1-1-2008

The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of selected urban middle school teachers in the Clark County School District

Ouida Mildred Brown
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION OF SELECTED URBAN MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

by

Ouida Mildred Brown

Bachelor of Science
Alcorn State University
1967

Master of Education, Foundations of Counseling
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
1980

Master of Education, Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
1982

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctor of Education Degree
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
May 2001

UNLV

Dissertation Approval
The Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

February 5, 2001

The Dissertation prepared by

Ouida Mildred Brown

Entitled

The Relationship Between Organizational Climate And Job Satisfaction Of Selected Urban Middle School Teachers In The Clark County School District

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor Of Education Degree

Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative

PR/1017-52/1-00

ABSTRACT

The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction of Selected Urban Middle School Teachers in the Clark County School District

by

Ouida Mildred Brown

Dr. Carl R. Steinhoff, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Dr. John Crawford, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction in the Clark County School District (Las Vegas, Nevada).

The data were collected from teachers randomly selected from urban middle schools in this district. There were 19 schools involved in the study, with 15 teachers selected from each school to respond to two instruments. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire – Revised Secondary (OCDQ-RS) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) were sent to 285 teachers, of which 197 were returned (70%). Demographic data were also collected from each of the respondents.

There were significant relationships found between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. This relationship was observed in correlational coefficients between the three subscales of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and the three subscales of job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction). There were significant positive correlations found between the characteristics of job satisfaction and the characteristics of organizational climate. Significant correlation among the climate subscales

and job satisfaction subscales indicated that job satisfaction and climate were related at the 0.01 or 0.05 alpha level. As expected, frustrated behavior had a negative significant relationship with satisfaction and negatively correlated to intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction.

Engaged behavior correlated in a significant positive relationship with intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction at the 0.01 alpha level. Intimate behavior and extrinsic satisfaction correlated in a significant positive relationship at 0.05 alpha level. The positive correlations indicated that the higher the engaged behavior the higher the intrinsic satisfaction and intimate behavior. The negative correlations indicated the higher the frustrated behavior score, the lower the satisfaction scores and vice versa. A positive significance relationship was found in the relationship of climate and job satisfaction as expected.

No significant relationship was observed between the variables gender, years of teaching experience (in or out of the CCSD), educational level, ethnicity, and climate or job satisfaction.

The study revealed that open climate and higher job satisfaction are related. This study revealed important information regarding the relationship between the process of school climate and the outcome of job satisfaction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No one completes the process of earning a Doctoral degree without an abundance of academic support, emotional support, and mentor support. This dissertation was completed due to the efforts of many people. Special thanks is given to Dr. Edward Chance, (deceased) Professor of Educational Leadership, for his mentorship, guidance, encouragement, professionalism, and patience as former chairman of my review committee. I extend grateful appreciation for his unselfish dedication to aiding the researcher's plan, perform, and complete the initial portion of this dissertation. Dr. Chance provided total support, constant encouragement, and expert guidance.

When a senior member retired, Dr. Carl Steinhoff graciously consented when I asked him to be a member of my committee. Dr. Steinhoff also graciously accepted my offer to become chairman of my committee with the untimely death of my chairman. I feel fortunate to have had the great fortune to have studied under, been supported, and guided by Dr. Carl Steinhoff. I give him my sincere thanks.

Dr. James Crawford became my chairman during the fall of 2000 when a tragedy occurred in Dr. Steinhoff's family. Dr. Crawford graciously consented to guide me through the process to the end. Dr. Crawford gave me confidence, encouragement, as well as mentorship, guidance, and friendship. Without him the completion of this dissertation would not be possible. I also give him my sincere thanks.

Seldom is one person fortunate enough to have had three chairmen who were mentors, great leaders, and professionals to guide him/her through the dissertation process. Without the support of Dr. Ed Chance and the guidance and sincerity of Dr. Carl Steinhoff, and the patience, dedication, and statistical expertise of Dr. Crawford this dissertation would not be possible. To Dr. Steinhoff, immediate past chairman of the Educational Leadership

Department and chairman of my review committee, I give my sincere gratitude, appreciation, and dedication for offering kind words of encouragement, providing support, and for being there when I needed him.

Sincere appreciation is afforded to other committee members who each exemplify the most positive aspects of our chosen profession and for their patience, expertise, and assistance: Dr. Patti Chance, for being a guiding force during this process, and providing encouragement, advice, kind words of wisdom, and sincerity in helping me to achieve; Dr. Teresa S. Jordan for stimulating, and challenging me as a student and as a member of my committee and as the current chairman of the Educational Administrative Department; and Dr. Porter Troutman for his humor, advice, patience when I needed someone to talk to, encouragement, and his sincere interest in me as an individual.

A special thank you to all the urban middle school teachers/principals who took the time to respond to the questionnaires. Without your willingness to share your perceptions, there would have been no data to analyze and, consequently, no dissertation to write.

And, many thanks to Mr. Paul Nakayu, the campus statistical guru. As he has done for so many graduate students, Paul guided me through the process of points of SPSS. I am truly thankful for all of his assistance.

I thank my parents Raphael and Frances McCuiston (deceased) for their continuous and unselfish understanding, love, and support. They taught me to never give up on my goals.

Most of all, greatest appreciation is extended to my wonderful and loving husband, Thomas, who gave his total support, love, encouragement, and understanding throughout this endeavor. I also thank him for the adjustments he had to make in our lifestyles. Finally, thanks to our children Tony Christopher (now deceased), Angela Khristin, and our granddaughter, Novina, who always encouraged and supported me throughout this process. I also give them all my love and devotion.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Organizational climate represents a set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of its members (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991). Additionally, the climate of an organization is conceived as the personality of the organization. In other words, climate is to organizations as personality is to individuals (Forehand & Gilmore, 1964; Halpin & Croft, 1963; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968).

The decade of the 1980s was characterized by an intensified desire for greater effectiveness in public education (Owens, 1995). Widespread discussion about school effectiveness raised public consciousness of educational concerns to a level reminiscent of reactions seen during the Sputnik era (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Public concern about falling standardized test scores was one of many issues accentuated in the media with reports such as A Nation at Risk (1983). The 1980s began with a president who pledged to abolish the U.S. Department of Education, and ended with another president who identified himself as the "education president". Throughout this time it was obvious that citizens were expecting more from their schools. Just what was expected, however, was not always clear (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Concurrent with increased demands on schools was an increasing emphasis on the importance of teacher and administrator roles. One recurring theme focused on improving teacher performance in the classroom (Berliner & Rosenshine, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Another focused on the principal's role in promoting excellence through leadership (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Chance, 1992; Edmonds, 1979).

