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Abstract

The working conditions are important for effective management of job satisfaction of the employees within an organization. Organizations which have suitable work environments, including effective management of the performance appraisals have happier employees, experience greater productivity, and also achieve organizational goals. This study examined the relationships on work environment, performance appraisal management, and job satisfaction among support at a public university in Uganda. In a cross-sectional survey study, a questionnaire was conducted among 175 support staff of the university. The results suggest that there is a relationship between work environment and job satisfaction at the university. However, this relation was found to be mediated by the results further that revealed that the effectiveness of performance appraisal management, suitability of work environment and job satisfaction at the university was moderate. The study concludes that to achieve high job satisfaction among the support staff, the work environment of the university should be enhanced to heighten job satisfaction of employees. There should be deliberate effort to have Performance Appraisal Management by encouraging employees to participate in the discussions during the process of performance appraisal. In addition, the process should be conducted in such a way that encourages feedback by the managers. It is recommended that workshops on effective performance appraisal management, fair working conditions and workload allocation to both support staff and administrative staff should be provided. The limitations and implications of the study are also discussed.
Chapter One

Introduction

Background

In productive organizations throughout the world, a suitable work environment that enhances an effective performance appraisal management is important to job satisfaction of the employees and hence success of the organization (Management Study Guide, 2008). Work environment, the situations, settings, conditions and circumstances under which people work (Nayak, & Sahoo, 2015). A suitable work environment is a key in employee’s satisfaction. Performance appraisal management, continuous process of planning, organizing, controlling and implementing the efforts of the employees in harnessing the work environment to achieve the strategic organizational goals of employees (Aguinis, 2009; Nuwagaba, 2015). Effective management of the appraisal system is necessary for job satisfaction of the employees or how happy in fulfilling the desires and needs at the work place (Malik, Saleem, & Ahmad, 2010).

Work environment with its associated effects on Performance appraisal management and employee job satisfaction dates back to prehistoric times. In China, the Chinese civil servants and military officers underwent mental, moral, and physical fitness evaluations as far back as 200 BCE (Wiese & Buckley, 1998 cited in Rubin, 2011). During the middle ages, European guilds used evaluations for certifying craftsmen as masters, and early universities used exams to evaluate students of divinity and the liberal arts (DeVries, Morrison, Shullman, & Gerlach, 1981). Furthermore, in the US, Wiese and Buckley (1998) as cited in Rubin (2011) appraisal activities were conducted by governments and the military for promotions and downsizing.

The history of job satisfaction studies can be traced back to the Hawthorne experiments of Mayo (1924) who found that novel changes in work conditions temporarily increased
satisfaction and thus productivity. Accordingly therefore, proper work environment helps in reducing the number of absenteeism and thus can increase the employees’ performance which leads to increased productivity and satisfaction at the workplace (Boles, 2004).

According to Ubeku (1975), performance appraisal systems for the case of Nigeria have been largely characterized by non-disclosure of appraisal results to the employees. The Ugandan situation is similar to that of Nigeria. Though performance appraisal is part of the performance management system for the Public Service of Uganda, often times the appraisees are not given effective, if any, feedback on their evaluations. In addition, the expected structural changes in the work environment that would foster job satisfaction are not affected. This tends to be the status quo in all government institutions in the country.

The public university investigated is one of the relatively young public universities in Uganda established in 2007 tends to grapple with her appraisal management system. Employee performance management was introduced at the university to examine the performance of the employees and identify areas of strength and weakness such as those that may require more training, promotion, salary and work environment enhancement among others in order to achieve institutional goals (Amaratunga & Baldry, 2002). It was further intended to identify employees who do not perform to the expected standards such that they are counselled and encouraged to perform their duties in addition to bettering their work environment for greater job performance and satisfaction.

However, the current encounters facing the university with regard to her work environment and performance appraisal management seem not to have generated the desired satisfaction levels among the support staff. Provided motivation for this study with a focus on the
work environment, performance appraisal management system, and job satisfaction among the support staff, with the aim of discovering ways to improve employee performance.

The study was guided by the Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). According to the theory, the connections between employees’ inner influences - intellects, feelings, emotional states and their reactions are all influenced by the work environment that affect their performance, commitment, and job satisfaction.

**Problem Statement**

A suitable work environment coupled with an effective performance appraisal management is a desired antecedent for employee job satisfaction; the employee builds confidence and participates actively in the success of the organization (Sypriewska, 2013). However, given the characteristic location of the University in a rural setting, the work environment seems to be less suitable than would enhance effective performance appraisal and job satisfaction among the support staff. For instance, there are reports of lack of office space, office furniture, and insufficient accommodation on campuses among others (Busitema University Faculty of Science and Education Support staff report, 2016). The performance appraisal management at the University also seems defective because some of the performance management tools seem not to be clear. For example, tools like employee coaching, conducting evaluations of the system, and giving feedback to employees.

That could likely have had a negative effect on the job satisfaction of the support staff at the university. Another report by the Appointments Board (2016) shows that a meagre 8.3% of the population of support staff were promoted in 2016, which indicates an ineffectiveness of the performance appraisal management. Such a scenario could lead to high levels of unsatisfactory
behaviors like failing to meet the stated standards, abscondment, failing to accomplish tasks on
time, lack of self-drive and working below the potentials. Therefore, the study sought to assess
the mediation effect of performance appraisal management, on the relationship between work
environment, and job satisfaction among support staff at the university.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to assess the relationship on work environment, performance
appraisal management, and job satisfaction of support staff at the university.

**Objectives of the Study**

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To determine the level of effectiveness of performance appraisal management at the university.
2. To find out the level of suitability of work environment of support staff at the university.
3. To determine the level of job satisfaction among support staff at the university.
4. To examine the mediation effect of performance appraisal management on the relationship
   between work environment and job satisfaction among support staff at the university.

**Significance of the Study**

The findings of the study may be of significance to the following

Human Resource Department on reviving ways of having an effective performance
appraisal management system

Management of the University in formulation of better performance appraisal management
policies that would guide in managing the process of performance appraisal.
Managers of the Universities to review their decisions on how to improve employee job satisfaction in public institutions.

Supervisors of the support staff to improve on the suitability of work environment of employees they supervise.

**Scope of the Study**

The study was conducted at a multi-campus public University in Eastern Uganda. It focused on the support staff who had worked for at least six months and participated in the appraisal process. The study focused on the relationship between work environment as the independent variable, performance appraisal management a mediating variable and employee job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The study used a structured questionnaire for collecting data from the respondents. The questionnaire had four different sections including the bio data section, the performance appraisal management scale, work environment scale and job satisfaction scale.

The bio data section consisted of questions relating to age range, gender, level of study, faculty, marital status, period of stay, department. Section C, measured performance appraisal management, using a Performance Management and Appraisal System Scale adapted from the original scale authored by the Civil Service of Jamaica (2006). It had 19 items. Section B, measured work environment using a work environment scale. It had 22 items. Section D, measured job satisfaction using a standard job satisfaction scale called the Generic Job Satisfaction Scale authored by Macdonald, & Macintyre, (1997). It had 10 items. The study was carried out from the months of May to July, 2017.
**Conceptual Framework**

Below is the conceptual framework showing the relationship between the independent variable mediating variable and dependent variable. The independent variable is work environment. The mediating is Performance Appraisal Management variable. The dependent variable is Job Satisfaction.

![Conceptual Framework Diagram](image)

*Figure 1.* A self-constructed conceptual framework illustrating the relationship between work environment, performance appraisal management and employee job satisfaction.

In Figure 2 above, work environment is postulated to affect job satisfaction in two ways, directly and indirectly and this is in line with affective events theory by Weiss and Cropanzano, (1996). In the direct relationship, a suitable work environment in the university is deemed to motivate the support staff to like their job and hence have a high job satisfaction. Conversely, an unsuitable work environment causes dissatisfaction in the employee.
In the indirect relationship, it is postulated that if the university work environment is suitable, it will influence the performance appraisal management to be effective. A suitable work environment in the university setting could be characterized by a fair workload and work-life balance, workplace safety and health, effective communication and supervision, strategy orientation and professional development. On the other hand, an effective performance appraisal management is reflected by strategic planning, gives feedback to the employees, carries out employee coaching, conducts appraisal exercise, and carries out evaluations of the process, automatically leading to high job satisfaction that will be reflected in employee commitment, active participation, employee recognition, and good employee relations with the supervisors. On the other hand, work environment characterized by poor relationships between the managers and subordinates over workloads and lack of work life balance, lack of work-health and safety measures leads to ineffective performance appraisal management and this automatically lead to low job satisfaction among the employees.
Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The literature review was structured into conceptual review, theoretical review, and an objective by objective review. Gaps realized in the literature were formulated into research questions and hypotheses that correspond to the objectives.

Conceptual Review

Work environment

Opperman (2002) as quoted in Yusuf and Metiboba (2012), define work environment as a composition of three sub-environments which include the technical environment, the human environment and the organisational environment. According to them technical environment involves the tools, equipments, and other technical elements of the workplace. Human environment includes the peers, team and work groups, interactional issues, the leadership and management. And, organizational environment includes systems, procedures, practices, values and philosophies which operate under the control of management. This definition therefore implies that work environment does not only refer to the tools and equipment used, the physical structure within the workplace but also includes the human factor and organization culture. This includes all the things such as: the organization of work, health, safety, working time and work-life balance and the working atmosphere.

It is additional expounded by Briner (2000) as a comprehensive set that involves the physical Setting that is to say heat, equipments etc, characteristics of the job itself, that is, workload, task complexity broader organizational features i.e. culture, history and even aspects of the extra organizational setting ie local labour market conditions, industry sector, work-home
relationships. It means that work environment is the sum of the interrelationship that exists among the employees and the employers and the environment in which the employees work which includes the technical, the human and the organizational environment.

Requirement of convenient and Quality Working conditions are important for improving productivity and have strong influence on an organizations performance appraisal management and the job satisfaction of the employees. Factors considered in working conditions are employee work safety and health, good relationship and supervision work load and work life balance.

