Order Number 8824888

A study of relationship of organizational climate and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction as perceived by the teachers in selected Michigan public secondary schools

Raisani, Rasul Bakhsh, Ph.D.

Michigan State University, 1988

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy ___✓___
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ___✓___
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received ___✓___
16. Other _____

_____

_____

A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND TEACHERS' AND SCHOOLS' SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS TO TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AS PERCEIVED BY THE TEACHERS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By

Rasul Bakhsh Raisani

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1988

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND TEACHERS' AND SCHOOLS' SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS TO TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AS PERCEIVED BY THE TEACHERS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By

Rasul Bakhsh Raisani

This study investigated the relationship of organizational climate, teachers' and school's selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction as perceived by Michigan Public Secondary School Teachers.

The data were collected from 340 teachers randomly selected from 56 secondary schools using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Revised Scale (OCDQ-RS) measuring organizational climate, the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) measuring job satisfaction and the demographic information.

Pearson Correlation and multiple stepwise regression analysis procedures were used to test the two stated hypotheses which predicted a significant relationship between job satisfaction and variables under study.

Significant relationship were found between organizational climate dimensions and certain job satisfaction factors. Positive relationships were found between: Engaged organizational climate dimension and

supervision, colleagues, working conditions, work itself and recognition; supportive and supervision, work itself and recognition; and Intimate and colleagues and working conditions. Frustrated negatively related to colleagues, working conditions, responsibility and security; as did Directive to colleagues and work itself job satisfaction factors. Pay and advancement were unrelated to any organizational climate dimension.

Demographic characteristics and job satisfaction also had significant relationships. Age negatively related to working conditions, advancement and recognition, as did sex to colleagues, responsibility and work itself; teaching experience and Employment status to advancement and recognition; and Science to Pay. However, Education positively related to responsibility and work itself, as did school size to working conditions, location to pay and Humanities to advancement.

Multiple regression analysis (stepwise) indicated that certain organizational climate dimensions and demographic characteristics significantly predicted certain job satisfaction factors.

The findings indicated that both organizational climate and demographic characteristics are related to job satisfaction, but organizational climate related more strongly to job satisfaction than demographic characteristics perceived by teachers.

The more engaged, intimate, supportive, less frustrated and directive the organizational climate was perceived to be by the teachers, the more satisfied were teachers in that school.

Teachers as a group, though more satisfied with other aspects of their job, were less satisfied with pay and advancement.

The findings also suggested that female, younger, more educated and less experienced teachers were more satisfied with certain aspects of their job than their male, older, less educated and more experienced counterparts.

This dissertation is dedicated to my father (deceased), mother, and my brother Rahmat Khan Raisani (deceased) who instilled in me the value of education and taught me hard working and perseverance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NO research is ever completed by a single person. Many people have contributed to this effort and assisted me in completing this task. It is time to acknowledge their contribution.

I am deeply indebted, and wish to express my deepest and sincere appreciation and gratitude, to members of my dissertation committee, Dr. John H. Suehr (academic advisor and chair of the guidance committee), Dr. Daniel R. Ilgen, Dr. Kenneth L. Neff, and Dr. James C. Costar (Committee members) for their patience, continuing encouragement, enduring support, positive guidance and never-failing enthusiasm which made the completion of this arduous task possible.

I wish to extend my appreciation to all the teachers and principals who gave their time freely and participated in the study. Without their cooperation, this dissertation would not have come into existence.

A special vote of thanks goes to Dr. Paula E. Lester (author of TJSQ) and Dr. Robert B. Kottkamp (Senior author of OCDQ-RS) for permitting me to use their instruments in this study.

Special thanks goes to all members of my family for their prayers, sustained support and encouragement during the years it took to complete this task.

Appreciation and thanks are extended to University of Baluchistan for providing me the opportunity and for granting study leave and Government of Pakistan for financial support.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank all my friends who supported and encouraged me in every stage of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Schools, despite their apparent similarity in structure, differ from each other in their operation. Careful observation unveils such differences. Each school is unique in dealing with its personnel, and each has an individuality or personality of its own. Some schools are energetic, prolific and warm, while others appear to be indifferent, aloof, and alienated, while in still others the discontent and apathy of personnel is conspicuous. The observation of such differences in schools' "feel" provided the impetus to study the organizational climate of schools. Halpin and Croft (1963) developed a perceptual measure of organizational climate (OCDQ) for elementary schools. Halpin and Croft (1963) are not the only ones to measure organizational climate via perceptions. Likert (1967), Litwin and Stringer (1968), Pace and Stern (1958), Schneider and Bartlett (1968), Campbell *et al.* (1970), Payne and Phesey (1971), Taylor and Bowers (1972), and Kottkamp, Mulhern and Hoy (1985) also developed perceptual measures of organizational climate.

The concept of organizational climate has increasingly become the focus of a wide variety of research studies. However, it is surrounded by conceptual, definitional and measurement problems. The diversity and contradiction in definitions, measurement techniques and ensuing results prompted Guion (1973) to state that "the concept of organizational climate is undoubtedly important, but it also seems to be one of the fuzziest concepts to come along in some time" (p. 121).

James and Jones (1974), in a review of organizational climate, theory and research, identified three approaches to the definition and measurement of organizational climate:

a) The multiple-measurement-organization attribute approach;

b) The perceptual-measurement-organizational attribute approach; and

c) The perceptual-measurement-individual attribute approach.

The perceptual measure of organizational climate has generated the greatest amount of research. However, there has been controversy whether it is as valid a measure of organizational climate as is an objective measure.

Critics argue that in such a measure characteristics of individual and organization are confounded (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; James and Jones, 1974). Guion (1973) found perceptual measures of organization climate ambiguous in

that it is not clear who or what is the subject of the study. He commented:

> . . . to many in the field, however, there seems to be a real confusion over whether 'climate' refers to attributes of organization or attributes of people. (p. 121)

James and Jones (1974), in an attempt to resolve the issue, suggested the use of "organizational climate" to represent organizational attribute and "psychological climate" to represent individual attribute. This issue has been addressed in a number of construct validity studies using different methodological techniques (Drexler, 1977; Howe, 1977; Jones and James, 1979; Gavin, 1975; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; Johnston, 1976).

Drexler (1977) after examining data from 1,256 groups in 21 organizations found a main effect for organization and thus, concluded that organizational climate is an attribute of organization, while Johnston (1976) and Gavin (1975) came to a different conclusion, indicating that organizational climate is neither exclusively an attribute of an organization nor an attribute of an individual.

Further confusion surrounding organizational climate is the possible overlap and redundancy between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Johannesson (1973) and Guion (1973) argued that organizational climate and job satisfaction measures are redundant concepts. They attributed this redundancy to researchers culling and/or borrowing items from satisfaction scales, and utilizing identical or similar methods of measurement. However, a

number of theorists and researchers do not share this view. A conceptual distinction has been drawn between organizational climate and job satisfaction, arguing that organizational climate measures are descriptive, while job satisfaction measures are affective and evaluative in nature (James and Jones, 1974; Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; LaFollett and Sims, 1975; Schneider, 1975; Payne, Fineman and Wall, 1976; Naylor, Pritchard and Ilgen, 1980). A number of research studies also provided support for conceptual distinction. They have shown that both measures related differently to performance (LaFollett and Sims, 1975), the organizational level and job performance influenced the nature of the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction (Downey *et al.*, 1974), and climate measures reflected different aspects of work from those reflected by job satisfaction measures (Schneider and Snyder, 1975). Based on their research findings, these researchers concluded that organizational climate and job satisfaction are not redundant but rather distinct constructs.

In short, there seems to be real confusion and debate over whether organizational climate be operationalized perceptually or objectively. If measured perceptually, whether does it refer to an organization attribute and/or an individual attribute? And are job satisfaction and organizational climate separate and/or distinct constructs?

Despite these controversies, the perceptual measure of organizational climate has gained popularity. A far larger group of researchers has attempted to operationalize organizational climate in terms of participants' perception of different aspects of work environment. The critics of perceptual measure of organizational climate have acknowledged the importance of perceptual organizational climate, and have not suggested abandoning its use completely. Even Guion (1973), who is highly critical of perceptual measure, said:

> These comments [on organizational climate] are not intended to disparage work on organizational climate or even on perceptions of organizational climate. . .perceptions, whether by employees or by consultants, can be used as estimates. . .of attributes of organizations (p. 124).

The issue of whether perceived organizational climate is an organization attribute or an individual attribute remains debatable. Studies by Drexler (1977), Howe (1977), and Schneider and Snyder (1975) have bolstered the assertion that organizational climate refers to an attribute of organization. But the findings of Johnston (1976) and Gavin (1975) provide contradictory evidence. A majority of researchers (with the exception of Schneider, 1973); Schneider and Bartlett, 1968 and 1970; and Schneider and Hall, 1972) have viewed climate as an organization attribute. The organization attribute approach regards climate as a unitary or main effect, and assumes that individuals within a given subunit or organization form similar perceptions about organizational climate.

Regarding the possible and potential overlap and redundancy of these two constructs, a conceptual distinction has been offered which suggests that organization climate is descriptive and organizationally oriented, while job satisfaction is affective and individually oriented. The distinction, however, has not been empirically demonstrated. It has been argued that descriptions are highly influenced by one's feelings (Johannesson, 1973). Still, the psychological problem remains of divorcing and/or isolating descriptions from feelings. This question shall have to be resolved empirically.

The approach to be used in this study is best characterized by James' and Jones' (1974) classification of the definitional and measurement approach of organizational climate, i.e., the "perceptual-measurement-organization attribute approach." The climate is conceived to be a descriptive/organization-oriented one, but is measured via perceptions of individual members. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, is conceived to be affective/individual-oriented. In a perceptual measure of organizational climate, the respondents are in effect asked to ignore their feelings about the organization and merely describe or indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes the organization.

Definition of Terms

1. Organizational Climate

> Refers to a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems, and that may be induced from the way that the organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974, p. 256).

Several themes are implicit in this definition of organizational climate:

a) perceptual responses sought are primarily descriptive, rather than evaluative;

b) the unit of analysis tends to be attributes of the organization or specific subsystems, rather than an individual;

c) the perceptions have potential behavioral consequences.

In this study, five dimensions of an organizational climate description questionnaire--Revised Scale (OCDQ-RS) for secondary schools, developed by Kottkamp *et al.* (1985) will be used to measure the organizational climate of public secondary schools: two dimensions related to principal behavior (supportive and directive), and three related to teacher behavior (engaged, frustrated and intimate).

> a) Supportive principal behavior: Characterized by principals' efforts to motivate teachers using constructive criticism and setting an example through hard work. Supportive behavior of principals is directed toward both task achievement and the social needs of the faculty.
>
> b) Directive principal behavior: Reflects rigid and domineering supervision by the principal, who

maintains close control over teachers and school activities.

c) **Engaged teacher behavior:** Reflected by high faculty morale. Teachers are supportive of each other and enjoy working with each other. They are also friendly with students, trust them and are concerned with the success of students.

d) **Frustrated teacher behavior:** Refers to the general pattern of influence, from both administrators and colleagues, that distracts from the basic task of teaching. Teachers get irritated and annoyed because of routine and excessive non-teaching duties.

e) **Intimate teacher behavior:** Reflects a cohesive network of social relationships among faculty. Teachers are close friends and regularly socialize together.

The organizational climate measure is descriptive of the conditions of an internal environment of an organization. The respondents indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes/represents the organization. On the other hand, job satisfaction represents the affective feelings of the respondents to different facets of the job. It is the reaction of organization members to the conditions of the job that are embedded in the organization. Job satisfaction, for the purpose of this study, is conceived of as being affective and individually oriented.

2. Job Satisfaction

Refers to "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience." (Locke, 1976,p. 1300)

In this study, the satisfaction of teachers will be ascertained using the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1983). It is intended to measure

affective feelings of teachers associated with different facets of their job situation. The instrument examines nine factors/facets of the job. Lester (1983) defined the factors as follows.

a) **Supervision:** The task-oriented behavior of the immediate supervisor.

b) **Colleagues:** The work group, as well as social interaction among fellow workers.

c) **Working conditions:** The work environment, and aspects of the physical environment.

d) **Pay:** Annual income.

e) **Responsibility:** The opportunity to be accountable for one's own work, and to take part in policy- and decision-making activities.

f) **Work itself:** The task related to the job. This includes the freedom to institute innovative materials and to use one's skills and abilities in designing one's work, as well as the freedom to experiment and to influence or control what happens on the job.

g) **Advancement:** The opportunity for promotion.

h) **Security:** The school's policies regarding tenure, seniority, layoffs, pensions, retirement and dismissal.

i) **Recognition:** Some act of notice, blame, praise, or criticism.

Job satisfaction is the reaction of individuals toward the job conditions of their organization. Those (teachers in this case) in an organization (school) tend to react or express their feelings to the job conditions on different bases. One such basis is demographic background. They establish a frame of reference (Smith, Kendall and Hullin, 1969) based on these demographic characteristics and respond accordingly. A host of personal and school demographic

characteristics may have some association with teacher job satisfaction. It is beyond the scope of this study to include all such demographic characteristics. Job attitude literature provided a basis for inclusion of demographic characteristics; however, the emphasis has been lop sided. Some demographics were studied extensively in relation to job satisfaction, while others were not given due emphasis. In this study, the following personal demographics of teachers (age, sex, marital status, education level, teaching experience, employment status, and teaching subjects) and school demographic characteristics (location and size of the school) are included:

3. Education level

The amount of formal education received by the teacher.

4. Teaching experience

The number of years a teacher has taught in a school system.

5. Nature of employment

The status of a teacher's employment. The teachers are classified as tenured or non-tenured teachers.

a) Tenured teachers: Those teachers who have completed six years of teaching service in a school system, and whose position as a teacher has been officially made permanent.

b) Non-tenured teachers: Those teachers who have not completed six years of teaching service in a school system.

6. Teaching subjects

The various subjects/disciplines the teachers are teaching, based on their specific knowledge and specialty in the field/discipline.

7. School Size

Refers to the enrollment of students in the school. For the purpose of analysis, the schools are classified as small (less than 300 students), medium (300-599 students) and large sized schools (600 and more students).

8. School Location

Refers to the physical location of the school building. The schools are classified as urban and rural schools.

a) **Urban Schools:** The physical location of the school building in a locality with a population of 2,500 or more inhabitants.

b) **Rural Schools:** The physical location of the school building in a locality with a population of less than 2,500 inhabitants.

Statement of the Problem

The level of satisfaction experienced by teachers has been an area of considerable interest to educational researchers. Attention has been concentrated on identifying the factors presumably associated with teacher job satisfaction. Early researchers focused more on personal demographic characteristics to find the sources of variation in teacher job satisfaction. But the recognition that variation in human behavior in some circumstances can be attributed to organizational factors, led researchers to relate job satisfaction to organizational variables. There is an array of demographic and organizational variables

which may have some association with job satisfaction. The focus of this study is on organizational climate and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics and their relationship to teacher job satisfaction.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold:

1) To determine the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction, as perceived by public secondary school teachers.

2) To ascertain the relationship between teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics (age, sex, marital status, level of education, nature of employment, nature of teaching subjects, location of the school and size of the school) and teacher job satisfaction.

Research Hypotheses

Previous research relating organizational climate and job satisfaction consistently has shown organizational climate and job satisfaction to be related (McElroy, 1984; Burke, 1982; Ronnenkamp, 1984; and LoFland, 1985). The studies investigating the relationship of job satisfaction to demographic characteristics showed no consistent pattern of relationship between the variables under study. There are a number of studies that indicated older teachers to be more satisfied than younger teachers (Hoppock, 1935; Belasco and Alutto, 1972; McElroy, 1984), female teachers are more satisfied than male teachers (Chase, 1951; Lortie, 1975;

Birmingham, 1984); experienced teachers are more satisfied than less experienced ones (Sweeney, 1981; Anderson and Iwanicki, 1984; Taylor, 1986), married teachers slightly more satisfied than single teachers (Chase, 1951), tenured teachers exhibit a higher level of satisfaction than non-tenured teachers (Quinn *et al.*, 1974). These studies thus indicated relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction and demographic characteristics and job satisfaction. On the basis of these findings, following testable hypotheses were generated for this study.

> **Hypothesis I:** There will be a significant relationship between organizational climate (measured by OCDQ-RS) and teacher job satisfaction (measured by TJSQ) as perceived by public secondary school teachers.
>
> **Hypothesis II:** There will be a significant relationship between teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics (age, sex, marital status, level of education, nature of employment, nature of teaching subjects, location and size of the school) and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by public secondary school teachers.

Need for the Study

This study can be justified on the following grounds.

1) No study, to the best of my knowledge, has been conducted to investigate the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction involving public secondary school teachers in the state of Michigan.

2) Elementary and secondary schools are different in their structures. Elementary schools are designed to be

self-contained classrooms. Teachers are relatively independent of each other and enjoy a great deal of freedom (at least behind classroom doors), whereas secondary schools are departmentalized and teachers are interdependent. This structural difference is accompanied by differences in norms established at each level which to a large extent govern the teacher behavior. These differences require that the organizational climate at each level should be assessed with instruments that reflect conditions in the schools before relating it to other criteria.

Prior research relating organizational climate to teacher job satisfaction indiscriminately used the organizational climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed by Halpin and Croft (1963) to assess secondary school climate. This instrument was specifically designed to measure the organizational climate of elementary schools. The utility of this instrument in assessing secondary school organizational climate was questioned by various researchers (Morris, 1964; Watkins, 1968; Carver and Sergiovanni, 1969).

This study is the first to use an instrument specifically designed to measure the secondary school organizational climate in Michigan public secondary schools.

3) Schools are functioning in an era of rapid change and increasing mobility. Schools are a part of a broader environment which itself is changing continuously and exerting much influence upon schools. The vicissitudes of external environment augment the need for schools to create

an internal environment which allows the development of the unique capacities of each teacher. Teachers must be willing to execute not only their basic tasks of teaching, but also carry out other organizational assignments in order to cope effectively with the changing external environment. To achieve these objectives, schools must be concerned with satisfying the needs and expectations of their teachers.

4) Schools, specifically secondary schools, have undergone a series of changes (such as teacher negotiation/ collective bargaining, new teaching methods, and expansion of school goals). All these changes have contributed to a more complex operation of schools. Specifically, collective bargaining in public schools has affected virtually every aspect of operations and governance of schools (Kowalski, 1982), including the organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers. In the wake of these changes, the need for assessment of organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction becomes quite evident.

Furthermore, society's demand for quality education, accountability in the teaching profession, discipline problems, and teachers' organizations militant posture and increasing demands for fringe benefits and greater involvement in policy- and decision-making all accentuated the need for studying teacher job satisfaction.

5) Previous studies relating teacher job satisfaction to personal demographic characteristics have studied few personal variables at a time. This study includes a

relatively large number of demographic variables to investigate their relationship to job satisfaction.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

No survey research in its entirety can be perfect, there are bound to be some limitations. This study is no exception. This study is limited in a number of ways which are as follows:

1) The study is delimited to Michigan Public Secondary Schools.

2) The study is delimited to the perceptions of public secondary school teachers.

3) The study is delimited to the perceptions of teachers and their responses to OCDQ-RS and TJSQ and not included those who opt not to participate in the study, since the participation was voluntary.

4) A possible methodological limitation of the study is the validity of participants' perceptions as a measure of organizational climate. The organizational climate was measured through the perceptions of teachers, the accuracy and validity of perceptual measure has been subjected to much controversy and debate.

Generalizability of the Study

As indicated earlier, the study was limited to Public Secondary Schools and their teachers' responses to organizational climate and job satisfaction, therefore, the

findings from this study can only be generalized to Michigan Public Secondary Schools.

Organization of the Study

This study is comprised of five chapters. In Chapter 1 were presented the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research hypotheses, and need for the study. Also presented in chapter 1 were the limitations of the study, scope of the generalizability of study and definition of terms and variables used in the study.

Chapter 2 contains a review of literature, including definitions of organizational climate, dimensions and importance of organizational climate, discussion of major problems associated with organizational climate construct and a discussion of studies relating organizational climate and job satisfaction. Presented also in chapter 2 is review of job satisfaction including a discussion of theories related to job satisfaction and a discussion of findings of studies relating job characteristics and demographic characteristics to job satisfaction.

In chapter 3 the research design, sampling procedures, and a discussion of instruments used in the study are discussed. Also presented is the discussion of data gathering and data analysis procedures.

Chapter 4 presents the data analysis results concerning the relationships of organizational climate and demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction.

Chapter 5 comprises the summary of the study, findings of the study and discussion of these findings, along with conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The organizational climate and job satisfaction constructs have been focus of considerable attention. Numerous articles, papers, books and dissertations have been published on the topics. Presented in this chapter is a review of pertinent literature. Though the review is not exhaustive in its coverage, however, every attempt has been made to review the relevant literature that have similarity to this study. The review of literature is presented into two sections. In the first section is provided review of literature pertaining to organizational climate, including definitions, dimensions, importance, and measurement of organizational climate. Also presented in this section is the controversies surrounding organizational climate i.e., organization vs. individual attribute debate, shared perceptions debate, and the controversy whether organizational climate and job satisfaction are redundant concepts. And finally, an overview of the study findings that related organizational climate to job satisfaction, is provided.

The second section constituted of review of job satisfaction, including definitions of job satisfaction, brief overview of theories of job satisfaction, and overview of study findings relating job characteristics and individual characteristics to job satisfaction, is presented in that order.

Organizational Climate

The Organizational climate construct, though important, has been subjected to debate and controversy. Much of the controversies/debate centered around conceptual, definitional and measurement problems. The difficulty in conceptualizing the concept, encountered by organizational students, was realized by Argyris (1958) when he posed the question:

How is this living complexity, conveniently defined as "the climate of the organization," to be analyzed and conceptualized without presenting us with an oversimplified picture of reality, a picture devoid of the life one is committed to studying? (p.502). Despite these difficulties, for specific purposes climate concept is defined operationally and many definitions have been offered. Representative and commonly accepted definitions of organizational climate are provided below.

Definitions of Organizational Climate

Forehand and Gilmer (1964) defined organizational climate as:

> The set of characteristics that describe an organization and that a) distinguish the organization from other organizations, b) are relatively enduring over time, and c) influences the behavior of people in the organization. (p. 362)

Tagiuri (1968) considered this definition deficient because it places excessive emphasis on organization at the neglect of perceptions of the members of the organization. Thus, he proposed the following definition:

> Organizational climate is a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that a) is experienced by its members, b)influences their behavior, and c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization. (p. 27)

Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) offered a definition of organizational climate and included "subsystem" climate in it, which later has been interpreted by others as "group climate" (Howe, 1977' Powell and Butterfield, 1978).

Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) stated that:

> Organizational climate refers to a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems, and that may be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment. (p. 256)

The preceding definitions clearly indicate that climate has been considered exclusively an organizational attribute, which can be perceived and assessed objectively as well. Some researchers, however, do not seem to share this view of organizational climate. They consider it an individual attribute. The pioneers of this school of thought are

Schneider and his associates. As Schneider (1973) stated that:

> The concept of climate in the present research may best be described as personalistic; climate is an individual perception. There was no attempt to restrict the climate definition to perceptions shared by members of a work group or organization. As stated elsewhere (Schneider and Bartlett, 1970),'. . . what is psychologically important to the individual must be how he perceives his work environment, not how others might choose to describe it (p. 510).' (p. 254)

Climate is a particularly complex component of any organization. The school organizational climate researchers have emphasized this complexity and viewed it as analogous to personality.

As Halpin and Croft (1963) stated:

> Organizational climate can be construed as the organizational 'personality' of a school; figuratively, 'personality' is to the individual what 'climate' is to the organization. (p. 1)

In the Same Vein, Norton (1984) defined the organizational climate of a school as:

> The collective personality of a school or enterprise, the atmosphere as characterized by the social and professional interactions of the individuals in the school. (p. 43)

Keefe, Kelley and Miller (1985) defined the organizational climate of schools as: "The relatively enduring patterns of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members" (p. 74).

These definitions seem to share certain elements. The organizational climate is considered a molar concept, an enduring quality which is perceived by members as well as non-members (these perceptions are descriptive in nature),

and that climate has potential impact on the behavior of people in the organization. Taken together, however, there are distinct differences in these definitions. Climate has evolved from being considered exclusively an organizational attribute to an individual and subsystem (group) attribute. It is conceptualized as one concept, but defined and operationalized at three different levels of analysis within the organization (Field and Abelson, 1982). This has stirred debate and controversy surrounding the construct, which will be discussed in detail in a later section of this chapter.

Dimensions of Organizational Climate

The basic assumption that a varied group of social environments can be characterized by a limited number of dimensions (Jones and James, 1979) directed researchers' attention to focus on defining and measuring core dimensions of climate.

Forehand and Gilmer (1964) stated:

> The definition of a climate dimension requires evidence that: the objective determinants of the dimension are applicable to all subunits, and the dimension is perceived comparably by individuals in the subunit. (p. 378)

It emphasizes that individuals exposed to similar situations perceive those situations in similar ways and use essentially the same dimensions to describe them (Jones and Butler, 1980).

Tagiuri (1968) conceptualized climate as a summary concept dealing with the total environmental quality within

an organization. According to Tagiuri (1968), dimensions of climate include:

a) Ecology (Physical and material aspects);

b) Milieu (social dimension concerned with the presence of persons and groups);

c) Social System (social dimensions concerned with relationship patterns of persons and groups); and

d) Culture (social dimension concerned with belief system and meaning systems).

Dimensions of organizational variation in determining organizational climate proposed by Forehand and Gilmer (1964) in their order of effect upon individual behavior were:

a) Size;

b) Structure;

c) System's complexity;

d) Leadership style; and

e) Goal direction.

Campbell *et al.* (1970), in a review of organizational climate research, identified four dimensions of organizational climate common to a number of empirical climate studies in organizations.

a) Individual autonomy;

b) The degree of structure imposed upon the position;

c) Reward orientation, and

d) Consideration, warmth and support.

These dimensions received support from subsequent factor analytic studies by LaFollette and Sims, 1975; Waters, Roach and Batlis, 1974; Jones and James, 1979; Muchinsky, 1976; Payne and Pugh, 1976; Sims and LaFollette, 1975.

It was noted, however, that a communality of items and/or outward appearance of factors might have contributed to the results (Campbell *et al.*, 1970), and that the number of dimensions was perhaps too few (Jones and James, 1979).

While it seems apparent that four dimensions of organizational climate are common and have received wide acceptance, several other writers, however, have noted the multidimensionality of organizational climate and suggested that there may be other dimensions (Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Schneider, 1975; Naylor *et al.*, 1980).

Schneider (1975) suggested that: "Organizational climate should refer to an area of research rather than a . . . particular set of dimensions" (p. 472). He viewed organizations having a number of climates, therefore any number of dimensions, and thus posited that the question of dimension salience was relevant in the context of a particular criterion.

Anderson (1982) in a review of school climate research, used Tagiuri's (1968) typology of organizational climate to evaluate the relative importance assigned to the four climate dimensions by school climate researchers. She came to the conclusion that the majority of factors measured by

school climate instruments fell in the social system and culture dimensions, and tended to ignore the dimensions of ecology and milieu.

In sum, "most 'measures' of climate concern particular aspects of the organization usually only a few dimensions are focused on, and they are seldom combined to capture the essence of the climate" (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 28).

The Importance of the Organizational Climate

The organizational climate, though surrounded by conceptual, measurement and definitional problems, "has been a popular concept for theorizing and research" (Schneider, and Reichers, 1983). It is these controversies that prompted some theorists to conclude that it is the 'fuzziest' concept (Guion, 1973) and most confusing and universally misunderstood construct (Naylor *et al.*, 1980). However, these comments did not seem to obscure or vitiate the importance of the concept.