The former theme sought to identify and develop teaching behaviors that promoted an increase in student achievement (Berliner & Rosenshine, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The latter placed more responsibility on the leadership of principals (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Chance, 1992; Edmonds, 1979). The two themes represented examples of a growing pressure to change the quality of education (Berliner & Rosenshine, 1987; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

During the 1980s, teacher job satisfaction and burnout became important concerns (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Cole, 1977; Pook, 1980). Many qualified teachers left the classroom for jobs in the private sector (Owens, 1995). Some teachers have admitted that they might not choose to become teachers, if given the opportunity to start their careers over (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986). Daily stress in the classroom was coupled with greater external demands for more accountability from educators (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Lester, 1988; Owens, 1995).

Principals shouldered the burden for production as well. Demand to halt the decline of test scores led to greater principal accountability for instructional processes (Argyris, 1971; Erb, 1988; Smith & Andrews, 1989). The principal was no longer viewed primarily as an administrator or manager. The ideal principal was seen as an instructional leader, one who placed priority on curriculum issues and set high expectations for student achievement (Chance, 1992; Edmonds, 1979; Smith & Andrews, 1989). Principals who were leaders, and not simply managers, were able to model and articulate their vision while they consistently strived to create the organization they envisioned (Chance, 1992, p.52). Principal leadership behaviors have been described as the key to educational excellence (Owens, 1995). Edmonds' (1979) research helped establish what became known as The Effective School Movement that had five broad correlates. These five interrelated correlates were (1) the instructional leadership of the principal; (2) a safe, orderly school climate; (3) an instructional focus on well established academic goals; (4) high expectations for student performance and

achievement; and (5) frequent systematic measurement of students to ascertain their level of performance (Edmonds, 1979, p.11). However, according to Chance (1992), the successful completion of any one of the five correlates alone would not make a school effective.

Nevertheless, the role of the principal has been shown to impact school climate, social structure, morale, and student achievement (Austin, 1978; Duckett, Park, Clark & McCarthy, 1980; Lezotte, 1980). Indeed, according to Austin (1978), the principal's attitude and expectations for student success are critical factors that determine school climate.

Over the last two decades the public's opinion of schools has declined (Gallup, 1985), while demands for productivity have increased (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). During the 1980s, an extensive amount of research regarding the organizational climate of schools was conducted (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Owens, 1995). Unfortunately, one of the existent problems was the fact that organizational climate has not been an easily defined term (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Some researchers used the idea of organizational climate for descriptive purposes only (Likert, 1961; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988; Steinhoff, 1965). Others regarded organizational climate as an explanation of differences between schools (Halpin, 1966; Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Owens, 1995; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968). Overall, indications of healthy school climate are commonly linked with the effective school movement (Edwards, 1979; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

In business, the relationship between satisfaction and productivity has been a cornerstone of management theory for decades (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Hauseman & Hatfield, 1989; Vroom & Deci, 1970). Organizational climate included two goals which educators have persistently pursued: productivity and satisfaction (Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987). Furthermore, Edmonds (1979) envisioned productivity in schools as most evident in academic achievement. Owens (1995) viewed satisfaction as high morale, trust and

cohesiveness. Therefore, schools with high levels of satisfaction among employees and high student academic achievement are clearly schools with a good climate (Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987). Educational leaders who pursue higher productivity and satisfaction are approaching an ideal of instructional leadership (Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987). According to Edmonds (1979), urban schools that taught poor children successfully exhibited strong leadership and a climate of high expectation that all children will learn (Edmonds, 1979, p. 15).

Still, improving school climate has been the focus of numerous research initiatives (Chance, 1992; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987; Kelly, 1980; Kershaw, Bellon, Blank, Brian & Perkins, 1990; O'Neal, O'Neal, Short, Holmes, Brown, Deweese & Carter, 1987). Anticipated gains in academic achievement and teacher satisfaction have been cited as the primary reason school administrators have been recognized as being influential in affecting school climate (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Additionally, building level administrators have consistently provided basic leadership for assessing organizational climate and directing improvement strategies. However, providing for fulfillment of basic human needs (such as, acceptance, achievement and recognition) is essential to improving school climate (Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987).

Background of the Study

The term "school climate" has been defined by many researchers (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy & Miskel, 1982; Likert, 1961; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988; Steinhoff, 1965; Stern, 1970; Willower, Eidell & Hoy, 1967). Four basic frameworks of school climate have emerged in the organizational literature (Hoy & Miskel, 1982, 1996; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988):

1. Halpin & Croft's (1963) concept of open and closed climate;

2. Likert's (1961) concept of managerial systems ranging from exploitive authoritative to participative;
3. Steinhoff's (1965) & Stern's (1970) needs -press model; and
4. Willower, Eidell, & Hoy's (1967) concept of pupil-control orientation (cited in Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

The first and second conceptualizations view school climate as the measurement of an individual's relations with other employees in the work environment and in terms of faculty-principal or subordinate-superordinate relationships (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Likert, 1961). The third conceptualization involved human behavior in the context of internal or external environment presses that corresponded to personal needs (Steinhoff, 1965; Stern, 1970). The final conceptualization of school climate focused on the relationship of teachers and their students (Willower, Eidell & Hoy, 1967).

The school effectiveness literature provided a more recent view of school climate that differs from traditional organizational climate literature (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Keefe, Kelly & Miller, 1985). The concept of school climate has been expanded through school effectiveness researchers to identify school level factors (including climate) which impact student achievement (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Keefe, Kelly & Miller, 1985). The essential elements of effective schools have the following indispensable characteristics: (1) strong administrative leadership; (2) instructionally effective schools have a climate of high expectations; (3) the school's atmosphere is orderly, quiet, and the atmosphere is conducive to learning; (4) effective schools make it clear that pupils acquisition of basic skills take precedence over all other school activities; (5) school resources can be diverted to the furtherance of the fundamental objectives; and (6) pupil academic progress is frequently monitored, used as the measure of student achievement, and is the basis for program evaluation (Edmonds, 1979, 1982, p. 22 & 11). As schools acquire the characteristics of effective schools,

they create a school climate more receptive to effective teaching (Lezotte, 1980; Edmonds, 1979).

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) was developed by Halpin & Croft (1963) as an instrument to measure the organizational climate of schools. The instrument consisted of 64 Likert-type statements developed to map the teacher's perception of the principal's behavior and its impact on the school (Halpin, 1966; Halpin & Croft, 1963). It also assessed the nature of the interpersonal and social relationships of the faculty (Halpin, 1966; Halpin & Croft, 1963).