A suitable work environment is where results can be achieved as expected by management (Ajala, 2012). The work environment is the most critical factor in keeping an employee satisfied in today’s business world. Therefore all organizations should ensure that all the employees are satisfied with their work environment by providing a suitable environment that will lead to an effective performance appraisal management.

Work environments have components that may affect both physical and psychological well-being of workers (Wännström, Peterson, Åsberg, Nygren, & Gustavsson, 2009). This implies that the way employees engage with components in their work environments determines to a large extent the level of effectiveness of performance appraisal management and satisfaction with other employees with in their work environment. Ali and Adan (2013) states that more attention should be paid in identifying and dealing with work environment because when employees are less satisfied with their work environment sometimes suffer from poor performance appraisal management system. Accordingly therefore, when employees’ are happier with their will have the desire to work hence increasing the effectiveness of performance appraisal management system and satisfaction outcomes.
However, work environment can be defined as those work practices, systems, structures, tools or conditions in the workplace that makes the workplace suitable or unsuitable for employees to perform their duties. It also includes policies, rules, culture, resources, working relationships, work location, ways that employee perform their work.

Work environment plays significant role towards improving the level of effectiveness of performance appraisal management of employees, it is said to impact greatly on employees’ performance negatively or positively (Chandrasekar, 2001). Improved productivity is one of the results of better work environment. Better physical work environment of office will increase the level of effectiveness of performance appraisal management and job satisfaction of employees. In addition, proper work environment also helps in reducing the number of absenteeism and thus can increase the employees’ performance which leads to increased productivity and satisfaction at the workplace.

Various literature pertain to the study of multiple offices and office buildings indicated that the factors such as dissatisfaction, cluttered workplaces and the physical environment are playing a major role in the loss of employees’ productivity (Ali, Ali, & Adan, 2013). This means that suitable work environment characterized by enough office space, good buildings, work life balance and work load coupled with work safety and health all lead to satisfaction of the employees and high productivity.

Work environment is divided into components namely physical and behavioral components. The physical environment contains of basics that relate to the office inhabitants’ ability to physically connect with their office environment. The behavioral environment consists of components that relate to how well the office occupiers connect with each other, and the impact the office environment can have on the behavior of employee. According to Haynes (2008), the physical environment with the productivity of its occupants falls into two main categories office layout (open-
According to Obiora, and Iwuoha, (2013) Conducive work environment ensures the wellbeing of employees which invariably will enable them exert themselves to their roles with all vigor that may translate to higher productivity. This implies that a conducive environment does not only lead to higher productivity but also improves on the satisfaction of the employees at their work environments.

According to Bhawsar, (1992) work environment comprises the totality of forces, actions and other influential factors that are currently or potentially competing with the employee’s activities and performance. This however means that work environment is the sum of the interrelationship that exists within the employees and the environments in which the employees work.

Noah and Steve, (2012) was of the opinion that “the ability to share knowledge throughout organizations depends on how the work environment is designed to enable organizations to utilize work environment as if it were an asset. This aids organizations to improve effectiveness of managing their performance appraisal system. In addition, he argued that work environment designed to suit employee’s satisfaction and free flow of exchange of ideas is a better medium of motivating employees towards higher productivity. However, work environment when appropriately designed, brings about satisfaction of the employees within an organization.

In agreement with Newman and Cullen (2002) who stated out that searching for the office machine is not an easy work, because good office machine should meet the needs of those going to operate it. However, searching for the machine is not the only aspect to be considered
other aspects such as the costs, dependability, standardization, durability as well as equipment operator input should be taken care of by the organizations and this increases satisfaction of employees. But those Organizations, which fail to obtain suitable office equipment, may reduce its employee satisfaction that may lead to lower productivity.

Performance appraisal management.

Performance appraisal management is defined as the continuous process of planning, organizing, controlling, and implementing the efforts of the employees as well as using other resources to achieve the strategic organizational goals through periodical appraising of employees. Aguinis (2009); Nuwagaba (2015); and Yosuy (2003) on their part defined performance appraisal management as a process which contributes to the effective management of individuals and teams to achieve high levels of organizational performance. Anthony, Perrewe, and Kacmar (1996) as cited in Huang (1998) state that performance appraisal management system must be well-defined, supported corporately and supervised. It must also be extensively communicated and directed towards achieving corporate objectives as well as integrated as part of a performance management system focused towards achieving corporate goals.

The construct of performance appraisal management was conceptualized as activities such as assessment of employees and giving feedback that enhances improvement in setting appropriate goals, establishing tools for the measurement of performance and consistently using them to align goals of the institution and address the expectations of the employees. This was accompanied by carrying out continuous strategic planning, employee coaching, appraisals, giving feedback as well as carrying out Evaluations of the whole process (Islam, & Rasad, 2006)
According to Moore (2008) a performance management system and process would be used to give each employee a clear vision of their responsibility in the overall mission and describe measurable achievements. This makes employees to feel more involved in their own and the company's success. With regular feedback, they begin to see how their own individual contribution affects the overall objectives of the organization by setting out clear, measurable performance goals for each employee and it even become easier to identify where the weak points are and then solve them.

Performance appraisal management is concerned with satisfying the needs and expectations of organizations management and employees. He further posts that performance management appraisal practices such as relevant training and coaching of staff, management development activities, evaluations and performance appraisals need to be carried out.

Khoury and Analoui, (2004) suggested that performance management practice is a means of getting results from a whole Organization by understanding and managing performance within an agreed framework of planned goals standards and competence requirements. Accordingly therefore, performance management practices may include goal setting workers selection and placement, performance appraisal, compensation training and development and career management.

Performance appraisal management is dependent with employee satisfaction. Participative approach to performance appraisal management allows employees to respond in terms of their flexibility, cooperation, commitment and eventually satisfaction (Gathoni, 2012). However performance appraisal management should be managed at both individual level and organizational level, based on the two organizations and employees taking ownership of
performance appraisal management process adds up well to employee's satisfaction and the suitable work environment.

Piccolo, Greenbaum, Hartog and Folger (2010) posts that practices relating to people, performance appraisal management and organization results also show association with employees satisfaction. He further indicated that employee performance at work is interdependent with employees satisfaction in the sense that when employees performs well by meeting their goals, they derive satisfaction from this and this propels them to perform even better. Accordingly therefore, Performance appraisal management plays a vital part in motivation it is an ingredient of job satisfaction.

Snell and Bohlander (2010) defines performance appraisal management as a process, typically performed/delivered by a supervisor to a subordinate, designed to help employees understand their roles, objectives, expectations and performance success. Further he explains performance appraisal management as the process of creating a work environment in which people can perform to the best of their abilities. It is a whole work system that begins when a job is defined. This therefore implies that performance appraisal management is a way, by which senior officers keep some periodic objective of the subordinates, clears the expected role and explain performance success by his actual performance with pre-determined standard. In addition, performance appraisal management is a way of creating the whole work environment suitable for employees to perform their best.

Koshy and Suguna (2014)) defines performance appraisal management as the process of planning performance, appraising performance, giving its feedback, and counselling employees to improve their performance. Therefore, performance appraisal is considered as the key ingredient or an important step of whole performance management system and this is in line with
(Potgieter, 2002). They concluded that performance appraisal management systems were the precursor to today’s performance appraisal management.

McClelland (1992) asserts that productivity is also affected by the environment with which people work and the type of job they do. Employees without proper direction in the workplace develops resentments leading to relationship issues that negatively affect job satisfaction of employees. Employee is an important asset in organization and when this asset develops problems, it affects both quality and resulting productivity.

**Employee job satisfaction.**

The most important goal of an organization is to maximize employee performance in order to achieve goals (Butler & Rose, 2011). To gain this, the organization does not only need a suitable environment and an effective performance appraisal management but also satisfied employees to enhance performance and productivity in the organization. Employee satisfaction and performance appraisal management and a suitable work environment have always been very important issues in human resource management.

Employee job satisfaction means how happy the employees are in fulfilling their desires and needs at their work place (Spector, 1997). However, many scholars have in various ways tried to explain the meaning of Job Satisfaction. Malik, Saleem, and Ahmad (2007) explained employee satisfaction with work as the extent to which employees like or dislike their job. Accordingly therefore, job satisfaction can be said as the likeliness to the job that motivates the employees to be present at their work places and carry out tasks happily.

Malik, Bibi, and Rahim (2010) state that people like and struggle to work in those organizations that provide suitable work environments where they feel they are making
difference and where most people in the organization are capable of moving the organization forward. Besides, Commitment towards an organization is an indication of job satisfaction.

Malik, Nawab, Naeem, and Danish (2013) studied the effect of various scopes of job satisfaction affecting commitment towards organization in a public sector university in Pakistan and found out that employee job satisfaction improves organizational commitment of workers. Similarly, Job Satisfaction boosts employee’s level of participation in the institution. Furthermore, employee participation in the performance appraisal management process is positively related to the employee satisfaction with the performance process, perceived fairness, and acceptance of such a practice (Cawley, Keeping, & Levy, 1998).

Spector (1997) refers to job satisfaction in terms of how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. These aspects of the job however may include the work environment and the performance appraisal management in which managed well increases the job satisfaction of the staff and vice versa. This is also in line with the Ellickson and Logsdon (2002) who support this opinion by defining job satisfaction as the extent to which employees like their work.

