated Human Resource Development System. In: Goodstein, L. D. & J. W. Pfeiffer, The 1985 Annual: Developing Human Resources. San Diego CA: University Associates.
[14]. Rao, T.V. (1991). Readings in Human Resource Development. Oxford and IHB publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
[15]. Rao, T. V. (1996). Human Resource Development: Experiences, Intervention, Strategies. Sage Publications, New Delhi.
[16]. Rao, T.V. and Abraham, E. (1986). Human Resource Development Climate in Indian Organizations. In Rao T.V. and D. F. Pereira (ed.), Recent Experiences in Human Resources Development, pp. 70-98. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH.
[17]. Rohmetra, N. (1998). Towards creating a learning organization-the HRD Climate Focus. Pradigm, 2(1): 56-63.
[18]. Ravi, Aluval. (2009).  "Perceived HRD climate and job satisfaction: A study of selected IT companies in Hyderabad". Unpublished PHD dissertation submitted to Business Management, Osmania University, Hyderabad.
[19]. Sharma and Purang (2000). Value Institutionalization and HRD Climate: A Case Study of a Navratna Public Sector Organization. Vision, The Journal of Business Perspective, 4: 11-17.
[20]. Solkhe, A. and Chaudhary, N. (2010). HRD Climate and Organizational Performance with focus on Job Satisfaction as a Correlate: Exploratory Analysis. Technia Journal of Management Studies, Vol. 5, No.1, April-September, pp.47-63.
[21]. Solkhe, A. and Chaudhary, N. (2011, April-September). HRD Climate and Organizational Performance with focus on Job Satisfaction as a Correlate: Exploratory Analysis. Technia Journal of Management Studies, 5(1): 47-63.

[22].    Srimannarayan, M. (2009). Human Resource development climate in manufacturing sector. Management & Change, 13(1).
[23].    Wilson, J.P. (2005). Human Resource Development: Learning and training for individuals and organizations. 2nd  ed.  London: Kogan Page Limited.

