Faculty Perception Towards Institutional Climate with Special Reference to Namakkal District – An Empirical Study

Mr. M. Christopher	Associate Professor, K.S.R.School of Management, Tiruchengode-637215, Tamilnadu India
Dr. A. Lakshmi	Director, K.S.R.School of Management, Tiruchengode-637215, Tamilnadu India

ABSTRACT

The study aims to find out the faculty perceptions towards their institutional climate and this study find out the impact of demographic factors on the institutional policy and procedure like the kind of reward system, leave policy, benefits, promotion and increment. The researcher randomly selected 120 faculty members working in engineering colleges in Namakkal district of Tamilnadu for this study. This study is to find out the perceptional difference in institutional climate due to demographic factors, especially on policies and procedures. The researcher found out significant differences in perception among faculty members on policies and procedures and there were no difference of opinions about general climate among faculty members.

INTRODUCTION:

Organizational climate represents the way in which its members perceive it. We can not see or touch it, but it is there. Organizational climate is the thoughts and feelings about where we work and those thoughts and feelings impact how we work. Collection of those thoughts and feelings about the work environment is called as organizational climate. Organizational climate is that the way people feel about where they work has a powerful impact on how they work and how hard they work. In educational setting, the organizational climate is the perceptions of the faculty members about their institutional climate and the perceptions have a influence on their performance.

Organizational climate usually has a major influence on motivation, productivity, and job satisfaction. Most of the studies have shown that organizational climate is a significant determinant of individual satisfaction. Friendlander (1969) argued that the degree of impact of the climate upon satisfaction. Hellriegal (1975) observed that organizational climate interacts with individual personality to influence performance and job satisfaction. Friedlander (1969) OC and individual value systems upon job satisfaction. Several recent studies have addressed the topic of climate strength—the degree to which there is agreement among an organization's members regarding the practices and policies as well as the shared values that characterize the organization. Organizational climate has significant relationship with the members educational and other demographic factors on organizational climate factors like policies, rules, salary and promotion. A study conducted by Jianwei Zhang on "Organizational Climate and its Effects on Organizational Variables- an Empirical Study" revealed that individuals with different educational level had significant differences on the perception of rules, performance, promotion and communication climates. Compared to individuals with high educational level, those with low educational level had more positive perception of rules. This study aims to find out the influence of demographic variables on organizational policies and procedures.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

1. To find out the faculty perceptions towards general institutional climate.
2. To analyze the impact of demographic variables on organizational policy and procedures.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The research design followed in this study is descriptive research design. All the faculty members working in engineering colleges in Namakkal district forms the population. A random sample of 120 faculty members was taken for collection of data. The primary data were collected from the faculty members through questionnaire method. The gathered data was analyzed through statistical software SPSS.

Factors taken for studying the perception of faculty member towards general climate are:

1. Faculty members how they enjoy performing actual day to day activities of their job.

2. Faculty member's freedom to try out new ideas in their job.
3. Faculty member's opinion towards how the institutional culture promotes good performance.
4. Faculty member's satisfaction towards job.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

The collected data were analyzed and presented as follows:

Table 1. Age wise faculty perception towards institutional general climate

Factor	Age category	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
General Climate	25 and below	24	4.1583	.5985	0.391	0.760
	26-35	79	4.1342	.5394		
	36-45	14	4.1000	.5421		
	46 and above	3	4.4667	.1155		
	Total	120	4.1433	.5434		

Source: Primary Data

From the above Table it is observed that there is no age-wise difference among faculty members on their perception towards institutional climate. The faculty members in different age groups have perceived institutional climate in the same manner.

Table 2. Gender wise faculty perception towards general climate

Factor	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference	t	Sig.
General Climate	Male	66	4.18	.55	0.0922	0.925	0.357
	Female	54	4.09	.53			

Source: Primary Data

It is clear from the above table that there is no gender-wise difference in opinion about institutional climate. Both male and female faculty members perceive the institutional climate in the same manner.

Table 3. Marital Status of faculty members and their perception towards general climate.

Factor	Marital status	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference	t	Sig.
General Climate	Single	46	4.10	.49	0.0703	0.687	0.493
	Married	74	4.13	.58			

Source: Primary Data

It is clear from the above table that the perception of faculty members on institutional climate does not vary with respect to their marital status.