Weiss (2002) view job satisfaction as emotional responses to aspects of the work environment. This definition of job satisfaction is an emotive reaction of employees in relation to the aspects of their job and response(s) they go through at their workplace. Aspects such as the workload and safety, friendly staff relationships, fair policies and systems such as the performance appraisal management system all contribute to the level of satisfaction of employees. This therefore to some extent implies that, a satisfied worker is that one who is satisfied with the aspects of his or her job, work environment and the performance appraisal system.
Pocztowski (2003) believes that the level of job satisfaction experienced by an employee is depends on the wages, advancement opportunities, management leadership, job description, interpersonal relations, working conditions, work organization, management and corporate reputation. This is in line with the studies carried out by Makin, Cooper & Cox (2000) who post that job satisfaction is an emotional mental state in the perception of positive and pleasant which proceeds with the evaluation of their own work or experience. They emphasize among others, factors that influence the feeling of job satisfaction as: interesting work, well-paid jobs, and the possibility of advancement, good superiors and good relationships with other workers. Accordingly therefore organizations should ensure a suitable work environment and effective performance appraisal management to maintain a satisfied work force.

Generally, satisfied people build positive relationships based on cooperation and effective solidarity with others, thus increasing communication and ensuring proper communication and effective conflict mitigation (Ibsen, 2005). Satisfied employees mean reduced absenteeism, a high level of commitment to work, loyalty and permanence of employment, improved health and a lack of the desire to avoid work, simulated malaise and excuses to be absence from work. (Argyle, 2004).

In summary, however job satisfaction is defined as an extent to which people like or dislike their job which implies whether employees are happy and contented in fulfilling their desires and needs at work. Therefore, satisfied employees will work towards achieving the strategic goals of an organization. Job satisfaction is generally defined as an individual’s opinion about their occupation (Spears, 2001).
Theoretical Review

Several theories have been advanced to explain the relationship between performance appraisal system work environment and employee job satisfaction. They include the Expectancy Theory, Goal Setting Theory, Herzberg two factor theory, Equity Theory, and Affective Events Theory among others. However, this study will be guided by mainly by three theories that is; Herzberg’s (1968) theory the Goal Setting Theory and Affective Events Theory.

Herzberg’s two factor theory

Another theory used was Herzberg’s (1968) theory. It was as a result of a five year research program on job attitudes initiated by a grant from the Buhl Foundation. There was a need at the time for a better insight about the attitudes of employees towards their jobs due to the occurrence of job dissatisfaction indicators such as strikes, slowdowns, and filing of grievances (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957). However, this theory proposes that most factors which contribute to job satisfaction are motivators (achievement, recognition, the satisfaction of the work itself, responsibility and opportunities for advancement and growth) and most factors which contribute to job dissatisfaction are hygiene elements (company policy, general management, the individual relationship with their manager and working conditions). According to this theory, if hygiene factors are not attended to by managers of the organization, feelings of employees’ job dissatisfaction and poor job performance will occur (Gitonga, 2014).

This theory evidently shows that job dissatisfiers which include the broader working conditions in organizations such as policies and management, interpersonal relations with superiors and colleagues, supervisory practices are critical factors that need to be addressed so as to increase the performance of the employees since they affect job satisfaction which directly influences job performance of the staff. However, the satisfiers on the other hand play a critical
role in enhancing job performance in that it recognizes personal motivational factors that are outside of the organization’s direct control in enabling one perform his/her duties.

Accordingly, therefore, organizations that focused on hygiene factors in an attempt to improve productivity influences job satisfaction. Orpen (1979) argued that this was the wrong approach. In order to increase satisfaction, the motivation factors must be improved. Accordingly therefore, jobs should be restructured to increase the ability of workers to achieve goals that are meaningfully related to the doing of the job. Job satisfaction can also be reached by matching the individual’s work capacity to the work he/she will need to do. Equally, managers must provide recognition of employees when needed and effectively plan and organize the work. Finally, workers must be allowed to set their own goals since it encourages them to determine how they can achieve them. This will give workers a greater sense of achievement over their work hence satisfaction.

Goal Setting Theory.

This theory was proposed by Edwin Locke in the year 1968. The theory suggests that the individual goals established by an employee with the help of management play an important role in motivating him/her for greater performance. This is because the employees keep following their goals. If these goals are not achieved, they either improve their performance or modify the goals and make them more realistic. In case the performance improves it will result in achievement of the performance appraisal management aims (Salaman, Storey, & Billsberry, 2005).

However, the decision to set a goal comes from dissatisfaction with existing performance levels. This will change a person's behavior to work towards achieving the set goal. Therefore,
Goal-setting theory predicts that people will be motivated to channel their effort toward accomplishing their goals and this in turn may affect performance (Locke & Latham, 1990).

Accordingly therefore, when performance appraisal management is appropriately carried out, it does not only let employees know how well they are performing but also influence their future level of efforts and task direction. It also forces employees to be focused on work activities and goals by providing a basis for performance improvement.

According to Locke and Latham (2002), the more difficult the goal, the more important it is that the employee commits him/herself towards its achievement. This however means that well-defined and challenging goals motivate the employees to greater improved performance than vague or easy goals. So it is important to encourage and support the employee and maintain a good working relationship.

Equally, employee satisfaction and performance are higher when individuals set specific goals which are difficult but reasonably attainable. All in all, work targets helps an organization and individuals to meet their objectives. Therefore, employees must be involved in setting targets together with the support from management of the organization so that they can be motivated to achieve those goals, however, ambiguous goals or not setting goals at all may lead to failure in enhancing employee satisfaction as well as performance.

**The Affective Events Theory.**

Another theory that will guide the study is the Affective Events Theory. This theory was developed by Psychologist Howard M. Weiss and Russell Cropanzano (1996). The theory explains the connections between employees’ inner influences - intellects, feelings, emotional states and their reactions to events that occur in their work environment that affect their
Similarly, Affective Events Theory focuses on how people feel while working, what workplace events cause those feelings and how those feelings influence subsequent job attitudes and behaviors. Therefore performance appraisal management as an event in an organization creates emotion that portrays either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Suitability of Work Environment

A safe and clean physical environment impacts both on employees’ performance and the managers’ at large (Leung, Chan, & Wang, 2006). Decent facilities make additional contributions to employees work, for example, Leung (2006) found a direct relationship between organizational architecture and the collaboration of employees. The arrangement of space has immediate and far reaching consequences for employee’s ability to effectively and efficiently accomplish their work, the formation of social and professional relationships, and the sharing of information and knowledge. Consideration of the spaces where employees meet and collaborate is just as important as the design of the classroom (McGregor, 2004). Accordingly therefore, organizations with dilapidated and incomplete structures demoralize both employees who interact and work in such facilities.

A study done by Nyathira (2013) posts that the amount of work and facilities are fringe benefits that motivated the teachers to work hard and increase their level of performance. In Nigeria employees were frustrated and demotivated since the work environment were dotted with dilapidated buildings, equipped with outdated laboratory facilities and equipment. In Uganda, a study by Carasco, Munene, Kasente and Odada, (1996), points out that a number of
employee trainees were exposed to poor work environments like poor physical structures with incomplete classrooms without doors, windows, poor sanitation facilities and lack of teaching resources, which hindered their performance. On the other hand, inadequate facilities and resources cannot be ignored. When facilities are not safe for employees to use them while at work, or have insufficient resources, they are likely to feel unsupported and to be less successful than they otherwise would be (Ladd, 2011).

Adequate facilities which are spacious for work, clean, physically safe and well maintained, therefore provide a conducive teaching and learning environment. This study therefore, intends to examine the performance appraisal management, work environment and job satisfaction.

**Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Management in Universities**

Effective performance appraisal management should have clear guidelines. In order to have effective appraisal, the process must be rooted in the organization where the values shape part of the everyday life of the organization (Piggot-Irvine, 2003). Performance goals must be specifically and clearly defined, performance appraisal management programmes should draw personal rewards to organizational performance, the supervisor and employee should jointly identify ways to improve the employee's performance, and establish a development plan to help the employee achieve their goals, the appraiser should be given feedback regarding his/her effectiveness in the performance appraisal process, the performance appraisal system, regardless of the methodology employed, must comply with legal requirements notably, equal employment opportunities guidelines.
Performance appraisal management to be effective should be intended to gather information and measurements about the activities of staff and the organizations operations which are valuable to management for enhancing the employees’ productivity, satisfaction, working conditions, their morale, and internal workings of the organization wholly (Rahman & Shah, 2012).

Wiese and Buckley (1998) posit that “Effective managers recognize performance appraisal management systems as a tool for managing rather than a tool for measuring subordinates. They may use performance appraisals management to motivate, direct and develop subordinates”. More to the above, having both the manager carrying out the appraisal, coaching of employees, evaluations and the employee setting goals mutually is crucial for the effectiveness of the performance appraisal management and this can ensure that the employee will work harder to reach these goals as they participated in setting them initially. Accordingly therefore, the degree of participation of juniors in the appraisal has been seen to be of an advantage to the success of the system and brings satisfaction among them. However, one of the major causes of ineffective performance appraisal management is the ineffectiveness of the whole process by management.

Performance Appraisal management is one of the most emotionally charged procedures in management (Swan, 1991). A Performance appraisal management system should be fair and must provide accurate and reliable data (Karimi, Malik, & Hussain, 2011). Therefore it is important that performance appraisal management systems are fair to staff so that employee satisfaction can be reached. So many Performance Appraisal management systems are exclusively used as a procedure to determine whether employee feedback, appraisal process, coaching and evaluations will be given or as a way of communicating to staff what their role is.
Not only that, but performance appraisal management should be used for the benefit of both the employee and the organization. Continuous assessment could probably be used as a retention tool and as a system of determining what skills the organization has and what ones it is lacking. However, managing and evaluating performance is still a major challenge for the majority of managers today (Armstrong, 1994).

Performance appraisal management is important that managers need to show support of the process in their organizations. It is a duty of Managers to ensure that performance appraisal management tools are understood accessed and observed by all levels of staff. If supervisors play their role in performance appraisal management effectively, the employees will understand them (Murphy & Cleveland, 2007).

Boice and Kleiner, (1997) stated that an effective performance appraisal system assist to generate a motivated and committed labor force. In their analysis, they pointed out that with large spans of control, several managers may work with individual employees. They concluded that building an effective performance appraisal system needs strong commitment from top management: if the system does not provide the linkage between employee performance and organizational goals, it is bound to be less than completely effective.