# Annex

## Annexure 1:- The HRD Climate Analysis

| Items Code No. | The HRD Climate Items | Mean | Std. dev | % | Elements |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HRDC 1 | Employees in this bureau are helpful to each other. | **3.06** | **1.054** | **51.44** | GC |
| HRDC 2 | The management believes that employees are extremely important resources so that they have to be treated more humanly. | 2.97 | 1.317 | 49.17 | GC |
| HRDC 3 | Personnel policies in this bureau facilitate the development of employee. | 2.94 | 1.259 | 48.47 | GC |
| HRDC 4 | Employees in this bureau trust each other. | 2.67 | 1.143 | 41.79 | OCTA |
| HRDC 5 | Officers in this bureau take active interest in their juniors and help them learn their job. | 2.81 | 1.169 | 45.36 | GC |
| HRDC 6 | Job rotation in this bureau facilitates employee development. | 2.88 | 1.383 | 47.12 | HRDM |
| HRDC 7 | Employs are sponsored for training programs on the basis of genuine training needs. | 2.6 | 1.299 | 39.89 | HRDM |
| HRDC 8 | This bureau ensures employee welfare that the employees can save a lot of their mental energy for work purpose. | 2.5 | 1.266 | 37.48 | HRDM |
| HRDC 9 | Employees are not afraid to express or discuss their feelings with their superiors. | 2.77 | 1.28 | 44.25 | OCTA |
| HRDC 10 | Delegation of authority to encourage juniors to develop handling higher responsibilities is quite common in this bureau. | 2.51 | 1.238 | 37.76 | OCTA |
| HRDC 11 | The psychological climate of this bureau is very conducive to any employee interested in developing himself by acquiring new knowledge and skills. | 2.56 | 1.253 | 38.91 | GC |
| HRDC 12 | Team spirit is of high-order in this bureau. | 2.82 | 1.133 | 45.41 | OCTA |
| HRDC 13 | Development of the subordinates is seen as an important part of their job by officers. | 2.32 | 1.225 | 33.07 | GC |
| HRDC 14 | Employees are encouraged to experiment with new methods and try out creative ideas. | 2.43 | 1.19 | 35.85 | HRDM |
| HRDC 15 | The bureau's future plans are made known to the managerial staff to help them develop their juniors and prepare them for the future. | **3.04** | **1.164** | **51.02** | OCTA |
| HRDC 16 | When an employee does good work his supervisor take special care to appreciate it. | 2.24 | 1.253 | 30.89 | HRDM |
| HRDC 17 | Performance appraisal in the bureau is based on objective assessment and adequate information but not on favoritism. | 2.76 | 1.314 | 43.92 | HRDM |
| HRDC 18 | When any employee makes a mistake his supervisor treats with understanding and helps him to learn from such mistakes rather than pushing or discouraging him. | 2.75 | 1.263 | 43.69 | HRDM |
| HRDC 19 | Weaknesses of employees are communicated to them in a non-threatening way. | 2.68 | 1.225 | 42.02 | HRDM |
| HRDC 20 | When feedback is given to employee they take it seriously and use it for development. | 2.98 | 1.166 | 49.54 | HRDM |
| HRDC 21 | When employees are sponsored for training, they take it seriously and try to learn from the programs they attend. | **3.4** | **1.169** | **60.11** | HRDM |
| HRDC 22 | Employees lacking competency to do their jobs are helped to acquire competence rather than being left unattended. | 2.4 | 1.213 | 35.11 | GC |
| HRDC 23 | Seniors guide their juniors and prepare them for the future responsibilities they are likely to take up. | 2.52 | 1.131 | 37.99 | GC |
| HRDC 24 | Managers of this bureau believe that employee's behavior can be changed and people can be developed at any stage of their life. | 2.89 | 1.291 | 47.17 | GC |
| HRDC 25 | The top management of this bureau makes efforts to identify and utilize the potential of the employees. | 2.5 | 1.231 | 37.62 | GC |
| HRDC 26 | Employees in this bureau are very informal and do not hesitate to discuss their personal problems with their supervisors. | 2.53 | 1.226 | 38.27 | GC |
| HRDC 27 | Employees returning from the training programs are given opportunities to try out what they have learnt. | 2.5 | 1.149 | 37.48 | HRDM |
| HRDC 28 | The top management is willing to invest a considerable part of their time and other resources to ensure the development of employees. | 2.43 | 1.23 | 35.67 | GC |
| HRDC 29 | Career opportunities are pointed out to juniors by senior officers in the bureau. | 2.65 | 1.285 | 41.28 | OCTA |
| HRDC 30 | Promotion decisions are based on the suitability of the promotee rather than on favoritism. | **3.06** | **1.321** | **51.62** | HRDM |
| HRDC 31 | There are mechanisms in this bureau to reward any good work done or contribution made by the employees. | 1.76 | 1.161 | 18.92 | HRDM |
| HRDC 32 | When seniors delegate authority to juniors, the juniors use it as an opportunity for development. | 2.76 | 1.208 | 43.88 | OCTA |
| HRDC 33 | When problems arise employees discuss the problems openly and try to solve them rather than keep accusing each other behind the back. | 2.34 | 1.229 | 33.53 | OCTA |

| Items Code No. | The HRD Climate Items | Mean | Std. dev | % | Elements |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HRDC 34 | Seniors are not interested to express or discuss their feelings with their subordinates. | 2.88 | 1.376 | 46.94 | OCTA |
| HRDC 35 | Employees are encouraged to take initiative and do things on their own without waiting for instructions from supervisors. | 2.96 | 1.188 | 49.07 | OCTA |
| HRDC 36 | The top management of this bureau goes out of its way to make sure that employees enjoy their work. | 2.38 | 1.216 | 34.55 | GC |
| HRDC 37 | Employees in this bureau take pains to find out their strengths and weaknesses from their supervising officers or colleagues. | 2.9 | 1.251 | 47.4 | HRDM |
| HRDC 38 | Employees in this bureau do not have any fixed mental impressions about each other. | 2.62 | 1.267 | 40.49 | HRDM |
| **Overall Average Score of the General climate** | | **2.64** | **1.217** | **40.98** | |
| **Overall Average Score of OCTAPACE culture** | | **2.74** | **1.224** | **43.49** | |
| **Overall Average Score of HRD mechanisms** | | **2.67** | **1.245** | **41.76** | |
| *Overall Average Score of HRD climate* | | **2.68** | **1.23** | **41.95** | |