Table 4: Designation-wise faculty perception towards general climate

Factor	Designation	N	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	F	Sig.
General Climate	L	57	4.16	.53	2.60	5.00	0.595	0.553
	AP	59	4.11	.56	2.40	5.00		
	AsP	4	4.40	.43	3.80	4.80		
	Total	120	4.14	.54	2.40	5.00		

Source: Primary Data

L – Lecturer; AP – Asst.Professor; AsP- Associate Professor

It is observed from the above table that the opinion of the faculty members in different designations perceived their institutional climate in the same way.

Table 5: Cross Tabulation: Policies and Procedures vs. Age

Factor	χ^2 value	df	Significance
Kind of rewards expected by faculty members from the institution	3.543	4	0.471
Satisfaction towards number of days leave provided	7.076	4	0.132
Satisfaction towards with the current benefits provided by the organization	2.316	4	0.678
Faculty opinion about promotion policy of this institution	2.515	4	0.642

Source: Primary Data

It is observed from the above table that perception of faculty towards various factors of institutional policies and procedures do not differ with respect to their age. There is no association between age of faculty members and their opinion on different factors on policies and procedures.

Table 5.1. Age vs kind of rewards
H_o: There is no association between age category and kind of rewards expected.
H_1: There is a significant association between age category and kind of rewards expected.

Age Category * What kind of rewards will you expect from your organization? Crosstabulation

			What kind of rewards will you expect from your organization?			
			monetary	non monetary	both	Total
Age Category	25 and below	Count	7	2	15	24
		Expected Count	7.6	2.1	14.4	24.0
		% within Age Category	29.2%	8.3%	62.5%	100.0%
	26-35	Count	27	6	46	79
		Expected Count	25.0	6.8	47.3	79.0
		% within Age Category	34.2%	7.6%	58.2%	100.0%
	36-45	Count	3	2	9	14
		Expected Count	4.4	1.2	8.4	14.0
		% within Age Category	21.4%	14.3%	64.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	37	10	70	117
		Expected Count	37.0	10.0	70.0	117.0
		% within Age Category	31.6%	8.5%	59.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.543a	4	.471
Likelihood Ratio	3.171	4	.530
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.974
N of Valid Cases	103		

a. 4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.

Interpretation:
There is no association between age category and kind of rewards expected.

Table 5.2. Age vs. leave provided
H_o: There is no association between age category and satisfaction level on leave facility.
H_1: There is a significant association between age category and satisfaction level on leave facility.

Age Category * Are you satisfied with the number of days leave provided? Crosstabulation

			Are you satisfied with the number of days leave provided?			
			dissatisfied	satisfied	higly satisfied	Total
Age Category	25 and below	Count	5	16	2	23
		Expected Count	5.8	11.4	5.8	23.0
		% within Age Category	21.7%	69.6%	8.7%	100.0%
	26-35	Count	19	28	19	66
		Expected Count	16.7	32.7	16.7	66.0
		% within Age Category	28.8%	42.4%	28.8%	100.0%
	36-45	Count	2	7	5	14
		Expected Count	3.5	6.9	3.5	14.0
		% within Age Category	14.3%	50.0%	35.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	26	51	26	103
		Expected Count	26.0	51.0	26.0	103.0
		% within Age Category	25.2%	49.5%	25.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.076a	4	.132
Likelihood Ratio	7.785	4	.100
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.950	1	.163
N of Valid Cases	103		

a. 2 cells (22.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.53.

Interpretation:
There is no association between age category and satisfaction level on leave facility.

Table 5.3. Age vs. satisfaction on current benefits
H_o: There is no association between age and satisfaction level on current benefits.
H_1: There is a significant association between age and satisfaction level on current benefits.

Age Category * Are you satisfied with the current benefits provided by your organization? Crosstabulation

			Are you satisfied with the current benefits provided by your organization?			
			dissatisfied	satisfied	higly satisfied	Total
Age Category	25 and below	Count	8	12	2	22
		Expected Count	7.5	12.2	2.3	22.0
		% within Age Category	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	100.0%
	26-35	Count	24	38	9	71
		Expected Count	24.1	39.5	7.4	71.0
		% within Age Category	33.8%	53.5%	12.7%	100.0%
	36-45	Count	4	9	0	13
		Expected Count	4.4	7.2	1.3	13.0
		% within Age Category	30.8%	69.2%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	36	59	11	106
		Expected Count	36.0	59.0	11.0	106.0
		% within Age Category	34.0%	55.7%	10.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.316a	4	.678
Likelihood Ratio	3.613	4	.461
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.973
N of Valid Cases	106		

a. 3 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.35.