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire- Revised Secondary (OCDQ-RS) is a redesigned and revised version of the OCDQ. The 34-item instrument with five dimensions identifies the behavior of secondary teachers and principals. The instrument was designed to measure secondary school climate (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991). It measures two aspects of principal leadership; supportive and directive behavior, and three aspects of teacher interactions - engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior. Openness and intimacy are the two basic dimensions of climate that were formed from the five aspects of school interaction (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

One key component of organizational climate studies is measurement of teacher job satisfaction (Hartlet & Hoy, 1972; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; LaFollette & Sims, 1975). Levels of job satisfaction increased as the organizational climate of schools became more open and participative (Grassie & Carss, 1973; Miskel, McDonald & Bloom, 1983). Job satisfaction has been correlated with various combinations of variables, such as type of organization, personality, and motivation (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

In 1957, the Work Adjustment Project at the University of Minnesota began to develop an instrument to measure job satisfaction (Bishop & Lester, 1993, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Originally it was developed as a diagnostic tool for assessing the work adjustment potential of

applicants for vocational rehabilitation (Weiss et. al., 1964). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) has been used extensively in job satisfaction studies of teachers (Bishop & Lester, 1993, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). The MSQ measures satisfaction with different aspects of the work environment, such as work conditions, security, independence, and social status (Weiss & Dawis, 1964, 1965). The short form of the MSQ is composed of 20 items and consists of three scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and general satisfaction (Bishop & Lester, 1993, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1967).

Statement of the Problem

A review of literature indicated that there has been no research conducted where the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire – Revised Secondary (OCDQ-RS) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) instruments have been utilized together to measure the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. This study examined the relationship between teacher perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction) within the urban middle schools of the Clark County School District. Additionally, the differences that existed due to gender, educational degree level, experience (in and out of the Clark County School District (CCSD), and ethnicity were examined.

Purpose of the Study

This study provided educators and researchers with data concerning the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. The data concerning organizational climate indicators and job satisfaction components of one school district may be useful for administrators of middle schools in that system. Other school districts may use the findings for comparative and analytical purposes. Bogdan and

Biklen (1992) and Glesne and Peshkin (1992) explained that one of the objectives of quantitative research is to reveal understanding, not pass judgment. Therefore, the following research questions were proposed as appropriate for this study:

1. What are teacher perceptions regarding the organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) of selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District (CCSD)?
2. What are teacher perceptions regarding job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
3. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
4. Is there a relationship between teacher gender and perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
5. Is there a relationship between teachers educational degrees and their perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
6. Is there a relationship between teachers' experience (years in teaching profession both in and out of the Clark County School District) and their perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

7. Is there a relationship between ethnicity and teacher perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools of the Clark County School District?

Significance of the Study

Organizational climate has been studied by researchers (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Herzberg, 1961; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Likert, 1961). In the last three decades, studies related to the organizational climate of schools have increased dramatically (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991). Organizational climate has been correlated with academic achievement and morale (Edmonds, 1979). Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991) observed that organizational climate has also been addressed in educational reform legislation.

Lester (1988) concluded that additional research regarding the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction should be conducted at all levels of schools and in a variety of school districts. There is a need for this study to provide administrators with awareness of school level organizational climate and personnel characteristics that effect school effectiveness.

Data concerning organizational climate indicators and job satisfaction within one school district may be useful for administrators in that system; other school districts may also use the findings for comparative and analytical purposes. Replications of the study in other districts may add to the research literature. Additionally, higher education institutions will be able to use the data obtained for the preparation of future educational leaders.

Delimitations

This study will be delimited to teacher perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction whereas the principals were not surveyed. The two principal behaviors (supportive behavior and directive behavior) were not used. The exclusion of this group may have affected the results gathered in this study regarding organizational climate. Openness and intimacy the two basic dimensions of climate were not utilized. This exclusion may affect the results also. Only the three teacher behaviors (Engaged Teacher Behavior, Frustrated Teacher Behavior, and Intimate Teacher Behavior) were used in this study of organizational climate.

Limitations

A potential limitation of this study is the bias and honesty of the participants who responded to the questionnaires (Borg & Gall, 1996). The study will also be limited to and by the ability of the assessing instruments to elicit the desired data in an optimally useful manner (Gay, 1981; McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). The investigation of a sample of only one school district could produce a limitation to the generalizability of the results of the study (Borg & Gall, 1996; Gay, 1981, 1987). The sample was also limited on the generalizability of the results by restricting the population to urban middle school teachers (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will be used for the purpose of this study:

Job Satisfaction : is defined as teacher response scores on the MSQ. Extrinsic satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction are the three components that are included in the MSQ definition of job satisfaction (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

Extrinsic Satisfaction : The values an individual receives from the environment surrounding the context of work, such as: pay, supervisory relationship, tenure, and praise (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

Intrinsic Satisfaction : the values associated with the content of work tasks, such as competence, achievement, and self-actualization (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

General Satisfaction : when an employee is satisfied through both the values an individual receives that are from the environment surrounding the context of work and the values associated with work tasks (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

School Climate : has been used for descriptive and explanatory purposes for many years. In this study, Halpin's (1966) concept of organizational climate as a school's personality is used.

Engaged Teacher Behavior : reflects a faculty in which teachers are proud of their school, enjoy working with each other, are supportive of their colleagues, and committed to the success of their students (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Frustrated Teacher Behavior : depicts a faculty that feels itself burdened with routine duties, administrative paperwork, and excessive assignments unrelated to teaching (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Intimate Teacher Behavior : reflects a strong and cohesive network of social relations among the faculty (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Middle School Teacher - a teacher of students in grades 6-8 (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991).

Urban Middle School : The urban middle school is a sixth through eighth grade institution located in the inner-city where shared decision making, teachers and administrators have been investigating models of collaborative planning and

development of "cluster models." Such models may incorporate a teacher-advisory program, provide transition and articulation activities, use interdisciplinary teaching and block schedules, flexible scheduling and grouping of students, common planning time, team teaching, provide staff development activities that extend the range of teaching strategies appropriate to their students and thematic approaches to the curriculum (George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992, p.11 and 149).

Correlational Design : Research in which information on at least two variables are collected for each subject in order to investigate the relationship between variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

Correlation Coefficient : A number that is calculated to indicate the size and direction of the degree of relationship between two variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (Pearson r or r): A mathematical expression of the direction and magnitude of the relationship between two measures that yield continuous scores (Gall & Borg, 1996).

Summary

Organizational climate is analogized by many as climate is to organizations as personality is to individuals (Forehand & Gilmer, 1964; Halpin & Croft, 1963; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968). In other words, organizational climate is the measurement of an individual's relationship with other employees in the work environment (teacher-principal or subordinate - superordinate relationships (Halpin & Croft, 1963). Hoy and Forsyth (1986) stated that teachers' performances in schools are determined by the climate in which they work. They further wrote that climate is a broad concept that refers to teachers' perceptions of the school's work environment: it is affected by the formal organization, informal organization, and leadership practices in the school (Hoy & Forsyth 1986, p.76). Thus organizational climate is a general synthesizing idea that is directly influenced by the principal and supervisor, which in turn affects the

motivations and behaviors of teachers (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Organizational climate is the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of its members (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986). Climate is a relatively enduring quality of the school environment that teachers experience, (a) influences their behavior, (b) experienced by teachers, and (c) is based on their collective perceptions (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Improving school climate has been the focus of numerous research initiatives where anticipated gains in academic achievement and teacher satisfaction are cited as the prime reasons for such endeavors (O'Neal, et. al., 1987; Howard, et al., 1987; Kelly, 1980; Kershaw, et al., 1990). Providing for fulfillment of basic human needs (such as, achievement and recognition) is essential to improving school climate (Howard, et al., 1987).