More than a dozen reviews of the construct have appeared (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Campbell *et al.*, 1970; Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; James and Jones, 1974; Schneider, 1975; Payne and Pugh, 1976; Thomas, 1976; Powell and Butterfield, 1978; Woodman and King, 1978; Jones and James, 1979; Joyce and Slocum, 1979; Naylor, Pritchard and Ilgen, 1980; Anderson, 1982; Schneider, 1983). These reviews and the prodigious number of articles and papers on the topic speak to the significance of the concept in the field of the organization. It should

be noted, however, that these reviews have been very critical of the conceptualization and measurement of the climate construct.

Guion (1973), though very critical of the perceived organizational climate, speaks of the importance of the construct in these words:

> The construct. . . . implied by the term organizational climate, may be one of the most important to enter the thinking of industrial-organizational psychologists in many years (p. 120).

For others, the construct is important because it provides a conceptual link between analysis at the organizational level and the individual level (Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Payne and Mansfield, 1973), aids in the prediction of organizational phenomena and is a link with other organizational constructs, forming a nomological net (Field and Abelson, 1982), aids in understanding employee behavior in work organization (Schneider, 1975), has potential for describing and understanding the behavior of individuals within organizations (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; Woodman and King, 1978), and is a useful device for understanding the way individuals structure and organize their perceptions of their work environment (Naylor, Pritchard and Ilgen, 1980).

The importance of organizational climate construct received equally good recognition from school climate researchers.

Lindlow and Mazzerella (1981) spoke of the importance of climate in schools:

> Certainly the satisfaction and morale of students and staff are higher in school with healthy climates than in schools with unhealthy climates; indeed, school climate measures are often a direct reflection of satisfaction with the school (p. 175).

Baugh (1970) describes the importance of organizational climate in schools in these words:

> Organizational climate has become a vital and much studied concept in educational research and practice. To have an organization is to have an organizational climate of some kind. This climate will either contribute to the effectiveness of the organization in meeting its members' social needs and in accomplishing its goals, or it will contribute to the ineffectiveness of the organization in fulfilling its responsibilities (pp. 39-40).

Thomas (1976), in a review of organizational climate of schools, concluded that "research should continue. The concept of organizational climate is too important to abandon" (p. 457).

The controversies surrounding organizational climate that have been relatively recently the focus of attention have long been recognized by pioneers of the concept. Tagiuri (1968) has summarized the most important of these problems as:

> 1) Distinguishing between the objective and subjective environment;
> 2) Distinguishing between the person and situation;
> 3) Determining what aspects of the environment need to be specified;
> 4) identifying the structures and dynamics of the environment (p. 64).

"These problems remain pertinent to the study of organizational climate today and to a large extent are still unresolved" (Woodman and King, 1978, p. 817).

Measurement of the Organizational Climate

Researchers have come to a partial agreement concerning the meaning of organizational climate (Joyce and Slocum, 1984). However, there is great diversity on how to measure the organizational climate (Lindlow and Mazzerella, 1981).

Johannesson (1973) reports that measurement of organizational climate has proceeded along two lines: objective and perceptual.

Objective Measures of Organizational Climate

Objective measures of organizational climate do not rely on perceptions by individuals. These objective measures are associated with the works of Evan (1963); Lirtzman, House and Rizzo (1973); Pugh *et al.*, (1969); Whisler (1970); and Friesen (1978); Lawrence and Lorsch, (1967). The objective measures of organizational climate have the characteristics of accuracy and reliability (Helleriegel and Slocum, 1974). However, they are not devoid of limitations. Some criticisms that have been leveled against objective measures of organizational climate include: "The variables that may be examined are too numerous and too specific to be readily interpreted" (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964, p. 365).

A second criticism is that:

> Studies that examine in isolation specific objective properties of an organization leave unanswered the questions of how they are related to useful constructs of organizational functioning (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964, p. 365).

Characteristics which can be measured objectively are too far removed from behavior; they affect participants in the organization only indirectly (Woodman and King, 1978; Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974).

Some researchers have suggested an objective measure of climate by using an outside observer. This method of assessing climate has also been criticized.

As, Sarason (1971) pointed out:

> By virtue of the fact that observer is himself part of a structure--be it in the school culture or in one outside of it--his perception and thinking are in various ways incomplete, selective, and distorted (p. 15).

Moos (1979) indicated that any attempt to validate perceptions with observations is complicated by several other factors.

First, the behavior that leads to perception may be infrequent but intense, and may be a crucial dimension of the climate, but the observer would not observe an incident of it. Second, the behavior that leads to perception may take place regularly, but in a place not observable to the outsider.

These limitations of objective measures led researchers to measure organizational climate through perceptions of individual members in the organization. It is argued that

"perceptions of the environment are more important determinants of behavior than is the objective environment itself" (Joyce, Slocum and Abelson, 1977, p. 262).

Litwin and Stringer (1968) argue, that:

> Realities of the organization (organizational structure, leadership and decision making processes etc.) are understood only as they are perceived by members of the organization, allowing climate to be viewed as a filter through which objective phenomena must pass (pp. 42-43).

Perceptual Measures of Organizational Climate

The perceptual measurement of organizational climate, associated with controversies, has generated the greatest amount of research.

James and Jones (1974), in a review of organizational climate theory and research, identified three approaches to definition and measurement of organizational climate;

a) The "multiple-measurement-organization attribute"; which regards organizational climate exclusively as a set of organizational attributes or main effects measurable by a variety of methods;

b) The "perceptual-measurement-organization attribute," which views organizational climate as an organizational attribute or main effect, but is measured via perceptual means; and

c) The "perceptual-measurement-individual attribute" views the organizational climate as an individual attribute and measured through perceptions.

Parallel to this categorization of measurement approaches are three levels of climate presented by Naylor, Pritchard and Ilgen (1980).

a) **Actual environmental attributes:** (level one climate). This parallels James and Jones' (1974), the multiple measurement organization attribute approach.

b) **Perceived environmental attributes:** (level two climate). This parallels James and Jones' (1974) the perceptual measurement-organization attribute approach.

c) **Psychological climate construct:** (level three climate). This parallels James and Jones' (1974), perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach.

Those who have emphasized the perceptual measure of organizational climate argue that "such perceptions are based on experience that is both more extensive and more involved than that of an outside observer" (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964, p. 364); "the perceptions have potential behavioral consequences" (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974, p. 256); "what is psychologically important to the individual must be how he perceives his environment, not how others might choose to describe it" (Schneider and Bartlett, 1970, p. 510); and it is only through perceptions that the relationship between causal variables (structure, supervisory practices, etc.) and end result variables (productivity, attitudes, etc.) may be understood (Likert, 1961, p. 196).

Critics of perceptual measure, on the other hand, argue that "in such a measure, characteristics of individual and organization are confounded" (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964, p. 365); "there are potentially as many climates as there are people in the organization" (Johannesson, 1971, p. 30); and ". . . the use of perceptual measurement introduces variance which is a function of differences between individuals and is not necessarily descriptive of organization or situation" (James and Jones, 1974, p. 1103).

These conflicting but persuasive, and/or compelling arguments for and against perceptual measure of organizational climate raised another issue concerning the convergent validity of subjective and objective measures of organizational climate. This concern was forcefully presented by Campbell *et al.*, (1970) when they commented:

> . . . a distinction is necessary between perceptual and objective measures of situational characteristics. The two measurement processes of 1) asking an individual how he perceives his environment and 2) defining situational variables a *priori* and measuring them independently yield variables of very different order. The central issue is whether the determiner of significant effects is the situation as it actually is or as it is perceived (p. 389).

Payne and Pugh (1976), reviewed a variety of convergent studies (Astin and Holland, 1961; Barker, 1963; and Stern, 1970) conducted in educational settings, concluded that the perceptual measures have validity and correlate with more objective and non-perceptual measures of climate.

Woodman and King (1978), after a review of climate research, argued that the problem of convergent validity

between perceptual and more objective measurement of organizational climate remains unresolved.

They concluded that:

> . . . until these issues of validity (convergent and discriminate) can be resolved, much speculation about organizational climate is likely to elude science and remain in the realm of organizational folklore (p. 624).

Organization Vs. Individual attribute

The central issue, whether individual perceptions reflect actual attributes of the organization or whether these are perceived attributes of individuals, was raised by Campbell *et al.* (1970). However, Guion's (1973) comments on this issue resulted in many studies attempting to resolve this issue. Regarding the issue of what perceptual measures of climate actually measure, Guion stated:

> The idea of "perceived organizational climate" seems ambiguous; one can not be sure whether it implies an attribute of the organization or of the perceiving individual (p. 120).

A number of research studies addressed this question. Gavin (1975) studying a sample of managerial-level employees in a bank, reported that personal and organizational variables (in an additive rather than interactive way) roughly equally accounted for significant amounts of variance in climate perceptions. He concluded:

> A tentative conclusion that one might draw from this research is that organizational climate perceptions do not merely reflect organizational, or individual differences, as some have suggested (cf. Guion, 1973) (p. 138).

Similarly, Johnston (1976), conducting a field study of a single firm contrasting the perceptions of two groups of individuals (those who have been with the organization over three years vs. those who have been 6 months to one year), found two different organizational climates,and concluded:

> The concept of climate as a joint function of situational and personality variables provides a direct and unequivocal answer to the . . . difficult question posed by Guion (1973), whether climate is an attribute of the organization or of its members. The answer implied by the concept presented here is that it is neither exclusively. As the field study data indicates here, that climate is an attribute of both the individual and organization (p. 102).

In an attempt to resolve the organizational vs. individual-attribute controversy, James and Jones (1974) recommended using "organizational climate" to reflect organizational attribute, and "psychological climate" to represent individual attribute.

Drexler's (1977) research directly addressed this question. The main interest was whether descriptive but perceptually generated measures of organizational climate characterize organizations, or whether they represent variance at individual, group or other levels of interest. He examined the data from 1,256 groups representing 6,996 individuals in 21 organizations. He found a main effect for organization which explained 42% of the variance in climate. Subunit effects were also found, much weaker than organizational effects. Drexler (1977) concluded:

> These results support the position that descriptive measures of organizational climate characterize organizations. Such measures have

> organization-specific variance and, in James and Jones' (1974) terminology, constitute organizational attributes (p. 40).

Schneider (1983) expressed the opinion that the distinction between organizational climate and psychological climate proposed by James and Jones (1974) has gained general acceptance. According to Schneider (1983),

> Psychological climate is the meaning an individual attaches to work context; Organizational climate is the aggregated meaning, that is typical average or usual way people in a setting describe it (p. 109).

A considerable amount of research studies have tested the construct validity of organizational climate. A number of methodological criteria have been employed.

1) Discrimination, or demonstrable differences between mean perceptions between climates (Drexler, 1977; Howe, 1977; Newman, 1975; Jones and James, 1979; Joyce and Slocum, 1984);

2) Predictable relationships to organizational or individual criteria (Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Jones and James, 1979; Joyce and Slocum, 1984);

3) Internal consistency or agreement in perceptions (Howe, 1977; Jones and James, 1979; Joyce and Slocum, 1984).

Field and Abelson (1982), after reviewing a number of construct validity studies (Litwin and Stringer, 1968; Drexler, 1977; Howe, 1977; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; Offenberg and Cernius, 1978; Newman, 1977; Jones and James, 1979), concluded that "these results indicate a substantial

amount of evidence regarding the construct validity of organizational and group climate" (p. 190). And they suggested:

> . . . it appears necessary to greatly limit the energies exerted on the argument of the whether the climate construct exists, and redirect these energies into more constructive activities. Appropriate models should be developed and tested (p. 198).

Shared/Consensual Perceptions

Many researchers and theorists (Halpin and Croft, 1963; Guion, 1973; James and Jones, 1974; Schneider, 1975; Field and Abelson, 1982) have suggested that if perceptual measures of organizational climate are used to describe an organization, there should be a consensus or at least an agreement among members in their perceptions of organizational climate.

Halpin and Croft (1963) emphasized the importance of perceptual agreement in the measurement of school organizational climate. They posited that a degree of agreement among staff members' perception of school climate must be presented before the global concept of the organizational climate could be considered valid. However, they sensed the difficulty of obtaining such an agreement by pointing out:

> Here we are confronted by the perennial phenomenological dilemma: each person is limited to seeing the world through only his own perceptions. Yet we are prepared and are still prepared to take the position that when a majority of the faculty group shows consensus in its perception of school climate, this consensus can

be used as a dependable index of what is out there (p. 10).

The extent to which individuals agree with respect to perceptions of their work environment has been addressed in a number of studies (Drexler, 1977; Gavin and Howe, 1975; Howe, 1977; James, Demaree and Hater, 1980; Jones and James, 1979; Payne and Mansfield, 1973; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Schneider, 1972; Schneider and Bartlett, 1970; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; Campbell and Beaty, 1971). Many studies reported evidence of agreement on climate perceptions among members of an organization.

Schneider and Snyder (1975) reported that respondents (in life insurance agencies) in different hierarchical positions within an organization (managers, assistant managers, supervisors, secretaries and stenographers) tended to agree more on the climate of their agencies than they did on how satisfied they were.

Schneider (1972) found that not only members' (managers, assistant managers and agency agents) perceptions were in agreement, but also non-members' (newly contracted agents) perceptions were in agreement with those of members.

Campbell and Beaty (1971), in an organizational study of salaried personnel in a manufacturing plant, indicated that :

a) Subjects had more similar perceptions of their total organizational climate than of their job climate; and

b) A significant portion of climate variance was attributable to subunit differences (rather than individual differences in perceptions).

Organizational climate studies in school settings also presented evidence of perceptual agreement. Offenburg and Cernius (1978) gave their organizational pattern questionnaire to members of two schools that had known different climates. The factor patterns of the results for the two schools were significantly different. However, a significant number of each faculty was able to select the factor pattern of its own school.

Friesen (1972) in a school organizational climate study, reported evidence of agreement among experts', principals' and teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate. A school considered to have a more open climate by experts and principals was also perceived to be open by its teachers (as measured by OCDQ). However, students' perceptions were not in agreement with those of principals and teachers.

Other studies, however, reported significant differences in the perceptions of climate among members in the same organization.

Walden, Taylor and Watkins (1975), in a study of elementary school organizational climate, found that teachers and principals significantly differ in their perceptions. Similar findings were reported by Wiggins (1972) and Grassie (1973).

Payne and Mansfield (1973) reported differences in the perceptions of climate among employees in different organizational hierarchy. Persons higher in the organizational hierarchy tended to perceive their organization's climate as:

1) Less authoritarian;

2) Providing greater work interest;

3) More friendly; and

4) More ready to innovate.

The work environment (climate) perceptions have been shown to differ across roles and organizational positions (Gavin and Howe, 1975; Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; Johnston, 1974; Payne and Mansfield, 1973; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; Schneider and Bartlett, 1970; Herman, Dunham and Hulin, 1975; Newman, 1975). Previous studies also have shown that climate perceptions reflect differences in individual characteristics, such as personality attributes (George and Bishop, 1971; Johnston, 1974; Kenney, White, and Gentry, 1967); cognitive complexity (Jones and Butler, 1980); need strength (Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Downey, Hellriegel and Slocum, 1975); work values (Coughlan, 1971; Friedlander and Margulies, 1969); and demographic characteristics, such as age (Brinkmeir, 1967; Cook, 1965; McLeod, 1969; Jones and James, 1979; and Newman, 1975); sex (Kimpston and Sonnabend, 1975) education (Jones and James, 1979; Kimpston and Sonnabend, 1975; and Newman, 1975); experience (Kalias, 1980: Kimpston and Sonnabend, 1975);

tenure (Jones and James, 1979; Newman, 1975 and Kalias, 1980); and size (George and Bishop, 1971; Carver and Sergiovanni, 1969; Flagg, 1964; Payne and Mansfield, 1973).

Naylor *et al.* (1980) resented the idea of using perceptual agreement, arguing that individuals within an organization use different sets of attributes to describe the environment; and even if they did use the same sets, their judgements (perceptions) would not necessarily be of the same magnitude.

Schneider (1975) asserted that people do share perceptions of their work environment and attributed the failure of perceptual agreement findings to the lack of sophisticated measures of organizational climate. He comments:

> People in a work setting tend to share their perceptions of the work setting's climate, although the degree of sharing is not very great with current measures (p. 474).

Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction Redundant Concepts

Another confusion surrounding organizational climate research is the possible overlap or redundancy between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Critics have attributed this tautology to:

a) Researchers culling and/or borrowing items from satisfaction scales (Guion, 1973; Johannesson, 1973, 1971; Campbell *et al.*, 1970);

b) Identical or similar methods of measurement (Johannesson, 1973); and

c) The influence of affective predisposition of perceptual climate measure, which were assume to elicit descriptive responses (Johannesson, 1973).

Johannesson's (1973) conclusion that job satisfaction and organizational climate are not distinct, but rather redundant concepts, is based on his research study. He examined the relationship between organizational climate cluster scores and cluster cores based on the SRA (Science Research Association) employee inventory and the job descriptive index (JDI). It was hypothesized that "most of the variance in a perceptual measure of organizational climate could be subsumed in factors traditionally found in satisfaction research." He found support for the hypothesis, and claimed that "by and large, organizational climate as measured in this study fails to add new or different variance to commonly identified satisfaction factors" (p. 141). Thus, he concluded that the two concepts are redundant.

A number of theorists (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; Stern, 1964; Schneider, 1975; James and Jones, 1974; Payne, Fineman and Wall, 1976; Naylor, Pritchard and Ilgen, 1980; Joyce and Slocum, 1979), have forcefully responded to this criticism. They offered a conceptual distinction arguing that organizational climate measures are descriptive and job satisfaction measures are affective and/or evaluative in orientation. In response to the criticism that satisfaction and organizational climate are redundant concepts,

Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) argued that "climate instruments allege to describe work environments, whereas jog satisfaction serves to evaluate them" (p. 256).

In similar vein, James and Jones (1974) tended to differentiate two constructs, arguing:

> . . . job satisfaction and perceived climate may be dynamically related and still provide somewhat different sources of related information; for example, climate provides descriptive information, often contaminated by satisfaction, while satisfaction provides actual evaluations and reactions (p. 1108).

Schneider and Snyder (1975) argued that a logical and empirical distinction between the concepts of organizational climate and job satisfaction is possible if:

> 1) Organizational climate is conceptualized as a characteristic of organizations which is reflected in the descriptions employees make of the policies, practices and conditions which exist in the work environment;
> 2) Job satisfaction is conceptualized as an affective response of individuals which is reflected in the evaluations employees make of the individually salient aspects of their job and the organization for which they work (p. 326).

Payne, Fineman and Wall (1976), in a conceptual synthesis of organizational climate and job satisfaction, agreed that measures of job satisfaction and organizational climate have a number of content areas in common. However, they claimed that despite such overlaps the measures are conceptually different in two ways:

> a) Job satisfaction is focused upon a particular job, while organizational climate refers to organization as a whole;
> b) Job satisfaction concerns a person's affective response to his job, while organizational climate is derived from a person's description of what the organization is like (p. 45).

They concluded that "while there is evidence of a relationship between measures of these two concepts, logically and empirically they remain distinct" (p. 47).

LaFollette and Sims (1975), like most other researchers, tended to differentiate job satisfaction from climate measure by arguing:

> Organizational climate attempts to measure properties of work environment, whereas satisfaction measures assess the affective responses to facets of work environment (p. 260).

Research has provided support for the conceptual distinction between organizational climate and satisfaction.

Downy, Hellriegel, Phelps and Slocum (1974) found that job satisfaction and organizational climate were related; however, this relationship was found to be affected by organizational level and job performance. On the basis of these findings, they concluded:

> In this study, organizational level and job performance exhibited strong effects on the nature of the relationship between the climate and satisfaction dimensions. The data provide some basis for concluding that organizational climate and job satisfaction are not one and the same (p. 246).

LaFollette and Sims (1975) found that though climate and satisfaction were related, both dimensions related differently to performance. This, according to them, tended to cast serious doubts on the redundancy hypothesis. Thus, they concluded that "we believe. . . . that Johannesson's conclusion of redundancy is premature and judgemental, and is contrary to prevailing evidence to date" (pp. 275-276).

Schneider and Snyder (1975), in an attempt to resolve the issue of possible overlap and redundancy of organizational climate and job satisfaction measures, examined the relationship among organizational effectiveness, measure of organizational climate and two measures of job satisfaction. They found that responses to two measures of satisfaction were more related to each other than they were to the responses to a measure of climate.

Thus, they concluded that "organizational climate and satisfaction data are not equivalent" (p. 327).

Joyce and Slocum (1984), in an exploratory study of collective climates (climates formed on the basis of similarities in perceptions) found that membership in a collective climate was significantly related to job satisfaction in two of the three plants. Furthermore, the proportion of variance in job satisfaction explained by climate varied from one aspect of job satisfaction to the other. On the basis of these findings, they asserted:

> Guion (1973) and Johannesson (1973) have argued that climate and satisfaction are redundant. If this were the case, climate and satisfaction should have been consistently and strongly related. The absence of such effects in plant I and the lack of consistency across the three plants does not support the equivalence of these constructs (p. 730).

The conceptual distinction between these two constructs is commonly accepted, and the research findings have provided additional credence to this distinction. However, there remains the danger of contamination of descriptions by feelings. Critics have put forth the argument that

description of one's environment is greatly influenced by the feelings of an individual about that environment. Johannesson (1973) forcefully presented this argument:

> If feelings heavily influence descriptions of perceptions, or perceptions themselves, how can derivates of them be called satisfaction dimension at one point in time and climate dimensions at another? (p. 112).

The distinction has not been empirically demonstrated. Still, there remains the psychological problem of separating and/or isolating descriptions from feelings. This question remains to be resolved empirically.

Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction Relationship Studies

Recognition of the importance of the work environment (climate), its potential utility and multiple impact upon human behavior stimulated the possibility that job satisfaction was somehow related to an organization's climate. With the assumption that organizational climate has an influence on , or is influenced by, job satisfaction, many studies were conducted to determine the relationship between climate and job satisfaction.

In an experimental study, Litwin and Stringer (1968) found that job satisfaction was highest in "affiliation" induced climates, relatively high in "achievement" induced climates and lower in "power" induced climates.

Friedlander and Margulies (1969) included the work values as moderator in the organizational climate and job satisfaction relationship. They found that certain type of

job satisfaction factors were predicted by certain organizational climate dimensions. However, relationships were moderated by employee-held work values. Among those for whom work was more important, an organizational climate high in thrust maximized satisfaction; among those for whom work was less important, an organizational climate high in esprit and low in disengagement maximized satisfaction.

Pritchard and Karasick (1973) considered personality needs and their relationships to climate, job satisfaction, and performance. A highly supportive climate was found to be associated with higher satisfaction for most managers, regardless of individual personality needs. However, managers with a high need for order tended to perform better in a highly structured climate. Managers with a high need for autonomy were more satisfied in a low decision centralization climate than those low in such a need.

Downey, Hellriegel, Phelps and Slocum (1974) found a significant positive relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. However, these relationships were moderated by organizational level and job performance. When they partialled out the effect of organizational level and job performance, significant positive zero order correlations transformed to significant negative partial correlations. On the basis of these findings, they concluded that "organizational climate and job satisfaction are not one and the same" (p. 247).

Downey, Hellriegel and Slocum (1975) tested the proposition that organizational climate interacts with individual personality needs in influencing job satisfaction and performance. They found that individuals with personality needs for sociability who perceived the organization climate as open and empathetic, and who set high standards for achievement, were more satisfied with pay and supervision than those individuals with similar personality need structures who perceived the organization's climate as closed, bureaucratic, and impersonal. Highly self-confident individuals who perceived that the organization clearly assigned responsibility, and had clear-cut policies, were more satisfied with their co-workers than individuals (regardless of self-confidence) who perceived the climate as unstructured.

LaFollette and Sims (1975) reported significant positive correlation between five organizational climate factors and each of five job descriptive index scales (a job satisfaction measure).

Lawler, Hall and Oldham (1974) in a study using scientists from a research and development organization, reported significant positive correlation between organizational climate and satisfaction. The results suggested that the more the organization's climate was perceived by scientists as competent,responsible, practical, risk-oriented and impulsive, the more satisfied was the scientist on the job.

Muchinsky (1977), with a sample of a large public utility's employees, reported a significant relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Five of the six organizational climate factors were positively correlated with JDI subscales. Standards factor of organizational climate was found to be significantly but negatively correlated with JDI subscales.

Schneider and Snyder (1975) also reported a relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. However, climate and satisfaction perceptions were found to be more highly correlated for people in some positions (staff, in-house trainees and brokerage trainees) than for people in other positions (managers and secsten).

Studies in school settings also reported similar results. Coughlan (1971), in a study analyzing the effects of organizational structure (open and closed school systems) and work values on job satisfaction, found that in a relatively open school organization systems, the teachers as a group were significantly more satisfied than in closed systems, but were significantly divided with respect to work values on colleague relations.

Grassie and Carss (1973), in a comparative study of two groups of Australian school teachers, found that professionally-oriented teachers were more satisfied with work and colleagues in a setting or structure characterized by considerate and trusting leadership (and the opportunity to participate in decisions about policies and programs,

with the absence of a rigid hierarchy of authority and organizational constraints) than teachers less professionally-oriented.

Craig (1979) found that teachers in open climate schools were more satisfied than those in closed climate schools. Similarly, McElory (1984) reported a relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. Teachers who exhibited a higher level of satisfaction tended to perceive their school climate as open.

Ronnenkamp (1984) reported a direct relationship between the organizational climate and job satisfaction on the part of teachers and administrators as a combined group. This relationship diminished, however, when respondents were partitioned based on selected demographic characteristics. It indicates that these selected demographic characteristics acted as moderator in these relationships.

Lofland (1985) also found that the type of organizational climate (open or closed) significantly affected teacher job satisfaction.

To recapitulate, organizational climate is considered to be an important construct, conceptual, definitional and measurement problems, however, have plagued climate research. A large number of reviews did not completely clarify the concept. However, limited conceptual and methodological progress has been made, such as the clarification of psychological and organizational climate and the differentiation of climate and job satisfaction

measures. Still there are issues awaiting to be resolved, specifically, what attributes are actually being measured by perceptual measures?

Job Satisfaction

Attitudes of employees toward their job have received considerable attention. Though widely studied, there seems to be a lack of a clear and widely accepted definition of just what is implied by the term "job satisfaction." The problem is complicated further because of its different usage. Sometimes, the term has been used in a very narrow sense of attitudes with regard to the job itself, while other times it has been given a broad meaning of "morale" (Hinrichs, 1968).

Definitions of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined in a variety of ways. Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say 'I am satisfied with my job'" (p. 47). According to Brayfield and Rothe (1951), "job satisfaction refers to the individual's attitude (feeling) toward his work" (p. 307). According to Vroom (1964), "job satisfaction refers to the positive affective orientation of individuals toward the work role which they are presently occupying" (p. 99).

Porter (1968) states that satisfaction is "the difference between what a person thinks he should receive

and what he feels he actually does receive." This is similar to how Locke (1969) viewed job satisfaction: "a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it is offering" (p. 316).

Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) viewed job satisfaction as "the feelings a worker has about his job" (p. 6).

According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction is "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values" (p. 1300).

As is evident from the preceding definitions, there is great variation in the definition of job satisfaction. This reflects different theoretical orientations. For some, job satisfaction is the positive affective feeling or orientation toward the job, but for others, it is the degree to which an individual member's needs, values or expectations are fulfilled in a job situation. There seems to be no single agreed-upon definition of job satisfaction.

Theoretical Frame Work

Because of continuing interest in the construct, many theories and models emerged in the job satisfaction literature. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) classified these theories into content/substantive or process/mechanical theories.