Interpretation:
There is no association between age and satisfaction level on current benefits.

Table 5.4. Age vs. promotion policy of this institute
H_o: There is no association between age and satisfaction level on promotion policy of this institute.
H_1: There is a significant association between age and satisfaction level on promotion policy of this institute.

Age Category * What do you feel about the promotion policy of this institute? Crosstabulation

			What do you feel about the promotion policy of this institute?			
			average	good	very good	Total
Age Category	25 and below	Count	5	10	3	18
		Expected Count	4.9	9.8	3.3	18.0
		% within Age Category	27.8%	55.6%	16.7%	100.0%
	26-35	Count	15	35	13	63
		Expected Count	17.1	34.2	11.6	63.0
		% within Age Category	23.8%	55.6%	20.6%	100.0%
	36-45	Count	5	5	1	11
		Expected Count	3.0	6.0	2.0	11.0
		% within Age Category	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	25	50	17	92
		Expected Count	25.0	50.0	17.0	92.0
		% within Age Category	27.2%	54.3%	18.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.515a	4	.642
Likelihood Ratio	2.423	4	.659
Linear-by-Linear Association	.527	1	.468
N of Valid Cases	92		

a. 4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.03.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between age and satisfaction level on promotion policy of the institute (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between age and satisfaction level on promotion policy of the institute.

Table 6: Cross Tabulation: Policies and Procedures vs. Gender

Factor	X2 value	df	Significance
Kind of rewards expected by faculty members from the institution	1.112	2	0.574
Satisfaction towards number of days leave provided	0.331	4	0.988
Satisfaction towards with the current benefits provided by the organization	2.604	4	0.626
Faculty opinion about promotion policy of this institution	3.613	4	0.461

Source: Primary Data

From the above Table 6 it's observed that gender difference among faculty members and their expectation towards the kind of rewards they expect from their institution there is no significant relationship. Both male and female faculty members are expecting any kind of reward either monetary or non monetary or both. Further the Table 6 revealed that there is no significant relationship between gender and their satisfaction towards the number of leave provided, current benefits and promotion policy. There no difference in their satisfaction level based on gender wise.

Table 6.1. Gender vs kind of rewards

H_o: There is no association between gender and kind of rewards expected.
H_1: There is a significant association between gender and kind of rewards expected.

Crosstab

			What kind of rewards will you expect from your organization?			
			monetary	non monetary	both	Total
GENDER	male	Count	20	4	42	66
		Expected Count	20.4	5.5	40.2	66.0
		% within GENDER	30.3%	6.1%	63.6%	100.0%
	female	Count	17	6	31	54
		Expected Count	16.7	4.5	32.9	54.0
		% within GENDER	31.5%	11.1%	57.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	37	10	73	120
		Expected Count	37.0	10.0	73.0	120.0
		% within GENDER	30.8%	8.3%	60.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.112a	2	.574
Likelihood Ratio	1.108	2	.575
Linear-by-Linear Association	.195	1	.658
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.50.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between gender and kind of rewards expected (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between gender and kind of rewards expected.

Table 6.2 Gender vs satisfaction level on leave provided

H_o: There is no association between gender and satisfaction level on the number of days leave provided.
H_1: There is a significant association between gender and satisfaction level on the number of days leave provided.

Crosstab

			Are you satisfied with the number of days leave provided?					
			highly dissatisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	higly satisfied	Total
GENDER	male	Count	1	6	14	30	15	66
		Expected Count	1.1	6.6	14.3	28.6	15.4	66.0
		% within GENDER	1.5%	9.1%	21.2%	45.5%	22.7%	100.0%
	female	Count	1	6	12	22	13	54
		Expected Count	.9	5.4	11.7	23.4	12.6	54.0
		% within GENDER	1.9%	11.1%	22.2%	40.7%	24.1%	100.0%
Total		Count	2	12	26	52	28	120
		Expected Count	2.0	12.0	26.0	52.0	28.0	120.0
		% within GENDER	1.7%	10.0%	21.7%	43.3%	23.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.331a	4	.988
Likelihood Ratio	.331	4	.988
Linear-by-Linear Association	.069	1	.792
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .90.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between gender and number of days leave provided (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between gender and number of days leave provided.