According to Obisi (2011), ‘Organizational performance and its resultant efficiency and effectiveness can only be achieved when individuals are continuously appraised and evaluated. This shows why most of every organization carries out some form of performance appraisal either on its own or as part of their performance management system. Performance assessment is one of the most common practice in every organization. It is essential for the better performance of employees and organization.
Flecher (2001) posits that it is beneficial to train or coach both supervisor and supervisee since both are partners in implementation of performance appraisal. The low level of understanding of performance appraisal process can cause a lot of confusion among individual workers at all levels. Accordingly therefore, Failure to conduct employee coaching may lead to difficulties in coping up with setting objectives. If this happens automatically, it will lead to ineffectiveness in Performance appraisal management.

In determining what to evaluate, designers of appraisal system usually consider not only results, but also the behaviors that lead to the results (Bodil, 1997). According to Cleveland, and Murphy (1989) there are four main uses for Performance Appraisal in organizations today. These are Between Individual Comparisons, Within Individuals Comparisons, Systems Maintenance and Documentation. Linking Performance Appraisal to the business goals of the company has been seen as an innovative way of focusing employees’ actions to the priorities of the business. The purpose of Documentation is the use of performance appraisal to document or justify personnel decisions and ensure they are meeting legal requirements (Cleveland et al, 1989; Wiese & Buckley, 1998).

Throughout the vast amount of journal articles and research on performance appraisal management, there is a substantial view that while performance appraisal seems like a great tool and should be of huge benefit to every organization, they can be moderately ineffective and so have taken a lot of criticism. Lawler and McDermott (2012) discuss how a lot of literature poses the idea of dismissing performance appraisal completely, but he believes that Performance Appraisal is a vital procedure for effective talent management. He recommends that the way forward for Performance Appraisal as a tool of management is not to eliminate it but to work on making it an effective tool. ‘The key is to make them part of a complete performance
management system, which includes goal setting, development, compensation actions, performance feedback and a goals-based appraisal of performance (Lawler, 2012).

The study conducted by Brown, Hyatt, and Benson (2010) examined that there was a direct connection between the performance appraisal management and employee outcomes, which produces employee job satisfaction. Accordingly, performance appraisal management which is effective, brings about satisfaction among the employees.

Levels of Employee Job Satisfaction in Universities

Roberson, (1990) suggest that employee job satisfaction is a positive attitude regarding performance appraisal which result bring about good working atmosphere and employees dedicate their self to achieving organizational goals and objectives. Satisfaction depends on what an individual wants from the world, and what he gets.” Employee satisfaction is a measure of how happier workers are with their job and work environment. It is sure that there may be many factors affecting the organizational effectiveness and one of them is the employee satisfaction. Effective organizations should have a culture that encourages the employee satisfaction.

Employee Satisfaction is very important to organizations because it is a precondition for productivity, responsiveness, and quality and customer service. Staff attendance, compliance with policies and confidence in leadership are other indirect indicators of allegiance while excessive theft and sabotage spell obvious lack of job satisfaction.

In another research it is said that employee satisfaction influenced employee productivity, absenteeism and retention (Allen & Wilburn, 2002). However, the success of any organization is directly linked to the satisfaction of the employees who represent that organization, retaining talented people is critical to the success of any organization (Sageer, Rafat and Agarwal, 2012). Studies show that businesses that excel in employee satisfaction issues reduce turnover by 50%
from the norms, increase customer satisfaction to an average of 95% and lower labor cost by 12% (Hamdan, Alzalabani, & Nair, 2011). The more satisfied an employee is, the less turnover and absenteeism occurs. On the other hand, employee satisfaction is positively linked with motivation, job involvement, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, mental health, and job performance, and negatively related to absenteeism, turnover, and perceived stress and identify it as the degree to which a person feels satisfied by his/her job.

Employees who feel a sense of teamwork and common purpose, a strong commitment to communication, and managerial empowerment are most able, and willing, to deliver the results that customers expect (Employee Satisfaction, 2005) Human Relations perspective posits that satisfied workers are productive workers (Likert, 1961; Johnson, 2005). Thus, organizational productivity and efficiency is achieved through employee satisfaction and attention to employees’ physical as well as socio emotional needs.

Consistent with the above reasoning, Sageer, Rafat, and Agarwal (2012) argued that collaborative effort directed towards the organization’s goals is necessary for achievement of organizational objectives, with unhappy employees failing to participate (effectively) in such efforts. The predominant view has focused on the situational context (e.g., supervisory support) as a cause of satisfaction and has argued that high-performance work practices and thus a positive working climate foster employee satisfaction (Wright, Moynihan, & Allen, 2005; Wright & Snell, 2001).
Mediation effect of performance appraisal management between Work Environment and Job Satisfaction

A work environment that attracts employees at their work place and encourages them to perform effectively is a supportive environment (Osibanjo, Gberevbie, Adeniji, & Oludayo, 2015). The intent of providing an attractive work environment is to create a conducive work environment for the employees to enable them to perform effectively. This means making best use of their knowledge, skills, and competences to improve and provide quality services. The conducive environment contributes positively to the job satisfaction of employees.

A poor work environment on the other hand has proved to be associated with reduced job satisfaction, absenteeism, somatic complaints, burnout and depression phenomena (Osibanjo, Gberevbie, Adeniji, & Oludayo, 2015). According to Mary (2013), people strive to work and to stay in those corporations that offer good and positive work environment, where employee feel that they are valued mostly and making difference. This means that organizations should provide conducive and supportive work environments to their employees. In addition, the important physical factors in the office is an important factor in enhancing employee productivity and satisfaction (Khan, Azhar, Parveen, Naeem, & Sohail, 2011). Selecting appropriate office furniture is an important consideration in which office managers need to pay more attention to make sure that the physical environment is properly maintained. The office design encourages employees to work a certain way by the way their work stations are built. In doing so, the organization is answering the firm’s business plan while making sure their employees have everything they need to work with (Osibanjo et.al. 2015).

It is generally understood that the physical design of offices and the environmental conditions at work places are important factors for employee’s job satisfaction and performance.
One survey conducted by Brill in particular has suggested that improvements in the physical design of office buildings may result in a 5-10 percent increase in productivity and eventually increase performance as well as job satisfaction.

Other studies examined the effect of physical work environment on workers’ job satisfaction, performance, and health. For example Scott, Bishop, & Chen, (2003) reported that working conditions associates with employee’s job involvement and job satisfaction. Strong, (1999) in a study observed that social, organizational and physical context serve as the motivator for tasks and activities, and considerably influence worker performance. Researches on quality of work life have also established the importance of safe and healthy working conditions in determining employees’ job satisfaction.

According to Lambert, Hogan, and Barton, (2001) posts that environmental factors are important cause of job satisfaction among the employees. The level of salary, promotion, appraisal system, climate management, relation with coworkers and furniture/ fittings in the office are the very important factors.

According to the survey by Kithuka, (2015) of 2000 employees of various organizations and industries in multiple levels. The reported results of these survey revealed that nine employees out of ten believed that a workspace and quality of the furniture affects the attitude of employees and increases their productivity. Similarly Osibanjo, et.al. (2015) concluded that the type and the comfort ability of the furniture and fittings within the office environment have a significant impact on the satisfaction level of employees as it affects their performance. Accordingly therefore it is important to recognize the significance of these factors to increase the employees’ satisfaction level in the workforce. How employees perceive their work environment
can affect employee's commitment, motivation, and performance and also helps organization to form a competitive edge over its rivals.

Rezgui, Hopfe, and Vorakulpipat (2010) posts that “the ability to share knowledge in organizations depends on how the work environment is designed to facilitate organizations to use work environment as if it were an asset. This helps organizations to improve effectiveness and allow employees to benefit from collective knowledge”. Further, he argued that work environment designed to suit employee’s satisfaction and free flow of exchange of ideas is a better medium of motivating employees towards higher productivity.

Osibanjo et al. (2015) concluded that a motivational and empowered work climate (furniture inclusive) influences employee's attitudes toward work positively and can improve work performance and satisfaction. In addition, work place survey conducted for steel case described that an effective work environment management entails making work environment (including attractive furniture) creative, comfortable, satisfactory and motivating to employees so as to give.

According to Sarwar (2017), (2003). A good performance appraisal management system works towards the improvement of the organizational performance by managing the performances of teams and individuals for ensuring the achievement of the overall organizational ambitions and goals. According to Fisher and Ashkanasy (2000), performance feedback has an important influence on employee affection. Regular reviews should be done on regular basis in organizations. According to Lawson (1995) a good performance appraisal management system permits individual employees develop their abilities, increase job satisfaction and achieve their potential to their own benefit and to that of the Organization. Therefore, the type of feedback on performance provided by managers can affect employee performance and job satisfaction.
According to Gathoni, (2012) performance appraisal management practices are geared towards getting results from the whole organization by understanding and managing performance within an agreed framework and planned goals. As Boswell and Boudreau (2000) indicated that employee's performance appraisal management plans if well done will lead to employee satisfaction. Owalla, (2011) Puts it that these practices will further lead to greater commitment and enjoyment by the employees.

Where the consequence of a low levels of performance appraisal management is low levels of job satisfaction leading to low employee commitment, participation, recognition and poor supervisor-supervise relations. Furthermore, unfair procedures used in performance appraisal management create job dissatisfaction.

Human relations researchers further argue that employee satisfaction sentiments are best achieved through maintaining a positive social organizational environment, such as by providing autonomy, participation, and mutual trust (Likert, 1961). Employees’ job satisfaction sentiments are important because they can regulate collaborative effort.

**Research Questions**

1. What is the level of Performance Appraisal Management at the university?
2. What is the level of job satisfaction among support staff at the university?
3. How does performance appraisal management affect job satisfaction among support staff of the university?
Research Hypothesis

The research was guided by the hypothesis (H1) that there is a significant mediating relationship between work environment performance appraisal management and employee job satisfaction at the public university in Uganda.
Chapter Three
Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology that was used in the study. It includes the research design, study population, sample size and selection, sampling method, data collection methods and instruments, pretesting of instruments, and study procedure. The validity and reliability of the study instruments were also described. Techniques of data management and analysis are explained within the chapter.