Process theories are concerned with specifying the types or classes of variables (needs, values, expectations, etc.), as well as how these variables combine to determine

job satisfaction. Content theories, on the other hand, attempt to identify the variables most conducive to job satisfaction, but are less concerned with how these variables influence job satisfaction.

Content Theories of Job Satisfaction

Two major theories have dominated the contemporary scene (Locke, 1976): Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory

Maslow's theory (1954, 1970) asserts that humans have five basic needs:

1) **Physiological needs:** the fundamental biological necessities of the human organism (Food, water, air, etc.).

2) **Safety and security needs:** protection against physical threats and freedom from harms, as well as economic security.

3) **Social/belonging and love needs:** satisfactory association with and affection from others.

4) **Esteem needs:** achievement and competence, as well as recognition, respect, appreciation and approval from others.

5) **Self-actualization:** maximum development and achievement of one's potential.

Theory posits that these needs are arranged in a hierarchy of prepotency, in ascending order from

physiological needs to self-actualization. According to theory, a need at a higher level does not become a potent source of motivation, until the level below it is largely satisfied. The theory also postulates that one level of need ceased to become a potent motive when it is substantially satisfied.

Porter (1961) slightly modified Maslow's need-hierarchical paradigm by deleting the physiological need category and adding an autonomy need, which lie between esteem and self-actualization. The rationale provided was that needs for autonomy and responsibility are different from those of esteem, and that physiological needs are substantially satisfied in professional organizations. Porter (1962) then developed the Need Satisfaction Questionnaire (NSQ) based on Maslow's theory, assuming that the discrepancy between actual and desired need fulfillment was an index of job satisfaction.

The NSQ has been the most popular measure to test Maslow's theory. However, it does not reflect Maslow's need classification scheme (Wahba and Bridwell, 1973).

Maslow's need hierarchy theory gained popularity among educators and was much studied to determine educator's job satisfaction.

Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) used a modified version of NSQ with educators. They reported that the largest need deficiencies for all educators (school teachers and administrators) were in esteem, autonomy and self-

actualization. Teachers, in comparison to administrators, were found to indicate greater need deficiencies in the esteem category whereas administrators reported less esteem deficiencies but more self-actualization deficiencies.

Carver and Sergiovanni (1971) replicated the findings with a sample of teachers, indicating that teachers were more satisfied with lower-order needs (security and social). Again the greatest need deficiencies reported by teachers were in esteem, autonomy and self-actualization.

Sweeney (1980, 1981) also reported similar results indicating that for teachers the greatest need deficiencies were in higher level needs (esteem and self-actualization).

Earlandson and Pastor (1981), in a comparative study of teachers with higher-order need strength and lower-order need strength, found that the teachers with the highest order, in general, were the least satisfied.

Anderson and Iwanicki (1984) reported that for teachers perceived need deficiencies were greater in esteem, autonomy and self-actualization than for lower-level security and social needs.

Kries and Milstein (1985), in a study of high school teachers based on Maslow's theory, reported a significant relationship between job satisfaction and need fulfillment. However, the literature's conclusion that satisfaction is related to hierarchical arrangement of need was not supported.

The preceding studies all used a modified version of Porter's NSQ; generality of findings is restricted, because of lack of validity of NSQ. Pierson *et al.* (1985), in a cross-validation of NSQ for educators using factor analytic procedure, found two factors instead of five in the original NSQ. They concluded that "the results of the factor analysis indicated that NSQ measures higher but not lower order teacher need deficiencies" (p. 637). Maslow's need hierarchy has been a popular theory of motivation. However, despite its "intuitive appeal" as Locke (1976) puts it, this theory's major thesis of need hierarchy arrangement did not receive firm support from research studies.

Herzberg's Two Factor Theory

Another popular content theory of job satisfaction has been proposed by Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959). The theory is popularly known as "two-factor," Motivation-Hygiene, or Herzberg's Theory. The original basis for two-factor theory was a study of engineers and accountants, who were asked (using critical incident interview technique) to recall a time when they had felt exceptionally good (or bad) about their jobs. The respondents were asked also if the feelings of satisfaction in regard to their work had affected their performance, their personal relationships and their well-being.

This technique resulted in two sets of factors. One set (work itself, achievement, recognition, responsibility and advancement) was frequently mentioned by respondents as

sources of satisfaction, but much less as sources of dissatisfaction, and was termed "Motivators" or "Satisfiers."

Another set of factors (supervision - technical, interpersonal relations with superiors, subordinates and peers, company policy and administration, working conditions, pay, job security and status and possibility of growth) was frequently mentioned as sources of dissatisfaction, but less frequently as sources of satisfaction. This set was labeled "Hygiene" or "dissatisfiers."

Theory postulates that the effects of these sets are unidirectional. Motivators cause only job satisfaction, while "Hygiene" factors cause dissatisfaction.

Herzberg postulated that the factors involved in producing job satisfaction are separate and distinct from the factors that led to job dissatisfaction, and that these two feelings (satisfaction and dissatisfaction) are not converses of each other. The opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction. Similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction, but no job dissatisfaction.

The theory has been widely tested, but the findings to support it are mixed. The theory was supported when critical incident procedure was used, but the support for the theory is limited when methods other than critical incidents were used.

Criticism of the Theory: Much criticism has been leveled against the theory.

One criticism of two-factor theory is that it is "method-bound" (King, 1970; Wolf, 1970; Dunnette *et al.*, 1967; House and Widgor, 1967). That is, most studies using critical incidents support the theory, while those using a different method do not. Vroom (1964) observed that such results are artifacts of defensive mechanism. The individual attributes causes of satisfaction to their achievement and accomplishments and causes of dissatisfaction to the environment.

Locke (1976) criticizes the theory on the grounds that it ignores individual differences in reporting causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The major criticism of the theory lies in its emphasis on unidirectionality of the factors. House and Widgor (1967) and Dunnette, Campbell and Hakel (1967), after an extensive review of research, concluded that two-factor theory is a grossly oversimplified portrayal of the Mechanism by which job satisfaction and dissatisfaction come about. Dunnette, Campbell and Hakel (1967) indicated that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction can reside in job content, job context or in both jointly. On the basis of these observations Campbell *et al.* (1970) and Dunnette *et al.*, (1967) suggested that the theory has served its purpose and should be altered or respectively laid to rest.

The theory also has been tested in educational settings. Sergiovanni (1967) replicated Herzberg's study with teachers. He demonstrated that factors which accounted for high job feelings of teachers (Motivators) and factors which accounted for low job feelings (Hygiene) of teachers were mutually exclusive. Achievement, recognition and responsibility were factors which accounted predominantly for teacher job satisfaction. Interpersonal relations (subordinates, peers), supervision-technical, school policy and administration were factors that contributed predominantly to teacher job dissatisfaction. Advancement and work itself, however, did not appear as satisfiers. Work itself appeared to be the source of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Schmidt (1976) also found support for the motivation-hygiene theory of job satisfaction with school administrators. He found that administrators reported recognition, achievement and advancement as major sources of job satisfaction. Interpersonal relations (subordinates, peers and superiors), salary, policy and administration, and supervision were reported as sources of dissatisfaction.

Holdaway (1978) found general support for the two-factor theory. He reported that recognition, responsibility, sense of achievement, advancement and job security were found to be sources of satisfaction for teachers; working with students was the major source of teacher job satisfaction. Working conditions, administration and

policies, status of teachers and supervision were perceived to be sources of dissatisfaction. However, relationships with teachers and salary were both sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Friesen, Holdaway and Rice (1983) found a limited support for two-factor theory with a sample of school principals. The major sources of satisfaction for principals were interpersonal relationships, achievement, responsibility and autonomy. Administration and policy, amount of work, attitude of society and working conditions were reported as sources of job dissatisfaction. However, relationships with teachers, responsibility, autonomy and relationships with parents' and students' attitude and performance were mentioned both as sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. It contradicts what two-factor theory suggests.

Medved (1982), in a study of teachers based on Herzberg's theory using a questionnaire, found that those factors that most often contribute to the satisfaction of teachers were also, if absent, most often the cause for teacher dissatisfaction.

To summarize, studies in school settings generally have supported two-factor theory. However, the theory's assertion that one set of factors produces satisfaction and another set causes job dissatisfaction did not receive firm support. Many factors appeared to be bi-polar--that is, they caused both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Furthermore, some

"motivators" in two-factor theory were found to be dissatisfiers for educators; similarly, some "hygiene" factors appeared to be motivators for educators.

Process Theories of Job Satisfaction

All process theorists agree that job satisfaction depends on the relationship between the individual and his work environment. There are considerable differences of view as to which process relates to job satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979).

According to discrepancy theories, job satisfaction is determined by the extent of the discrepancy between what the job offers and what the individual expects, what the individual wants and what the individual values.

Needs/Values Fulfillment Theories

According to needs fulfillment theory, it is the degree to which the job fulfills an individual's need that determines his/her job satisfaction (Morse, 1953; Schaffer, 1953; and Porter, 1962).

As Schaffer (1953) stated:

> Overall job satisfaction will vary directly with the extent to which those needs of an individual which can be satisfied are actually satisfied; the stronger the need, the more closely will job satisfaction depend on its fulfillment (p. 3).

Porter (1962) used the discrepancy between actual and desired need fulfillment as an index of job satisfaction. The greater the need deficiency, the lower the satisfaction or vice versa.

Vroom (1964) identified two models of job satisfaction, "subtractive" and "multiplicative."

According to the subtractive model, the job satisfaction is the function of the discrepancy between what an individual needs and what is believed to be received from the job. The greater the discrepancy, the less the satisfaction; the lower the discrepancy, the greater the satisfaction.

Kuhlen (1963) tested the subtractive model with a sample of school teachers. He measured the strength of need of teachers and the potential of the teaching profession for satisfying each need. He obtained a discrepancy score by subtracting the former (need strength) from the latter (the potential of occupation in fulfilling those needs). The results did not support the subtractive model of job satisfaction. The total discrepancy score for all needs was found to correlate .25 with ratings of satisfaction in occupation for men and .02 for women. The study of Kuhlen shows the subtractive model is related to job satisfaction for male teachers but not for female teachers. Individual differences seem to affect the importance of needs and need-fulfillment on the job.

The Multiplicative Model of job satisfaction considers the need importance. The perceived amount of need fulfillment provided by the job, is multiplied by the importance to the individual of that need. The products for

each are summed to arrive at a total measure of job satisfaction.

Vroom (1960) reports results favorable to the multiplicative model. He found that the relationship between the extent to which a person reported participation in decision-making in his job and his satisfaction with the job depends on the strength of his need for independence. The correlation between participation and job satisfaction was high for persons high in need for independence. However, the correlation was low for those low in need for independence.

Locke (1976) argued that both models are flawed. The subtrative model emphasizes on need fulfillment but ignores the effect of value importance, and the multiplicative model focuses on value importance but overlooks need fulfillment.

Locke (1976) noted that both views fail to distinguish between "the amount of value wanted by the person and how much the person wants that amount, that is, the importance of the value (or the desired amount of it) to him" (p. 1306).

Locke (1969, 1976) argues that job satisfaction is the discrepancy between what the individual wants (including how much he wants) and what he perceives himself as getting and the importance of what is wanted. He argues that accurate estimates of the degree of job satisfaction reflect both perceptions--value discrepancy and value importance.

Expectations

Another group of theorists (Ilgen, 1971; McClelland *et al.*, 1953; and Spector, 1956) have argued that an individual's affective reactions depend upon the discrepancy between what his environment offers or what he attains, and what he has adapted to, or expects (Locke, 1976, p. 1303).

Locke (1976), however, questioned whether expectations and their relationship to what the job actually offers has any relevance to understanding job satisfaction. He argued that when there is discrepancy between what is expected from the job and what the job actually offered, the reaction is not job dissatisfaction but surprise. Satisfaction/ dissatisfaction will depend, Locke (1976) argues, upon whether the deviation from the expectation is in a direction one values or in a direction one disvalues.

Evidence exists to suggest that when one changes expectations without changing values, then there are no effects on reported satisfaction (Amaee and Gruneberg, 1976).

There are, however, a number of studies which underscored the importance of expectations in understanding job satisfaction. Scott (1972) and Wanous (1973) have indicated that giving individuals a more realistic job preview (realistic expectations) of the organization they join and the role they will be playing has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

Instrumentality Theory

Formulated by Vroom (1964) and modified by others (Graen, 1969; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Lawler, 1971, 1973), the theory is called valence-instrumentality-expectancy (VIE) theory, value theory and instrumentality theory.

According to instrumentality theory, it is the degree to which the job leads to the attainment of valued/ attractive outcomes that determines one's job satisfaction. It is assumed that individuals have varying preferences/ values for certain outcomes (e.g., pay, promotion, responsibility, etc.). They estimate the extent to which the job leads to each of these outcomes. In arriving at an estimate of satisfaction, the individual believes the job will bring, the individual considers all the possible outcomes in the set and evaluates each in relation to the others by its perceived value or attractiveness. It is called instrumentality theory because of its emphasis on the extent to which the job is instrumental in producing satisfaction.

Miskel, DeFrain and Wilcox (1980) substantiated the theory with respect to teacher job satisfaction.

Instrumentality notion has been considered more important to motivation than to job satisfaction. Problems inherent in the instrumentality notion have restricted its usefulness for job satisfaction. Its future orientation, complexity involved in its weighting system for each outcome through its instrumentality, and lack of explanation for

forming valences have restricted its utility in understanding job satisfaction (McCormick and Ilgen, 1980).

Equity Theory

Equity theory is based on cognitive dissonance and social comparison theory (Homans, 1961; Patchen, 1961; Adams, 1963, 1965).

According to equity theory, an individual compares his/her inputs (e.g., effort, skill, ability, education, experience, etc.) and outputs (e.g., pay, rewards, benefits, etc.) to those of others. If an individual perceives he/she is inequitably treated, he/she would be dissatisfied. The theory postulates that both underpayment (under-reward) and over-payment (over-reward) will cause inequity and thus dissatisfaction.

Predictions of theory concerning the effects of under-payment have consistently been supported by indicating that under-payment leads to job dissatisfaction (Pritchard, Dunnette, and Jorgenson, 1972). However, the effects of over-payments are at best limited (Pritchard, Dunnette, and Jorgenson, 1972).

Miskel, Galnsp and Hatley (1975), in a study of job satisfaction of school teachers, reported partial support for theory's prediction regarding under-reward.

The evidence seems to indicate that equity norms do exist (McCormick and Ilgen, 1980). However, the concept of equity is so loose it allows for enormous variation in individual interpretation (Locke, 1976).

In sum, each individual theory of job satisfaction is important in understanding job satisfaction. No individual theory alone can explain the variance of job satisfaction. We are still far from a coherent theory of job satisfaction to account for all the variance in job satisfaction. This, clearly, shows the complex nature of the job satisfaction phenomenon.

Factors Associated with Job Satisfaction

Identification of the underlying sources of job satisfaction has been a subject of considerable importance. Several explanations have been suggested to account for the variation in job satisfaction. One way of explaining variations in job satisfaction is in terms of job characteristics. One set of factors has been referred to as job content, and another as job context.

Job Content Factors

Challenging and Interesting Work: Work that allows for creativity, the utilization of skills/abilities and is mentally challenging has been found to be satisfying. (Locke, 1976; Hackman and Lawler, 1971; and Vroom, 1964) Research summarized by Hulin and Blood (1968), however, indicated that all employees do not desire or seek mentally challenging work. It follows then that challenging work will be satisfying for those who greatly desire it. Work that is personally interesting and meaningful, regardless of whether

it is challenging or not, is an important precondition of employee work satisfaction (Herzberg *et al.*, 1959).

Achievement/Accomplishment and Success on the Job: It is not sufficient that there must be challenges on the job, but these challenges must be successfully overcome for the individual to experience satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Achievement, accomplishment or success in reaching specific standards is an important determinant of work satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966; Locke, 1965; Vroom, 1964).

Freedom/Control (Autonomy) in Work: The job that provides a greater degree of freedom and control (autonomy) in work method and work pace also enhances satisfaction with the work (Vroom, 1964; Hughey and Murphy, 1982; Brodinsky, 1984).

Participation in Decision Making or Amount of Responsibility: There is considerable evidence that the satisfaction of subordinates is positively associated with the degree to which they are permitted an opportunity to participate in making decisions (Vroom, 1964; Belasco and Alutto, 1972; Sweeney, 1981; Schneider, 1984), but the effects of participation in decision making on satisfaction depends on the personality of each participant. Vroom (1960) showed that the amount of participation was most positively related to satisfaction of persons high in need for independence.

Recognition: Recognition for one's task performance/ accomplishment has been found to be a significant

contributor to employee job satisfaction. Locke (1973) found recognition to be one of the single most frequently mentioned events causing satisfaction/dissatisfaction, especially for blue-collar workers.

Researchers using Herzberg's methodology found it to be one of the most frequently mentioned sources of satisfaction, but found it one of the most frequent sources of dissatisfaction when methods other than critical incidents were used (House and Widgor, 1967).

Job Context Factors

Pay: The amount of payment has been found to be a significant factor in relation to employee job satisfaction. Nearly all occupational groups consider the amount of pay to be relatively important (Herzberg *et al.*, 1957). Herzberg *et al.* (1957) found pay to be more a source of dissatisfaction, but was ranked fourth in importance. Similarly, Lawler (1971) found pay to be most dissatisfying, but ranked third in importance by employees. Fournet, Distefano and Pryer (1966) have stated that "the difficulty in establishing its relation to job satisfaction is that it is confounded with other factors such as age, occupational level and education" (p. 174).

Supervision: There is evidence that the job satisfaction of employees is affected by the style of leadership and kind of supervision they experience. Vroom (1964) cites evidence that there are often changes in satisfaction following changes in supervision. Consideration

of subordinates and employee-centered leadership on the part of the supervisor results in a high level of satisfaction (Vroom, 1964; Gruneberg, 1979). Herzberg *et al.* (1957) found that supervision was mentioned as a source of satisfaction more frequently than security, job content, company and management, working conditions or opportunity for advancement.

Promotion: There is evidence that individuals express satisfaction with a job which provides substantial promotional opportunities (Vroom, 1964).

Locke (1976) suggested that promotion is likely to be associated with job satisfaction. He, however, indicated that it will depend upon personal ambition and career aspirations of individuals. Herzberg *et al.* (1957) reported that promotion is ranked second in importance by employees, but was mentioned frequently as a source of dissatisfaction.

Security: A job that provides security (e.g., tenure, seniority, pension, etc.) has a significant effect on the job satisfaction of employees. Herzberg *et al.* (1957) found security to be ranked first in importance and a strong reason for liking the job, but infrequently as a source of dissatisfaction. This finding is at variance with Herzberg *et al.* (1959), who indicated that security was mentioned frequently as a source of dissatisfaction.

Individual demographic characteristics

Individual demographic characteristics have been a likely target of sources of variation in job satisfaction.

Many such aspects of workers have been studied in relation to job satisfaction. The most frequently studied of these personal characteristics include:

Age: Age has been shown consistently related to job satisfaction (Rhodes, 1983). Three views have been advanced concerning the nature of relationship between age and job satisfaction (Lee and Wilbur, 1985). Herzberg *et al.* (1957) found a U-shape relationship between age and job satisfaction. Morale is high when people start their job, it goes down after a few years and remains relatively low level, then it begins to rise and continues through the remainder of the working career (Herzberg *et al.*, 1957). The second view is that job satisfaction increases in a positive linear fashion with respect to age. That is, the job satisfaction increases with the increase of age (Hulin and Smith, 1965). The third function is positive and linear until a terminal period when there is a significant drop in job satisfaction (Saleh and Otis, 1964; Carrell and Elbert, 1974).

These contradictions found in research suggest that other factors, such as job tenure, education level and salary may be affecting the relationship between age and job satisfaction. Lee and Wilbur (1985) investigated the relationship of age to job satisfaction. They showed that job satisfaction increased with age. while statistically controlling the effects of salary, job tenure and education, the same differences were found.

In educational settings, results indicate that older teachers were more satisfied with their job (Hoppock, 1935; Trusty and Sergiovanni, 1966; Belasco and Alutto, 1972; Sweeney, 1980, 1981; Medved, 1982; Anderson and Iwanicki, 1984; Galloway, *et al.*, 1985). However, there are studies which reported no relationship between age and teachers' job satisfaction (Lipka and Goulet, 1979; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979; Davis, 1981; Oades, 1983; LoFland, 1984; Ronnenkamp, 1984).

Sex: Studies relating employee's sex to job satisfaction did not show any consistent pattern of relationship. Some studies have found women to be more satisfied than men; others have found men to be more satisfied; while others found no difference (See Herzberg *et al.*, 1957; and Hulin and Smith, 1964). Weaver (1978) found no difference in males' and females' job satisfaction after they controlled variables which were thought to have moderating effect. Lee, Mueller and Miller (1981), who controlled the effect of salary, found sex differences in job satisfaction. Women were found to be more satisfied with their compensation than men, but were more dissatisfied with working conditions than men. Studies in school settings also showed no consistent pattern of relationship. Many studies reported female teachers to be more satisfied than male teachers (Trusty and Sergiovanni, 1966; Belasco and Alutto, 1972; Lortie, 1975; NEA, 1980; Birmingham, 1984) while some studies showed that male teachers were more satisfied than

female with professional autonomy (Galloway, *et al.*, 1985), with pay (Medved, 1982), still other studies reported no relationship between sex and teacher job satisfaction (Hoppock, 1935; Sergiovanni, 1967; Davis, 1981; Sweeney, 1981; Oades, 1983; Goodson, 1984; Ronnenkamp, 1984; LoFland, 1985).

Length of Service: The relationship between job satisfaction and tenure is not clear. Herzberg *et al.* (1957) reported job satisfaction to be high at the beginning, dropping within a few years of service, and remaining low for a number of years, but as service increases job satisfaction also increases. Hulin and Smith (1965) showed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and length of service. However, Gibson and Klien (1970) showed a negative relationship between job satisfaction and length of service.

Studies with school teachers have shown that more experienced teachers are more satisfied (Chase, 1951; Greenfield and Blase, 1981; Sweeney, 1981; Anderson and Iwaninicki, 1984; Binnie, 1984; and Taylor, 1986), while other studies found no such relationship (Trusty and Sergiovanni, 1966; Sergiovanni, 1967; Lipka and Goulet, 1979; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979; Davis, 1981; Driscoll and Shirey, 1985; LoFland, 1985).

Education: Again, studies showed no consistent pattern. Vollmer and Kinney (1955) indicated that more educated employees reported dissatisfaction with their jobs. Similar findings were reported by Klien and Maher (1966); their data

indicated that college-educated managers were less satisfied with pay than non-college educated managers. These results are somewhat at variance with the studies reviewed by Herzberg *et al.* (1957), who found some studies to show that more educated employees were more satisfied with their jobs. And those of Glenn and Weaver (1982) who showed a positive relationship between education and work satisfaction. Still other studies found no relationship between education and work satisfaction (Gordon and Arvey, 1975; King, Murry and Atkinson, 1982).

Amirtash (1982) found a negative relationship between education and teacher job satisfaction. A number of studies reported no relationship between education and teacher job satisfaction (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1981; Goodson, 1984; and Taylor, 1986)

Marital Status: The relationship of marital status of employees to job satisfaction did not show any consistent pattern. Studies reviewed by Herzberg *et al.* (1957) indicated contradictory results, some studies indicated that more married workers were satisfied with their jobs than single worker, while other studies showed single workers to be more satisfied than married ones, while still others indicated no relationship between employee's marital status and their job satisfaction.

Studies relating teachers' marital status to job satisfaction are scant. Chase (1951) reported that married

teachers were slightly more satisfied than single teachers. Hoppock (1935), however, found no such relationship.

To summarize, inspite of a large number of studies concerning employee job satisfaction, we are still far from predicting accurately the job satisfaction of employees, and there is a lack of a systematic accumulation of knowledge. The inconsistencies and contradictions in findings clearly point to the complex nature of job satisfaction. The comparison of these findings is not possible, and is severely limited due to many reasons, such as the nature of dependent variables used, data collection techniques, measurement techniques, samples used, time periods and the conditions under which the studies were undertaken, and the statistical analysis that were performed.

Summary of the Chapter

The organization climate has been much studied. However, it is surrounded by conceptual, definitional and measurement problems. There is a debate over whether organizational climate be measured through perceptions of individual members or it should be objectively measured. Whether the perceptual measure refer to attributes of individuals or attributes of the organization and whether organization climate and job satisfaction are distinct constructs. Many reviews of the construct have appeared but they failed to completely clarify the issues. Though limited conceptual and methodological progress has been made. One thing is, however, quite clear that organizational climate

and job satisfaction are related. Studies both in school settings and settings other than school have consistently shown that organizational climate and job satisfaction are associated with each other.

The review of literature pertaining to job satisfaction indicated the complexity of job satisfaction. Many theories of job satisfaction have been offered. No individual theory in itself is capable of explaining the job satisfaction phenomenon. We are still far from a coherent theory of job satisfaction. Our understanding of job satisfaction is very limited. The studies that attempted to relate factors that were presumably were associated with job satisfaction do not provide conclusive evidence. The findings are contradictory and inconsistent. Our understanding of these inconsistent results is limited. The difficulties involved in comparing the findings have further restricted our understanding of these inconsistent results. Those difficulties range from different theories used to study job satisfaction to different statistical method to analyze the results.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was two-fold:

1) To determine if there was any relationship between organizational climate (measured by OCDQ-RS) and teacher job satisfaction (measured by TJSQ) as perceived by public secondary school teachers.

2) To ascertain whether there was any relationship between schools' and teachers' selected demographic characteristics and job satisfaction.

To achieve these objectives of the study, two hypotheses were formulated. It was predicted that there would be a significant relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by public secondary school teachers. It was also hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between schools' and teachers' selected demographic characteristics and teacher job satisfaction. To test these hypotheses, data were collected from a predetermined population using sampling procedures. Presented in this chapter are the research design, a description of the population along with the Sampling procedure, research instruments utilized in

data gathering, data-collecting procedures employed in the investigation and a discussion of data analysis procedures.

Research Design

This study was concerned with obtaining the responses of teachers regarding the organizational climate of their respective schools, their job satisfaction and their demographic characteristics, to determine whether any relationship existed between organizational climate and demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction. Survey research was thus employed as an appropriate and feasible research design. According to Babbie (1973 survey research is logical, deterministic, and parsimonious.

Survey research method basically has three main objectives: description, explanation and exploration of a phenomenon (Babbie, 1973). Survey research method was used to describe the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by public secondary school teachers. "Surveys can be used to explore the relationship between two or more variables" (Borg and Gall, 1983, pp. 407-408). The survey research method was also used to explore the relationship of demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction.

Since the data for this study were collected at a specific point in time, a cross-sectional survey design was adopted. "In a cross-sectional survey data are collected at one point in time" (Babbie, 1973, p. 62). For this study

data were collected from a selected sample of teachers in Fall, 1987.

The Population

The population for this study comprised all of the public secondary school teachers in the state of Michigan in Fall, 1987.

Sampling Procedures

Sample selection procedure comprised two stages. In the first stage, a sample of schools were selected using cluster sampling with stratification. In the second stage, a simple random sampling technique was employed to select teachers within each school selected.

Cluster Sampling

The schools in this study were primary sampling units and were used as clusters. "A cluster sampling is a simple random sample in which each sampling unit is a collection, or cluster of elements." (Scheaffer *et al.*, 1986, p.197)

The decision to utilize cluster sampling is consistent with the observation of Scheaffer *et al.* (1986), who asserted that cluster sampling is an effective design for obtaining a specific amount of information at minimum cost when:

> A good frame listing population elements either is not available or is very costly to obtain, while a frame listing cluster is easily obtained (p.198).