During the past thirty years, the middle school movement has been a driving force in public education (George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992). What began as a better way to handle rapidly increasing numbers of students has developed into a formalized program to better meet the educational needs of transient students (Johnston, 1991). Today's formal middle school program assists students in making a successful transition from the nurturing environment of the elementary classroom to the departmentalized environment of the high school (George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992; Lounsbury, 1988; Raymer, 1971). Theoretically, students should be happier and experience more school success in the middle school environment than in the traditional junior high (Johnston, 1991; Wiles, 1981). Toward this goal, a successful middle school environment has traditionally been created by teachers who have positive attitudes toward leading their students to succeed (George, 1990; George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992; Raymer, 1991).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of literature regarding organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction is presented in order to better understand these concepts in the larger setting of educational research. Taken as individual constructs, both climate and job satisfaction have been the focus of numerous studies (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Demps, 1978; Grace, 1986; Grassie & Carss, 1973; Halpin, 1966; Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hartley & Hoy, 1972; Hellrigel & Slocum, 1974; Hoy & Clover, 1986; Hoy & Miskel, 1982, 1996; Owens, 1995; Slezak, 1984; Sergiovanni & Carver, 1980; Vroom, 1964; Weiss & Dawis, 1965). When the concepts have been studied together the field is more limited (Johnston, 1991; LaFollette & Sims; Lofquist & Dawis, 1969; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Nonetheless, there is ample literature relative to this study (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Owens, 1995; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

This review considers the major contributions in the general fields of climate and satisfaction. Most attention is given to literature that has similarity to this study. This review is organized to facilitate a broader understanding of organizational climate, including definitions, characteristics, and conceptualizations. In chapter one, the researcher provided a general review of job satisfaction, a presentation of definitions, theoretical considerations, and components of job satisfaction.

A good climate makes it possible to work toward important goals such as academic learning, social development, and curriculum improvement (Clark, 1977; Slezak, 1984).

The climate of a school is the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of its members (Halpin & Croft, 1963). School climate is the relatively enduring quality of the school environment that is experienced by participants, affects their behavior, and is based on their collective perception of behavior in schools (Halpin, 1966; Hoy & Miskel 1987; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968).

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) indicated that teachers' performance in schools is determined by the climate in which they work. They further wrote that climate is a broad concept that refers to teachers' perceptions of the school's work environment: it is affected by the formal organization, informal organization, and leadership practices in the school (Hoy and Forsyth, 1986, p.147). Thus organizational climate can be considered as a general synthesizing concept that is directly influenced by the supervisor, which in turn affects the motivations and behaviors of teachers. Organizational climate represents those internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of its members (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986). Climate is a relatively enduring quality of the school environment that (a) is experienced by teachers, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) is based on their collective perceptions (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986, p. 147).

The 1980s were characterized by an intensified desire for greater effectiveness in public education (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Widespread discussion about school effectiveness raised the public consciousness of educational concerns to a level reminiscent of reactions during the Sputnik era (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Concern about declining standardized test scores was among the issues accentuated in the media, exemplified by reports such as A Nation At Risk (1983).

Emphasis on the role of the teacher and administrator in school improvement increased with the expanding demands on schools. One segment of researchers focused on improving teacher performance in the classroom (Berlinger & Rosenshine,

1987; Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987; Trusty & Sergiovanni, 1966). Another group of researchers focused on the principal's role in promoting excellence through leadership (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Chance, 1992; Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Lezotte, 1990; Owens, 1995). Pressure to change the quality of education resulted in the identification and development of teaching behaviors that promoted increases in student achievement (Berlinger & Rosenshine, 1987; Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987). Others placed more responsibility on the leadership of the principal (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Chance, 1992; Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Lezotte, 1990; Owens, 1995).

Concurrently, teacher job dissatisfaction and burnout became important issues to many researchers (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Some teachers have admitted that, if given the opportunity to begin their careers over again, they might not choose to become teachers (Berlinger & Rosenshine, 1987). Stress in the classroom has been coupled with greater demands for an increased academic improvement (Grassie & Carss, 1973).

Slezak (1984) indicated that an effective school climate included two goals that educators persistently pursue which are best described as: productivity and satisfaction. Productivity in schools is most evident in academic achievement (Edmonds, 1979). Satisfaction is seen through high morale, trust, and cohesiveness (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Slezak (1984) concluded that schools with high levels of satisfaction among employees and high academic achievement are clearly schools with good climate. School leaders who pursue higher productivity and satisfaction are pursuing an ideal of instructional leadership according to Howard, Howell and Brainard (1987). The relationship between satisfaction and productivity has been a cornerstone of management theory in business for many years (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Huseman & Hatfield, 1989; Slezak, 1984; Vroom & Deci, 1970).

Improving school climate has become the focus of numerous researchers (Howard, Howell, & Brainard, 1987; Kelly, 1980; Kershaw, Bellon, Blank, Brian & Perkins, 1990; O'Neal, O'Neal, Short, Holmes, Brown, Deweese & Carter, 1987). Gains in academic achievement and teacher satisfaction are cited as the prime reasons for such endeavors (Slezak, 1984). Building level administrators have, perhaps, the most influential role in affecting school climate. As building leaders they provide basic leadership for assessing school climate and directing improvement strategies (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987). Providing for fulfillment of basic human needs (such as achievement and recognition) is essential to improving school climate (Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987; Glasser, 1990, 1992). Individual needs in the organization and the organizational needs of a school is commonly called "social behavior" (Getzel & Guba, 1957).

Systems Theory of Organizational Climate

Organizational climate has commonly been defined in the conceptual framework of general system or social system theory (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Bertalanffy (1968) identified systems in the natural sciences (such as biology) that have a complexity of elements standing in interaction which exchange matter with their surroundings (p.76). While this approach is rooted in natural scientific observations, similarities in models for the behavioral or social sciences have been commonly applied. Silver (1983) discussed the inter-disciplinary approach as a viable means of describing similarities in the functioning of diverse phenomena, such as living organisms, galaxies, machines and human organization (p. 125).

Berrien (1968) studied this approach prior to Silver where he found various aspects of so-called systems (Berrien, 1968, p.140). He defined a system as a set of components interacting with each other and sharing a boundary which has a filtering capacity (p. 140). Berrien (1968) indicated the filtering capacity of the boundary affects

the rate and type of flow between a system and its environment. The degree to which the boundary may be penetrated determined if the system was open or closed. The components are the smallest units that interact with each other to achieve the goals of a system. The more complex the system the greater the number of components in interaction (Berrien, 1968).