Table 6.3. Gender vs. satisfaction level on current benefits provided

H_o: There is no association between gender and satisfaction level on current benefits provided.
H_1: There is a significant association between gender and satisfaction on current benefits provided.

Crosstab

			Are you satisfied with the current benefits provided by your organization?					
			highly dissatisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	higly satisfied	Total
GENDER	male	Count	2	6	16	35	7	66
		Expected Count	1.7	5.0	19.8	33.0	6.6	66.0
		% within GENDER	3.0%	9.1%	24.2%	53.0%	10.6%	100.0%
	female	Count	1	3	20	25	5	54
		Expected Count	1.4	4.1	16.2	27.0	5.4	54.0
		% within GENDER	1.9%	5.6%	37.0%	46.3%	9.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	3	9	36	60	12	120
		Expected Count	3.0	9.0	36.0	60.0	12.0	120.0
		% within GENDER	2.5%	7.5%	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.604a	4	.626
Likelihood Ratio	2.612	4	.625
Linear-by-Linear Association	.049	1	.824
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.35.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between gender and satisfaction level on benefits provided (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between gender and benefits provided.

Table 6.4 Gender vs. satisfaction level on promotion policy of this institute

H_o: There is no association between gender and satisfaction level on promotion policy of this institute
H_1: There is a significant association between gender and satisfaction on promotion policy of this institute.

Crosstab

			What do you feel about the promotion policy of this institute?					
			no idea	poor	average	good	very good	Total
GENDER	male	Count	5	9	17	26	9	66
		Expected Count	6.6	7.2	14.3	28.6	9.4	66.0
		% within GENDER	7.6%	13.6%	25.8%	39.4%	13.6%	100.0%
	female	Count	7	4	9	26	8	54
		Expected Count	5.4	5.9	11.7	23.4	7.7	54.0
		% within GENDER	13.0%	7.4%	16.7%	48.1%	14.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	12	13	26	52	17	120
		Expected Count	12.0	13.0	26.0	52.0	17.0	120.0
		% within GENDER	10.0%	10.8%	21.7%	43.3%	14.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.613a	4	.461
Likelihood Ratio	3.667	4	.453
Linear-by-Linear Association	.095	1	.758
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.40.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between gender and satisfaction level on promotion policy

of this institute (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between gender and promotion policy of this institute.

Table 7: Cross Tabulation: Policies and Procedures vs. Marital Status

Factor	X2 value	df	Significance
Kind of rewards expected by faculty members from the institution	2.109	2	0.348
Satisfaction towards number of days leave provided	4.588	4	0.332
Satisfaction towards with the current benefits provided by the organization	6.439	4	0.169
Faculty opinion about promotion policy of this institution	3.580	4	0.466

Source: Primary Data

From the above Table 7 it's observed that marital status of the faculty members and their perception towards policies and procedures of the institution. There is no significant relationship between the kind of rewards expected and the marital status of the faculty members. Both married and unmarried are expecting any kind of reward either monetary or non monetary or both. Further the Table 6 revealed that there is no significant relationship between marital status of the faculty members and their satisfaction towards the number of leave provided, current benefits and promotion policy.

Table 7.1. Marital status vs. kind of rewards expected

H_o: There is no association between marital status and kind of rewards expected.

H_1: There is a significant association between marital status and kind of rewards expected.

Crosstab

			What kind of rewards will you expect from your organization?			
			monetary	non monetary	both	Total
MARITAL	single	Count	13	2	31	46
		Expected Count	14.2	3.8	28.0	46.0
		% within MARITAL	28.3%	4.3%	67.4%	100.0%
	married	Count	24	8	42	74
		Expected Count	22.8	6.2	45.0	74.0
		% within MARITAL	32.4%	10.8%	56.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	37	10	73	120
		Expected Count	37.0	10.0	73.0	120.0
		% within MARITAL	30.8%	8.3%	60.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.109a	2	.348
Likelihood Ratio	2.245	2	.325
Linear-by-Linear Association	.746	1	.388
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.83.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between marital status and kind of rewards expected (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between marital status and kind of rewards expected.

The management need not take into the marital status of the faculty while deciding on the kind of reward.

Table 7.2. Marital status vs. satisfaction level on number of days leave provided

H_o: There is no association between marital status and satisfaction level on number of days leave provided.