This was true for this study. The frame listing all population elements (teachers) was not available from a

single source. In order to obtain such a list, every school principal had to be contacted, which was monetarily not possible for the researcher.

Stratified Sampling

Stratification can be carried out by "Separating the population elements into non-overlapping groups, called strata, and then selecting a simple random sample from each stratum" (Scheaffer *et al.*, 1986, p. 79).

To implement this procedure, the schools, based on size (enrollment of students), were grouped into three strata. The strata included: 1) Small-sized schools (less than 300 students), 2) Medium-sized schools (300-599 students), and 3) Large-sized schools (600 and more students).

The stratification sampling technique was employed for representation and to minimize sampling error. Sampling error can be reduced either by selecting a large sample or by homogeneity; stratification ensures the representation.

Sample Selection Procedure

Sample selection procedure comprised two stages: one for school selection, the other for teacher selection.

School Sample Selection Procedure

A cluster sampling technique with stratification was used for selection of the school sample. To implement these procedures, using the Michigan Education Directory and Buyers Guide (1986) and Patterson's American Education Directory (1986), two lists of public secondary schools

(rural and urban) were generated. Schools were then stratified according to their size. This stratification procedure produced six lists of schools, three for each classification. A *priori* decision to select 10% of schools, a simple random sampling technique, using a random numbers table, was employed to select schools from each stratum in proportion to their size. This provided a total of 62 sampled schools (36 urban and 26 rural), from a total of 360 urban and 260 rural schools. Among the 36 urban choices, 7 small, 9 medium-sized and 20 large schools were selected; among the 26 rural schools, a sample of 8 small, 13 medium-sized and 5 large ones were selected. Of these original 62 schools, 6 (5 large and 1 medium-sized urban schools) opted not to participate. Therefore, 56 schools (90%) comprised the sample. A 100% participation rate for rural schools was obtained, while 83% of urban schools participated in the study. Of the 30 urban schools, 15 were large schools, 8 were medium-sized and 7 were small sized schools. Of the 26 rural schools, 8 were small schools, 13 were medium-sized and 5 were large schools. The distribution of school sample according to school size with location and participation rate is provided in Table 3.1.

Teacher Sample Selection Procedure

A list of teachers within each sampled school (N=56) was obtained from their principals. Within each school, eight teachers were randomly selected, using a random numbers table to complete one of the two instruments (with

Table 3.1. Distribution of School Sample, Participation Rate According to Location and Size of the School.

	School Sample			
School Location	School Size	No.school originally sampled	No.school participated	Percentage of school participation
Urban	1.Small	7	7	100%
	2.Medium	9	8	89%
	3.Large	20	15	75%
	Total	36	30	83%
Rural	1.Small	8	8	100%
	2.Medium	13	13	100%
	3.Large	5	5	100%
	Total	26	26	100%
Total	1.Small	15	15	100%
	2.Medium	22	21	95%
	3.Large	25	20	76%
	Total	62	56	90%

the exception of only one school with just four teachers, thus all teachers in that school were chosen). In all, 444 teachers from a sample of 56 schools were selected. To ensure methodological independence between two measures, half of the respondents (N=222) were asked to respond to the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ) and the other half (N=222) were asked to respond to the organizational climate description questionnaire, revised scale (OCDQ-RS) for secondary schools.

Instrumentation

This study was undertaken to measure the organizational climate of public secondary schools, teacher job satisfaction and teacher demographic characteristics as perceived by the teachers. On the basis of teacher responses, the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction, and demographic characteristics and job satisfaction, were examined. The description of research instruments used in this study to measure climate, job satisfaction and demographic characteristics follows.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-Revised Scale (OCDQ-RS) for Secondary Schools

Organizational climate was measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-Revised Scale (OCDQ-RS) for secondary schools, developed by Kottkamp, Mulhern and Hoy (1985). This instrument contained 34 items, measuring five dimensions of secondary school organizational climate: supportive principal behavior (7

items), directive principal behavior (7 items); engaged teacher behavior (10 items), frustrated teacher behavior (6 items) and intimate teacher behavior (4 items). Respondents answered items in this instrument according to a four-point scale, with response choices ranging from rarely occurs to very frequently occurs. The response are given a score of 1, 2, 3, 4 for RO (rarely occurs), SO (sometimes occurs), OO (often occurs) and VFO (very frequently occurs) respectively. A high score thus indicates favorable response and a low score unfavorable response.

Per authors, the instrument has been found to be a valid and reliable research instrument.

The internal consistency of the instrument was determined by calculating an alpha coefficient for each set of sub-test items. The reliability coefficients were: "Supportive .91; directive, .87; engaged, .85; frustrated, .85; and intimate, .71." (Kottkamp *et al.*, 1985, p. 14).

This instrument in its original form was administered by mail to half of the sampled respondents (N=222), who were asked to describe the extent to which each item in the instrument characterizes the school on a four-point scale. The response choices were: RO = Rarely Occurs, SO = Sometimes Occurs, OO = Often Occurs, & VFO = Very Frequently Occurs. The internal consistency of the instrument was determined through computation of an alpha coefficient. The reliability coefficient was calculated for the total scale as well as for each subscale. The total scale alpha

coefficient for the sample (N=171) was .78. The alpha coefficients for each subscale were: Supportive, .91; Directive, .69; Engaged, .79; Frustrated, .56 and Intimate, .77.

Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)

Teacher job satisfaction was measured by the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1983). This instrument contains 66 items, measuring teacher job satisfaction in nine areas: Supervision (14 items), colleagues (10 items), working conditions (7 items), Pay (7 items), responsibility (8 items), work itself (9 items), advancement (5 items), security (3 items), and recognition (3 items). The instrument was designed to measure the feelings of teachers about different facets of their job. The respondents are asked to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement with each statement on a five-point scale: strongly disagree, disagree, Neutral (neither agree nor disagree), agree, and strongly agree.

This instrument has been found to be a valid and reliable instrument. Internal consistency of the instrument was determined by calculating alpha coefficient. The reliability coefficient was computed for the full scale as well as for each factor. The alpha coefficient for full scale was .93. The alpha coefficients for each factor were: supervision, .92; colleagues, .82; working condition, .83; pay, .80; responsibility, .73; work itself, .82; advancement, .81; security, .71; and recognition, .74.

(Lester, 1983, pp. 80-81) Favorable responses to each statement are given a score of 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 for strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree respectively. A reverse scoring system is suggested by the author of the instrument for unfavorable or negative items (i.e., 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, and 5=1). Thus, a low score represents a low level of job satisfaction, and a high score represents a high level of job satisfaction.

A teacher job satisfaction questionnaire in its original form was administered by mail to the other half of the respondents (N=222), who were asked to express their feelings about job conditions by indicating their level of agreement and/or disagreement with the statement. The response choices of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral (neither agree nor disagree), agree and strongly agree were given a score of 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 respectively. For the negative and/or unfavorable items, the scoring system was reversed as suggested. Internal consistency of the instrument was determined by calculating an alpha coefficient. The reliability coefficient (alpha) was computed for the full-scale as well as for each subscale. The full scale alpha coefficient for the sample (N=169) was .92. The alpha coefficients for each factor were: supervision, .91; colleagues, .81; working condition, .83; pay, .82; responsibility, .68; work itself, .66; advancement, .82; security, .60; and recognition, .62.

Demographic Characteristics

To measure the selected demographic characteristics of respondents, a demographic information sheet developed by the researcher was used. This sheet was attached to each mailed questionnaire. The respondents were asked to indicate their demographic characteristic by checking the right category. The demographic characteristics of teacher that were measured included: age, sex, marital status, level of education, teaching experience, nature of employment and nature of teaching subjects. School characteristics included location of the school and size of the school.

Data-Gathering Procedures

The data for this study were collected during fall, 1987 by mail from sampled teachers in 56 public secondary schools, using OCDQ-RS to measure climate of the schools, TJSQ to measure teachers' job satisfaction, and a demographic information sheet to measure teachers' demographic characteristics. The sample for this study constitutes teachers (N=444) from 56 public secondary schools. To avoid response bias/set and desirability, and to ensure methodological independence between the measures, the subjects (sampled teachers) within each school were randomly divided into two groups. Half of the respondents (N=222) were mailed the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ) with a demographic information sheet attached to it, together a transmittal letter which explained the purpose of

the study and assured them their responses would be kept in strict confidence.

Similarly, the other half of the respondents (N=222) were mailed the organizational climate description questionnaire along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and assuring the respondents their responses would be kept confidential. After three follow-ups, allowing a period of approximately two weeks in between the administration of instruments, and each subsequent follow-up letter, the returns were 345 (78%). The returns for each were, 173 (78%) for TJSQ and 172 (77%) for OCDQ-RS. Five returned questionnaires (1.4%), unusable because they were not completed properly, were excluded from analysis. The breakdown of respondents who returned completed questionnaire is as follows: 340 (77%) for both instruments, 171 (77%) for OCDQ-RS and 169 (76%) for TJSQ. Among 171 who responded to OCDQ-RS, 87 (74%) were from urban schools 84 (81%) came from rural schools; 43 (74%) represented small schools, 68 (81%) from medium-sized schools and 60 (75%) from large schools.

Among the 169 who responded to TJSQ, 86 (73%) were from urban schools, 83 (80%) from rural schools; 49 (84%) from small schools, 64 (76%) from medium-sized schools and 56 (70%) from large schools. The distribution of teacher sample according to school location, school size, instrument, number of participation and response rate is provided in Tables 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4.

Table 3.2. Distribution of Teachers Combined Sample According to Location and School size.

Combined Teacher Sample				
School Location	School Size	No.of Teachers originally sampled	No.of Teachers participated	Response rate (%)
Urban	1.Small	52	41	79%
	2.Medium	64	45	70%
	3.Large	120	87	73%
	Total	236	173	73%
Rural	1.Small	64	51	80%
	2.Medium	104	87	84%
	3.Large	40	29	73%
	Total	208	167	80%
Total	1.Small	116	92	79%
	2.Medium	168	132	79%
	3.Large	160	116	73%
	Total	444	340	77%

Table 3.3. Distribution of Teacher Sample Responded to TJSQ and Size and Location of the School.

		Teachers Responded to TJSQ		
School Location	School Size	No.of Teachers originally sampled	No.of Teachers participated	Response rate (%)
Urban	1.Small	26	23	88%
	2.Medium	32	23	72%
	3.Large	60	40	67%
	Total	118	86	73%
Rural	1.Small	32	26	81%
	2.Medium	52	41	79%
	3.Large	20	16	80%
	Total	104	83	80%
Total	1.Small	58	49	84%
	2.Medium	84	64	76%
	3.Large	80	56	70%
	Total	222	169	76%

Table 3.4. Distribution of Teacher Sample Responded to OCDQ-RS and Size and Location of the School.

		Teachers Responded to OCDQ-RS		
School Location	School Size	No.of Teachers originally sampled	No.of Teachers participated	Response rate (%)
Urban	1.Small	26	18	69%
	2.Medium	32	22	69%
	3.Large	60	47	78%
	Total	118	87	74%
Rural	1.Small	32	25	78%
	2.Medium	52	46	88%
	3.Large	20	13	65%
	Total	104	84	81%
Total	1.Small	58	43	74%
	2.Medium	84	68	81%
	3.Large	80	60	75%
	Total	222	171	77%

Data Analysis

The data for this study were collected from sampled teachers (N=340) in 56 public secondary schools. Once the data had been collected, the researcher coded the data to facilitate quantitative analysis. Analysis was done by using statistical package for the social sciences (SPSSX).

The scoring of responses to TJSQ and OCDQ-RS are as follows:

Scoring of Responses to OCDQ-RS

The subject responded to each item in the OCDQ-RS using a four-point likert type scale. Responses to items were given the following scale scores:

4 = very frequently occurs

3 = often occurs

2 = sometimes occurs

1 = rarely occurs.

Thus, the highest score represented positive or favorable response and the lowest denoted negative or unfavorable response. The unit of analysis for climate was school. The responses to each subscale items were aggregated by averaging the teacher responses within each school. The result was mean school scores for five subscales of OCDQ-RS.

Scoring of Responses to TJSQ

The subjects responded to the Teacher Job Satisfaction questionnaire using a five-point likert type scale.

Responses to favorable items were given following scale scores:

5 = Strongly agree

4 = Agree

3 = Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)

2 = Disagree

1 = Strongly disagree.

For unfavorable or negative items, the scoring system was reversed (i.e., 5=1, 4=2, 3=3, 2=4 and 1=5). Thus, a low score represented a low level of job satisfaction, a high score represented a high level of job satisfaction. The responses to each subscale's items were aggregated by averaging the teacher responses within each school to obtain a school score for nine subscales of TJSQ. To obtain individual subscale scores, the average score over the number of items in the subscale was computed.

The first stage of the data analysis comprises the description of the characteristics of the sample. A table of frequencies with percentages based on demographic characteristics for the combined sample and for each sample responded to TJSQ and OCDQ-RS was calculated. A table of school means for each subscale of organizational climate and for Job Satisfaction factors with their standard deviations was computed. The second stage of data analysis included testing of the hypotheses. To test the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction, data were aggregated by averaging the responses within each school.

The result was mean school scores for five subscales of OCDQ-RS and nine factors of TJSQ. School mean organizational climate subscale scores were correlated with school mean job satisfaction factors using Pearson correlation coefficients. A multivariate multiple regression test of significance was also performed. To analyze the relative contribution of organizational climate subscales separately or in combination in predicting job satisfaction, a series of regression analyses (Stepwise-multiple regression) were performed using organizational climate subscales as independent variables, and each of nine factors in job satisfaction as dependent variables.

The second hypothesis regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and demographic characteristics was tested by using Pearson correlation and multivariate multiple regression. The unit of analysis in these analyses was the individual teacher, however, rather than the school. The qualitative demographic characteristics were dummy coded before entering them in the regression. The individual score for each subscale was obtained by averaging scores over the number of items. This individual score was correlated with demographic characteristics of the teacher using Pearson correlation. The relative contribution of demographic characteristics separately or in combination in predicting job satisfaction was analyzed by a series of regression analyses (stepwise multiple regression) using demographic

characteristics as independent variables and each of nine factors in job satisfaction as dependent variables.

Coding Procedures for Teachers' and Schools' Selected Demographic Characteristics

The following teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics were measured.

Age: was treated as a categorical variable. Respondents were classified into four groups, 20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years and 50 and over, then given a numerical value of 1, 2, 3, or 4, respectively, for the purpose of analysis.

Sex: was used as a discrete variable, and was dummy coded (0=female, 1=male) for analysis purposes.

Marital Status: was treated as a discrete variable. Respondents were categorized into two subgroups and dummy coded (0=single, 1=married) for the purpose of analysis.

Education: was measured in terms of formal education a respondent has received. Originally respondents were categorized into five subgroups: 1=BA/BS; 2=BA/BS with some college credits; 3=MA/MS; 4=Educational specialists/Ed.D. and/or Ph.D; 5=other. But for analysis purposes two categories were used. There were no respondents in the fifth category, only 3 respondents in the fourth category and only 8 respondents in the first category (see Table 4.3). The two subgroups used for analysis resulted by merging the first and second categories (BA/BS + BA/BS with some college credits), and by merging the third and fourth categories

(MA/MS + Ed.specialist/Ed.D and/or Ph.D). The resultant two subgroups were coded 1 or 2, respectively.

Teaching Experience: was treated as a categorical variable, and the respondents were classified into four subgroups given a numerical value of 1, 2, 3 or 4 for 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and over 15 years of experience, respectively.

Nature of Employment: was used as a discrete variable, and respondents were categorized into two subgroups: tenured and non-tenured. They were dummy coded 1 and 0 respectively for the purpose of analysis.

Teaching Subjects: also used as a discrete variable. Respondents were categorized into three groups: Those who were teaching science subjects, those teaching humanities/ social sciences and those teaching languages. Dummy coding included 100=Science, 010=Humanities and 001=Languages. In regression analysis, only two groups science and Humanities teachers were used. The number of teachers teaching languages was not large enough to be used for meaningful analysis and thus was excluded.

Location of the School: was treated as a discrete variable. Sample members were from rural and/or urban schools. Schools were dummy coded 0=rural and 1=urban.

Size of the School: was used as a categorical variable. School size indicated the enrollment of students in the school. Respondents were divided into three groups based on the student enrollment of their school: Small Schools (Fewer

than 300 students), Medium-sized Schools (300 - 599); and Large Schools (600 or more students). The numerical value of 1, 2 and 3 was given to represent each subgroup of teachers, respectively.

Summary of the Chapter

Presented in this chapter were sample selection, data collection and the procedures of scoring and coding responses to OCDQ-RS, TJSQ and demographic information. The sample selection procedure comprised of two stages. First, Schools were selected using cluster sampling technique with stratification. The second stage consisted of teacher selection which was done by using sample random sampling technique. The data were collected mainly by mail, using OCDQ-RS to measure organizational climate, TJSQ to measure teacher job satisfaction and demographic characteristics. In the final part of this chapter, presented are the scoring and coding of responses to OCDQ-RS, TJSQ and demographic information.

In chapter 4 presented will be the data analysis and results of the study.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship of organizational climate and job satisfaction as perceived by public secondary school teachers, and further to determine the relationship of teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction.

Two hypotheses were generated to test the relationships of organizational climate and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction.

> **Hypothesis I:** It was hypothesized that there would be significant relationship between organizational climate, as measured by OCDQ-RS, and teacher job satisfaction, measured by TJSQ, as perceived by public secondary school teachers.
>
> **Hypothesis II:** It was predicted that there would be a significant relationship between teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics and teacher job satisfaction.

Data for the study were collected from Sampled teachers (N = 340) in 56 public secondary schools, using OCDQ-RS, TJSQ and demographic information questionnaires. To ensure methods had methodological independence, the respondents were randomly divided into two groups and were asked to

respond to one of the two instruments. To test the hypotheses, the Pearson correlation and multiple stepwise regression analysis procedures were used. Following is the description of respondent characteristics, the findings from the descriptive statistics and intercorrelations between variables.

Demographic Characteristics

As indicated, the respondents in each school were randomly divided into two groups to respond to one of the two instruments. Responses to their demographic characteristics were also elicited using a demographic information sheet. The description of demographic characteristics that follows thus has three sections:

a) Frequencies and percentages of the combined sample (N = 340);

b) Frequencies and percentages of subjects who responded to OCDQ-RS (N = 171); and

c) Frequencies and percentages of subjects who responded to TJSQ (N = 169).

In Table 4.1 are presented the characteristics of subjects for both group of respondents. As Table 4.1 shows, the majority of the respondents, 189 (56%), were over 40 years of age; most of them, 204 (60%), were male; an overwhelming majority, 258 (76%), were married; and little over half of them held Masters' and/or higher degrees. In terms of length of service, approximately two-thirds, 250 (74%), of the respondents have over 11 years of teaching

Table 4.1. Distribution of respondents (combined sample) based on age, sex, marital status, level of education, teaching experience, employment status, and size and location of the school (N = 340).

Teacher Respondents (N = 340)			
Variables		Frequency	Percentage
1- Age	a) 20-29 years	29	8.6%
	b) 30-39 years	121	35.7%
	c) 40-49 years	127	37.5%
	d) 50 and over	62	18.2%
2- Sex	a) Male	240	60.2%
	b) Female	135	39.8%
3- Marital Status	a) Married	258	76.3%
	b) Single	45	13.3%
	c) Divorced/ widow(er)	35	10.4%
4- Education	a) B.A./B.S.	20	5.9%
	b) B.A./B.S. with extra college credits	137	40.7%
	c) M.A./M.S.	173	51.3%
	d) Ed. specialist/ Ed.D/Ph.D	7	2.1%
5- Teaching Experience	a) 0- 5 years	35	10.3%
	b) 6-10 years	54	15.9%
	c) 11-15 years	58	17.1%
	d) 16 and over	192	56.6%
6- Employment Status	a) Tenured	310	91.2%
	b) Non-tenured	30	8.8%
7- Teaching Subjects	a) Science	110	32.6%
	b) Humanities	180	53.4%
	c) Languages	47	13.9%
8- School Location	a) Rural	173	50.8%
	b) Urban	167	49.1%
9- School Size	a) Small	92	27.0%
	b) Medium	132	38.8%
	c) Large	116	34.1%

experience. An overwhelming majority of the respondents, 310 (91%), have tenure, 54% of the respondents teach humanities/social science subjects, while only one-third (33%) of subjects teach mathematics/science subjects. In terms of school location, the respondents are evenly distributed. 50% of the respondents came from rural schools; approximately the same percentage came from urban schools. 39% of the respondents represented medium-size schools, 34% of them represents large schools, and only 27% represented small schools.

The characteristics of subjects who responded to the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RS) are provided in Table 4.2. As is evident, the majority of the respondents, 97 (56%), were over 40 years of age; 99 (58%) of the respondents were married; 53% of the respondents had Master's and/or higher educational degrees; a majority of respondents (72%) had been teaching more than 11 years, and an overwhelming majority (92%) had tenured status. With regard to their subjects, 50% of the respondents indicated they were teaching humanities and/or social science, whereas only 32% reported they were teaching mathematics and science subjects. In terms of location of school, the respondents were evenly distributed. 50% represented rural schools and 50% come from urban schools. Approximately 40% of the respondents were teaching in medium sized schools. Only 35% were teaching in large schools; the rest 25% were from small schools.

Table 4.2. Distribution of subjects responded to OCDQ-RS based on age, sex, marital status, level of education, teaching experience, employment status, teaching subjects, location and size of the school (N = 171).

Teacher Respondents (N = 171)			
Variables		Frequency	Percentage
1- Age	a) 20-29 years	13	7.6%
	b) 30-39 years	61	35.7%
	c) 40-49 years	69	40.4%
	d) 50 and over	28	16.2%
2- Sex	a) Male	99	58.2%
	b) Female	71	41.8%
3- Marital Status	a) Married	131	77.1%
	b) Single	22	12.9%
	c) Divorced/ widow(er)	17	10.0%
4- Education	a) B.A./B.S.	12	7.1%
	b) B.A./B.S. with extra college credits	67	39.9%
	c) M.A./M.S.	85	50.6%
	d) Ed. specialist/ Ed.D/Ph.D	4	2.4%
5- Teaching Experience	a) 0- 5 years	18	10.6%
	b) 6-10 years	30	17.6%
	c) 11-15 years	27	15.9%
	d) 16 and over	95	55.9%
6- Employment Status	a) Tenured	158	92.4%
	b) Non-tenured	13	7.6%
7- Teaching Subjects	a) Science	53	31.4%
	b) Humanities	85	50.3%
	c) Languages	31	18.3%
8- School Location	a) Rural	87	50.9%
	b) Urban	84	49.1%
9- School Size	a) Small	43	25.1%
	b) Medium	68	39.8%
	c) Large	60	35.1%

Table 4.3 presents the characteristics of subjects who responded to the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). The majority, 92 (55%), of the respondents were over 40 years of age; 62% of the respondents were male; two-thirds of the respondents were married. The majority of the respondents (54%) reported they held a Masters', or higher, degree. In terms of teaching experience, the table indicates that two-thirds of the respondents had taught over 11 years, and a majority (90%) were tenured. 56% of them were teaching humanities/social science subjects, whereas 34% of them reported they were teaching mathematics and science subjects. With regard to location of school, the respondents were equally distributed. Half of them represented rural schools, the other half urban ones. 40% of them, however, were teaching in medium-sized schools, 33% of them were teaching in large schools, and only 29% were teaching in small schools.

As a whole, the respondents were relatively older, male and married, more educated and more experienced.

Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Climate Dimensions

The means and standard deviations for organizational climate subscales are provided in Table 4.4. The means for the organizational climate subscales were the result of summing scores on the 10, 6, 4, 7 and 7 items comprising the organizational climate subscales. These summed values were divided by the number of items in each subscale, then

Table 4.3. Distribution of subjects responded to TJSQ based on age, sex, marital status, level of education, teaching experience, employment status, teaching subjects, location and size of the school (N = 169).

Teacher Respondents (N = 169)			
Variables		Frequency	Percentage
1- Age	a) 20-29 years	16	9.5%
	b) 30-39 years	60	35.7%
	c) 40-49 years	58	34.5%
	d) 50 and over	34	20.2%
2- Sex	a) Male	105	62.1%
	b) Female	64	37.9%
3- Marital Status	a) Married	127	75.1%
	b) Single	23	13.7%
	c) Divorced/ widow(er)	18	10.7%
4- Education	a) B.A./B.S.	8	4.7%
	b) B.A./B.S. with extra college credits	70	41.4%
	c) M.A./M.S.	88	52.1%
	d) Ed. specialist/ Ed.D/Ph.D	3	1.8%
5- Teaching Experience	a) 0- 5 years	17	10.1%
	b) 6-10 years	24	14.2%
	c) 11-15 years	31	18.3%
	d) 16 and over	95	57.4%
6- Employment Status	a) Tenured	152	89.9%
	b) Non-tenured	17	10.1%
7- Teaching Subjects	a) Science	57	33.9%
	b) Humanities	95	56.5%
	c) Languages	16	9.5%
8- School Location	a) Rural	86	50.9%
	b) Urban	83	49.1%
9- School Size	a) Small	49	29.0%
	b) Medium	64	37.9%
	c) Large	56	33.1%

Table 4.4. Means and standard deviations for organizational climate subscales (N = 56).

Variables	Means	Standard Deviations
Teacher Behavior		
1- Engaged	2.6	.29
2- Frustrated	1.9	.27
3- Intimate	2.4	.45
Principal Behavior		
4- Supportive	2.6	.54
5- Directive	1.7	.35

divided by number of teachers in each school to obtain a mean subscale score for each school. The results were 2.6 for engaged teacher behavior, 1.9 for frustrated teacher behavior, 2.4 for intimate teacher behavior 2.6 for supportive principal behavior. Since the conceptual mean of the instrument was 2.5, only two of the means exceeded that of conceptual mean. These results suggest that teachers describe their schools as being high on engaged and supportive dimensions, but low on intimate, frustrated and directive dimensions. That is, teachers described schools as having principals who were concerned with task achievement as well as social needs of the faculty. Teachers were supportive of each other, concerned with students' success and enjoyed working with each other. However, schools were described by teachers as falling short of intimacy. That is, teachers were not perceived to be in a cohesive network of

social relationships. Generally, the climate of the schools was positively perceived by the teachers.

Means and Standard Deviations for Job Satisfaction Factors

The means and standard deviations for teacher job satisfaction factors are provided in Table 4.5. The means for the job satisfaction factors were the result of summing scores on the items, then dividing these summed values by the number of items in each of the job satisfaction factors. The resultant means were 3.4 for supervision, 3.8 for colleague, 3.2 for work conditions, 2.6 for pay, 4.3 for responsibility, 4.0 for work itself, 2.7 for advancement, 3.8 for security and 3.0 for recognition. Since the conceptual mean of the continuum is 3.0, all factors leaned toward the positive end of the continuum, with the exception of pay and advancement factors. These findings suggest that teachers were satisfied with all aspects of their job except pay and advancement. The highest level of satisfaction expressed by teachers was with responsibility factors, indicating that teachers are provided opportunities to participate in policy and decision-making and awarded sufficient freedom and responsibility to carry out their activities. The second-highest factor with which the teachers express satisfaction was work itself. The teachers expressed least satisfaction with pay.

Table 4.5. Means and Standard deviations for job satisfaction factors (N = 56).

Variables	Means	Standard Deviations
1- Supervision	3.4	.47
2- Colleague	3.8	.35
3- Work Conditions	3.2	.52
4- Pay	2.6	.54
5- Responsibility	4.3	.23
6- work itself	4.0	.27
7- advancement	2.7	.56
8- Security	3.8	.47
9- Recognition	3.0	.45

Inter-correlations and Internal Consistency Reliability Coefficients

The initial evaluation of the organizational climate and job satisfaction measures consisted of exploring the internal consistency of the five *a priori* scales of organizational climate and nine *a priori* factors of job satisfaction used. Further, the relationships among the scales of organizational climate and job satisfaction measures were examined.