Research Design

This research was meant to assess the relationship on the relationship between work environment performance appraisal management and job satisfaction among support staff at the university. The purpose of the study was to analyze the effectiveness of the performance appraisal management in relation to work environment and employee job satisfaction.

The study employed quantitative methods, using descriptive correlational research design. The descriptive nature of the study was intended to describe the levels of suitability of the university work environment, effectiveness of performance appraisal, and job satisfaction among the support staff. The descriptive approach was relatively cheap and easy to implement, and yielded results in a short period of time (Sarandakos, 1998). The correlational design enabled easy determination of the degrees or strengths of the associations and structural equation modelling among the variables. This was important because the study sought to explain the study variables with respect to the demographics of the respondents. Since the study variables were
quantifiable, a correlational study was befitting to establish the relationships and interaction effects among them.

**Study Population**

The study consisted of support staff who had served the university for at least six months by the time of data collection given the fact that they had already been appraised. The target population of 207 employees (Human Resource Report, 2016) was involved in the study.

**Sampling and sample size**

The study used census method to engage all the support staff as participants. This method was preferred because the population was small and it allowed wholesome examination of the subjects as well as reducing bias during the exercise. The target population of 207 employees were thus considered as a sample.
Table 1
Sample Size and Sampling Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
<th>Top management</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Sampling Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Science and Education</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health sciences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agriculture and animal sciences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Natural resources &amp; Environmental sciences</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business &amp; Management sciences</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
<td><strong>09</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Busitema University Personnel Records (2016)*

**Research Instrument: The Questionnaire**

The study used a structured questionnaire for collecting data from the respondents. The questionnaire was cost effective and yielded results very fast. Closed-ended questions were used to limit the respondents to preset answers and avoid unwarranted responses. A 5-point Likert scale questionnaire was the main instrument of data collection for the study. The questionnaire has four different sections including the bio data, the performance appraisal management scale, work environment scale and job satisfaction scale.

The bio data consisted of questions relating to age range, gender, level of study, faculty, marital status, period of stay, department. This section assessed the demographics of the respondents.
Quantitative data for performance appraisal management was collected using a Performance Management and Appraisal System Scale adapted from the original scale authored by the Civil Service of Jamaica (2006). It had got 19 items. It had a sufficient number of items to determine its reliability. Three items of the scale measure strategic planning, five items of the scale measure Employee coaching, three items of the scale measure conducting appraisal, five items of the scale measure feedback and three items of the scale measure conducting Evaluation. Its acceptable Cronbach’s alpha reliability was 0.9 during the pilot study and during the final data analysis.

Quantitative data for work environment was measured using a work environment scale. It has got 22 items. It had a sufficient number of items to determine its reliability. Four items of the scale measured communication, three items of the scale measured supervision, three items of the scale measure social relations, two items of the scale measured workload and work life balance, four items of the scale measured workplace safety and health, four items of the scale measure professional development and two items of the scale measure strategy and orientation. Its acceptable Cronbach’s alpha reliability was 0.8 during the final analysis.

Quantitative data for job satisfaction was measured using a standard job satisfaction scale called the Generic Job Satisfaction Scale authored by (Macdonald, & Macintyre, 1997). It has got 10 items, sufficient to determine its reliability. Three items of the scale measured commitment, two items of the scale measured recognition, three items of the scale measured participation and two items of the scale measured supervisor-supervisee relations. It had acceptable Cronbach’s alpha reliability of .77. The value in this study was 0.8 during the pilot study and in the final data analysis.
**Pilot Study**

This pilot study was carried out at Kyambogo University. A sample size of 20 participants was involved in the study. This was because the above participants helped to identify the errors that might have been made in the questionnaires. The pilot study also enabled the researcher to acquire information concerning the variables of study from the pilot institution and relate that information to the institution of study.

**Procedure of the Study**

The researcher obtained an approval letter from departmental head that introduced her to various authorities for example the Deans of faculties where the study was conducted. This involved administering the questionnaire to all the staff. After self-introduction of the researcher and explanation of the purpose of the study to the support staff, dates were set for data collection. During data collection, the respondents were addressed, reasons and details of the study were explained, and respondents were requested for consent. The instrument was then administered to the consented respondents. The respondents were expected to fill the instrument within 30 minutes and questionnaires were collected the same day.

**Data Management**

The filled-in questionnaires were screened for completeness. The incomplete ones were disregarded while data in the complete questionnaires were coded and entered in Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) software. The entered data was cleaned and managed as follows;
Each of the items of the Performance Appraisal Management Scale was scored on 5-point Likert scale, 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scores to the items were added to constitute the individual’s rating of the efficiency of performance appraisal management of the university. The scores were categorized as low (19-44), moderate (45-70) and high (71-95) levels of effectiveness of performance appraisal management.

Each of the items of the work environment Scale was scored on 5-point Likert scale, 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scores to the items were added to constitute the individual’s rating of the suitability of work environment of the university. The scores were categorized as low (22-51), moderate (52-81) and high (82-110) levels of suitability of work environment.

Each item of Job Satisfaction Scale was scored on 5-point Likert scale, 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scores to the items were also added to constitute the individual’s rating of his or her job satisfaction within the university. The scores were categorized as low (10-23), moderate (24-46), and high (47-50) levels of job satisfaction. The different score ranges of the instruments are presented in Table 2.
Table 2

Score Ranges of the Various Scales Used in the Quantitative Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score range</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>19-44</td>
<td>Low effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-70</td>
<td>Moderate effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71-95</td>
<td>High effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Scale</td>
<td>22-51</td>
<td>Low suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52-81</td>
<td>Moderate stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82-110</td>
<td>High suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>10-23</td>
<td>Low satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-36</td>
<td>Moderate satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37-50</td>
<td>High satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative Data Analysis

The filled-in questionnaires were screened for completeness. The incomplete ones were disregarded while data in the complete questionnaires were coded and entered in Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) software. The entered data was cleaned and analyzed as follows:

Frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviations for objective one, two and three. Pearson Correlation was used for objective four. This involved determining the number of respondents in the various demographics having different levels of performance appraisal management, work environment and job satisfaction. Further, more statistical tests were done to
establish whether the differences in the levels of the study variables among the bio data categories were statistically significant.

**Ethical Considerations**

Participants were asked to sign informed consent forms which spelt out their rights and benefits. The identities of the respondents was not indicated on the instruments in order to keep confidentiality. All information from the respondents were kept confidential. The researcher also sought permission from the faculty Deans and gate keepers before administering any of the research instruments. The researcher finally ensured that confidentiality was observed in that the names of the respondents were not indicated on the questionnaires.
Chapter Four

Results

Introduction

This chapter is comprised of various subsections of the questionnaire and presentations start with the demographic information followed by objective by objective presentation of the findings. Tables and textual presentations are used.

Demographic Information

This involved the bio data considered in the study that included personal information such as the age range, gender, marital status, religious affiliation, and department belonged, and level of education, time range, and number of years one has worked is also provided. This demographic information is summarized in Table 2.
Table 3

Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time range</td>
<td>Below 3 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of work</td>
<td>Dean of students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University secretary</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Registrar</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windowed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religios Affiliation</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seventhday Adventist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample distribution in Table 2 indicates that majority of the participants were male 84 (78.5%) in the age range 30-39 years 60 (77.9%). This implies that results were generally influenced by this age group because they are the majority in the university. Education level of certificate, 59 (81.9%); married, 93 (76.9%); and Anglicans by religious affiliation, 42 (80.8%).
Most of them were under University secretary’s department 92(80.0%); and had worked for a period ranging from 3 years and below73 (85.9%). Age ranged from 20 to 57; mean age was 35.13 (SD = 7.72).

**The level of suitability of work environment for support staff at the University**

Objective 1 was set to determine the suitability of work environment of support staff at a public university in Uganda. Results indicate that the support staff rated the working environment at the university as moderately suitable for working ($M = 71.22$, $SD = 12.87$). This implies that the relationship between the subordinates and the managers is fair, the workload and work life balance of the support staff is fair, work safety and health is also fair at the public university.
Table 4
The Level of Suitability of Work Environment of Support Staff at a public university in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Level of Suitability of Work Environment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
<td>31(68.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>5(6.5)</td>
<td>58(75.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>3(7.7)</td>
<td>29(74.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2(18.2)</td>
<td>2(18.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level of Suitability of Work Environment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11(10.3)</td>
<td>70(65.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2(3.1)</td>
<td>50(76.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Level of Suitability of Work Environment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>8(11.1)</td>
<td>53(73.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
<td>29(64.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>21(75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>2(25.0)</td>
<td>5(62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>12(63.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time range</th>
<th>Level of Suitability of Work Environment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 years</td>
<td>3(3.5)</td>
<td>59(69.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>7(13.0)</td>
<td>39(72.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>2(8.3)</td>
<td>17(70.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>1(11.1)</td>
<td>5(55.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of work</th>
<th>Level of Suitability of Work Environment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean of students</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>25(80.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University secretary</td>
<td>13(11.3)</td>
<td>75(65.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Registrar</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>20(76.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Level of Suitability of Work Environment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2(6.7)</td>
<td>22(73.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9(7.4)</td>
<td>85(70.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windowed</td>
<td>1(16.7)</td>
<td>4(66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>1(6.7)</td>
<td>10(66.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Level of Suitability of Work Environment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>4(7.7)</td>
<td>37(71.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4(10.8)</td>
<td>24(64.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1(5.0)</td>
<td>12(60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>4(9.5)</td>
<td>31(73.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>11(73.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>5(83.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 13(7.6) | 119(69.2) | 40(23.3) | 172 |

The sample distribution in Table 4 indicates a greater percentage of the support staff in the age range of 50-59 (63.6%) rated suitability of work environment at the university as high.
This implies that the support staff under that category never had any more expectations, not worked for a long time, less responsibility from the university.