General system theory can be applied to human organizational behavior in settings such as schools or school districts (Johnson, 1989). An educational system may be viewed as a series of subsystems. Among the subsystems in interaction are: student behavior and effort, personnel relations, safety and security, extracurricular activities and community relations (Berrien, 1968). Content-based disciplines, such as science, mathematics and social studies are further delineation of the subsystem strata. This view of systems provides a meaningful description of relationships among component parts of schools as complex organizations (Johnson, 1989).

Silver (1983) argued that general system theory fails to account for equally complex social and psychological phenomena. Social groups or psychological beings are different than natural components such as biological interactions. The role of human behavior must be considered in describing complex organizational system interaction. Parsons (1951), an early proponent of social system theory, recognized that the most basic component of a system is the social interaction of individuals. Individuals are actors who participate in roles as part of the social process. Among the subsystems of the model are culture, organisms, social and personality types (Parsons, 1968).

A weakness of this model is that human interaction is portrayed only within the larger totality of human social actions. Other models have sought to explain human interaction as a more concrete experience (Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, Lipham & Campbell, 1968). Getzels and Guba (1957), for example, defined social system included the application to an individual school or even a single class within a school (p.57). This model expresses the interaction of two independent factors or functions.

The first factor is the institution itself, with roles and expectations that fulfill the goals of the system. The second factor is the individuals within the system. Individual personalities and needs constitute what is commonly called "social behavior" (Getzel & Guba, 1957, p.57-65). The behavior of individuals in institutions is determined by roles and assigned expectations. Behavior in institutions is therefore normative. The function of institution, roles and expectations describes the nomethetic (normative) dimension of activity in organizations. The personal or ideographic dimension of social activity consists of the individual, personality and need-dispositions. Because each individual uniquely fulfills a role, the idiographic dimension represents the psychological analysis of systems. The normative dimension describes the sociological analysis (Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968). The institution, the individual personality, and the needs-dispositions fulfill a distinct role and responsibility in the organization climate of the social system theory (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988)).

Organizational Climate

Schools are examples of institutions, which function, in a social context (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986). Schools interact with the social environment in ways similar to other institutions (Halpin, 1966). Organizations climate in schools has been studied for about 30 years (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Hoy, Wayne, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988; Stern, 1970). In the 1970s the term school climate began to be used more frequently in support of the unique climate of educational organizations (Hartley & Hoy, 1972; Howard, Howell & Braninard, 1987). While researchers have begun to use the term school climate widely, there still is no concise, acceptable definition (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; O'Neal, et. al., 1987; Owens, 1995).

Most confusion stems from the perspective of the researcher (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). The two major perspectives either see school climate as a sample form of

organizational climate (Halpin & Croft, 1963; James & Jones, 1974; Johnson, 1989; Hoy, Wayne, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991) or as the effect of school-level characteristics on student performance (Edmonds, 1979; Fox, 1978; Keefe, Kelley & Miller, 1985; Kelly, 1980; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Lindelow & Mazzarella (1985) contended that organizational climate research is still only in the developmental stage. School climate may be defined in the context of social systems theory (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Halpin and Croft (1963) defined climate as the personality of the organization. Hoy and Miskel (1982) described organizational climate as "that set of internal characteristics that distinguish one school from another and influences the behavior of people" (Hoy & Miskel, 1982, p.185). Tagiuri and Litwin (1968) highlighted the importance of perceptions of the members of an organization; organizational climate is defined as 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).

Keefe, Kelly and Miller (1985) defined school climate as "the relatively enduring patterns of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members" (p.74). This definition added the important component of perceptions by both members and non-members of an organization. Judgments about "good" or "bad" climate are relevant to how well an organization meets the expectations of its members as well as the non-members (Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987). Perceptions about the sub-systems (individuals, groups, etc.) within an organization are equally important attributes of the overall climate of the organization (Hellriegel & Slocum, 1974).

Characteristics of Organizational Climate

Organizational climate is a summary of concepts related to the total environmental quality within the organization. (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968). According to this viewpoint climate has four distinct dimensions, which comprise taxonomy: ecology, milieu, social system, and culture (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968, p. 47). Ecology includes the physical and material aspects of an organization's climate, such as the building and related facilities. Milieu is represented by the presence of individuals or groups who have specific attributes, such as social classes. The pattern of relationships between individuals are among groups is the social system itself, and culture involves belief systems, values, and meaning (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968, p. 57).

According to Anderson (1982), the social system dimension of climate has been the focus of most research in organizational climate of schools. Howard, Howell & Brainard (1987) stated satisfaction is one of the primary goals, which make up the fabric of American public education. For this reasons some authors use climate and morale synonymously, for morale is closely linked to organizational survival and productivity (Andrew, Parks, Nelson & The Phi Delta Kappan Commission on Teacher/Faculty Morale, 1985). Feelings of satisfaction and productivity are dimensions of school climate, which emerge from expectations for the organizational environment of schools (Andrew, Parks, Nelson & The Phi Delta Kappan Commission on Teacher/Faculty Morale, 1985; Kelly, 1980).

Forehand & Gilmer (1964) described characteristics of organizations, which determine organizational climate, as having direct effect upon individual (p.46). They are, in order of direct effect: size, structure, complexity of the system, leadership style, and goal direction. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick (1970) identified the most common characteristics affecting organizational climate as: (a) individual autonomy, (b) the degree structure imposed, (c) reorientation, (d) consideration, (e) warmth, and (f) support (p. 151).

School climate characteristics may be described from another perspective. Nwanko (1979) studied causal relationships in schools, which produced conflicts among students, while schools with open climates had good discipline. Nwanko's definition of climate supported the social system construct, stating that climate is the general "we-feeling" of groups or sub-cultures in the interactive life of the school (p. 27). Schools with poor climate are described as having (a) low initiative drive, (b) job dissatisfaction, (c) student alienation, (d) lack of creativity, (e) complacency, and (f) frustration (Clark, 1977, p. 10).

Organizational climate may be viewed as part of a larger context of stimulation in the workplace or schools. Forehand and Gilmer (1975) have discussed the psychological characteristics of organizational climate. Among the variables affecting climate are problems of satisfaction and perceptions regarding success and failure (Forehand & Gilmer, p. 361-370). They further defined organizational climate as "the set of characteristics that describes an organization 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).

Schneider and Barltett (1970) discussed climate as a function of the psychological importance an individual assigns to his work environment (Schneider & Barltett, 1970, p.493). This view of climate is limited to the individual perspective and does not consider it shared perception among members or non-members (Schneider, 1970, p.496). The individualistic view of climate excludes social group orientation toward work environments (Schneider & Bartlett, 1970). This view concluded that organizations have a variety of climates, as perceived by a number of individuals. Schneider (1975) insisted that organizational climate refers to a body or area of research, rather than a particular set of dimensions.