Internal Consistency Reliability (OCDQ-RS)

Presented in Table 4.6 are the estimates of internal consistency (coefficient alpha) of 5 scales of organizational climate. These estimates ranged from .56 to .91, the median being .77. As is shown in Table 4.6, two scales failed to meet a .70 criterion for adequate scale reliability. Two organizational climate scales have reliability less than .70: Directive (.69) and Frustrated (.56). Reliability estimates (coefficient alpha) were considered acceptable because an alpha coefficient is a function of number of items in the scale that increases monotonically with the number of items comprising a scale, and tends to be conservative (Lord and Novick, 1968).

Intercorrelations Between OCDQ-RS scales

Also presented in Table 4.6 are scales score intercorrelations. These range from -.12 to +.44. Most of the intercorrelations are low, indicating that different dimensions tap different aspects of school organizational climate. But there were a few intercorrelations that were large. Specifically, engaged dimension correlated with supportive ($r = .44$, $p < .001$) and with intimate ($r = .41$, $p < .001$). Obviously, then all the scales are not completely independent of each other.

Table 4.6. Intercorrelations between organizational climate scales and internal consistency reliability estimates (alpha coefficients).

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	Alpha Coefficient
1- Engaged	---					.79
2- Frustrated	-.33[b]	---				.56
3- Intimate	.41[c]	-.27[a]	---			.77
4- Supportive	.44[c]	-.16	.05	---		.91
5- Directive	-.16	.09	.19	-.12	---	.69

[a] Significant at .05 level
[b] Significant at .01 level
[c] Significant at .001 level

Total scale alpha was .78 (N = 171)

Inter-correlations and Internal Consistency Reliability Coefficients for Job Satisfaction Factors

Table 4.7 presents intercorrelations between job satisfaction measures and internal consistency reliability coefficients (alpha) for nine factors of job satisfaction. The estimates of internal consistency reliability ranged from .60 to .91, the median being .81. The full scale alpha coefficient was .92 (N = 169). Four job satisfaction factors had reliability less than .70: Security (.60), recognition (.62), work itself (.66) and responsibility (.68). Reliability estimates were considered acceptable because coefficient alpha is a lower bound estimate of internal

Table 4.7. Intercorrelation among job satisfaction factors and internal consistency reliability (coefficient alpha) N = 169.

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Alpha Coefficient
1- Sup.	--									.91
2- Col.	.27[c]	--								.81
3- W.C.	.60[c]	.27[c]	--							.83
4- Pay	.26[c]	-.03	.37[c]	--						.82
5- Res.	.19[b]	.36[c]	.11	-.15[a]	--					.68
6- W.I.	.33[c]	.33[c]	.32[c]	.05	.47[c]	--				.66
7- Adv.	.34[c]	.13[a]	.39[c]	.33[c]	-.06	.31[c]	--			.82
8- Sec.	.07	.13[a]	.28[c]	.29[c]	.18[b]	.25[c]	.11	--		.60
9- Rec.	.58[c]	.19[b]	.41[c]	.37[c]	.10	.29[c]	.44[c]	.18[b]	---	.62

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.
[c] Significant at .001 level

Total scale alpha was .92 (N = 169).

Sup. = supervision;
Col. = colleagues;
W.C. = working conditions;
Res. = responsibility;
W.I. = work itself;
Adv. = advancement;
Sec. = security;
Rec. = recognition.

consistency reliability that increases monotonically with the number of items comprising a factor.

Also presented in Table 4.7 were intercorrelations among job satisfaction factors. While most of the intercorrelations were low, there were a few intercorrelations which were quite large. The supervision factor has intercorrelations of .60 (with working conditions) and .58 (with recognition factor). These intercorrelations suggested that not all the factors were independent of each other.

Inter-correlations Between Demographic Characteristics

Presented in Table 4.8 are inter-correlations between demographic characteristics. These inter-correlations range from -.01 to .66. Most are generally very low, indicating that demographic characteristics are independent of each other. There are, however, some inter-correlations which were very large in magnitude. Age was correlated ($r = .66$) with teaching experience. Similarly, teaching experience highly correlated ($r = .57$) with employment status. Humanities correlated negatively ($r = -.82$) with science. These inter-correlations clearly indicate that not all demographic characteristics are independent of each other.

Presented in Table 4.9 are correlation coefficients between organizational climate dimensions and size and location of the school.

Table 4.8. Intercorrelations between demographic characteristics of subjects responded to TJSQ (N = 169).

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1- Age	---										
2- Sex	-.01	---									
3- Marital Status	.01	.24[c]	---								
4- Education	.20[b]	.04	.03	---							
5- Teaching Experience	.66[c]	.12	.03	.26[c]	---						
6- Employment Status	.42[c]	.02	.10	.32[c]	.57[c]	---					
7- Science	-.03	.17[b]	.11	-.07	.06	-.09	---				
8- Humanities	-.02	-.01	.01	.01	-.08	.10	-.82[c]	---			
9- Languages	.08	-.25[c]	-.19[b]	.10	.03	-.03	-.23[c]	-.37[c]	---		
10- Size	.01	-.07	-.11	.06	-.03	.04	-.04	.04	.01	---	
11- Location	.16[a]	-.03	-.12	.16[a]	.11	.03	-.16[a]	.06	.15[a]	.20[b]	---

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.
[c] Significant at .001 level.

Table 4.9. Correlation between organizational climate dimensions and size and location of the school (N = 56).

	Engaged	Frustrated	Intimate	Supportive	Directive
1- Location	.09	.09	-.06	.10	.24[a]
2- Size	-.10	-.10	.10	.15	.07

[a] Significant at .05.

The correlation between school characteristics and organizational climate did not show any significant correlation, with the exception of relationship between location of the school and directive organizational climate subscale. The results indicate that teachers in urban schools perceive their principals to be high on directive behavior, that is, their principals used domineering and rigid supervision style and closely control teachers' activities. Size of the school was found to be unrelated to any climate dimensions.

Results of Hypotheses Tests

Presented in this section are the results of hypotheses tests. Two hypotheses were generated to determine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction and the relationship between teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics and teacher job satisfaction.

Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction Relationship

To determine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction, the following hypothesis was formulated.

> **Hypothesis I:** There will be a significant relationship between the organizational climate of public secondary schools, (measured by OCDQ-RS) and teacher job satisfaction, (measured by TJSQ) as perceived by public secondary school teachers.

This hypothesis was tested using the Pearson correlation, and multiple regression analysis (stepwise).

Zero-order Correlations: Table 4.10 shows the Zero-order correlations between the nine factors of job satisfaction and five dimensions of organizational climate (N = 56). Of the possible 45 correlation coefficients, 16 were statistically significant ($p < .05$ or less). The engaged dimension was significantly correlated with recognition ($r = .43$, $p < .001$), supervision ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), work itself ($r = .36$, $p < .001$), working conditions ($r = .30$, $p < .01$), and with colleague ($r = .26$, $p < .05$). The frustrated teacher behavior dimension was significantly, but negatively, related to colleagues ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$), security ($r = -.30$, $p < .01$), responsibility ($r = -.23$, $p < .01$) and working conditions ($r = -.23$, $p < .01$). The intimate climate dimension was only significantly positively related to two job satisfaction factors, colleagues ($r = .35$, $p < .01$), and working conditions ($r = .34$, $p < .01$). The supportive principal behavior dimension was also found to be significantly, but

Table 4.10. Correlations between organizational climate scales and job satisfaction factors (N = 56).

Job Satisfaction Factors	Organizational Climate				
	Engaged	Frustrated	Intimate	Supportive	Directive
Supervision	.40[c]	.04	-.01	.41[c]	-.19
Colleagues	.26[a]	-.32[b]	.35[b]	.05	-.21[a]
Working Conditions	.30[b]	-.23[a]	.34[b]	.10	-.05
Pay	.17	-.02	.03	.04	.06
Responsibility	.13	-.23[a]	.17	.09	-.09
Work Itself	.36[b]	-.16	.07	.28[b]	-.29[b]
Advancement	-.02	.13	-.05	.17	-.00
Security	.20	-.30[b]	.04	.04	-.04
Recognition	.43[c]	-.01	-.06	.36[b]	-.02

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.
[c] Significant at .001 level.

positively, related to three of the nine job satisfaction factors: supervision ($r = .41$, $p < .001$), recognition ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), and work itself ($r = .28$, $p < .01$). The directive principal behavior organizational climate was significantly and negatively related to two of the nine job satisfaction factors, colleagues ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$), and work itself ($r = -.29$, $p < .01$). Two of the job satisfaction factors (e.g. pay and advancement) were found to be unrelated to any organizational climate dimension. These results suggest that in schools described by teachers as being high on engaged teacher behavior, low on frustrated teacher behavior, high on intimate teacher behavior, high on supportive principal behavior and low on directive principal behavior, teachers expressed satisfaction with all aspects of their job with the exception of pay and advancement, which were not related to any organizational climate factors. These results thus provide strong support for hypotheses one, indicating that organizational climate and job satisfaction are related.

Multiple Regression: To further clarify the relationship between organizational climate dimensions and job satisfaction factors, a multiple stepwise regression analysis was performed. Multiple regression was used to analyze the relative contributions of organization climate dimensions individually and/or collectively in predicting job satisfaction, using organizational climate dimensions as independent variables and each of the nine factors in job

satisfaction as dependent variables. A multivariate multiple regression test of significance was performed before using multiple regression analyses. The multivariate F showed statistically significant effects ($F = 1.74$, $p < .01$). The results of multiple regression (stepwise) analysis are provided in Tables 4.11 -- 4.16.

Table 4.11. Multiple Regression (stepwise) analysis summary for organizational factors, with supervision being the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Supportive	.41[c]	.29	4.7[a]	.17
Engaged	.40[c]	.27	4.1[a]	.06
		equation	7.9[c]	.23

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[c] Significant at .001 level.

Table 4.11 presents the multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary of organizational climate dimensions, with supervision being the dependent variable. The regression equation is significant ($F = 7.9$, $p < .001$), and the explained variance is relatively high at 23%. The number of predictors, however, is only two. Teachers described supervision as satisfying when principals exhibited a supportive behavior (beta = .29), that is, when the principal was concerned with both the task accomplishment

and social needs of the teachers. Engaged teacher behavior also made an independent positive contribution in explaining the variation in the perceived supervision factor of job satisfaction (beta = .27). Thus, results showed that engaged teacher behavior and supportive principal behavior were positively related to teacher satisfaction with supervision.

The multiple regression analysis summary for colleague being the dependent variable is provided in Table 4.12. The colleagues' job satisfaction was regressed on organizational climate dimensions. The regression equation is statistically significant ($F = 6.7$, $p < .01$), and 20% of the variance in the job satisfaction variable colleagues was explained. Again, the number of significant predictors was two. Intimate teacher behavior contributed positively (beta = .40) and directive principal behavior contributed negatively (beta = -.28) to the teacher satisfaction with colleagues. The results suggest that teachers were satisfied with colleagues in schools perceived to be high in intimate teacher behavior, but were dissatisfied in schools described as being high in directive principal behavior.

Table 4.13 shows the results of multiple regression (stepwise) analysis for organizational climate factors in relation to working conditions. The regression equation was statistically significant ($F = 6.8$, $p < .01$), and 11% of the variance in the job satisfaction working conditions factor was explained. The only significant positive predictor was the intimate organizational climate factor. Teachers

described working condition as being satisfying, when teachers perceived themselves to be a part of cohesive network of social relationships (beta = .33), that is, in a situation where teachers were provided opportunities to socialize regularly and had close friendships with each other.

Table 4.12. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis for organizational climate, with colleagues' job satisfaction variable as dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Intimate	.35	.40	10.4[b]	.12
Directive	-.21	-.28	5.4[a]	.08
		equation	6.7[b]	.20

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.

Table 4.13. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary for organizational climate factors, with working conditions being the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Intimate	.34	.33	6.8[b]	.11
		equation	6.8[b]	.11

[b] Significant at .01 level.

A summary of multiple regression analysis is provided in Table 4.14, showing significant predictors of the work-itself factor of job satisfaction. Two organizational climate factors, Engaged and Directive, were significant predictors of work itself. The regression equation reached a statistically significant level ($F = 8.0$, $p < .01$), and 18% of variance in the work-itself factor was explained. Teachers exhibited satisfaction with work itself (beta = .32) in climates where teachers' morale was high, they were concerned with students' success, enjoyed working with each other, and where principals demonstrated low directive behavior (beta = -.24)--that is, the principal did not use rigid and domineering supervision.

Table 4.14. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary of organizational climate factors, with work-itself being the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Engaged	.36	.32	6.5[b]	.13
Directive	-.29	-.24	3.7[a]	.05
		equation	8.0[b]	.18

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.

The results of regression (stepwise) analysis are shown in Table 4.15, for security as being the dependent variable.

Only one organizational climate dimension--frustrated--was found to be a significant predictor of the security factor of job satisfaction. Teachers reported dissatisfaction with security in schools described by teachers as being high in the frustrated dimension of organizational climate (beta = -.30). That is, teachers perceived they were distracted from the basic task of teaching by burdens of routine and excessive non-teaching duties.

Table 4.15. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary for security (as the dependent variable) and organizational climate factors as independent variables.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Frustrated	-.30	-.30	5.2[a]	.09
		equation	5.2[a]	.09

[a] Significant at .05 level.

The summary of multiple regression analysis with recognition as the dependent variable appears in Table 4.16. The Engaged variable from organizational climate (beta = .54) is related to teacher satisfaction with recognition. The Intimacy, however, represents an interesting finding. The zero-order correlation of -.06 is not significant, while the beta weight of -.28 is significant. It explains 7% of the variance in recognition

over and above what was explained by engaged climate. The intimate dimension of organizational climate assumes some characteristics of a suppressor. The examination of the intercorrelation matrix in Table 4.16 suggests otherwise. The intimacy variable is hardly related to any other organizational climate dimension, and probably entered the equation because it makes a unique contribution to the explained variance in teachers' satisfaction with recognition.

Table 4.16. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary with recognition as the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Engaged	.43	.54	17.0[c]	.18
Intimate	-.06	-.28	4.6[a]	.07
		equation	8.7[c]	.25

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[c] Significant at .001 level.

The multiple regression analysis results further provide support for hypothesis I, indicating that organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction are related.

Demographic Characteristics and Job Satisfaction Relationship

Hypothesis II: It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics and teacher job satisfaction.

To test the hypothesis concerning the relationship of teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction, the Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis procedures were employed.

Zero-order Correlations: The correlation between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction appear in Table 4.17. Of the possible 99 correlation coefficients, only 21 are significant ($p < .05$ or less). Age is negatively related to three of the nine job satisfaction factors: working conditions ($r = -.20$, $p<.01$), Advancement ($r = -.18$, $p < .01$), and recognition ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$). The results suggest that younger teachers are relatively satisfied with working conditions, advancement opportunities and recognition of their job. Sex is also related negatively to three job satisfaction factors, sex correlated with colleagues ($r = -.25$, $p < .01$), responsibility ($r = -.28$, $p < .01$), and work itself ($r = -.18$, $p <.01$) indicating that female teachers are more satisfied with colleagues, responsibility and work itself than male teachers. Marital Status of teachers showed no relationship with job satisfaction factors, with the exception of the security factor. Marital Status was negatively related to security ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$) suggesting that single teachers tended

Table 4.17. Correlation between demographics and job satisfaction factors (N = 169).

Variables	Supervision	Colleagues	Working Conditions	Pay	Responsibility	Work Itself	Advancement	Security	Recognition
Age	-.11	.07	-.20[b]	-.08	.01	-.08	-.18[b]	.04	-.12[a]
Sex	.03	-.25[b]	.07	-.07	-.28[b]	-.18[b]	.03	-.01	-.05
Marital Status	.09	-.01	-.01	-.09	.01	.06	-.06	-.13[a]	.04
Education	-.02	-.09	.04	.06	.15[a]	.14[a]	.03	.09	-.04
Teaching Experience	-.10	.08	-.09	-.02	.05	-.03	-. 22[b]	.18[b]	-.12[a]
Employment Status	.09	.02	-.11	-.13[a]	.09	-.06	-.20[b]	.16[a]	-.11
Science	-.08	-.07	-.08	-.12[a]	.02	-.03	-.08	-.08	-.03
Humanities	.05	.03	.04	.01	-.02	-.02	.15[a]	.07	.02
Languages	.04	.06	.05	.17[a]	-.01	.08	-.12[a]	.00	.02
Size	-.04	.03	.15[a]	.10	.06	-.05	.09	.00	-.05
Location	.05	.09	-.04	.21[b]	.02	.07	.01	-.04	.07

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.
[c] Significant at .001 level.

to be more satisfied with the security aspect of their job than married teachers. The education level of teachers was found to be related positively with responsibility ($r = .15$, $p < .05$) and work itself ($r = .14$, $p < .05$). Teaching experience shows a significant correlation of ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$) with advancement ($r = .18$, $p < .01$) with security and ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$) with recognition. Employment status is significantly related to three of the nine job satisfaction factors. It is related negatively to pay ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$), advancement ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$) and positively to security ($r = .16$, $p < .05$). Teachers of humanities/social sciences reported satisfaction with advancement, humanities is correlated ($r = .15$, $p < .05$) with advancement. The language teachers indicated satisfaction with pay, but expressed dissatisfaction with advancement opportunities. The science teachers expressed dissatisfaction with pay, science correlated negatively ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$) with pay.

The size of the school relates only positively with working conditions ($r = .15$, $p < .05$). Similarly, the location of school is positively related only to pay ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). In sum, the supervision job satisfaction factor was the only variable found to be unrelated to any of the demographic characteristics. All other job satisfaction factors were found to be related to one or more of the demographic characteristics. However, the magnitude of relationship was very low. None of the correlation

coefficients exceeded .28. Thus, hypothesis II received limited support.

Multiple Regression Analysis: To analyze the relative contribution of demographic characteristics individually and/or collectively in predicting job satisfaction, a series of regression analyses (stepwise-multiple regression) were performed, using demographic characteristics as independent variables and each of the nine factors in job satisfaction as dependent variables. A multivariate test of significance was performed to examine if there are any significant effects. The multivariate test of significance showed statistically significant effects ($F = 1.4$, $p<.0001$). The multiple stepwise regression analysis results are presented in Tables 4.18 to 4.24.

Table 4.18 shows the multiple regression (stepwise) analysis for demographic characteristics, with colleagues as the dependent variable. The regression equation was statistically significant ($F = 10.6$, $p<.001$), and 6% of the variance in colleagues was accounted for by sex. The only significant predictor was the sex of the respondents. Sex was found to be negatively related (beta = -.25) to the colleagues factor of job satisfaction, suggestion that female teachers expressed more satisfaction with colleagues relations than male teachers.

Table 4.18. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary for demographic characteristics, with colleagues as being the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Sex	-.25	-.25	10.6[c]	.06
		equation	10.6[c]	.06

[c] Significant at .001 level.

The multiple regression (stepwise) analysis in Table 4.19 shows a statistically significant regression equation ($F = 5.3$, $p<.01$), and 6% of the variance in working conditions factor of job satisfaction was explained. Age was found to be negatively related (beta = -.19) to working conditions, while size of the school positively related (beta = .16) to working conditions. These results suggest that older teachers were more dissatisfied with working conditions than younger teachers. However, teachers representing large schools expressed more satisfaction with working conditions than their counterparts in small and medium-sized schools.

Pay was found to be related only to location of the school. The summary of multiple regression analysis presented in Table 4.20 shows a significant regression equation ($F = 7.8$, $p < .01$), and 4% of the variance in pay satisfaction was accounted for by location of the school (beta = .21). The results suggested that teachers from urban

schools were more satisfied with pay than their rural counterparts.

Table 4.19. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary, with working conditions as the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Age	-.20	-.19	6.5[b]	.04
Size	.15	.16	4.2[a]	.02
		equation	5.3[b]	.06

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.

Table 4.20. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary for demographic characteristics, with pay as the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Location	.21	.21	7.8[b]	.04
		equation	7.8[b]	.04

[b] Significant at .01 level.

Table 4.21 shows the multiple regression analysis results for demographic characteristics, with responsibility as the dependent variable. Two demographic characteristics

of teachers entered the regression equation. 8% of the variance in responsibility factor was explained by sex of the respondents (beta = -.29). The education of respondents also makes a unique contribution, accounting for additional 3% of the variance in responsibility factor. The data indicated that female teachers were more satisfied with responsibility than their male counterparts. Further, teachers with Masters' and higher degrees expressed more satisfaction with the kind of responsibility they were given than those teachers with less than Masters'.

Table 4.21. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary for demographic characteristics, with responsibility as the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Sex	-.28	-.29	14.8[c]	.08
Education	.15	.16	4.7[a]	.03
		equation	9.4[c]	.11

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.
[c] Significant at .001 level.

The results of multiple regression analysis for demographic characteristics, with work itself being the dependent variable, are shown in Table 4.22. Work itself was found to be negatively related to the sex of respondents

(beta = -.17), and only 3% of the variance in work itself was accounted for by the sex of respondents. The results suggested that female teachers were more satisfied with work itself than their male counterparts.

Table 4.22. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary for demographic characteristics, with work itself as the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Sex	-.18	-.17	4.9[a]	.03
		equation	4.9[a]	.03

[a] Significant at .05 level.

Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis results, using advancement as the dependent variable, are presented in Table 4.23. The regression equation was statistically significant ($F = 6.2$, $p < .01$), and 7% of the variance in advancement factor was accounted for. The number of significant predictors was only two. Teaching experience was a negative predictor (beta = -.20) of advancement, whereas humanities emerged as a positive predictor (beta = .15) of advancement. The data suggested that more experienced teachers were dissatisfied with opportunities for advancement more than those with less experience. The results also suggested that teachers who were teaching

humanities/social science subjects exhibited satisfaction with the opportunities for advancement.

Table 4.23. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis for demographic characteristics, with advancement as the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Teaching Experience	-.22	-.20	7.1[b]	.05
Humanities/Social Sciences	.15	.15	4.0[a]	.02
		equation	6.2[b]	.07

[a] Significant at .05 level.
[b] Significant at .01 level.

Table 4.24 presents the multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary of demographic characteristics, with the security factor of job satisfaction as dependent variable. The regression equation was statistically significant ($F = 6.3$, $p < .01$), and 4% of the variance in security was explained. The number of predictors was only one. Teaching experience was the only positive predictor (beta = .18) of security, indicating that teachers with more experience tended to be more satisfied with the security their job provided than their counterparts with less experience.

Table 4.24. Multiple regression (stepwise) analysis summary for demographic characteristics, with security as the dependent variable.

Independent Variable(s)	r	beta	F	R^2
Teaching Experience	.18	.18	6.3[b]	.04
		equation	6.3[b]	.04

[b] Significant at .01 level.

Results of hypotheses testing revealed several potentially important relationships. These results provided support for both of the hypotheses. However, the support for the hypothesis I was stronger than hypothesis II. The magnitude of correlations and magnitude of the explained variance was higher for organizational climate and job satisfaction factors than for demographic characteristics and job satisfaction.

Summary of the Chapter

This study was designed to determine the relationship of organizational climate and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction. The results of correlational and multiple regression analyses were presented in this chapter. The results indicated that generally teachers perceive climate of their school positively. With respect to satisfaction, teachers in general expressed satisfaction with all aspect

of their job with the exception of pay and advancement. The results of hypotheses tests provided support for both hypotheses. However, the support for hypotheses concerning the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction was stronger than for relationship between demographic and job satisfaction. This was manifested from the magnitudes of correlations and explained variance.

Chapter 5 presents the summary of the study, findings, discussion of findings, conclusions and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship of organizational climate, and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics, to teacher job satisfaction, as perceived by public secondary school teachers in Michigan.

The following two hypotheses were generated to test these relationships.

> **Hypothesis I:** It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between organizational climate (measured by OCDQ-RS) and teacher job satisfaction (measured by TJSQ), as perceived by Michigan public secondary school teachers.
>
> **Hypothesis II:** It was predicted that there would be a significant relationship between teachers' selected demographic characteristics (age, sex, marital status, education, teaching experience, employment status, and teaching subjects) and schools' characteristics (size and location of the school) and teacher job satisfaction.

The sample selection procedure was comprised of two stages. In the first stage, a sample of public secondary schools was selected, using a cluster sampling technique with stratification. Of the 62 originally sampled, six schools opted not to participate in the study. Therefore, 56

(90%) of the schools constituted the school sample. A 100% participation rate for rural schools was obtained, while 83% of urban schools participated. Among the 56 sampled schools, 15 were small, 22 medium-sized, and 25 large.The second stage of sampling included selection of a teacher sample. A simple random sampling procedure, using a table of random numbers, was employed to select eight teachers from each school. One school, however, had just four teachers, so all teachers in that school were chosen. In all, 444 teachers from a sample of 56 schools were selected.

The data for the study were collected, using OCDQ-RS (to measure organizational climate), TJSQ (to measure job satisfaction), and demographic information (to measure demographic characteristics). To avoid response bias and to ensure methodological independence between the measures, the respondents within each school were randomly divided into two groups to respond to one of the two instruments. Each of the group of respondents were mailed one of the instruments to complete the questionnaire. After three follow-up letters, a total of 340 (77%) respondents of the sample voluntarily participated and returned completed instruments. Returns for each instrument were 169 (76%) for TJSQ and 171 (77%) for OCDQ-RS.

In terms of demographic characteristics, of the respondents who completed the OCDQ-RS, 57% were over 40 years of age, an approximately equal percentage (58%) were male and a majority (77%) were married. As for educational

level, 53% of the respondents had Masters' and/or higher degrees. A majority (72%) of the respondents had been teaching more than 11 years, and an overwhelming majority (92%) had tenured status. Half of the respondents came from rural schools, and other half from urban.

Of those who responded to the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ), a majority (75%) were married, and male (62%). As for educational level, 54% reported they had a Masters' and/or higher qualification. In terms of length of service, a majority (76%) reported teaching service of more than 11 years, and an overwhelming majority (90%) were tenured. A majority (66%) reported that they were teaching humanities and/or languages, while only 34% were teaching mathematics and science subjects. Half of the respondents represented rural schools, the other half urban schools.

Two questionnaires and a demographic information sheet were used to obtain data. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire--Revised Scale (OCDQ-RS) for secondary schools, developed by Kottkamp, Mulhern and Hoy (1985) was administered by mail in its original form to one half of the respondents (N = 222) to measure organizational climate of the schools. This instrument had 34 items in all, measuring five subscales of organizational climate: Engaged, Frustrated, Intimate, Supportive and Directive. The internal consistency reliability coefficients (alpha coefficient) were calculated for each of the subscales. The reliability coefficients for each subscale were: Supportive (.91),

Directive (.69), Engaged (.79), Frustrated (.56), and Intimate (.77).

The Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ), developed by Lester (1983) was administered by mail in its original form to the other half of the respondents (N = 222) to measure teacher job satisfaction. This instrument contained a total of 66 items, measuring nine facets of teacher job satisfaction. The internal consistency reliability coefficient (alpha coefficient) for total scale was .92, and for each factor was: supervision (.91), colleagues (.81), working conditions (.83), pay (.82), responsibility (.68), work itself (.66), advancement (.82), security (.60), and recognition (.62).

Responses were also elicited from subjects to indicate their demographic characteristics. The following demographic characteristics of teachers were included: age, sex, marital status, education, teaching experience, employment status and nature of teaching subjects. The school demographic characteristics included size and location of the school. Four categories wee used to represent teachers' age. Sex was classified as male or female. Education level was represented by four categories. Teaching experience denoted total years of experience as a teacher, and was divided into four categories. Employment status was classified as tenured or non-tenured. Teaching subjects were classified as science, humanities/social sciences or languages. Location of school was classified as urban or rural. The size of the

school denoted the student enrollment, and was divided into three categories (small, medium-sized and large schools).