Greater fraction of males (10.3%) rated work environment as having high suitability compared to females (3.1%). This means females were generally less satisfied with the suitability of work environment as compared to females because of their being sensitivity by their biological nature, most of the campuses are in remote areas for example Namasagali campus is far away and therefore cannot allow them to meet their basic needs such as socializing.

A greater percentage of support staff who had spent more than 10 years and above (33.3%) at the university rated suitability of work environment as high. This implies that the support staff who had worked for 10 and above years were familiar to the work environment, they are able to make ends, able to interact with the colleagues and administrators freely and therefore balance their duties with their personal life.

By marital status, the suitability of the work environment was rated low by the singles (6.7) and the divorced (6.7%). This implies that both support staff who were singles and divorced were uncomfortable with the work environment at the public university in eastern Uganda because they also need to get partners since Busitema is located in a rural setting. This forces some of them to go to Kampala from Friday and return on Tuesday. While the divorced are overwhelmed by the family responsibility.

The greater fraction of the Muslims (35.0%) support staff rated suitability of work environment as high. This is because of the freedom of worship granted and employment opportunities given by the University and also being few in number.
The Level of Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Management at the Public University in Uganda.

Objective 2 aimed to determine the level of effectiveness of performance appraisal management. The results indicated that the effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Management was generally moderate ($M = 53.35$, $SD = 9.88$). This implies that on average there is limited coaching and training of the employees about the process of performance appraisal, less or no feedback given after the appraisal and also less involvement of the employees during the evaluation exercise. This means that the University policy on performance appraisal management is relatively weak without clear guidelines governing the whole process and even if they are present they are not circulated to the employees.

Further distribution of the performance appraisal management level as reported by respondents of different demographic backgrounds is presented in Table 3.
Table 5
Demographics and Levels of Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Management among Support Staff at the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3(6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11(14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>10(25.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2(18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17(15.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9(13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>10(13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>8(17.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4(14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1(12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3(15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 3 years</td>
<td>9(10.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>8(14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>7(29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>2(22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of students</td>
<td>2(6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University secretary</td>
<td>18(15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Registrar</td>
<td>6(23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2(6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>21(17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windowed</td>
<td>1(16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>2(13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>5(9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>8(21.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>3(15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>10(23.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26(15.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority, (80.2)% rated it as moderate while a good number (15.1)% rated it as low. This implied that support staff have the idea about performance appraisal management but have not yet conceptualized it. This made the performance appraisal management at the university ineffective. While the ones rating it as low implied that there was a fraction of support staff who do not understand the whole process when one of the employees was interviewed had this to say “I even do not understand the whole process”

A greater percentage of support in 30-39(7.9) % age range than other percentages rated performance appraisal management effectiveness as high. This implied that support staff in this age group have stayed there for a short period of time and still excited about the whole performance appraisal management system.

Performance appraisal management effectiveness was rated low as distributed by department of work as follows, Dean of Students (6.5%) and Academic Registrar (3.1%). This implied that the support staff in Dean of Students department interact with the immediate supervisors giving feedback about the performance appraisal management system compared to those in Academic Registrars who seem to be taken up by their duties that make them to have limited interactions with their immediate supervisors. This renders the feedback to be ineffective.

Low performance appraisal management effectiveness by marital status decreased in the order, married (16.7%), and single (6.7%). This implied that the married have enough time to interact with their the superiors in order to protect their jobs because of their family demands. While the singles have less time to interact with their superiors much of the time they go socializing

By religious affiliation, low performance appraisal management effectiveness decreased in the order, Pentecostals (23.8%), Anglican (9.6%). This probably means that the Pentecostals
by the virtual of their faith, believe that the effectiveness of performance appraisal management at the university was relatively high. While their counter parts the Anglicans seem not follow their faith duly that is why they rated it low.

The Level of Job Satisfaction among Support Staff at the University

Objective 3 was set to determine the level of job satisfaction among support staff at a public university in Uganda. Results indicate that the support staff rated the job satisfaction among support staff at the university as moderately satisfactory ($M = 36.44$, $SD = 6.16$). This meant that there was less recognition of support staff for their performance, less commitment to their work, less participation and fair supervisor-supervisee relationship. This implied that the support staff are not fully satisfied with their jobs due to the ineffectiveness of the results of performance appraisal management and also with the suitability of the work environment of the University.
The sample distribution in Table 5 indicates that 20-29 (64.4%) of the support staff within the age range of rated job satisfaction as high. This means that the support staff under the above age have limited responsibility, they are excited of their jobs. This implies that the support staff...
under that age are committed to their duties, actively take on their additional roles, and obedient to their supervisors.

By gender males (56.1%) generally rated the level of their job satisfaction as high compared to females (52.3%). This meant their jobs make them to satisfy their needs. This implied the males can afford to meet all their basic needs. While for females are not satisfied because they had high aspirations. This implied that females are on a look out for bigger opportunities.

Support staff who had diploma (2.2%) rated job satisfaction as low. This meant that these support staff have aspirations to go for further studies because of marginalization and desire for a high pay and promotion. This implied that there was limited commitment to their job

The support staff who had spent three years and below (2.4%) in the University had low level of job satisfaction. This meant that the support staff within the above period spent were not satisfied with their jobs at the university because they were still new staff with a new environment. This made them to take time to acquainted to the new environment in terms and conditions of the job. This implied that the support staff within that period of time spent had low commitment to their jobs.

The Mediation Effect of Performance Appraisal Management on the Relationship between Work Environment and Job Satisfaction among Support Staff at the University

Objective 4 of the study was to examine the mediation effect of performance appraisal management on the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction among support staff at a public university in Uganda. This involved first determining the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient between the variables. Results indicate that there was a moderate
statistically significant positive correlation ($r = .386, p < .05$) between Performance Appraisal Management and Job Satisfaction. This implied that when Performance Appraisal was managed with high effectiveness, the Job Satisfaction is high. Results indicate that there was a moderate statistically significant positive correlation ($r = .386, p < .05$) between work environment and Performance Appraisal Management. This implied that when Performance Appraisal is managed with high effectiveness, the Job Satisfaction was high. Results also indicate that there was a moderate statistically significant positive correlation ($r = .457, p < .05$) between Work Environment and Job Satisfaction. This implied that when Work Environment is suitable, the Job Satisfaction was high.

Since the Objective 4 was purposed to determine the mediation effect of performance appraisal management on the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction among support staff in the university structural equation modelling using multiple regression with the Process plugin Model 4 in SPSS by Hayes (2013) was performed. The multiple regression revealed that the direct path $c$ of regressing performance appraisal management on work environment was significant, $b = .25, t = 7.46, p < .05$, with a significant overall model, $F (1, 170) = 47.43, p = < .05, R^2 = .36$. Path a showed that work environment significantly predicted performance appraisal management, $b = .35, t = 6.70, p < .05$, with a significant overall model for the path, $F (1, 170) = 44.95, p < .05, R^2 = .21$.

Path $b$ of regressing performance appraisal management on performance appraisal management was also significant, $b = .09, t (170) = 2.16, p < .03$. In the indirect path $c'$, the regression of performance appraisal management on work environment while controlling for performance appraisal management was still significant, $b = .28, t (170) = 9.40, p < .05$ with a significant overall model, $F (170) = 88.29, p < .05, R^2 = .34$. But the Sobel test (normal theory
test) results showed that $c-c'$ was significantly different from zero, $z = 2.04$, $p < .05$, $k^2 = .03$.

This suggests partial mediation effect of performance appraisal management on the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction. In other words, a higher level of suitability of the work environment would enhance a higher level of performance appraisal management effectiveness, and consequently a higher level of job satisfaction and vice versa. Thus Hypothesis 4 was accepted. Figure 2 shows a diagrammatic representation of the mediation.

*Figure 2.* Indirect path of work environment on job satisfaction through the effect of performance appraisal management.

*Note.* $* = p < .05, ** = p < .01, *** = p < .001.$
Chapter Five

Discussions, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter contains the summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations based on the research questions raised in this study. The current study evaluates the mediation between the work environment, performance appraisal management and job satisfaction of support staff at the university.

Discussions

The overall levels of performance appraisal management, work environment suitability and job satisfaction among support staff at the selected public university in Uganda, according to the results got by running a Pearson correlation coefficient, were all moderate. Similar results by Karimi et al. (2011) as cited in Khan (2007) indicate that the performance appraisal system in practice is fair enough to keep all the employees satisfied. On the other hand, contrasting results by Bricker (1992) and Saleem and Sash (2015) indicate that the employees were dissatisfied with the performance appraisal systems adopted by their organizations.

The study also indicated a general understanding and support from various stakeholders on the appraisal system. The study also helped in identifying factors that are barriers to effective performance appraisal management. However, to a smaller extent, the study found out that the appraisal system has helped to develop the staff professionally.
The Level of Effectiveness of Work Environment at the University

Results indicate that the support staff rated the working environment at the selected university as moderately suitable for working. This is similar to results obtained by Oswald (2012) and Jayaweera1 (2015). However, results of the study by Fine and Kobrick (1978), Mohapatra and Srivastava (2003), and Naharuddin and Sadegi (2013) indicate that there was a high level of suitability of work environment. The reasons for the moderate level of suitability may include the fact that most respondents reported that there was the presence of few equipment such as computers for the support staff and this affects performance. This implies that for an employee to be efficient and productive in today's job environment she/he needs to be equipped with the right gears so as to boost the competence as employee by themselves cannot perform better without the working tools. Not only has that but the presence of a good office with quality furniture also motivated workers to perform well as well as the safety in the workplace.