Among the individuals concerned with perceptions of school climate are the administration, the teachers, and the student body. Halpin (1966) viewed climate as the

"feel" and personality of the school. He stated, "that there are a number of differences in how observers view climate from one school to another." "In one school, the teachers and the principal are zestful and exude confidence in what they are doing." "They find pleasure in working with each other; this pleasure is transmitted to students...In a second school the brooding discontent of teachers is palpable...and this psychological sickness of such a faculty spills over to the students who, in their frustration, feed back to teachers a mood of despair" (Halpin, 1966, p.131).

The variable of personality may be described as the characteristics most affecting an individual's ability to adjust to environmental demands (Grace, 1986). Grace (1986) to demonstrate the similarity between the terms personality and climate used assumptions about personality. The nine similarities are as follows:

1. Personality/climate is possessed by every person/organization.
2. Personality/climate develops over a period of time.
3. Personality/climate is a pattern of consistent behaviors and characteristics.
4. Personality/climate is dynamic rather than static.
5. Personality/climate is partially inherent and partially acquired.
6. Personality/climate can be described by characteristic behavior traits or constellations of "related" traits (types).
7. Personality/climate is influenced by internal, external, and adjustment processes.
8. Personality/climate predisposes an individual/organization to certain behavioral patterns.
9. Personality/climate provides defenses-and outlets-for the self-concept and acquired motives (Grace, 1986, p.23, 24).

School climate according to Kelly (1980) involves two major personal components: satisfaction and productivity. Howard, Howell & Brainard (1987) related these goals as to school climate. The goal of productivity means that the school provides a wholesome, stimulating, and productive learning environment conducive to the academic and personal growth of students. The goal of satisfaction means that the

school provides a pleasant and satisfying environment within which young people can work. Satisfaction includes such factors as a sense of personal worth, enjoying school, and success from participation in worthwhile activity (p.6).

Howard, Howard, Howell & Brainard (1987) asserted that for a school to be productive and satisfying (and therefore have good climate), several basic human needs of students, faculty, and administrators must be fulfilled: (a) psychological needs (b) safety needs (c) acceptance and friendship needs (d) achievement and recognition needs and (e) needs to maximize one's potential (p.6).

In drawing upon the research, Fox (1978), and Howard, Howard, Howell and Brainard (1987) developed a listing of factors associated with good school climate:

> (a) continuous academic and social growth - students and faculty are improving their skills and knowledge with respect to academic and social assignments. Both students and faculty understand the expectations of academic achievement and are optimistic about success; (b) respect - students and faculty see themselves as persons of worth. School is viewed as a place of mutual respect where individuals have self-esteem, are considerate, and appreciate others; (c) trust - essentially, others have the integrity to be counted upon to do what they say they will do; (d) high morale - individuals in the school are described as feeling good about what is happening; (e) cohesiveness - often called school spirit or esprit de corps, this characteristic indicates people's sense of belonging to the school; (f) opportunities for input - every person has the desire to contribute ideas and know they have been considered; (g) school renewal - the school has the quality of growth, development, and change; it is self-renewing. Improvement is possible and expected; and (h) caring - people in the school are interested in each

other. They know that others are concerned about them (Fox, 1978; Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987, p.7, 8).

Lezotte (1980) pointed to the obvious linkage between productivity and satisfaction. The affective, satisfaction-based relations among individuals comprise the most commonly held notions of social climate. This accounts for the often-synonymous usage of climate and morale (Lezotte, 1980, p. 195-96). Kelley (1980) indicated that climate research in the 1950s and 1960s centered around two themes: the study of organizational climate in schools, and description of effective schools.

Organizational Climate in Schools

Halpin and Croft (1963) developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire OCDQ, working with a sample of seventy-one elementary schools. They constructed a continuum of six climate types, which were to be derived from the school's average scores on eight sub tests in order to measure organizational climate. The eight climate factors subscales are as follows:

a) hindrance - the teacher's feeling as a result of being burdened with work by the principal;

b) intimacy - the teacher's feeling of friendliness toward other teachers and social need satisfaction apart from work accomplishment;

c) disengagement - the teacher's tendency to work only by routine, rather than real involvement tasks;

d) esprit - the teacher's feeling that social needs are satisfied and accomplishment of tasks;

e) aloofness - the principal is perceived as impersonal and formal, motivated by rules and avoiding face-to-face contact;

f) trust - the principal is seen as task-oriented and wishes to move the school by his direction and example;

g) consideration - the principal is warm and friendly, and facilitates teachers by humane treatment; and

h) production emphasis - the principal is directive and uses close supervision and one-way communication (Halpin & Croft, 1963, p. 53).

They identified a continuum, which included the following, six types of climate: open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed. Generally, one would expect to find that schools with a more closed climate (familiar, paternal, closed) tend to have teachers and principals who dictate rules, are critical, and provide for few meeting and informal gatherings. The more open climates (open, autonomous, controlled) tend to have staffs who show commitment to their work and who cooperate with others. Their principals interact positively with both teachers and students (Anderson, 1982).

Miskel & Ogawa (1988) reported that in spite of some limitations, the Halpin and Croft conceptualization has led the way for a generation of researchers to examine climate and its relationship to a variety of factors (p.135). Among the contributions to this construct is a study which established that there is a relationship between open climate and the absence of student alienation in high schools (Hartley & Hoy, 1972). Kanner (1974) found a relationship between teacher satisfaction and loyalty to their principals in schools with open climate. Additional research indicated that principals of open schools displayed more confidence and sociability than principals in closed schools (Anderson, 1964).

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

Halpin & Croft (1963) developed one of the earliest conceptualizations of organizational climate. This construct utilized Halpin's earlier work in leadership studies. School climate was described as the work in leadership studies. School climate was described as the quality of relations between teachers and administrators (Halpin & Croft 1963, p.119). Two structural dimensions of the Halpin leadership model were indicative of the quality of the climate: consideration and the initiation of structure (Halpin, 1966).

Lezotte (1980) and Kelley (1980) reported no predictive or casual relationship between satisfaction and productivity. The affective, satisfaction-based relations among individuals comprise the most commonly held notions of social climate. This accounts for the oftentimes-synonymous usage of climate and morale. Kelly (1980) emphasized that "this lack of predictive link between satisfaction (morale and performance or productivity led most theorists and researchers to conclude by the 1960s that morale studies are important if measures of satisfaction are sought, but are relatively meaningless to use in making inferences about productivity. Thus, 'climate' and 'morale' are related but conceptually distinct terms" (p.6).

The Diagnostic Inventory for School Climate (DISC) was an example of this approach (O'Neal, et. al., 1987). Climate was defined in general terms as a reflection of the importance given to productivity and satisfaction as outcomes and as an interaction between the two components. O'Neal, and O'Neal, Short, Holmes, Brown, Deweese, & Carter, (1987) stated that "the academic, social, and physical development of skills, knowledge, and attitudes are all aspects of this component of climate. Satisfaction includes student morale and staff job satisfaction is concerned with quality of school life and fulfilling individual and group needs" (p.13).