H_1: There is a significant association between marital status and satisfaction level on number of days leave provided.

Crosstab

			Are you satisfied with the number of days leave provided?					
			highly dissatisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	higly satisfied	Total
MARITAL	single	Count	1	4	9	25	7	46
		Expected Count	.8	4.6	10.0	19.9	10.7	46.0
		% within MARITAL	2.2%	8.7%	19.6%	54.3%	15.2%	100.0%
	married	Count	1	8	17	27	21	74
		Expected Count	1.2	7.4	16.0	32.1	17.3	74.0
		% within MARITAL	1.4%	10.8%	23.0%	36.5%	28.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	2	12	26	52	28	120
		Expected Count	2.0	12.0	26.0	52.0	28.0	120.0
		% within MARITAL	1.7%	10.0%	21.7%	43.3%	23.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.588a	4	.332
Likelihood Ratio	4.670	4	.323
Linear-by-Linear Association	.190	1	.663
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .77.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between marital status and satisfaction level on number of days leave provided (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between marital status and satisfaction level on number of days leave provided.

Table 7.3. Marital status vs. satisfaction level current benefits provided

H_o: There is no association between marital status and satisfaction level on current benefits provided.

H_1: There is a significant association between marital status and satisfaction level on current benefits provided.

Crosstab

			Are you satisfied with the current benefits provided by your organization?					
			highly dissatisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	higly satisfied	Total
MARITAL	single	Count	2	4	13	26	1	46
		Expected Count	1.2	3.5	13.8	23.0	4.6	46.0
		% within MARITAL	4.3%	8.7%	28.3%	56.5%	2.2%	100.0%
	married	Count	1	5	23	34	11	74
		Expected Count	1.9	5.6	22.2	37.0	7.4	74.0
		% within MARITAL	1.4%	6.8%	31.1%	45.9%	14.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	3	9	36	60	12	120
		Expected Count	3.0	9.0	36.0	60.0	12.0	120.0
		% within MARITAL	2.5%	7.5%	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.439a	4	.169
Likelihood Ratio	7.493	4	.112
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.954	1	.162
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.15.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between marital status and satisfaction level on current benefits provided (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between marital status and satisfaction level on current benefits provided.

Table 7.4. Marital status vs. satisfaction level on promotion policy of the institute

H_o: There is no association between marital status and satisfaction level on promotion policy of the institute.

H_1: There is a significant association between marital status and satisfaction level on promotion policy of the institute.

Crosstab

			Are you satisfied with the current benefits provided by your organization?					
			highly dissatisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied	higly satisfied	Total
MARITAL	single	Count	2	4	13	26	1	46
		Expected Count	1.2	3.5	13.8	23.0	4.6	46.0
		% within MARITAL	4.3%	8.7%	28.3%	56.5%	2.2%	100.0%
	married	Count	1	5	23	34	11	74
		Expected Count	1.9	5.6	22.2	37.0	7.4	74.0
		% within MARITAL	1.4%	6.8%	31.1%	45.9%	14.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	3	9	36	60	12	120
		Expected Count	3.0	9.0	36.0	60.0	12.0	120.0
		% within MARITAL	2.5%	7.5%	30.0%	50.0%	10.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.439a	4	.169
Likelihood Ratio	7.493	4	.112
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.954	1	.162
N of Valid Cases	120		

a. 4 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.15.

Interpretation:

There is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no association between marital status and satisfaction level on current benefits provided (p>0.05). Hence the analysis reveals that there is no association between marital status and satisfaction level on current benefits provided.

Discussion:

Table no: 1 indicate that faculty member's perception on general climate has not evidenced perceptual difference based on Age of the faculty members.(i) The faculty members enjoying their day to day activities in their job irrespective to Age. (ii) Faculty members are having enough freedom to try out new ideas in

their job expressed by faculty members; Age has made no difference of opinion or perception by the faculty members. (iii) All the age group of faculty members are felt that the institutional culture promotes the performance of the faculty members. (iv) Irrespective of Age, majority of the faculty members expressed a satisfaction feeling with their institution.

Table no: 2 indicate that faculty member's perception on general climate has not evidenced perceptual difference based on gender wise of the faculty members.(i) The faculty members enjoying their day to day activities in their job irrespective to gender. (ii) Faculty members are having enough freedom to try out new ideas in their job expressed by faculty members, gender wise there is no difference of opinion or perception by the faculty members. (iii) All the faculty member in different gender strongly felt that the institutional culture promotes the performance of the faculty members. (iv) Irrespective of gender, majority of the faculty members expressed a satisfaction feeling with their institution.