Two hypotheses were generated to analyze the data collected. The first hypothesis predicted a significant relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. This was tested using the Pearson correlation, and multiple regression (stepwise) analysis procedures. The Pearson correlation was used to examine which organizational climate dimensions were related to which job satisfaction factors. Multiple regression was used to examine the contribution of each of the organizational climate dimensions collectively or separately in predicting job satisfaction factors. The second hypothesis predicted a significant relationship between teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics and teacher job satisfaction. It was tested using, again, the Pearson correlation and stepwise multiple regression analysis.

Findings

Presented in this section are findings of the study concerning the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction as perceived by public secondary school teachers, and the relationship between demographic characteristics and teacher job satisfaction. Two hypotheses were generated to test such relationships.

Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction Relationship

Hypothesis I: There would be a significant relationship between organizational climate (measured by OCDQ-RS) and teacher job satisfaction (measured by TJSQ) as perceived by public secondary school teachers.

Supervision: Two of the organizational climate subscales were found to be positively related to supervision--Engaged and Supportive. Both of these organizational climate dimensions contributed significantly to teacher satisfaction with supervision. A total of 23% of the variation in supervision was accounted for by engaged and supportive dimensions of organizational climate. These results suggested that teachers expressed satisfaction in a climate perceived to be high in engaged teacher behavior, that is, where teachers were perceived to be enjoying their work with each other and trusting their students, and where principals were perceived to be concerned with both task accomplishment and professional needs of the faculty.

Colleagues: Of the five organizational climate subscales, four were significantly related to colleagues. Only the supportive subscale of organizational climate was found to be unrelated to colleagues. Engaged and Intimate were positively related to colleagues, while Frustrated and Directive dimensions were found to be negatively related to colleagues. The multiple regression analysis, however, indicated the Intimate and Directive dimensions were significant predictors of teachers' satisfaction with colleagues. Intimate contributed positively, while the

Directive contributed negatively, suggesting that teachers tended to be satisfied with colleagues in schools described to be high in Intimate teacher behavior that is, where teachers were perceived to be part of a cohesive network of relationships and were close friends. But teachers expressed dissatisfaction with colleagues in climates perceived to be high in directive principal behavior, that is, where principals used rigid and domineering patterns of supervision and closely controlled teachers' activities.

Working Conditions: Correlational analysis revealed working conditions to be positively related to Engaged and Intimate organizational climate dimensions, but negatively related to the Frustrated dimension. Multiple stepwise regression analysis, however, indicated the Intimate dimension as the only significant predictor of working conditions. This suggested that teachers tended to be satisfied with working conditions in a school climate described to be high in intimacy, that is, where teachers socialized regularly and had close friendships with eachother.

Pay: No organizational climate subscale was found to be significantly related to the pay factor of job satisfaction.

Responsibility: Correlational analysis indicated the Frustrated dimension to be negatively related to responsibility. These findings suggest that teachers tended to be dissatisfied with responsibility in climates where teachers were perceived to be distracted from their basic

task of teaching by burdens of routine and excessive non-teaching assignments.

Work Itself: Work itself was found to be positively related to Engaged and Supportive, but negatively related to Directive dimensions of organizational climate. The results of multiple stepwise regression analysis revealed Engaged as a positive predictor, and Directive a negative predictor, of work itself. These results suggested that teachers exhibited satisfaction with work itself in climates perceived by teachers to be high in Engaged teacher behavior. That is, where teachers were perceived to enjoy working with each other and their morale was high. But teachers expressed dissatisfaction with work itself in climates where principals used rigid and domineering supervision and closely controlled teacher's activities.

Advancement: No organizational climate subscale was found to be related to the advancement factor of job satisfaction.

Security: The Frustrated subscale of organizational climate was the only subscale found to be negatively related to security. These results suggested that teachers exhibited dissatisfaction with the security aspect of their job in climates where teachers perceived to be burdened with too much paperwork and other excessive non-teaching and routine duties.

Recognition: Correlational analysis revealed Engaged and Supportive to be positively related to recognition.

Multiple stepwise regression analysis, however, showed interesting results. The Engaged dimension was found to be a significant predictor of teacher satisfaction with recognition. Another organizational climate subscale--Intimate--which had a non-significant correlation with recognition entered the regression equation, and was found to be a negative predictor of teacher satisfaction with recognition. First, it was thought that this dimension served as a suppressor. However, the examination of the intercorrelation matrix (Table 4.6) did not warrant such a conclusion, since the Intimate subscale was hardly related to any other organizational climate subscales. Probably, it entered the equation because it made a unique contribution in the explained variance in teacher satisfaction with recognition. These results suggested that teachers were satisfied with recognition in climates where teachers perceived to have a high morale, but were dissatisfied with recognition where teachers' social needs were not fairly met as perceived by the teachers.

Discussion

The findings from this study support the hypothesis that organizational climate and job satisfaction are related. Several potentially important relationships were found between organizational climate and job satisfaction factors. The correlational analysis (Table 4.10) showed the engaged dimension to be significantly but positively related to supervision, colleagues, working conditions, work itself

and recognition. The frustrated dimension was negatively related to colleagues, working conditions, responsibility and security. The intimate dimension was found to be positively related to two of the job satisfaction factors: Colleagues--and working conditions. The supportive dimension was correlated positively with supervision, work itself and recognition, but the directive dimension was correlated negatively with colleagues and work itself. These findings are consistent with previous climate research, both in school settings and outside schools, that has consistently shown organizational climate and job satisfaction to be related. These findings lend support for the findings by Friedlander and Margulies (1969), Pritchard and Karasick (1973), Downey, Hellriegel, Phelps and Slocum (1974), Downey, Hellriegel and Slocum (1975), LaFollette and Sims (1975), Lawler, Hall and Oldham (1974), and Schneider and Snyder (1975), studies conducted in settings other than schools, and findings by Coughlan (1971), Grassie and Carss (1973), Craig (1979), Burke (1982), McElroy (1984), Ronnenkamp (1984) and LoFland (1985), in school settings, that organizational climate and job satisfaction are related. Several findings, however, are unique to this study. Noteworthy is the lack of significant correlation between climate dimensions and two job satisfaction factors--pay and advancement. This is not surprising, however, since principals and teachers have very little direct control over advancement processes and salary schedules. Therefore, no

relationship between organizational climate dimensions and advancement and pay is not an unexpected finding. Ronnenkamp (1984) also reported similar findings. Using a canonical correlation analysis, he found no redundancy between organizational climate (OCDQ) dimensions and JDI-pay and promotion factors. This finding can be interpreted as no relationship between pay and promotion and OCDQ dimensions. Thus, findings of this study reinforce those of Ronnenkamp (1984). In general, the correlational analysis suggested that the more engaged, intimate, supportive, less directive and frustrated the climate of school is perceived to be by the teachers, the more teachers were satisfied on-the-job in that school with supervision, colleagues, working conditions, responsibility, work itself, security and recognition. These correlational analyses thus provide strong support for Hypothesis I: that organizational climate and job satisfaction are related. Further support for this hypothesis is found in the multiple stepwise regression analyses presented in tables 4.11-4.16. All equation statistics for the stepwise regression procedures provide substantial support for the hypothesis. All were significantly different from zero beyond the 1% level, with the exception of one which was significant at the 5% level. And the magnitudes of the explained variance were important, though not substantial. It should be noted, however, that only two of the five independent variables entered into any of the prediction equations.

An examination of both correlational and multiple regression analyses indicate that organizational climate dimensions pertaining to teacher behavior are more significantly related to teacher job satisfaction than dimensions pertaining to principal behavior. These findings lend additional support to the studies (Ronnenkamp, 1984, and Amirtash, 1982) that teacher behavior dimensions were more significantly related to job satisfaction factors than principal behavior dimensions. This is not to suggest, however, that principal behavior dimensions are not important at all. Both principal behavior dimensions (supportive and directive) were found to be significantly associated with some of the job satisfaction factors.

Directive principal behavior was found to be negatively related to teacher satisfaction with colleagues and with work itself. This finding confirms findings of Grassie and Carss (1973) who found supportive and considerate principal leadership positively related to teacher satisfaction with colleagues and work. Similarly, the supportive principal behavior was found in this study to be positively related to job satisfaction. The correlational analysis indicates the supportive dimension to be significantly but positively related to supervision. work itself and recognition. These correlational analyses are consistent with previous climate research and leadership research that the supportive and considerate leadership style of a principal is associated with teacher job satisfaction. More specifically, these

findings reinforce those of Grassie and Carss (1973), Kunz and Hoy (1976), Miskel, Fevurly and Stewart (1979), Craig (1979) and Litt and Turk (1985) that supportive and considerate principal leadership is related to teacher job satisfaction. The multiple regression analyses indicate supportive principal behavior is the only significant predictor of teacher satisfaction with supervision, and appears to be not as important a predictor of teacher satisfaction with work and recognition as is engaged teacher behavior. The examination of multiple regression analyses indicates the engaged dimension to be significantly related to teacher satisfaction with supervision, work itself and recognition. This buttresses the findings of Ronnenkamp (1984), Donohue (1983), Amirtash (1982), Holder (1984) and Ghonaim (1986), who reported the Esprit dimension (OCDQ) to be positively related to educators job satisfaction.

The frustrated dimension of organizational climate was found to be negatively related to teacher satisfaction with responsibility and security. These results suggest that teachers were dissatisfied with responsibility and security in school climates where teachers felt themselves burdened with routine and excessive non-teaching duties. Similar results were reported by Litt and Turk (1985), that teachers expressed dissatisfaction with their jobs when they perceived themselves assigned too much paper work. Donohue (1983) also found the hindrance dimension (OCDQ) to be negatively related to job satisfaction for faculties of

nursing schools. Holder (1984) found a negative correlation between hindrance and all JDI subscales, except people, as perceived by teachers.

The intimate dimension emerged as a significant predictor of teacher satisfaction with colleagues and working conditions. These results indicated that teachers were satisfied with colleagues and working conditions in school climates perceived by teachers to be high in intimacy. That is, where teachers felt that their social needs are fairly fulfilled, they have close friendships with their peers. Donohue (1983) and Amirtash (1982) also reported the intimate dimension to be positively related to educators' job satisfaction. Similarly, Holder (1984) found the intimate dimension to be positively related to all JDI subscales, except promotion, as perceived by teachers.

Both correlational and multiple regression analyses provide firm support for the hypothesis that organizational climate and job satisfaction are related. However, the magnitudes of correlation coefficients and explained variance were not substantial. Many possible reasons exist for such a moderate relationship of organizational climate and job satisfaction. First, concerning the aggregation (mean) climate scores: as Schneider (1975) stated,

> when climate and satisfaction scores are averaged within a work group and then correlated across work groups, a high correlation cannot be established because the averages have little or no reliability (p. 468).

The results, however, can not be entirely attributed to this aggregation problem, since many previous climate researchers utilized aggregation by employing different methodological criteria and showed it to be a valid measure (Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Schneider, 1972; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; Payne and Mansfield, 1973; Drexler, 1977; and Gavin, 1975). Schneider (1975), after reviewing a number of empirical studies utilizing aggregation, concluded:

> these data suggest that aggregate reports of practices and procedures [climate] can be reliable. They [studies] also suggest that an individual's report will not be a reliable report of what is happening in the situation (p. 469).

Besides, the magnitudes of correlation coefficients are not so low to warrant a conclusion that average reports are unreliable.

Another possibility for these moderate relationships is that some of the dimensions in OCDQ and some factors in the TJSQ had low reliabilities. This is particularly true for the frustrated dimension of OCDQ and the recognition and security factors of TJSQ. The examination of correlation coefficients does not support this explanation. If this were the case, then the correlation between dimensions of organizational climate and factors of job satisfaction with high reliability coefficients would have been very high. Another possibility is that the organizational climate as measured in this study is simply not highly related to teacher job satisfaction, since the organizational climate as measured in this study is very limited in its scope and

coverage. And these dimensions may be not particularly important in relation to teacher job satisfaction.

One other point in discussing these findings is in order. This study was not specifically designed to address the issues that have plagued climate research. The data, however, provide some basis to suggest that organizational climate and job satisfaction are not redundant constructs, as suggested. Johannesson (1973) and Guion (1973) have claimed that organizational climate and job satisfaction are not distinct, but rather redundant, concepts. If this were the case, then organizational climate dimensions and job satisfaction factors should have been consistently and highly related to each other. No relationship between any organizational climate dimensions and pay and advancement factors, and a moderate relationship between climate and job satisfaction, do not support the assertion that organizational climate and job satisfaction are redundant.

Demographic Characteristics and Job Satisfaction Relationship

Hypothesis II: There would be a significant relationship between teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by public secondary school teachers.

This hypothesis was also tested by using Pearson correlation and multiple stepwise regression analyses. The findings of Zero-order correlation and multiple regression analyses are provided first, followed by a discussion of findings.

Supervision: The supervision factor of job satisfaction was found to be unrelated to teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics, indicating that teachers' reaction to supervision is independent of their demographic characteristics.

Colleagues: Both correlational and multiple regression analysis showed sex of respondents to be significantly but negatively related to teachers' satisfaction with colleagues. These results suggested that female teachers tended to exhibit more satisfaction with colleagues than their male counterparts.

Working Conditions: Correlational analysis revealed age to be negatively related to working conditions, and size to be positively related to working conditions. Multiple regression analysis results were consistent with correlational analysis, indicating age as a negative predictor and size as a positive predictor of teacher satisfaction with working conditions. These results indicated that older teachers expressed dissatisfaction with working conditions more often than their younger counterparts. Teachers from large schools were more satisfied with working conditions than were teachers from small and medium-sized schools.

Pay: Pay was found to be negatively related to employment status and science, but positively related to the location of the school. These results indicated that teachers with non-tenured status were relatively more

satisfied with pay than teachers with tenured status. And teachers of mathematics and science subjects were dissatisfied with pay. And teachers from urban schools exhibited more satisfaction with pay than teachers from rural schools. Multiple regression analysis, however, showed location of the school as the only significant predictor of teacher satisfaction with pay.

Responsibility: Sex of respondents was found to be negatively related to, and Education to be positively related to, responsibility. Multiple regression analysis results were also consistent with these findings. The results suggested that female teachers tended to be more satisfied with responsibility than male teachers. The teachers with Masters' and higher degrees also expressed more satisfaction with responsibility than those teachers holding less than a Masters' degree.

Work Itself: Sex and Education were found to be related to work itself. Sex was negatively related, but education was found to be positively related to teacher's satisfaction with work itself, indicating that female teachers and teachers with higher educational qualifications tended to be more satisfied with work itself. Multiple regression analysis showed sex of respondents as a negative predictor of teacher satisfaction with work itself.

Advancement: Teaching experience and age were found to be negatively, but humanities/social sciences to be positively, related to advancement. Multiple regression

analysis results showed teaching experience as a negative predictor and humanities as a positive predictor of teacher satisfaction with advancement. These results indicated that teachers with more experience were more dissatisfied with advancement than their counterparts with less experience. Teachers who were teaching humanities/social science subjects were also satisfied with advancement.

Security: Only two teachers' demographic characteristics were found to be related to security--marital status negatively and teaching experience positively. However, only teaching experience contributed significantly to teacher satisfaction with security. Multiple regression analysis suggested that teachers with more experience tended to be more satisfied with security than their counterparts with less experience.

Recognition: Correlational analysis showed age and teaching experience to be negatively related to recognition, suggesting that younger teachers were relatively more satisfied with recognition than older teachers. And more experienced teachers exhibited more satisfaction with recognition than teachers with less experience. However, none of these demographic characteristics entered in the regression equation.

Discussion

Generally, the findings of this study provide support for the hypothesis that teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics are related to teacher job

satisfaction. Both correlational and multiple regression analyses showed demographic characteristics to be significantly related to teachers' satisfaction with different aspects of their job. However, support for the hypothesis was limited. It is manifested in the magnitudes of correlation coefficients and explained variance that are very low. However, several potentially important relationships were found between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction. The correlational analysis revealed age to be negatively related to working conditions, advancement and recognition. Only one study could be located that reported somewhat similar findings to this study. Law (1955), in her interview of teachers aged 50 and over, noted that teachers expressed concern and dissatisfaction with non-promotion, lack of recognition and loss of status in their professional careers. Previous research relating teachers' age to job satisfaction can be broadly classified in two groups. One group of researchers reported no relationship between teachers' age and job satisfaction (Lipka and Goulet, 1979; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979; Davis, 1981; Oades, 1983; LoFland, 1984; and Ronnenkamp, 1984).

The other group reported age to be positively related to job satisfaction (Hoppock, 1935; Trusty and Sergiovanni, 1966; Belasco and Alutto, 1972; Sweeney, 1980, and 1981; Madved, 1982; Anderson and Iwanicki, 1984; and Galloway *et al.*, 1985). Findings from this study do not concur with the

findings of either group. Findings from this study indicated a relationship between age and teacher job satisfaction which varies from the findings of group one, which reported no relationship between age and job satisfaction. Similarly, the findings of this study contradict the second group. Many possible reasons exist for these findings. One possible explanation could be that older and younger teachers differ in their needs and professional aspirations. Kuhlen and Johnson (1952) provided relevant data. They noted that younger teachers had a stronger need for achievement, whereas the need for power was a strong motive in older teachers. Probably the needs and aspiration of older teachers are not fulfilled in the job situation, thus they express dissatisfaction with their job. Older teachers' dissatisfaction with recognition can be explained in terms of older teachers "feeling that they are not as useful as much as they were once" (Herzberg, 1957) and need more attention to revitalize the feeling that they are still useful. But if they are not given due attention and recognition, they become dissatisfied. Dissatisfaction of older teachers with advancement is self-explanatory. Since the teaching profession offers little opportunity for concrete advancement, such as changes in status or position, older teachers' dissatisfaction with advancement is understandable. Their dissatisfaction with working conditions can be explained in terms of their physical conditions. They feel the pressure more than they did when

younger (Herzberg, 1957), and seek more comfort. The working conditions in school might not suit their biological needs, and thus cause dissatisfaction among older teachers.

Multiple regression analysis, however, shows age to be the only significant predictor of teacher satisfaction with working conditions. These findings suggest that age *per se* may not be a significant contributor to teacher job satisfaction. Other factors such as teaching experience, job tenure and education level may affect the relationship between age and job satisfaction. This is evident from intercorrelations between age and other demographic characteristics. The older teachers were also more experienced, tenured and more educated.

The findings from this study indicate women to be more satisfied than men with colleagues, responsibility and work itself. These results provide partial support for earlier studies (Sergiovanni, 1967; Belasco and Alutto, 1972; Lortie, 1975; NEA, 1980; and Birminghan, 1984) that female teachers were more satisfied with their jobs than their male counterparts. Data do not provide information concerning female teachers' satisfaction with their jobs. Many possibilities exist. It is possible that "women seem to achieve more status in teaching than men" (Ornstein, 1981), getting more exposure and recognition and feeling more satisfied with their jobs. Another possibility for female satisfaction is that their needs are fairly met/fulfilled in job situation. Sergiovanni (1966) provides evidence of this

by indicating that female teachers were more satisfied with the opportunity their job provides for meeting social, esteem, autonomy and self-actualization needs. Male teachers are dissatisfied because they have more opportunities in the job market, with a wider range of professional choices (Ornstein, 1981), and feel underutilized (Miskel, 1973). Their job aspirations exceed that of female teachers (Sergiovanni, 1966), and teaching may not adequately meet their professional expectations, provide no means for fulfilling professional aspirations (Lipka and Goulet, 1979). Or it may be simply that male and female teachers differ in their work attitudes (Miskel, 1973).

The education level of teachers was positively related to responsibility and to work itself. It appears that more-educated teachers derive greater satisfaction from their jobs with respect to responsibility and work itself than their less-educated counterparts. The multiple regression analysis, however, showed education to be the only significant predictor of responsibility. These results are contradictory to what Goodson (1984) reported. He found no relationship between education and teacher job satisfaction. Taylor (1986) also reported no difference in teachers' job satisfaction holding M.A. and B.A. degrees. The findings of this study lend support to the findings of Glenn and Weaver (1982), who found a positive relationship between education and work satisfaction. This point of view suggests that education increases work satisfaction by increasing the

rewards of the work. Mottaz (1984) in a study examined the relationship between education and work satisfaction. His findings indicated that education has an indirect positive effect, but a direct negative effect on overall work satisfaction. That is, education increased work satisfaction when it led to intrinsic work rewards, but it significantly reduced work satisfaction when it did not lead to greater intrinsic rewards. The only possible explanation for more-educated teachers' satisfaction with responsibility is that because of their higher qualifications they may be awarded more responsibility and may be allowed to take part in policy and decision-making activities, hence they appear to derive greater satisfaction from their job with respect to responsibility. There is evidence that the more teachers perceive themselves to be participants in decision making, the more they become satisfied with their jobs (Belasco and Alutto, 1972; Sweeney, 1981).

Previous research relating teachers' teaching experience and job satisfaction suggested two view points. One group of researchers showed more experienced teachers to be satisfied with their jobs, while another group found no relationship between teaching experience and job satisfaction. Findings from this study suggest that the more-experienced are both satisfied and dissatisfied. They expressed satisfaction with security, but exhibited dissatisfaction with advancement opportunities. Similarly, the employment status correlated positively with security,

but correlated negatively with pay and advancement. Lortie's (1975) observation put these findings in perspective. Lortie (1975) stated that teaching is an unstaged, unstructured and front-loaded profession. That is, the lack of career stages in teaching provide limited opportunity for upward mobility, and the long service and job tenure bring with them a limited salary increase. These findings contradict what Quinn *et al.* (1974) reported: that tenured teachers exhibited a higher level of satisfaction. However, partial support for Quinn's finding can be found in a positive relationship between tenure and security. The finding that non-tenured teachers are dissatisfied with security provides support for Sergiovanni's (1967) finding. He found that non-tenured teachers were dissatisfied with security. New teachers without tenure are concerned about what administrators think of their performance. Being inexperienced, they have to prove that they are good enough to be offered the security of tenure (Sergiovanni, 1967).

Findings from this study show that mathematics/science teachers are dissatisfied with pay. Their dissatisfaction is understandable because of greater demand for their services, hence increased employability in the market, they have better chances of getting a well-paid job. Bromley (1981) provides relevant data to support this explanation. He reported that mathematics/science teachers, attracted by better-paying jobs, are leaving the teaching profession in large numbers. The data also indicated that

humanities/social science teachers were satisfied with advancement. This finding is difficult to explain, but Bromley (1981) may provide some explanation. Bromley finds that mathematics/science teachers defect from teaching. If this holds true for all U.S. mathematics/science teachers, then, promotions if any, remain available only for humanities/social science teachers, because they remain longer in teaching and are hence satisfied with advancement.

School size showed a positive relationship with working conditions. These results suggest that teachers in large schools are more satisfied with working conditions than their counterparts in small and medium-sized schools. Possibly, the working conditions in large schools are relatively better, hence their teachers expressed satisfaction with working conditions.

School location showed a positive relationship with pay. It appears that teachers in urban schools are more satisfied with pay than their counterparts in rural schools. This finding is at variance with the findings of Hughey and Murphey (1982). They found rural teachers to be satisfied with their salaries. It should be noted, however, that their sample was comprised of only rural teachers. Possibly, teachers in urban schools are better-paid, which causes satisfaction. However, no objective data are available to support this explanation; thus, this explanation is only speculative.

The foregoing discussion indicates that demographic characteristics are significantly related to different aspects of teacher job satisfaction. However, the magnitudes of correlations and explained variance remained very low. Only two of the eleven independent variables entered into any prediction equation. Thus the hypothesis concerning the relationship between demographic characteristics and job satisfaction received limited support.

The preceding discussion indicated that teachers possessing different backgrounds experienced a different level of satisfaction with respect to different aspects of the job. However, the results in table 4.5 indicate that teachers scored higher on all other aspects of their job, but scored lower on pay and advancement. It appears that teachers as a whole experience more satisfaction with their jobs, but were somewhat dissatisfied with their pay and opportunities for advancement. These findings lend additional support to the studies (Spivak, 1983; Birmingham, 1984; Nevels, 1984; Sylvia and Hutchison, 1985; and Taylor, 1986) that have reported teachers to be dissatisfied with pay and advancement.

Conclusions

The conclusions that were drawn from the findings of this study appear as general conclusions and specific conclusions.

General Conclusions

1) The first general conclusion that could be drawn from the findings of this study is that both organizational climate and demographic characteristics are significantly related to teacher job satisfaction as perceived by public secondary school teachers. The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction, however, appeared to be relatively stronger than the relationship of demographic characteristics and job satisfaction. This reinforces the findings by Herman and Hulin (1972), Herman *et al.* (1975), and Newman (1975), studies conducted in settings other than schools, that both personal and organizational characteristics are related to employee job attitudes. But the relationship of organizational characteristics and job attitudes is stronger than the relationship between personal characteristics and job attitudes. This conclusion also substantiated Dodge's (1982) conclusion that both organizational and personal characteristics are related to teachers' job satisfaction. However, the perceived organizational characteristics were much more important to public school teachers' feelings of satisfaction with their jobs than personal factors were.

2) The more engaged, intimate, supportive, and less-frustrated and directive the organizational climate was perceived to be by the teachers, the more satisfied were teachers in that school.

3) Generally, teachers were more satisfied with supervision, colleagues, working conditions responsibility, work itself, security and recognition, but were less satisfied with pay and advancement. This corroborates the earlier findings of Spivak (1983), Birmingham (1984), Nevels (1984), Sylvia and Hutchison (1985) and Taylor (1986) that teachers were dissatisfied with pay and advancement. Also corroborated were Burke (1982), and Litt and Turk (1985) who found that teachers expressed dissatisfaction with pay. And this further corroborated the findings of Oades (1983) and Chase (1985) who declared that teachers were dissatisfied with prospects of advancement.

4) All demographic characteristics were found to be related to at least one of the job satisfaction factors. Two demographic characteristics, sex and teaching experience, however, stand out as significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction. Sex of the respondent was found to be negatively related to teacher satisfaction with colleagues, responsibility and work itself, indicating that female teachers were more

satisfied with colleagues, responsibility and work itself than their male counterparts. Teaching experience was found to be significantly but negatively related to advancement and recognition, but positively related to security. Thus, experienced teachers tended to express more satisfaction with security than those with less experience, but were less satisfied with advancement and recognition than their less-experienced counterparts.

Specific Conclusions

The following specific conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1) Supervision, work itself and recognition were positively related to engaged and supportive dimensions, as perceived by teachers. Teachers expressed satisfaction with supervision, work itself and recognition in school climates where teachers perceived themselves to have a high morale and confidence in each other. These climates were further distinguished by trust in themselves and their students, and enjoyment of work with each other. Additional positive features of these climates were that principals were perceived by teachers to be concerned with task accomplishment, as well as the faculty's professional and social needs. Principals,

moreover, motivated teachers by working hard themselves and setting examples.

2) Teachers tended to be satisfied with colleagues in school climates described as high in engaged and intimate teacher behavior. That is, where teachers perceived themselves to have confidence in each other, enjoy working with each other and be concerned with students' success, and where teachers had close friendships with each other and socialized regularly.

3) Working conditions were described as satisfying for teachers in a school climate where teachers perceived themselves as woven into a cohesive network of social relationships and were close friends with each other.

4) Responsibility was perceived to be dissatisfying for teachers in school climates where teachers felt themselves distracted from the basic task of teaching because of faculty and administrators' annoying manners, with too much paper work and other excessive not teaching assignments.