In the DISC, "climate was defined as the combination of eight variables: (a) clear school mission - instruction (b) safe and well-ordered learning environment (c) expectations for success (d) high morale (e) effective instructional leadership (f) monitoring student progress (g) quality classroom instruction and (h) positive home-school relations" (O'Neal, et al., 1987, p.14).

Related Organizational Climate Studies

More recent research has been conducted using the OCDQ and has led to two revisions of the instrument (Clover, 1983; Mulhern, 1985). Many studies have criticized the OCDQ, especially the usefulness of the six climate types (Clover, 1983;

Hoy, Wayne, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988; Mulhern, 1985; Silver, 1983). Silver (1983) indicated the conceptual framework was lacking clear logic and was cumbersome (p.52). Production emphasis, for example, was mislabeled according to Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) because it actually measured close, autocratic control by the principal rather than emphasis on high production. They felt a better descriptor would be directiveness or controlling behavior. Halpin & Croft (1963) recognized this as a rather crude ranking at best, while Hoy (1972) argued for categorizing schools by relative openness and closedness. Another criticism has been that the OCDQ is not well suited for the study of urban or secondary schools (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

Revisions of the OCDQ have sought to resolve questions about the reliability and validity of the items and sub tests of the instrument. The unit of analysis of the OCDQ is primarily the individual, while the unit of analysis of the revisions is more properly the school (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). Clover (1983) and Mulhern (1985) generated new items for instrumentation, performed pilot studies, and field-tested the new instruments for reliability and validity assessment. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - Revised Elementary (OCDQ-RE and Revised Secondary (OCDQ-RS) are currently in use in place of the original instrument (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

The OCDQ-RS is a climate instrument with five dimensions describing the behavior of secondary teachers and principals. The instrument was designed for secondary schools. The OCDQ-RS describes a secondary school's openness by examining the interaction of principal behavior and teacher behavior (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991). Principal behavior is defined in terms of supportiveness and directiveness. Teacher behavior is defined in terms of frustrated, engaged, and intimate behavior. These aspects of school interaction form the basic dimensions of school climate - openness and intimacy (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

The OCDQ-RE describes an elementary school's climate by interaction of principal openness and teacher openness. Principal openness is derived from scores on subscales of supportive, directive, and restrictive behavior. Teacher openness comes from subscale scores of collegial, intimate, and disengaged behavior. An overall school climate type may be described as either open, engaged, disengaged, or closed (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Another of the most widely used constructs of climate is the managerial systems concept. This framework is concerned with superordinate-subordinate relationships (Likert, 1961). While Likert's conceptualization of climate has not been used as widely in schools as the OCDQ, this research has influenced understanding of the managerial behavior of school leaders (Lofland, 1985). Likert's (1961) work is rooted in the modern organizational theory that leader behavior is a casual variable for higher productivity in organizations. This conceptualization expected that organizations fall along a spectrum of four types of managerial systems: a) exploitive-authoritative, b) benevolent-uthoritative, c) constructive, and d) participative (Likert, 1961, p. 47). The similarity of this continuum to that of Halpin and Croft is obvious. In addition, Likert specified eight Organizational processes affecting an organization's placement along the continuum: "a) leadership processes; b) motivational forces; c) communication processes; d) interaction-influence processes; e) decision-making; f) goal setting; g) control processes; and h) performance goals and training ((Likert, 1961, p. 7-8)".

Murray (1938) described organizational climate in terms of environmental issues in the workplace. His premise was that the relationship between an individual and his environment determined a person's behavior at work. This concept, known as environmental press, described the conditions of external stimuli, which correspond to personality needs. Murray (1938) determined that behavior corresponds to the degree of congruency between environmental presses and individual needs. The relationship is a function of individual needs and the presses of the environment.

The primary outgrowth of the environmental press concept was the development of the so-called Syracuse Indexes (Kelley, 1980; Steinhoff, 1965; Stern, 1970). Among the assessment instruments are the Organizational Climate Index (OCI), the High School Characteristics Index (HSCI), the Elementary and Secondary School Index (ESI) and the Classroom Environment Index (CEI). These instruments adhere to the definition that school climate is related to satisfaction and productivity. The OCI measures perceptions of climate by faculty and other employees to include the following factors: "(a) intellectual climate (b) achievement standards (c) personal dignity (d) organizational effectiveness (e) orderliness and (f) impulse control. Dimensions of development press and task effectiveness are identified for measurement and diagnostic purposes"(Steinhoff, 1965, p. 36-37).

The HSCI, CEI, and ESI are used to measure student perceptions of climate. Climate factors identified by the instruments include (a) intellectual climate (b) expressiveness (c) group social life (d) dignity (e) achievement expectations (f) control and (g) peer group dominance. While the majority of climate measurement instruments derived perceptions from adults, the Syracuse Indexes made use of student perceptions (Moos, 1974, p. 76). For instance, the Classroom Environment Scale is used frequently with secondary school students. The measures of climate include (a) involvement (b) teacher support (c) affiliation (d) task orientation (e) competition (f) order and organization (g) teacher control and (h) goal orientation. This social ecology treats human interactions with physical and social dimensions of the environment as the measure of climate (Stern, 1970).

The role of students in the school climate literature focused on two aspects: behavior and academic success (achievement). Willower, Edell, & Hoy, (1967) developed the Pupil Control Inventory (PCI) which detailed a continuum of orientations toward pupil control. The spectrum ranges from custodial orientation to humanistic orientation. The humanistic orientation focuses on student behavior and performance as a psychological

phenomenon. Humanistically oriented teachers and administrators view pupil control in terms of self-discipline. Adult-pupil relations are the result of two-way communication, not directiveness. The custodial orientation originates from the viewpoint that the school is automatically arranged (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The hierarchy of downward flow of communication characterizes this structure orientation. Custodial teachers and administrators tended to stereotype students by behavior and socioeconomic status (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986). Hoy (1972) studied the relationship between pupil control orientation and student alienation. Strongly custodial schools tend to have high levels of student alienation.

School climate conceptualizations, which originate in the social-system dimension, are concerned with the environmental wellness of the institution. Howard, Howell & Brainard (1987) identify basic needs which should be met through; the environment: (a) physiological needs (b) safety needs (c) acceptance and friendship needs (d) achievement and recognition needs and (e) needs to recognize one's potential (Howard et al., 1987, p.6). Climate in the environment of institutions is formed by the norms, beliefs, and attitudes reflected in the conditions which endure and which distinguish among various environments (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986, p. 147). Expectations and needs are established by those who work within the environment and serve as the basis for interpreting events and activities occurring in the workplace (Kelly, 1980).