Table no: 3 indicate that faculty member's perception on general climate has not evidenced perceptual difference based on Marital Status of the faculty members.(i) The faculty members enjoying their day to day activities in their job irrespective to Marital Status. (ii) Faculty members are having enough freedom to try out new ideas in their job expressed by faculty members; Marital Status has made no difference of opinion or perception by the faculty members. (iii) Married and Unmarried faculty members are felt that the institutional culture promotes the performance of the faculty members. (iv) Irrespective of marital status, majority of the faculty members expressed a satisfaction feeling with their institution.

Table no: 4 indicate that faculty member's perception on general climate has not evidenced perceptual difference towards general climate it includes (i) The faculty members enjoying their day to day activities in their job irrespective to designation. (ii) Faculty members are having enough freedom to try out new ideas in their job expressed by faculty members, designation wise there is no difference of opinion or perception by the faculty members. (iii) All the faculty member in different designation strongly felt that the institutional culture promotes the performance of the faculty members. (iv) Irrespective of designation, majority of the faculty members expressed a satisfaction feeling with their institution.

Table No: 5 indicate that perceptual difference among faculty members based on age has evidence no difference of opinion among faculty members regarding the kind of rewards expected by the faculty members either monetary or non monetary anything the faculty member accepted from the institution, all the age group of faculty members are satisfied with the number of leave provided by the institution, the different age group of the faculty members are satisfied with the current benefits and promotion policy.

Table No: 6 indicate that perceptual difference among faculty members based on gender has evidence no difference of opinion among faculty members regarding the kind of rewards expected by the faculty members either monetary or non monetary any kind of reward the faculty member accepted from the institution, either male nor female are satisfied with the number of leave provided by the institution, the different age group of the faculty members are satisfied with the current benefits and promotion policy.

Table No: 7 indicate that perceptual difference among faculty members based on marital status has evidence no difference of opinion among faculty members regarding the kind of rewards expected by the faculty members either monetary or non monetary any kind of reward the faculty member accepted from the institution, either married nor unmarried are satisfied with the number of leave provided by the institution, either married or unmarried faculty members are satisfied with the current benefits and promotion policy.

Conclusion:
The study aims to find out the perceptual difference among faculty members toward their institutional climate especially their perception toward general climate and the institutional policy and procedures. The study revealed that all the faculty members irrespective of age, gender, marital status and designation they perceived their institutional climate are same the demographic factors has no evidence of influence of their perception toward their institutional climate. Further this study aims to find out the perceptual difference among faculty members towards institutional policy and procedures like the type of rewards, number of leave provided, satisfaction towards current benefits provided and promotion policy. It is found that there is no perceptual difference among faculty members towards their institutional policy and procedures based on the age, gender and marital status influence on institutional policy and procedures. Finally the study concluded that the demographic factor has no significant impact or influence on the perceptual difference among faculty members towards their institutional climate and institutional policy and procedures.

REFERENCE   1) Benjamin Schneider, Organizational Climate and Culture, Jossey – Bass Publishers, 1990. | 2) Dalpat S Sarupria, T.V.Rao and P.Sethumadhavan, Measuring Organizational Climate, Academy of Human Resource Development, 1996. | 3) Jianwei Zhang "Organizational Climate and its effects on organizational variables: an empirical study, School of Management and Economics, Beijing. | 4) L.M.Prasad, Organizational Behavior, Sultan Chand & Sons, 1998. | 5) Robert Stringer, Leadership and Organizational Climate, Prentice Hall Series, 2001. | 6) Roderic Grey, A Climate of Success, Butterworth-Heinemann and imprint of Elsevier, 2008. | 7) Udai Pareek, Training Instruments in HRD and OD, Second Edition, Tata McGraw-Hill, 2002. | 8) Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J., & Woodman, R. (1998). Organizational Behavior. | 9) Friedlander. R. and Margulis, N. (1969),"Multiple impacts of organizational climate and individual value systems upon job satisfaction", Personnel Psychology, Vol.22, pp.171-183. | 10) Jianwei Zhang on "Organizational Climate and its Effects on Organizational Variables- an Empirical Study" International Journal of Psychological Studies Vol. 2, No. 2; December 2010. |