The sample distribution in Table 4 indicates that a greater percentage of the support staff in the age range of 50-59 rated suitability of work environment at the university as high. This is similar with studies by Oludey (2015). This age range exhibited this phenomenon possibly because majority of the employees were mature and had worked in the institution for a long period of time and were used to the work environment. The above results were in contrast with the study carried out by Kirpal (2004) in which a greater fraction of males rated work environment as having low suitability compared to females. This possibly could be due to uncomfortable work environment coupled with heavy workloads that the greater fraction of male employees are less satisfied with. Therefore, the institution should embark on those factors that enhance satisfaction of the employees.
None of the support staff with qualifications of bachelor’s degree rated work environment suitability as neither high nor moderate. This is similar to studies carried out by (Ruchi & Surinder, 2014). This possibly means that the support staff with the above qualifications had greater expectations from the University towards the work environment. This implies that a greater percentage of support staff who had spent more than 10 years and above at the university rated suitability of work environment as high. This is in line with studies carried out by (Naharuddin & Sadegi, 2013). This is possibly may be because of presence of some equipment like computers as reported by the respondents among others and also those employees who had worked for over 10 years were more familiar to the working conditions.

None of the support staff in both departments of Dean of Students and Academic Registrar rated the suitability of the work environment as high. This means that the support staff under those two departments were dissatisfied with the suitability of work environment. This is in line with studies carried out by Bricker (1992), and (Saleem & Sash, 2015). This is possibly due to poor working conditions associated with lack of office space, limited work equipment and gears, poor working relationships, poor work health and safety. This implies that there should be presence of a good office with quality furniture well as well as the safety in the workplace for workers to perform their duties.

By marital status, the suitability of the work environment was rated low by the singles and the divorced. This is in contrast with studies carried out by (Naharuddin & Sadegi, 2013). This is possibly due to the presence of few equipment such as computers among others. This implies that the University should work towards improving the working conditions of the employees.
The greater fraction of the Muslim support staff rated suitability of work environment as high. This is in line with studies carried out by Fine and Kobrick (1978), Mohapatra & Srivastava (2003), Naharuddin & Sadegi (2013). This is possibly due to the presence of a suitable work environment.

The Level of Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Management at the Selected Public University in Uganda

The results in Table 3 indicate that the effectiveness of performance appraisal management was generally moderate. This is similar to results obtained by (Rubin, 2012; Bintu, 2014). However, results of the study by Abbas (2014) indicate that there was a high level of performance management. The reasons for the moderate level of effectiveness may include the fact that the study found out that the respondents were encouraged to participate in the discussions during the process of appraisal. However, there was evidence that workers are not usually provided with feedback by the respondents. Therefore, workers should be encouraged to participate in the whole process of performance appraisal so as to increase the level of effectiveness of performance appraisal management.

A greater percentage of support in 30-39 age range than other percentages rated performance appraisal management effectiveness as high. This is in line with studies conducted by (Abbas, 2014). The reasons for this possibly could be due to respondents were encouraged to participate in the discussions during the process of appraisal. This implies that employees should be inducted after recruitment and sensitized about the performance appraisal process bring about the effectiveness of performance appraisal management.
None of the support staff with qualifications higher than Bachelors’ degrees rated the performance appraisal management effectiveness as high. This is in line with studies conducted by (Karimi et al., 2011). This is possibly because of the higher expectations and limited feedback given to the employees as well as limited participation during the process of appraisal. Therefore, this implies that the institution should involve the employees in the whole process of appraisal and feedback should be given to them such that those who may need counselling to be counselled and improve in the areas of weakness.

None of the support staff who had spent ten years or more at the university rated the performance appraisal management effectiveness as high. This is in line with studies conducted by (Bricker, 1992) which stated that the employees were dissatisfied with the performance appraisal systems adopted by their organizations. This is due to the fact that the period given was enough for the respondents to rate the performance appraisal system as objectively. This implies that employees were disgruntled with the system of performance appraisal management at the target public university. So the management of the university should strive to improve the system.

Performance appraisal management effectiveness as low was distributed by department of work as follows, Dean of Students, University Secretary, and Academic Registrar. The reverse or trend is observed for rating of performance appraisal management as this. This is in line with studies conducted by (Bricker, 1992). This possibly could be due to the evaluations that are carried out once a year and limited coaching of the new recruits to make them aware of the whole process among others. This shows there is need for the management to carry out evaluations of the employees at least twice a year.
Low performance appraisal management effectiveness by marital status decreased in the order, married, widowed, divorced and single. This means that the married support staff and those who were once married were more dissatisfied with the performance system compared to the singles. This is in line with studies carried out by (Bricker, 1992). This implies that there is need for management to improve on the way performance appraisal management is carried.

By religious affiliation, low performance appraisal management effectiveness decreased in the order, Pentecostals, Catholics, Muslim, Anglican, Seventh Day Adventists and others. This implies that performance appraisal management is also affected by religion. This probably means that religion is a factor in interpreting the effectiveness of performance appraisal management at the university with support staff of certain religious affiliations feelings biased or more favored.

The Level of Job Satisfaction among Support Staff at the Selected Public University in Uganda

Results indicate that the support staff rated the job satisfaction among support staff at the university as moderately satisfactory. This is similar to results obtained by Saleem and Sash (2015) indicate that the bank employees were moderately satisfied with their job and (Kithuku, 2012). However, results of the study by Bond, Punnet, Pyle, Cazeca, and Cooperman (2004) indicate that there was a high level of job satisfaction. The reasons for the moderate level of effectiveness may include the fact that to some extent there was a positive relationship between management and employees and this improves employee morale, possibly, educational opportunities at work place, personal growth and training also contribute to the feeling of satisfaction, fair working conditions and workload in addition may explain the greater part of job satisfaction. Satisfaction with colleagues, however, is a less important determinant of job
satisfaction. This is in line with the findings of Chaboyer et al. (n.d.) who reported cohesion amongst nurses to be correlated moderately with satisfaction.

The sample distribution in Table 5 indicates that none of the support staff within the age range of 50-59 rated job satisfaction as high. This is in line with studies conducted by (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1983). This is possibly because of the fair superior-supervisee relationship and commitment of the employees to their work. Therefore, this implies that should ensure better supervisor-supervisee relationship and also enhance the commitment of the employees in order to improve on their satisfaction of their jobs.

By gender males generally rated the level of their job satisfaction as high compared to females. This is in line with studies conducted by (Bond, Punnet, Pyle, Cazeca & Cooperman, 2004). This is possibly because of high involvement or participation in their work. This implies that employees should be involved in all activities of the University such that they feel part of the University.

Support staff who had diploma and those who had attained other qualifications rated job satisfaction as low. This is in line with studies carried out by (Geeta, Gaurav & Pandey, 2014). This is possibly because of the less involvement in the activities in the institution, no recognitions for the work well done, and poor supervisor-supervisee relationships. However, this implies that management should ensure that all employees take part in activities of the University, recognize their employees for the work well done and maintain good relationship between them and the employees.

The support staff who had spent three years and below in the University had low level of job satisfaction. This is in line with studies carried out by (Shalley, Gilson, & Blum, 2000). This is possibly because poor supervisor-supervisee relationships, no recognitions for the work well
done among others. This implies that there is need to maintain good relationship between them and the employees and, recognize their employees for the work well done. That the support staff within the above age rage were not satisfied with their jobs at the university.

The job satisfaction of support staff was rated according to departments and it was indicated that none of the support staff under Dean of students rated the level of job satisfaction as high. This is in line with (Bond et.al., 2004). This is possibly because of the less involvement in the activities in the institution. This implies that management should ensure that all employees take part in activities of the University.

None of the support staff who were singles and windowed rated the level of job satisfaction as high. This is in contrast with (Shalley et.al., 2000). This is possibly because of the less commitment of the employees towards their work. This implies that there is need for the management to ensure that employees are committed towards their work.

By religious affiliation none of the support staff who were Muslims, Seventh Day Adventist and others rated the level of job satisfaction as high. This is in line with studies carried out by (Bond, Punnet, Pyle, Cazeca, and Cooperman, 2004). This is possibly because the active participation of the employees in the activities of the institution, recognitions given to the employees for the work well done, and good supervisor-supervisee relationships. This implies that that management should maintain active participation of the employee, recognize their employees for the work well done and maintain good relationship between them and the employees.
The Mediation Effect of Performance Appraisal Management on the Relationship between 
Work Environment and Job Satisfaction among Support Staff at the Target Public University in Uganda

Results indicated a moderate statistically significant positive correlation between performance appraisal management and job satisfaction. In other words, effective management of performance appraisal is associated with high job satisfaction (Rubin Brown, Hyatt, & Benson, 2010)

There was a moderate statistically significant positive correlation between work environment and performance appraisal management, meaning that when performance appraisal is managed with high effectiveness, the work suitability will be high (Jayaweeral, 2015; Oswald, 2012)

Results also indicate that there was a moderate statistically significant positive correlation between work environment and job satisfaction. When work environment is suitable, the job satisfaction is high (Bond, Punnet, Pyle, Cazeca, & Cooperman, 2004).

Results revealed that Hypothesis 4 was accepted: There was partial mediation effect of performance appraisal management on the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction. This means a suitable work environment enhances performance appraisal management effectiveness, and consequently job satisfaction (Rahman & Shah, 2012).

Conclusions

The work environment at the university was moderately suitable for the support staff. In this case, the manager-subordinate relationship, workload and work life balance, work safety and
health of the support staff were catered for but not fully. Therefore, the support staff needed to be equipped with the right tools and conditions so as to boost their competence as employees.

Performance appraisal management at the university was moderately effective. This implies that the coaching and training provided to the support staff in the process of performance appraisal is limited, inadequate feedback was given after the appraisal and there was also less involvement of the support staff during the evaluation exercise. Therefore, the University needed to tighten its policy on performance appraisal management and give clear guidelines on the process.

The job satisfaction among support staff at the university was moderately satisfactory. In other words, the support staff were not fully satisfied with their jobs. Hence there would be need to improve employee morale through opportunities for further studies, personal growth and training, and provision of fair working conditions and workload.