5) In School climates described by teachers as high on directive principal behavior (that is, where the principal closely controlled and monitored teachers' activities, adopting a rigid and domineering supervisory style) the teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the work itself.

6) The job satisfaction factor of security was negatively related to the frustrated dimension of organizational climate as perceived by teachers. This suggested that teachers tended to exhibit dissatisfaction with security in a school climate where they felt themselves variously distracted from their basic task of teaching, or burdened with excessive non-teaching duties and with too much paper work, or irritated by the mannerisms of other faculty and administrators.

7) The teachers expressed satisfaction with recognition in climates where they worked in an atmosphere of trust and confidence, enjoying work with each other and with students. However, they expressed dissatisfaction with recognition in climates characterized by a lack of cohesive social relationships and teachers who were not close friends.

8) Female teachers tended to exhibit more satisfaction with respect to colleagues, responsibility and work itself then their male counterparts.

9) In terms of age of the respondents, teachers 20 to 49 years old were more satisfied with respect to working conditions than their counterparts 50 and over.

10) Less-experienced teachers were more satisfied with respect to advancement and recognition than more-experienced teachers, and teachers with more experience were satisfied with security than their counterparts with less experience.

11) In terms of educational level, the respondents who held Masters' and higher degrees tended to exhibit more satisfaction with responsibility than their counterparts with less educational qualifications.

12) In terms of school size, the teachers from large schools were more satisfied with respect to working conditions than their counterparts from small and medium-sized schools.

13) Concerning the location of the school, teachers from urban schools were more satisfied with pay than those from rural schools.

Implications

From the findings of this study it appears that in more positively perceived climates teachers experienced greater job satisfaction. More specifically, the findings suggest that principals perceived by teachers as facilitating task accomplishment, taking interest in their welfare and professional development and setting an example by working hard themselves, teachers in that climate experienced satisfaction with certain aspects of their job. Conversely, in climates where teachers perceive their principals as being too rigid and domineering in their supervisory style,

lack confidence and trust in teachers and closely monitor and control teachers' activities, the teachers expressed dissatisfaction with certain aspects of their job. The correlation does not imply causality, yet, administrator-teacher rapport within school, and principal behavior in relation to teacher job satisfaction needs careful consideration. When salary and other extrinsic rewards are largely fixed and subject to little meaningful manipulation (Chapman, 1983) it becomes all the more important for administrators to be aware of the importance of their supervisory styles in relation to teacher job satisfaction. The importance of principals' in relation to teacher job satisfaction has been documented in other studies (Grassie, and Carss, 1973; Kunz and Hoy, 1976; Craig, 1979; Litt and Turk, 1985). There is also evidence to suggest that among the most frequently teacher cited sources of stress and reasons for leaving teaching are those related to the principal (Boland and Selby, 1980). Teachers believe that they alone are responsible for running their classrooms and that to do so successfully need maximum autonomy and independence (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz and Smylie, 1984). Such autonomy has been shown to be significantly related to teacher satisfaction in the work place (Kries and Brockopp, 1986). When the perceived autonomy seems to be in jeopardy as these data indicate by principals' close supervision and controlling teacher activities, teachers expressed dissatisfaction with their work. A principal who is

supportive, creates an environment of mutual trust and confidence, allows for greater autonomy and freedom for teachers, provides opportunities for teachers' involvement in decisions and awards more responsibility to teachers may enhance the likelihood of greater teacher job satisfaction. Nonetheless, a distinction between increasing the number of tasks and increasing responsibility (Kaiser, 1982) should be made. Giving excessive non-teaching and routine duties is frustrating for teachers and construed by teachers as distraction from basic task of teaching and unnecessary busy work. The data are clear on this point, that teachers should be awarded responsibility that is meaningful and allows for skills acquisition and professional development. Furthermore the results suggest that climates where teachers perceive themselves and their colleagues as having a high morale, a sense of trust and confidence in themselves and their students, enjoyment of working each other, and a sense of being a cohesive group in terms of social relationship was also associated with satisfaction for teachers in that school. This clearly points to the importance of collegial relations among teachers. The principal who assumes the responsibility of an interaction facilitator could foster a collegial setting. The collegial settings foster teacher skill acquisition and development and provide a forum for social support and on going professional development (Rosenholtz and Smylie, 1984).

Furthermore, the findings from this study that teachers on the whole are dissatisfied with pay and advancement should be a serious concern of educators. Teacher job satisfaction is closely associated with teacher attrition (Litt and Turk, 1985). Teaching has traditionally been an easy exit and reentry career (Rosenholtz and Smylie, 1984) and one with extremely high turnover (Charters, 1970; and Lortie, 1975). According to Charters (1970) 62% of the teachers leave teaching within five years. The teaching profession cannot afford the luxury of loosing already existing talented teachers, specifically when its capacity to recruit, select and retain teachers of high academic ability is rapidly diminishing (Rosenholtz and Smylie, 1986). Teacher attrition clearly indicated that teachers who intend to leave teaching cited more frequently the lack of opportunities for professional growth and advancement (Bredeson *et al.*, 1983; Chapman and Hutcheson, 1982 and Litt an Turk, 1985) and inadequate salary (Chapman and Hutcheson, 1982; Chapman, 1983; and Litt and Turk, 1985) as specific reasons for leaving teaching. And individuals who do not choose teaching as a career frequently mentioned low salaries and low occupational status as major reasons for seeking alternatives (Page and Page, 1982; Roberson, Keith and Page, 1983). Increased opportunities for professional advancement must be provided if teachers are to experience more job satisfaction. Increasing hierarchical structure of teaching as suggested by Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) or

career ladders notion proposed by Rosenholtz and Smylie (1984) provide excellent guidelines for enhancing advancement opportunities for teachers. Similarly, teachers' salaries have to be raised if teachers are to experience satisfaction.

The findings that teachers with different backgrounds react differently to different aspects of their job, have important implications. In any attempt to improve teacher job satisfaction, the personal characteristics of teachers must be carefully considered. Prior to bring changes in any job aspect in efforts to improve or increase teacher job satisfaction, input from different strata of teacher population may prove beneficial.

The finding that female teachers are satisfied with their jobs is encouraging. But at the same time, the data indicate that male teachers are dissatisfied is disappointing and requires a careful consideration. Specifically, at a time when more men are gradually entering the teaching profession (Ornstein, 1981), efforts should focus on to improve job characteristics in order to make teaching more attractive for talented male population and retain those already in the profession. The data clearly indicate that male teachers derive less satisfaction from the work, colleagues and opportunities for responsibility. To increase job satisfaction of male teacher population, they should be awarded more responsibilities and greater freedom and autonomy to carry out these responsibilities.

Furthermore, an atmosphere of trust, confidence and cooperation should be fostered, where teachers can interact with each other. The older, more experienced and teachers with tenure derive less satisfaction from pay, advancement and recognition their job provides. Career advancement, salary increases and greater opportunity for recognition or approval by administrators and colleagues may increase the likelihood of job satisfaction of this teacher population. The finding that more educated teachers experience greater satisfaction with their work and opportunities for responsibility their job provides, is a sign of relief. However, we should not loose sight of the fact that education has indirect positive effect on job satisfaction, but more direct negative effect on job satisfaction (Mottaz, 1984). Education, as long as leads to intrinsic rewards, creates satisfaction but dissatisfaction accrues when it fails to lead to such intrinsic rewards. Administrators should be cognizant of the concerns of more educated teachers and efforts should be made to sustain more educated teachers' existing level of job satisfaction by providing them greater responsibility and autonomy to carry out their responsibilities.

Science teachers dissatisfaction with their salaries should be a serious concern of educators. At times, when greater emphasis is being placed on science and mathematics education at high school level, the importance of science teachers' satisfaction and retention becomes quite evident.

In short, different segments of teacher population differ in the importance they place on different aspects of the job. And experience a varying degree/level of satisfaction with difference aspects of the job. In order to make teachers' job pleasant and satisfying, the concerns of each segment of teacher population must be carefully considered. Otherwise, the efforts to improve teacher job satisfaction will not bring desired consequences, rather may further complicate the problem.

Recommendations Regarding Instruments

1) The reliability of one's findings is closely linked to the quality of instruments used. The instruments used in this study have been carefully designed, and their validity and reliability have been established. However, some of their dimensions/factors though acceptable, fell short of adequate reliabilities. The frustrate dimension, in OCDQ-RS, and recognition, security, work itself and responsibility factors, in TJSQ, had reliabilities less than .70. The reliability coefficients reported are alpha coefficients, which tend to increase as the number of items increase. In order to increase the reliability of these factors, the number of items in each factor should be increased. The researcher will run the risk of low response rate; nonetheless, it is

worth the risk of losing some respondents rather than using less reliable instruments.

2) The OCDQ-RS is limited in its scope and coverage. It is limited to social and/or interpersonal relations between teachers and teachers, teachers and students and teachers and principals. In order to capture the essence of secondary school organizational climate, it needs to be expanded to include reward and structure dimensions.

3) The TJSQ somewhat indirectly measures teacher job satisfaction. Rather than ask how satisfied a teacher is, this measure gauged the degree of agreement/disagreement with the statements related to job satisfaction. To obtain a clear picture of teachers' satisfaction with different aspects of their job, a direct measure would be more fruitful.

4) Generally, the intercorrelations between organizational climate dimensions and intercorrelations between job satisfaction factors were low, indicating that factors are independent of each other. However, the supervision had a high intercorrelation with working conditions and recognition. The items in these factors clearly need to be revised to ensure their independence so that the degree of satisfaction of teachers with

each factor could be established independent of the other.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are suggested for further research:

1) A replication study using a large sample of schools and teachers is highly desirable to determine whether these findings hold.

2) This study was cross-sectional in nature, that is, the data were collected at a particular point in time. In such a design, it is not clear whether teachers' perceptions regarding organizational climate and job satisfaction are stable. Thus, systematic longitudinal studies should be conducted to examine whether the problems identified are stable, or simply artifacts of the particular time the surveys were administered.

3) Perceptual measure was employed in this study to assess organizational climate of schools. Further research, concomitant to perceptual measures, should employ as much objective data as possible to validate perceptual information.

4) This study was designed to determine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Relationship studies do not indicate cause and effect. Further research should

investigate causal association between organizational climate and job satisfaction.

5) This study should be extended to determine whether there is a significant relationship between organizational climate, job satisfaction and job performance.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Letters

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH INVOLVING
HUMAN SUBJECTS (UCRIHS)
250 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
(517) 355-2180

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1046

September 15, 1987

Mr. Rasul B. Raisani
Educational Administration

Dear Mr. Raisani:

Subject: Proposal Entitled, "A Study of Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction as Perceived by the Teachers in Selected Michigan Public Secondary Schools"

UCRIHS' review of the above referenced project has now been completed. I am pleased to advise that the rights and welfare of the human subjects appear to be adequately protected and the Committee, therefore, approved this project at its meeting on September 14, 1987.

You are reminded that UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year. If you plan to continue this project beyond one year, please make provisions for obtaining appropriate UCRIHS approval prior to September 14, 1988.

Any changes in procedures involving human subjects must be reviewed by the UCRIHS prior to initiation of the change. UCRIHS must also be notified promptly of any problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects during the course of the work.

Thank you for bringing this project to our attention. If we can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

Henry E. Bredeck, Ph.D.
Chairman, UCRIHS

HEB/jms

cc: Dr. John H. Suehr

1418 G Spartan Village
East Lansing MI. 48823

Dr. Paula Lester
Long Island University
School of Education
Greenvale, N. Y. 11548

Dear Dr. Lester,

This letter is a follow up of our phone conversation on Monday, March 3rd, 1987. The purpose of this letter is to seek permission to use the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) for my Ph. D. Dissertation study conducted under the direction of department of Educational Administration at Michigan State University.

The purpose of this doctoral study is to determine the relationship that may exist between organizational climate of public secondary schools and teachers' job satisfaction as perceived by Michigan public secondary school teachers, and also to determine the relationship of teachers' selected demographic characteristics to organizational climate and job satisfaction.

I would highly appreciate if you would please send me an authorization letter to use the questionnaire along with manual for instrument containing a copy of the questionnaire with instructions, scoring procedures, number and specification of items to each factor, reliability coefficients and statement about the validity of the instrument.

I would also appreciate to provide any current information concerning the instrument, its reliability and/or validity that you may have.

I would be happy to send you a summary of the findings of the study if you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

Rasul B. Raisani
Ph.D. Candidate

C.W. POST CAMPUS

Long Island University

Greenvale, New York 11548
Telephone 516-299-2244

School of Education
Department of Educational
Leadership and Administration

March 30, 1987

Mr. Rasul Raisani
1418 G Spartan Village
East Lansing, MI 48823

Dear Mr. Raisani:

Thank you very much for your interest in the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire that I developed and validated. You have my permission to use the questionnaire with the Michigan public secondary school teachers to determine the relationship between organizational climate and teachers' job satisfaction.

Please remember that the TJSQ is a copyright document and make the appropriate references in your dissertation.

The instructions, scoring, number and specification of items to each factor, reliability and validity information are all available in my dissertation.

I wish you the best of luck with your study. I would greatly appreciate a copy of your raw data and findings.

Please feel free to contact me if I may be of any assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Paula E. Lester

Paula E. Lester, Ph.D.

August 18, 1987

Dear Principal:

I need your help and cooperation in connection with a doctoral study I am planning. The purpose of this doctoral study is to determine the relationship of organizational climate of public secondary schools as perceived by the teachers, and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teachers job satisfaction.

The most important step in the data-gathering process is the selection of a representative sample. The data for this study will be collected from sampled school teachers through the use of the organizational climate description questionnaire--Revised Scale (OCDQ-RS) for public secondary schools. This questionnaire will measure school climate. The teacher job satisfaction questionnaire (TJSQ) will be used to measure teacher job satisfaction.

Your school is one of a randomly selected sample of area schools. I would greatly appreciate your help and cooperation in providing me with a list of teachers at your school. Use of this list will allow me to select a scientifically-based, representative sample of teachers to study.

No individual teacher or school will, in any way, be identified in the study. The data will be analyzed collectively for sampled schools and teachers as groups. Confidentiality for both the faculty and school is assured.

The satisfaction of teachers is critical for the optimal functioning of schools. The satisfaction that teachers derive from teaching is an integral part of school effectiveness in reaching its goals. The results of this study will be helpful in identifying the degree of teachers satisfaction with different facets of the job.

Changes and improvements in job factors and/or school conditions may occur as a result of the findings of this study. They will contribute to schools' effectiveness.

I will be happy to send you an abstract of the study if you desire. Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

RASUL B. RAISANI

September 13, 1987

Dear Professional Colleague:

May I extend my deepest appreciation for your taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of my doctoral study is to determine the relationship of the organizational climate of public secondary schools, and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction.

The attached survey instrument is concerned with the level of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction a teacher may express with different facets of his/her job. Such information can only be gained with your cooperation by completing this survey instrument. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. However, I particularly desire to obtain your response because your experience as a teacher in responding to the items in the instrument will contribute significantly toward identifying the level of teacher satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction with different facets of the job.

The results of this study will help in the efforts to improve the conditions of different facets of the job in ensuring a high level of teacher job satisfaction.

Other phases of this study cannot be carried out until I complete analysis of survey data. Therefore, I would appreciate it, if you would take a few moments of your valuable time to complete the enclosed survey instrument and return it in the self-addressed stamped enveloped enclosed.

May I assure you that no individual response will be identifiable. Your response will be kept in strict confidence. The data will be analyzed collectively for sample schools and teachers as groups. Confidentiality for both the school and faculty is assured.

I would be pleased to send you a summary of the survey results if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

RASUL B. RAISANI

September 13, 1987

Dear Professional Colleague:

May I extend my deepest appreciation for your taking the time to participate in this study. The purpose of my doctoral study is to determine the relationship of the organizational climate of public secondary schools, and teachers' and schools' selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction.

The attached survey instrument is concerned with identifying the conditions of the internal environment of schools. I hope I can gain this information with your cooperation. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. However, I would particularly like to obtain your response because your first-hand knowledge and experience in identifying the conditions of school internal environments will contribute significantly toward solving some of the problems we are encountering in this area of education.

The results of this study will help to provide a criterion to be used for developing better courses of action for improving the conditions of school environments and ensuring a high level of teacher job satisfaction.

Other phases of this study cannot be carried out until I complete analysis of survey instrument. Therefore, I would appreciate it, if you would take a few moments of your valuable time to complete the enclosed survey instrument and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelop enclosed.

May I assure you that no individual response will be identifiable. Your response will be kept in strict confidence. The data will be analyzed collectively for sample schools and teachers as groups. Confidentiality for both the school and faculty is assured.

I would be pleased to send you a summary of the survey results if you desire. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

RASUL B. RAISANI

October 20, 1987

Dear professional colleague

I mailed you a survey on September 13, followed by a letter on October 5, requesting you to complete and return the survey to assist me in my doctoral study.

As you know, other phases of the research cannot be carried out until I complete analysis of the data. But for meaningful analysis and for the findings to be conclusive enough to be generalized to a larger population. I need a high response rate. This is only possible with your help and cooperation. Hence, once again, I am asking the favor.

Quite frankly, this is an appeal to my fellow members in the profession of Education. I am enclosing a copy of the survey for your convenience. Please take a few moments of your time to complete and return this survey in return self-addressed envelop enclosed.

Once again be assured of the confidentiality of your responses. No individual or school will be identified in this study.

In case you already have mailed the survey. Please discard this letter and accept my thanks for your help. Perhaps, I can return the favor to you some day.

Sincerely,

Rasul B. Raisani

APPENDIX B

Survey Instruments

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please place a check mark to the right of the appropriate category:

1. AGE:

20 - 29 Years	1. _____
30 - 39 Years	2. _____
40 - 49 Years	3. _____
50 and over	4. _____

2. SEX:

Male	1. _____
Female	2. _____

3. MARITAL STATUS:

Married	1. _____
Single	2. _____
Divorced/widowed	3. _____

4. EDUCATION:

B.A/S.	1. _____
B.A/S with some College Education	2. _____
M.A/S.	3. _____
Educational Specialist/ ED.D. or Ph.D.	4. _____
Other (Please specify)	5. _____

5. TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

0 - 5 Years	1. _____
6 - 10 Years	2. _____
11 - 15 Years	3. _____
15 and over	4. _____

6. NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT:

Tenured	1. _____
Non-Tenured	2. _____

7. SUBJECT(S) YOU TEACH:

1. Art/Music _____
2. English _____
3. Foreign Language _____
4. Home Economics/Industrial Arts _____
5. Mathematics _____
6. Science _____
7. Physical Education _____
8. Social Studies _____
9. Humanities/Social Sciences _____
10. History _____
11. Biology _____
12. Physics _____
13. Chemistry _____
14. Sociology _____
15. Economics _____
16. Political Science _____
17. Psychology _____
18. Geography _____
19. Other(s) Please Specify _____

Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Directions: The following statements refer to organizational factors that can influence the way a teacher feels about his/her job. These factors are related to teaching and to the individual's perception of the job situation. When answering the following statements, circle the numeral which represents the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement. Please do not identify yourself on this instrument.

Key:	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral (neither disagree nor agree)	Agree	Strongly agree

1. Teaching provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Teacher income is adequate for normal expenses.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Teaching provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Insufficient income keeps me from living the way I want to live.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My immediate supervisor turns one teacher against another.	1	2	3	4	5
6. No one tells me that I am a good teacher	1	2	3	4	5
7. The work of a teacher consists of routine activities.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am not getting ahead in my present teaching position.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Working conditions in my school can be improved.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I receive recognition from my immediate supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions.	1	2	3	4	5

Key:	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral (neither disagree nor agree)	Agree	Strongly agree

12. My immediate supervisor offers suggestions to improve teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Teaching provides for a secure future.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I receive full recognition for my successful teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I get along well with my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The administration in my school does not clearly define its policies.	1	2	3	4	5
17. My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Working conditions in my school are comfortable.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Teaching provides me the opportunity to help my students learn.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I like the people with whom I work.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Teaching provides limited opportunities for advancement.	1	2	3	4	5
22. My students respect me as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I am afraid of losing my teaching job.	1	2	3	4	5
24. My immediate supervisor does not back me up.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Teaching is very interesting work.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Working conditions in my school could not be worse.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Teaching discourages originality.	1	2	3	4	5
28. The administration in my school communicates its policies well.	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral (neither disagree nor agree)	Agree	Strongly agree

29. I never feel secure in my teaching job.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Teaching does not provide me the chance to develop new methods.	1	2	3	4	5
31. My immediate supervisor treats everyone equitably.	1	2	3	4	5
32. My colleagues stimulate me to do better work.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Teaching provides an opportunity for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I am responsible for planning my daily lessons.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Physical surroundings in my school are unpleasant.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I am well paid in proportion to my ability.	1	2	3	4	5
37. My colleagues are highly critical of one another.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I do have responsibility for my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
39. My colleagues provide me with suggestions or feedback about my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
40. My immediate supervisor provides assistance for improving instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I do not get cooperation from the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Teaching encourages me to be creative.	1	2	3	4	5
43. My immediate supervisor is not willing to listen to suggestions.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Teacher income is barely enough to live on.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I am indifferent toward teaching.	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral (neither disagree nor agree)	Agree	Strongly agree

46. The work of a teacher is very pleasant.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I receive too many meaningless instructions from my immediate supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I dislike the people with whom I work.	1	2	3	4	5
49. I receive too little recognition.	1	2	3	4	5
50. Teaching provides a good opportunity for advancement.	1	2	3	4	5
51. My interests are similar to those of my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
52. I am not responsible for my actions.	1	2	3	4	5
53. My immediate supervisor makes available the material I need to do my best.	1	2	3	4	5
54. I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
55. Working conditions in my school are good.	1	2	3	4	5
56. My immediate supervisor makes me feel uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5
57. Teacher income is less than I deserve.	1	2	3	4	5
58. I try to be aware of the policies of my school.	1	2	3	4	5
59. When I teach a good lesson, my immediate supervisor notices.	1	2	3	4	5
60. My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me.	1	2	3	4	5
61. Teaching provides me with financial security.	1	2	3	4	5
62. My immediate supervisor praises good teaching.	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral (neither disagree nor agree)	Agree	Strongly agree

63. I am not interested in the policies of my school.	1	2	3	4	5	
64. I get along well with my students.	1	2	3	4	5	
65. Pay compares with similar jobs in other school districts.	1	2	3	4	5	
66. My colleagues seem unreasonable to me.	1	2	3	4	5	

OCDQ-RS
Secondary School Inventory

The statements below have no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested in your frank perceptions regarding these statements. Your responses will remain anonymous and no individual or school will be named in the report of this research. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Instructions: Following are some statements about the school setting. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement. Circle only one response for each statement.

	Rarely occurs	Sometime occurs	Often occurs	Very frequently occurs
1. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.	1. RO	SO	OO	VFO
2. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.	2. RO	SO	OO	VFO
3. The morale of the teachers is high.	3. RO	SO	OO	VFO
4. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.	4. RO	SO	OO	VFO
5. Teachers have too many committee requirements.	5. RO	SO	OO	VFO
6. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.	6. RO	SO	OO	VFO
7. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.	7. RO	SO	OO	VFO
8. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.	8. RO	SO	OO	VFO
9. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.	9. RO	SO	OO	VFO
10. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.	10. RO	SO	OO	VFO
11. Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis.	11. RO	SO	OO	VFO
12. Student government has an influence on school policy.	12. RO	SO	OO	VFO
13. Assigned non-teaching duties are excessive.	13. RO	SO	OO	VFO
14. Teachers help and support each other.	14. RO	SO	OO	VFO
15. Teachers are proud of their school.	15. RO	SO	OO	VFO

	Rarely occurs	Sometime occurs	Often occurs	Very frequently occurs
16. Teachers really enjoy working here.	16. RO	SO	OO	VFO
17. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.	17. RO	SO	OO	VFO
18. Teachers are friendly with students.	18. RO	SO	OO	VFO
19. Pupils are trusted to work together without supervision.	19. RO	SO	OO	VFO
20. The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers.	20. RO	SO	OO	VFO
21. Pupils solve their problems through logical reasoning.	21. RO	SO	OO	VFO
22. The principal sets an example by working hard himself/herself.	22. RO	SO	OO	VFO
23. The principal uses constructive criticism.	23. RO	SO	OO	VFO
24. The principal rules with an iron fist.	24. RO	SO	OO	VFO
25. The principal explain his/her reasons for criticism to teachers.	25. RO	SO	OO	VFO
26. The principal closely checks teacher activities.	26. RO	SO	OO	VFO
27. The principal compliments teachers.	27. RO	SO	OO	VFO
28. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the faculty.	28. RO	SO	OO	VFO
29. The principal is available after school to help teachers when assistance is needed.	29. RO	SO	OO	VFO
30. The pincipal is autocratic.	30. RO	SO	OO	VFO
31. Teacher-principal conferences are dominated by the principal.	31. RO	SO	OO	VFO
32. The principal supervises teachers closely.	32. RO	SO	OO	VFO
33. The principal moniotors everything teachers do.	33. RO	SO	OO	VFO
34. The principal talks more than listens.	34. RO	SO	OO	VFO

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. S., Inequity in Social Exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Adams, J. S., Toward an Understanding of Inequity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67 (1963): 422-463.

Amaee, S., and Gruneberg, M. M., Students' Knowledge of and Attitudes to, the Research Role of Lecturer. Research in Education, 17 (1976): 77-82.

Amirtash, A. M., Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among Selected Male High School Physical Educators in the City of Tehran, Iran. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1982. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43-09 (1983): pp. 2924-A.

Anderson, C. S., The Search for School Climate: A Review of The Research. Review of Educational Research, 52 (1982): 368-420.

Anderson, M. G., and Iwanicki, E. F., Teacher Motivation and Its Relationship to Burnout. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20 (1984): 109-132.

Argyris, C., Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1958): 501-520.

Astin, A. W., and Holland, J. L., The Environmental Assessment Techniques: A Way to Measure College Environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 52 (1961): 308-316.

Babbie, E. R., Survey Research Methods. Belmont: California, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.

Barker, R. G., On The Nature of the Environment. Journal of social Issues, 19 (1963): 17-38.

Baugh, S. C., The Organizational Climate in The Secondary Schools of Alpine District, Provo: Brigham Young University, unpublished Master's Project, 1970.

Belasco, J. A. and Alutto, J. A., Decisional Participation and Teacher Stisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (1972) 44-58.

Binnie, D. G., The Relationship of Expectancy Work Motivation, Selected Situational Variables and Locus of Control to Teacher Job Satisfaction Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Southern Florida, 1984. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46-06 (1985) p. 1450-A.

Birmingham, J. A., Job Satisfaction and Burnout Among Minnesota Teachers. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1984. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45-08 (1985) p. 2318-A.

Boland, P. A., and Selby, T. J., Factors associated with career change among secondary school teachers: A review of the literature. Educational Research Quarterly, 5(1980):13-24.

Borg, W. R., and Gall, M. D., Educational Research: An Introduction: New York: Longman Inc., 1983.

Brayfield, A. H., and Rothe, H. F., An Index of Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 35 (1951): 307-311.

Bredeson, P. V., Fruth, M. J., and Kasten, K. L. Organizational incentives and secondary school teaching. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 16(1983): 52-56.

Brinkmeir, O. A., "The Relationship Between Organizational climate and Selected Teacher Characteristics and Behavior." Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation University of Minnesota, 1967.

Brodinsky, B., Teacher Morale: What builds It, What Kills It. Instructor, 5 (1984): 36-40.

Bromley, D. A. The fate of the seed corn. Science, 213(1981): 159.

Burke, J. S. Leadership Styles of School principals as predictors of organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1982. Dissertation Abstracts International 43-12(1983) pp. 3762-A.