**Note:** *GC – the General Climate; OCTA – the OCTAPACE culture and HRDM – the HRD mechanisms*

## Annexure 2:- The job Satisfaction Analysis

| No | Items | N = 539 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | Std. dev | % |
| JS 1 | I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do. | 2.34 | 1.211 | 33.4 |
| JS 2 | There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. | 2.56 | 1.325 | 38.9 |
| JS 3 | My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. | **3.36** | **1.2** | **59.1** |
| JS 4 | I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. | 2.66 | 1.374 | 41.6 |
| JS 5 | When I do a good job, I receive recognition for it that I should receive. | 2.1 | 1.199 | 27.5 |
| JS 6 | Many of my organization's rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. | **3.2** | **1.213** | **55.1** |
| JS 7 | I am happy with the way my co-workers get along with each other. | **3.74** | **1.158** | **68.6** |
| JS 8 | I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. | **3.09** | **1.389** | **52.1** |
| JS 9 | Communications seem good within this organization. | **3.14** | **1.136** | **53.4** |
| JS 10 | Raises are too few and far between. | 2.18 | 1.302 | 29.5 |
| JS 11 | Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted. | 2.41 | 1.199 | 35.2 |
| JS 12 | My supervisor is unfair to me. | **3.26** | **1.247** | **56.6** |
| JS 13 | The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer. | 2.45 | 1.164 | 36.2 |
| JS 14 | I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. | 2.86 | 1.311 | 46.4 |
| JS 15 | My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by red tape. | 2.89 | 1.265 | 47.2 |
| JS 16 | My co-workers show little interest or support in my work. | **3.17** | **1.157** | **54.2** |
| JS 17 | My job provides me a feeling of accomplishment. | **3.46** | **1.221** | **61.5** |
| JS 18 | The goals of this organization are not clear to me. | **3.66** | **1.222** | **66.5** |
| JS 19 | I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. | 2.96 | 1.341 | 49 |
| JS 20 | I feel if I do well in my job I will get promoted. | 2.88 | 1.316 | 46.9 |
| JS 21 | My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. | **3.13** | **1.221** | **53.2** |
| JS 22 | The benefit package we have is equitable. | 2.64 | 1.24 | 41.1 |
| JS 23 | There are few rewards for those who work here. | 2.39 | 1.316 | 34.7 |
| JS 24 | My job is challenging. | **3.3** | **1.307** | **57.5** |
| JS 25 | I often feel isolated in my work. | **3.54** | **1.277** | **63.6** |
| JS 26 | I often feel that I do not know what is going on within the organization. | **3.6** | **1.231** | **64.9** |
| JS 27 | I feel a sense of pride in doing my job. | **3.35** | **1.353** | **58.7** |
| JS 28 | I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases. | 2.47 | 1.247 | 36.9 |
| JS 29 | There are benefits we do not have which we should have. | 2.61 | 1.318 | 40.3 |
| JS 30 | My supervisor encourages my development. | 2.75 | 1.217 | 43.8 |
| JS 31 | I am provided adequate facilities to do my job. | 2.88 | 1.344 | 47 |
| JS 32 | I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. | 2.55 | 1.273 | 38.7 |
| JS 33 | I am satisfied with my chances for promotion. | 2.52 | 1.217 | 38.1 |
| JS 34 | There is too much bickering and fighting at work. | 2.98 | 1.311 | 49.4 |
| JS 35 | I am given adequate freedom to do my job efficiently. | 3.12 | 1.238 | 53 |
| JS 36 | Work assignments are not fully explained. | 3.25 | 1.279 | 56.3 |
| | *Overall Average Score* | **2.93** | **1.259** | **48.23** |