Performance appraisal management partially mediated the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction among support staff at the university meaning that a high level of suitability of the work environment would promote effective performance appraisal management, and consequently a higher level of job satisfaction among the support staff. Thus Weiss and Cropanzano’s (1996) Affective Events Theory was supported. Therefore, there was need to promote the suitability of the work environment at the university so as to enhance performance appraisal management effectiveness and hence job satisfaction among the support staff. This could be achieved among others by encouraging employees to participate in the discussions during the process of performance appraisal and also feedback should be encouraged by the managers.
Recommendations

Based on findings and discussions, the following are recommended:

Need to equip offices with equipment, facilities at the working areas of all employees. Encouraging and improving good relationships among staff in different departments of the University. Developing strategies that strengthen the suitability of work environment and increase the employee morale and employee satisfaction to enhance productivity and performance.

There is need to ensure regular and effective communication to the appraisees as soon as the performance appraisal process is conducted to identify their strengths, weaknesses and opportunities available for continuous improvement. Need to review the performance appraisal process so as to assist the unsatisfied employees to restore their final results and also gain full participation of all employees in the performance appraisal process by intensifying education and coaching of the new recruits on the whole process of Performance appraisal and its management.

Dissatisfied workers should be counselled to investigate if factors causing dissatisfaction can be adjusted to their personal need. If not, organizations must accept greater responsibilities for the impact of their work practices on employee health. Workplace policies must be aimed at eradicating work practices that cause most dissatisfaction among their personnel. Employers must be encouraged to develop meaningful work environments for increased job satisfaction, greater motivation, increased productivity, and decreased employee turnover.
**Limitations of the study and other areas of further**

Quantitative study was the only study employed to establish the respondents perception. There would have been need to adopt a mixed study approach in order to triangulate the results with the qualitative study.

This study looked at support staff working at the university in Eastern region regarding the relationship on work environment, performance appraisal management and job satisfaction. However, the limitations could be considered as an opportunity for future research.

From the study, future researchers should address the effects of performance appraisal on the performance of other categories of staff.

To enrich the findings of this study, more research needs to be carried out to establish other factors in details influencing the performance of support staff at the University.
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Consent form

BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY
Consent to Participate in Research Study

Title of Study:
Work Environment, Performance Appraisal Management, and Job Satisfaction among Support Staff at Public University in Uganda

Introduction
You are being asked to be in a research study of to investigate how performance appraisal management mediates work environment and Job Satisfaction among Support Staff at Public University in Uganda University

You were selected as a possible participant because the negative effects associated with work environment, Performance Appraisal Management, and Job Satisfaction among Support staff negatively impact on the overall University objectives, where this study seeks to close the gap.

We ask that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Purpose of Study
The purpose of the study is to determine:

The purpose of the study was to assess the mediation effect of performance appraisal management, between work environment, and job satisfaction of support staff at the university

The study was guided by the following objectives:
5. To determine the level of effectiveness of performance appraisal management at the university.
6. To find out the level of suitability of work environment of support staff at the university.
7. To determine the level of job satisfaction among support staff at the university.
8. To examine the mediation effect of performance appraisal management on the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction among support staff at the university

Description of the Study Procedures
If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to carefully fill the provided questionnaires and give your personal independent opinion on the questions given. The researcher may further interface with you to get more opinion on your answers.

**Risks/Discomforts of Being in this Study**

The study has no reasonable foreseeable (or expected) risks. There may be unknown risks.

**Benefits of Being in the Study**

The benefits of participation are;

- The study might guide the University Management and Human Resource Department on the importance of having an effective appraisal management system at the university
- The findings of the study may also help in formulation of better performance appraisal management policies at the university that would guide managers in managing the process of performance appraisal
- The study might assist policy makers to review their decisions on how to improve employee job satisfaction in public institutions.
- The findings may serve as a benchmark tool for supervisors of the support staff to improve the suitability of work environment of employees under them

**Confidentiality**

This study is anonymous. We will not be collecting or retaining any information about your identity.

The records of this study will be kept strictly confidential. Research records will be kept in a locked file, and all electronic information will be coded and secured using a password protected file.

We will not include any information in any report we may publish that would make it possible to identify you.

Your identity will not be disclosed in the material that is published. However, you will be given the opportunity to review and approve any material that is published about you.

**Payments**

You will not receive any payment/reimbursement in exchange for filling this form
**Right to Refuse or Withdraw**

The decision to participate in this study is entirely up to you. You may refuse to take part in the study *at any time* without affecting your relationship with the researcher of this study or Busitema University. Your decision will not result in any loss or benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely from the interview at any point during the process. Additionally, you have the right to request that the interviewer not use any of your interview material.

**Right to Ask Questions and Report Concerns**

You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by me before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact me at email; justinanamwagwe@gmail.com. If you like, a summary of the results of the study will be sent to you. If you have any other concerns about your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigators, you may contact Busitema University Faculty of Science and Education.

**Consent**

Your signature below indicates that you have decided to volunteer as a research participant for this study, and that you have read and understood the information provided above. You will be given a signed and dated copy of this form to keep, along with any other printed materials deemed necessary by the study investigators.

Signature of Participant: __________________________ Date: __________________
Name of Participant: __________________________

Signature of Researcher: __________________________ Date: __________________
Appendix C
Questionnaire for Support

BUSITEMA UNIVERSITY– NAGONGERA CAMPUS
FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dear Participant
I am a postgraduate student at Busitema University. You have been selected to participate in the study about “Performance Appraisal Management and Job Satisfaction among Support staff at a Public University in Uganda.” This study is for academic purposes and the results will not be used for any other purposes. The researcher would like to assure you that your responses will strictly remain confidential and that under no circumstances will the responses be personalized. You are thus kindly requested to read this questionnaire and complete it as honestly as possible. Your participation in this study is very crucial and your responses will be highly appreciated and valued. I thank you in advance.

Section A: Biodata
Instructions: Please write in the space (_____) or tick (√) in the box the most appropriate response to the questions below as they apply to you.

Name of Faculty: ……………………………………………………………………………………………
1. Age (in years): ____________________
2. Gender: □ Male         □ Female
3. Level of Education: □ Certificate □ Diploma □ Degree □ Masters □ Others □
4. How long have you been at the university? _______ years
5. Which department do you work with? Dean of students □ University secretary □
                                            Academic registrar □
6. Your marital status: Single □ Married □ Widowed □ Divorced □
7. Religious affiliation □ Anglican □ Catholic □ Muslim □ Pentecostal □
                                            Seventh Day Adventist □ Other □

Section D
This section describes your views on your Work Environment at the university. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement about the Work Environment by reading each statement carefully, and ticking (√) in the appropriate box according to the following response options: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, UD = Undecided, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructive feedback is given in this University in a way that emphasizes positives, rather than negatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management encourages honest feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University management gives support staff feedback that can help them improve work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this University, management and support staff work in an environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is physically safe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff and management work in an environment that is clean and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff have sufficient access to a broad range of professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support (professional) personnel. Support personnel include lawyers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselors, nurses, and ICT specialists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff have sufficient access to a broad range of professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel. Support personnel include lawyers, counselors, nurses, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT specialists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff have sufficient access to technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff have sufficient training and support to fully use the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff have opportunities to learn from one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient resources are available for professional development in this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development is separated to meet the needs of individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts at work are recognized and acknowledged in tangible ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rewards for success are greater than the penalties for failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the University is a good place to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear-cut and non-contradictory policies and procedures in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff have sufficient access to appropriate materials and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources including rules and regulations, terms of reference, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff have sufficient access to technology, including computers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printers, and Internet access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The support staff have effective processes for making group decisions to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The culture and emotional climate of the University is generally positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and supportive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is teamwork (shared mission, values, efforts and goals).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is treated with courtesy, listened to, and invited to express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their thoughts and feelings within the University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrative team provides an environment in which workers feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe and secure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E: Performance Appraisal Management Scale
This section describes your views on Performance Appraisal Management at the university. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement about the Performance Appraisal Management by reading each statement carefully, and ticking (√) in the appropriate box according to the following response options: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, UD = Undecided, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Management reviews strategic plan that supports the strategic direction of the Institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management recruits adequate and competent staff that provide the organization’s desired outputs and outcomes to be achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management makes policies that support recruitment, retention, training and development, performance appraisal, employee welfare, discipline and termination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Management help employees to develop existing and new skills, and expanding their responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Management help in Improving staff morale and confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Management help in enrichment of employees Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Management help in improving productivity of employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Management collects performance related facts from a variety of written as well as other sources activity reports including Performance Objectives and Action Plans, Progress Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Management assist in educating employees about the process before conducting the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Management uses the appraisal info as an opportunity to recognize the employee's achievements and future potentials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Management criticizes weaknesses or past mistakes as well as concentrates on constructive suggestions for improvement of the employee during the Evaluation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Management gives routine feedback to the employees as part of the performance management process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Management build occasions into their work day to observe employees at work. This gives opportunities to understand areas where performance could be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Management carries out routine one-on-one meetings with direct reports, and include discussions about Performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Management collects performance related facts from a variety of written documents as well as other sources including activity reports, Action Plans, Progress Reports to improve the process of Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Management uses the Evaluation information as an opportunity to recognize the employee's achievements and future potentials.

18. Management uses weaknesses or past mistakes as well as concentrates on constructive suggestions to improve the Evaluation process.

**Section F: Job Satisfaction Scale**

This section describes your views on your Job Satisfaction at the university. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement about your job satisfaction by reading each statement carefully, and tick (✓) in the appropriate box according to the following response options: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, UD = Undecided, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I receive recognition for a job well done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel close to people at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel good about working at this institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe management is concerned about me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. On the whole I believe work is good for my physical health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My salary is good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All my talent and skills are used at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I get along with my supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel good about my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conditions in my job allow me to be as productive as I can be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND HONEST RESPONSES.