Campbell, J. P., and Beaty, E. E., "Organizational Climate: Its Measurement and Relationship to Work Group performance." Paper Presented at the Meeting of The American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., September, 1971.(In James and Jones, 1974)

Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., III., and Weick, K. E., Jr., Managerial behavior, Performance, and effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Carrell, M. R., and Elbert, N. F., Some Personal and Organizational Determinants of Job Satisfaction of Postal Clerks. Academy of Management Journal, 16 (1974): 53-66.

Carver, F. D., and Sergiovanni, T. J., Complexity, Adaptability and Job Satisfaction in High Schools. The Journal of Educational Administration, 9 (1971):10-31.

Carver, F. D., and Sergiovanni, T. J., Some notes on the OCDQ. The Journal of Educational Administration 7 (1969): 78-81.

Chapman, D. W., A Model of the Influences on Teacher Retention. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1983): 43-49.

Chapman, D. W., and Hutcheson, S. M. Attrition from teaching careers: A discriminant analysis. American Educational Research, 19(1982): 93-105.

Chapman, D. W., Career Satisfaction of Teachers. Educational Research Quarterly, 7(1983): 40-50.

Charters, W. W., Jr. Some factors affecting teacher survival in school districts. American Educational Research Journal, 7(1970): 1-22.

Chase, C. I., Two Thousand Teachers View their Profession. Journal of Educational Research, 79(1985): 12-18.

Chase, F. S., Factors for satisfaction in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 33(1951): 127-132.

Cook, E. V., "Leadership Behavior of Elementary School Principals and the Organizational Climate of the Schools which They Administer." Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Rutgers: The State University, 1965. Dissertation Abstracts, 27(1966) p. 345-A.

Coughlan, R. J., Job Satisfaction in Relatively Close and Open Schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 7 (1971): 40-59.

Craig, L. V., "The Effects of Organizational Climate and Leadership Behavior on Teacher Job Satisfaction in Selected Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation North-Texas State University, 1979. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41-01(1980) p. 36-A.

Davis, F. W., Predictors of Overall job satisfaction among public school physical educators. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42-12 (1982) p. 5055-A.

Dodge, J. M. Perceived organizational and personal factors related to job satisfaction in public school teachers. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation University of Maryland, 1982. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44-06 (1983) p. 1730-A.

Donohue, J. D., The relationship of faculty perceptions of organizational climate to job satisfaction in selected Baccalaureate Schools of nursing. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1983. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44-01(1983) p. 84-A.

Downey, K. H., Hellriegel, D., Phelps, M., and Slocum, J. W. Jr., Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Analysis. Journal of Business Research, 2(1974): 233-248.

Downey, K. H., Hellriegel, D., and Slocum, J. W. Jr., Congruence Between Individual Needs, Organizational Climate Job Satisfaction and Performance. Academy of Management Journal, 18(1975): 149-155.

Drexler, J. A. Jr., Organizational Climate: Its Homogeneity Within Organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62 (1977): 38-42.

Driscoll, A., and Shirey, D. C., Job Satisfaction, Professional Concerns, and Communication Patterns of Teachers: Differences Along the Professional Continuum. Teacher Educator, 21 (1985): 2-14.

Dunnette, M. D.; Campbell, J. P., and Hakel, M. D., Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction in Six Occupational Groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 2 (1967): 143-174.

Erlandson, D. A., and Pastor, M. C., Teacher Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Alternatives--Directions for Principals. NASSP Bulletin, 65 (1981): 5-9.

Evan, W. M., Indices of Hierarchical Structure of Industrial Organization. Management Science, 9 (1963): 468-477.

Field, R. H. G., and Abelson, M. A., Climate: A Reconceptualization and Proposed Model. Human Relations, 35 (1982): 181-201.

Flagg, J. T., "The Organizational Climate of Schools: Its Relationship to Pupil Achievement, Size of School, and Teacher Turnover." Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Rutgers: The State University, 1964. Dissertation Abstracts International, 26(1965) pp. 818-819-A.

Forehand, G. A., and Gilmer, B. V. H., Environmental Variations in Studies of Organizational Behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 62 (1964): 361-382.

Fournet, G. P., Distefano, M. K., Jr., and Pryer, M. W., Job Satisfaction: Issues and Problems. Personnel Psychology, 19(1966): 165-183.

Friedlander, F., and Margulies, N., Multiple Impacts of Organizational Climate and Individual Value Systems upon Job Satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 22 (1969): 171-183.

Friesen, D., Aston Studies in Education. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1978.

Friesen, D., Variations in Perceptions of Organizational Climate. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 18 (1972): 91-99.

Friesen, D.; Holdaway, E. A., and Rice, A. W., Satisfaction of School Principals with Their Work. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19 (1983): 35-58.

Galloway, D.; Boswell, K.; Panckhurst, F.; Boswell, C. and Green, K., Sources of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction for New Zealand Primary School Teachers. Education Research, 27 (1985): 44-51.

Gavin, J. F., and Howe, J. G., Psychological Climate: Some Theoretical and Empirical Considerations. Behavioral Science, 20 (1975): 228-240.

Gavin, J. F., Organizational Climate as a Function of Personal and Organizational Variables. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66 (1975): 135-139.

George, J. R., and Bishop, L. K., Relationship of Organizational Structure and Teacher Personality Characteristics to Organizational Climate. Administrative Science Quarterly 16 (1971): 467-475.

Ghonaim, A. A. A. A Study of the Relationship between Organizational Climate, Job Satisfaction, and Education District Size, and the Differences in their Perception by Male Administrators and Teachers in Saudi Arabia. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State Univerity, 1986.

Gibson, J. L., and Klien, S. M., Employee Attitudes as a Function of Age and Length of Service: A Reconceptualization. Academy of Management Journal, 13 (1970): 411-425.

Glenn, N., and Weaver, C. Further evidence on education and job satisfaction. Social Forces, 61(1982): 46-55.

Goodson, T. J., Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory Applied to Elementary Teachers in Selected Alabama Schools. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1984. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45-12 (1985): p. 3543.

Gordon, M., and Arvey, R., The relationship between education and satisfaction with job content. Academy of Management Journal, 18(1975): 888-892.

Graen, G., Instrumentality Theory of Work Motivation: Some Experimental Results and Suggested Modifications. Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph, 53 (1969): 1-25.

Grassie, M. C., High Schools as Staff Perceive Them. The Journal of Educational Administration, 11 (1973): 179-188.

Grassie, M. C., and Carss, B. W., School Structure, Leadership Quality and Teacher Satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (1973): 15-26.

Greenfield, W. and Blase, J. J., Opportunities for Principal--Motivating Teachers: Understanding The Factors That Shape Performance. NASSP Bulletin, 65 (1981): 1-10.

Gruneberg, M. M., Understanding Job Satisfaction, New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1979.

Guion, R. M., A Note on Organizational Climate. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 9(1973): 120-125.

Hackman, J. R. and Lawler, E. E., Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics (Monograph). Journal of Applied Psychology, 55 (1971): 259-286.

Halpin, A. W., and Croft, D. B., The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center. University of Chicago, 1963.

Hellriegel, D., and Slocum, J. W. Jr., Organizational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies. Academy of management Journal, 17 (1974): 255-280.

Herman, J. B., and Hulin, C. L. Studying organizational attitude from individual and organizational frame of reference. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 8(1972): 84-108.

Herman, J. B., Dunham, R. B., and Hulin, C. L., Organizational Structure, Demographic Characteristics and Employee Responses. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13 (1975): 206-232.

Herzberg, F., Work and the Nature of Man, New York: World Publishing, 1966.

Herzberg, F.; Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B., The Motivation to Work, New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1959.

Herzberg, F.; Mausner, B.; Peterson, R. O. and Capwell, D. F., Job Attitudes: Review of Research and opinion. Pittsburg: Psychological Service of Pittsburg, 1957.

Hinrichs, J. R., A Replicated Study of Job Satisfaction Dimensions, Personnel Psychology, 21 (1968): 479-503.

Holdaway, E. A., Facet and Overall Satisfaction of Teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (1978): 30-47.

Holder, C. A. Principal Leadership behavior and Teacher Job Satisfaction in Public Elementary Schools in Columbus (Ohio). Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1984. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45-08 (1984) p. 2330-A.

Homans, G. C., Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Hoppock, R., Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper, 1935.

House, R., and Rizzo, F., Toward The Measurement of Organizational Practices: Scale Development and Validation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (1972): 388-396.

House, R. J., and Wigdor, L. A., Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of Evidence and a Criticism. Personnel Psychology, 20 (1967): 369-390.

Howe, J. G., Group Climate: An Exploratory Analysis of Construct Validity. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19 (1977): 106-125.

Hughey, M. L. and Murphy, P. J., Are Rural Teachers Satisfied With The Quality of Their Work Life? Education, 104 (1982): 56-66.

Hulin, C. L. and Blood, M. R., Job Enlargement, Individual Differences, and Worker Responses. Psychological Bulletin, 69 (1968): 41-55.

Hulin, C. L., and Smith, P. C., Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 48 (1964): 88-92.

Hulin, C. L., and Smith, P. C., A Linear Model of Job Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49 (1965): 209-216.

Ilgen, D. R., Satisfaction with Performance as a Function of the Initial Level of Expected Performance and the Deviation from Expectations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance 6 (1971): 345-365.

James, L. R., and Jones, A. P., Organizational Climate: A Review of Theory and Research. Psychological Bulletin, 81(1974): 1096-1112.

James, L. R., Demaree, R. G. and Hater, J. J., A Statistical Rationale for Relating Situational Variables and Individual Differences. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 25 (1980): 354-364.

Johannesson, R. E., Job Satisfaction and Perceptually Measured Organizational Climate: Redundancy and Confusion. In M. W. Frey (Ed.), New Developments in Management and Organization Theory. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference Eastern Academy of Management, 1971, pp. 27-37.

Johannesson, R. E., Some Problems in The Measurement of Organizational Cimate. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 10 (1973): 118-144.

Johnston, H. R., A New Conceptualization of Organizational Climate. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (1976): 95-103.

Johnston, H. R., Some Personality Correlates of the Relationship between Individuals and Organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59 (1974): 623-632.

Jones, A. P., and Butler, M. C., Influences of Cognitive Complexity on The Dimensions Underlying Perceptions of The Work Environment. Motivation and Emotion, 4 (1980): 1-19.

Jones, A. P., and James, L. R., Psychological Climate: Dimensions and Relationships of Individual and Aggregated Work Environment Perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23(1979): 201-250.

Joyce, W. F., and Slocum, J. W. Jr., Collective Climate: Agreement as a Basis for Defining Aggregate Climates in Organizations. Academy of Management Journal. 27 (1984): 721-742.

Joyce, W. F., W. F., Slocum, J. W. Jr., and Abelson, M. A., A Causal Analysis of Psychological Climate and Leader Behavior Relationship. Journal of Business Research 5 (1977): 261-273.

Joyce, W. F., and Slocum, J. W., Jr., Climate in Organizations. In S. Kerr (Ed.), Organizational Behavior. Columbus, Ohio: Grid, 1979. pp.317-333.

Kaiser, J. S., Teacher Longevity: Motivation or Burnout. The clearing house, 56(1982): 17-19.

Kalias, M. C., Teching Experience: Its Effect on School Climate, teacher Morale. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (1980): 89-102.

Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., and Miller, S. K., School Climate: Clear Definitions and A Model for A Larger Setting. NASSP Bulletin, 69 (1985): 70-77.

Kenney, J. B., White, W. F., and Gentry, H. W., Personality Characteristics of Teachers and Their Perception of Organizational Climate. Journal of Psychology, 66 (1967): 167-174.

Kimpston, R. D., and Sonnabend, L. C., Public Secondary Schools. Urban Education, 10 (1975): 27-45.

King, M., Murray, M., and Atkinson, T. Background, personality, Job characteristics and satisfaction with work in a national sample. Human Relations, 35(1982): 119-133.

King, N., Clarification and Evaluation of the Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction. Psychological Bulletin, 74 (1970): 341-363.

Klien, S. M., and Maher, J. R., Educational Level and Satisfaction with Pay. Personnel Psychology, 19 (1966): 195-208.

KottKamp, R. B., Mulhern, J. A., and Hoy, W. K., Secondary School Climate: A Revision of the OCDQ. Manuscript, 1985.

Kowalski, T. J., Organizational Climate, Conflict and Collective Bargaining. Contemporary Education, 54 (1982): 27-30.

Kries, K. and Milstein, M., Satisfying Teachers' Needs: It's Time to Get out of the Hierarchical Needs Satisfaction Trap. The Clearing House, 59 (1985): 75-77.

Kries, K., and Brockopp, D. Y., Autonomy: A Component of Teacher Job Satisfaction. Education, 107(1986): 110-115.

Kuhlen, R. G., and Johnson, G. H. Changes in goals with adult increasing age. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 16(1952): 1-4.

Kuhlen, R. G., Needs, Perceived Need Satisfaction Opportunities, and Satisfaction with Occupation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 47 (1963): 56-64.

Kunz, D., and Hoy, W. K. Leader behavior of principals and the professional zone of acceptance of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12(1976): 49-64.

Kyriacou, C. and Sutcliffe, J., Teachers Stress and Satisfaction. Educational Research, 21 (1979): 89-96.

LaFollette, W. R., and Sims, H. P. Jr. , Is Satisfaction Redundant with Organizational Climate? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13 (1975): 257-278.

Law, N. R., Aging teachers. School Review, 63(1955): 341-346.

Lawler, E. E. III, Hall, D. T., and Oldham, G. R., Organizational Climate: Relationship to Organizational Structure, Process and Performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 11 (1974): 139-155.

Lawler, E. E. III, Motivation in Work Organizations. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1973.

Lawler, E. E., Pay and Organizational Effectiveness. A psychological View. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Lawrence, P. R., and Lorsch, J. W., Organization and Environment. Boston: Division of Research. Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1967.

Lee, R., and Wilbur, E. R., Age, Education, Job Tenure, Salary, Job Characteristic and Job Satisfaction: A Multivariate Analysis. Human Relations, 38 (1985): 781-791.

Lee, R.; Mueller, L. B. and Miller, K. J., Sex, Wage Earner Status, Occupational Level, and Job Satisfaction. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18 (1981): 362-373.

Lester, P. E., "Development of an Instrument to Measure Teacher Job Satisfaction." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1983.

Likert, R., New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, R., The Human organizations: Its Management and Values. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1967.

Lindlow, J., and Mazzarella J., School Leadership Handbook for Survival. Clearing House on Educational Management. University of Oregon, 1981, Eric Document ED 209 736.

Lipka, R. P., and Goulet, L. R., Aging--and Experience Related Changes in Teacher Attitudes Toward the Profession. Educational Research Quarterly, 4 (1979): 19-28.

Lirtzman, S., House, R., and Rizzo, J., "An Alternative to Organizational Climate. The Measurement of Organizaitonal Practices." Paper Presented at 33rd Annual Conference, Academy of Management. Boston: Mass, 1973.

Litt, M. D., and Turk, D. C. Sources of Stress and Dissatisfaction in Experienced high School Teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 78(1985): 178-185.

Litwin, G. H., and Stringer, R. A. Jr., Motivation and Organizational Climate. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1968

Locke, E. A., Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. M.D. Dunnette Ed. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976), pp. 1297-1349.

Locke, E. A., The Relationship of Task success to Task Liking and Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49 (1965): 379-385.

Locke, E. A., What is Job Satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4 (1969): 309-336.

Locke, E. A., Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers Among White Collar and Blue Collar Employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58 (1973): 67-76.

Lofland, G. D., The Study of Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Selected Schools in the District of Columbia, Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation. George Washington University, 1985. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46-06-(1985) p. 1466-A.

Lord, F. M., and Novick, M. R. Statistical theories of mental test scores. Readings, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Lortie, D. C., School Teacher, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality, (2nd ed.) New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality, New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

McClelland, D. C.; Atkinson, J. W.; Clark, R. A. and Lowell, E. L., The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

McCormick, E. J., and Ilgen, D. R., Industrial Psychology (7th ed.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1980.

McElroy, L. A., "An Analysis of the Relationships among Control Variables, Organizational Climate, Job Satisfaction, Teacher Absenteeism and Teacher Turnover in the Secondary Public School." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Houston, 1984. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46-02(1985) p. 317-A.

McLeod, R. K., "Relationship of Staff Size and Selected Staff Variables to the Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools." Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation University of Colorado, 1969. Dissertation Abstracts, 30(1969) p. 559-A.

Medved, J. A., The Applicability of Herzberg's Motivation--Hygiene Theory. Educational Leadership, 39 (1982): 555.

Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide. Lansing, MI: Michigan Education Directory, 1986.

Miskel, C., The motivation of Educators to work. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1(1973):42-53.

Miskel, C.; DeFrain, J., and Wilcox, K., A Test of Expectancy Motivation Theory in Educational Organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (1980): 70-92.

Miskel, C. G., Fevurly, R., and Stewart, J. Organizational Structures and Processes, Perceived School Effectiveness, Loyalty and Job Satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 15(1979): 97-118.

Miskel, C.; Glasnap, D. and Hatley, R., A Test of Inequity Theory of Job Satisfaction Using Educator's Attitude Toward Work Motivation and Work Incentives. Educational Administration Quarterly, 11 (1975): 38-54.

Moody, D. (ed) Patterson's American Education, Mount Prospect, Illinois: Education Directories Inc., LXXXII (1986).

Moos, R. H., Evaluating Educational Environments. San Francisco: Fossey-Bass, 1979.

Morris, D. V., Organizational Climate of Alberta Schools. Canadian School Administrator's Bulletin, 3 (1964).

Morse, N. C., Satisfaction in the White-Collar Job. Ann-Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1953.

Mottaz, C. Education and Work Satisfaction. Human Relations, 37(1984): 985-1004.

Muchinsky, P. M., An assessment of the Litwin and Stringer Organizational Climate Questionnaire: An Empirical and Theoretical Extension of The Sims and LaFollette Study. Personnel Psychology, 29(1976): 371-392.

Muchinsky, P. M., Organizational Communication: Relationships to Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 20 (1977): 592-607.

National Education Association. Teacher Opinion Poll: Job Satisfaction. Today's Education, 69 (1980):8 GE.

Naylor, J. D., Pritchard, R. D., and Ilgen, D. R., A Theory of Behavior in Organizations. New York: Academic Press. 1980. pp.251-268.

Nevels, R. W., A Study of Relationship between Teachers' Attitude toward Professionalism and Teachers' Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction with their Jobs. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1984. Dissertation Abstracts International 45-03 (1984) p. 713-A.

Newman, J. E., Development of a Measure of Percieved Work Environment. Academy of Management Journal, 20 (1977): 520-534.

Newman, J. E., Understanding The Organizational Structure - Job Attitude Relationship through Perceptions of The Work-environment. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 14 (1975): 371-397.

Norton, M. S., What's So Important About School Climate? Contemporary Education. 56 (1984): 43-45.

Oades, C. D., Relationship of Teacher Motivation and Job Satisfaction. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Manitoba (Canada), 1983. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44-01 (1983) pp. 35-36-A.

Offenberg, R. M., and Cernius, V., Assessment of Idiographic Organizational Climate, Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 14 (1978): 79-86.

Ornstein, A. C. Motivations for teaching. Illinois School Journal, special issue, (1981): 3-13.

Pace, C. R., and Stern, G. G., An Approach To the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 49 (1958): 269-277.

Page, F. M., Jr. and Page, J. A. Perceptions of teaching that may be influencing current shortage of teachers. College Student Journal, 16(1982): 308-311.

Patchen, M., The Choice of Wage Comparisons. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

Payne, R. L., and Mansfield, R., Relationship of Perceptions of Organizational Climate to Organizational Structure, Context and Hierarchical Position. Administrative Science Quarterly, 8 (1973): 515-526.

Payne, R. L., and Pheysey, D. C., G. G. Stern's Organizational Climate Index: A Reconceptualization and Application to Business Organizations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6 (1971): 77-98.

Payne, R. L., and Pugh, S. D., Organizational Structure and Climate. In, M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976:PP 1125-1173.

Payne, R. L., Fineman, S., and Wall, T. D., Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction: A Conceptual Synthesis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16 (1976): 45-62.

Pierson, D.; Archambault, F. X., and Iwanicki, E. F., A Cross Validation of the Porter Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire for Educators. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 45 (1985): 683-688.

Porter, L. W., A Study of Perceived Need Satisfactions in Bottom and Middle Management Jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 45 (1961): 1-10.

Porter, L. W., and Lawler, E. E. III, Managerial Attitudes and Performance, Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Porter, L. W., Job Attitudes in Management:I. Perceived Defficiencies in Need Fulfillment as a Function of Job Level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 46 (1962): 375-384.

Powell, G. N., and Butterfield. D. N., The Case for Subsystem Climates in Organizations. Academy of Management review, 3(1978): 151-157.

Pritchard, R. D., and Karasick, B. W., The Effects of Organizational Climate on Managerial Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9 (1973): 126-146.

Pritchard, R. D.; Dunnette, M. D. and Jorgenson, D. O., Effects of Perceptions of Equity and Inequity on Worker Performance and Satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology 56 (1972), Monograph No. I: 75-94.

Pugh, D., Hickson, J. E., Hennings, C. R., and Turner, C., The Context of Organizational Structure. Administrative Science Quarterly, 14 (1969): 91-114.

Quinn, R. P., Stains, G. L., and McCullogh, M. R. Job Satisfaction: Is there a trend? Manpower Research Monograph No. 30, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Rhodes, S. R., Age Related Differences in Work Attitudes and Behavior: A Review and Conceptual Analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 93 (1983): 328-367.

Roberson, S. D., Keith, T. Z., and Page, E. B. Now who aspires to teach? Educational Researcher, 12(1983): 13-21.

Ronnenkamp, S. F., "Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction in Schools: A Relationship Study in Selected Schools in the Davis County School District," Unpublished ED. D. Dissertation, Utah: Brigham Young University,1984

Rosenholtz, S. J., and Smylie, M. A. Teacher Compensation and Career Ladders. The Elementary School Journal, 85(1984): 149-166.

Saleh, S. D., and Otis, J. L., Age and Level of Job Satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 17 (1964): 425-430.

Sarason, S. B., The Culture of School and The Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Schaffer, R. H., Job Satisfaction as Related to Need Satisfaction in Work. Psychological Monographs, 67 (1953) No. 14 (whole No. 364).

Scheaffer, R. L., Mendenhall, W., and Ott, L., Elementary Survey Sampling. Boston: Duxbury Press, 1986.

Schmidt, J. L., Job Satisfaction Among Secondary School Administrators. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12 (1976): 68-86.

Schneider, B., and Bartlett, C. J., Individual Differences and Organizational Climate I: The Research Plan and Questionnaire Development. Personnel Psychology, 21 (1968): 323-333.

Schneider, B., and Bartlett, C. J., Individual Differences and Organizational Climate II: Measurement of Organizational Climate by The Multi-Trait, Multi-Rater Matrix. Personnel Psychology, 23 (1970): 493-512.

Schneider, B., and Hall, D. T., Toward Specifying the Concept of Work Climate: A Study of Roman Catholic Diocesan Priests. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (1972): 447-455.

Schneider, B., and Reichers, A. E., On The Etiology of Climates. Personnel Psychology, 36 (1983): 19-39.

Schneider, B., and Snyder, R. A., Some Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60 (1975): 318-328.

Schneider, B., Organizational Climate: An Essay. Personnel Psychology 28 (1975): 447-479.

Schneider, B., Organizational Climate: Individual Preferences and Organizational Realities. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56 (1972): 211-217.

Schneider, B., The Perception of Organizational Climate: The Customers' View. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (1973): 248-256.

Schneider, B., Work Climates: An interactionist Perspective. In N. W. Feimer and E. S. Geller (Eds.), Environmental Psychology: Directions and Perspectives. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983. pp.106-128.

Schneider, G. T., Teacher Involvement in Decision Making: Zones of Acceptance, Decision Conditions, and Job Satisfaction. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (1984): 25-32.

Scott, R. D., Job Expectancy: An Important Factor in Labor Turnover. Personnel Journal, (1972): 360-363.

Sergiovanni, T. J., Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers. Journal of Educational Administration, 5 (1967): 66-82.

Sims, H. P. Jr., and LaFollette, W., An Assessment of the Litwin and Stringer Organizational Climate Questionnaire. Personnel Psychology 28(1975): 19-38.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., and Hulin, C. L., The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Spector, A. J., Expectancies, Fulfillment and Morale. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52 (1956): 51-56.

Spivak, S. L., A Study of Job Satisfaction, Motivation and need Satisfaction of Urban Public School Educators in Connecticut. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, Univerity of Bridgeport, 1983. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46-06 (1985) p. 1475-A.

SPSSX, Chicago, Illinois: SPSS Inc., 1986.

Stern, G. G., B=F (P,E). Journal of Personality Assessment, 28 (1964): 161-168.

Stern, G. G., People in Context: Measuring Person-Environment Congruence in Education and Industry. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Sweeney, J., Professional Discretion and Teacher Satisfaction. The High School Journal,(1981): 1-6.

Sweeney, J., Teacher Dissatisfaction on the Rise: Higher Level Needs Unfulfilled. Education, 102 (1980): 203-207.

Sylvia, R. D., and Hutchison, T. What makes Ms. Johnson Teach? A study of teacher motivation. Human Relations, 38(1985): 841-856.

Tagiuri, R., The concept of organizational climate. In Tagiuri, Renato and Litwin, George H., Organizational Climate: Exploration of a Concept. Boston: Division of Research. Graduate School of Business administration. Harvard University, 1968.

Taylor, G. A. III, A Study of Job Satisfaction as Perceived by the Certified Staff in Florida Public Elementary Schools. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Central Florida, 1986. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47-04 (1986) p. 1185-A.

Taylor, J., and Bowers, D., Survey of Organizations. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1972.

Thomas, A. R., The Organizational Climate of Schools. International Review of Education, 22 (1976): 441-463.

Trusty, F. M., and Sergiovanni, T. J., Perceived Need Deficiencies of Teachers and Administrators: A Proposal for Restructuring Teacher Roles. Educational Administration Quarterly, 2 (1966): 168-180.

Vollmer, J. J., and Kinney, J. A., Age Education, and Job Satisfaction. Personnel, 32 (1955): 38-43.

Vroom, V. H., Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Vroom, V. H., Work and Motivation, New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1964.

Wahba, M. A., and Bridwell, L. G., Maslow Reconsidered: A Review of Research on the Need Hierarchy Theory. In Steers, R. M., and Porter, L. W. (ed.), Motivation and Work Behavior, (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Walden, J. C., Taylor, T. A., and Watkins, J. F. Organizational Climate Changes over Time. The Educational Forum, 40 (1975): 87-93.

Wanous, J. R., Effects of a Realistic Job Preview on Job Acceptance, Job Attitudes and Job Survival. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58 (1973): 327-332.

Waters, L. K., Roach, D., and Batlis, N., Organizational Climate Dimensions and Job Related Attitudes. Personnel Psychology, 27(1974): 465-476.

Watkins, J. F., The OCDQ -- An Application and Some Implications. Educational Administration Quarterly, 4 (1968): 46-60.

Weaver, C. N., Sex Differences in the Determinants of Job Satisfaction. Academy of Mangement Journal, 21 (1978): 265-274.

Whisler, T. L., Information Technology and Organizational Change. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1970.

Wiggins, T. W., A Comparative Investigation of Principal Behavior and School Climate. The Journal of Educational Research, 66 (1972): 103-105.

Wolf, M. G., Need Gratification Theory: A Theoretical Reformulation of Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Job Motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology 54 (1970): 87-94.

Woodman, R. W., and King, D. C., Organizational Climate: Science as Folklore. Academy of Management review, 3(1978): 816-826.