Effective Schools

The effective schools model viewed climate differently than the social system model. Goodlad (1975) described the social model when he declared: "What I am asking for, is that we suspend for a time, as a mater of policy, our preoccupation with pupil effects...and focus on the quality of life in schools..."(Goodlad, 1975, p.81).
In contrast, effective schools researchers have sought to show a positive relationship between school climate and pupil effects, namely, student achievement (Edmonds,

1979; Lezotte, 1980; Lindlow & Mazarella, 1985; McCormic-Larkin & Krited, 1982; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Rutter (1979) described student outcomes of achievement as the indicators of differences in climate between schools. Differences in levels of achievement are greater indicators of climate than student ability or socioeconomic status. Edmonds (1979) suggested that the importance of the school atmosphere (ethos) did not influence climate in the higher achieving schools.

Lindlow and Mazarella (1985) suggested a positive relationship between improved school climate and academic achievement, student conduct, and both student and faculty morale. Miskel and Ogawa (1988) reported that both school effectiveness research and organizational climate research treated climate as a component of the social-system dimension. The primary difference is that school effectiveness studies have "generally found that various elements of the cultural dimension of climate influence student achievement" (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988, p.295).

Several studies have focused on school improvement projects (Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Lezotte, 1980; McCormic-Larkin & Kritek, 1982). Climate studies have been conducted on student achievement as evidence of effective schools (Edmonds, 1982). Purkey and Smith (1982) reported that achievement studies have examined: (a) variables of structure and decision making in schools and districts (b) process determinants of change in schools and districts and (c) methods of improving time used in classrooms to increased instructional outcomes (p.79).

Duckett, Park, Clark, McCarthy, Lotto, Gregory, Herling & Burleson, 1980) published a Phi Delta Kappan study involving high achieving urban elementary schools. High student achievement was related to schools with excellent care of the physical setting in spite of neighborhood decadence. Leader's attitude, expectations, and philosophy were cited as variables significantly affecting positive climate and student achievement (Brookover & Lezette, 1977; Duckett, ET al., 1980). Effective

leadership techniques included goal setting, performance standards, availability of support, and productive working arrangements.

Brookover has identified school climate factors and Lezotte (1979) based on perceptions of students, teachers, and principals: (a) school climate (b) teacher's climate and (c) principal climate. Brookover & Lezotte (1979) defined school climate as a composite of variables, which are defined and perceived by members of this group (p.48). These factors may be broadly conceived as the norms of the social system and expectations held for various members as perceived by the members of this group and communicated to the members of the group (p.302). Brookover and Lezotte (1979) and Kelly (1979) identified these integral components of schools with a climate supportive of high achievement among students. They are (a) faculties accept basic objectives of the school (b) faculties have a strong commitment to high expectations and (c) faculties accept responsibility for achieving stated goals (p. 79 and p. 275).

The role of the principal has been shown to affect school climate, social structure, morale, and student achievement (Austin, 1978; Duckett, Park, McCarthy, Lotto, Gregory, Herling & Burleson, 1980; Lezotte, 1980). The principal's attitude and expectations for student success are critical factors, which determine school climate. Austin (1978) investigated differences between 18 high achieving schools and 12 low achieving schools. Among the most significant factors accounting for the differences, several were related to the principal, such as, involvement in instruction, assertive leadership, goal orientation, and high expectations.

Descriptive studies of effective schools were a topic for considerable study during the 1970s and 1980s. McKenzie (1986) synthesized the effective schools research into four categories; program evaluations, case studies, outliner studies, and school improvement projects. The study discovered that literature on organizational climate of effective schools focused singularly upon achievement:

"The ultimate effect is upon student achievement with the accepted definition that effective schools are the ones which foster student achievement at a higher level than less effective schools..."(p. 60). Other studies of climate in effective schools have produced generalizations supporting this paradigm. A widely accepted definition of effective schools has been stated by Edmonds (1979), simply that, effective schools show a positive end product (i.e., pupil effects, student achievement, and outcomes) (p.22). This requires that children acquire basic skills at an early level in order to insure successful transition to the next level of schooling. In contrast, an earlier study by Coleman (1966) indicated that family effects, such as socioeconomic status, most directly influence academic achievement (p. 55). Much of the school effectiveness research was in reaction to the publication of the Coleman report (Edmonds, 1979). It was felt by later researchers that schools would have greater impact on increasing student achievement than various family factors which might detract from success (Brookover & Lezette, 1979; Duckett, Park, Clark, McCarty, Lotto, Gregory, Herling & Burleson, 1980; Edmonds, 1979; McCormic-Larkin & Kritek, 1982).

In summary, school effectiveness researchers have approached the study of climate in terms of examination of school level factors. Factors, which affect school climate, are most widely displayed through increased student achievement and morale. Organizational structure, social structure, cultural elements, and physical/material aspects of the school have been shown to effect school climate (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Tagiuri & Litwin (1968) broadly conceptualized these four dimensions of climate as: a) ecology - the physical and material aspects of the organization b) milieu - the actual physical presence of individuals or groups c) social system - the patterns of relationships which exist between and among individuals or groups and d) culture - involves the belief system, values, and cognitive structures (p.47). School effectiveness research is concerned with measuring and improving student achievement as a

component in the process of improving climate (Edmonds, 1982; McCormic-Larkin & Kritek, 1982).

The social system paradigm of climate studies has been more narrowly conceptualized. Climate has been viewed in terms of existing social relationships which influence schools as organizations (Parsons, 1968). The social structure of schools is intertwined with relationships in the hierarchical structure (Getzels, Lipman & Campbell, 1968). Climate is conceived as the quality of relations among teachers and administrators or teachers and students.

Job Satisfaction

Studies regarding job satisfaction of employees were rare until well into the twentieth century (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell, 1957; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Owens, 1995). An emphasis on production without respect to employees working conditions and morale was a carryover from the industrialization of the nineteenth century (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Herzberg, 1966). Frederick Taylor, known as the father of scientific management, began to dissect the existing paradigm when he advocated maximization of potential through incentives in compensation (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Elton Mayo furthered the field with treatment of people as individuals when his studies at the Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric revealed a direct relationship between productivity and expectations from others (Owens, 1995).

Since the 1930's job satisfaction research has expanded to include virtually every employment field, including education (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Researchers find it hard to settle on one definition on job satisfaction with some researchers focusing on employees and others focusing on outcomes (Campbell, 1977; Hoppock, 1935; Lawler, 1967, 1983; Legge & Mumford, 1978; Sergiovanni, 1969; Vroom, 1964; Warner, 1981; and Waters, 1978).

Definition of Job Satisfaction

Definitions of job satisfaction are as numerous as the varieties of jobs studied. Some definitions of satisfaction focused on the feelings of the employee (effect)(Legge & Lawler, 1983, 1967; Mumford, 1978; Vroom, 1964; and Warner, 1981), while others focused on production (outcomes) (Campbell, 1977; Sergiovanni, 1969; Waters, 1978; and Hoppock, 1935) posited one of the earliest and simplest definitions of satisfaction as any combination of psychological and environmental circumstances that resulted in the employee's admission that he is "satisfied" with the job. Legge & Mumford (1978) felt that job satisfaction as an employee's positive attitude towards his work, when his needs, expectations, and aspirations in work match his job experiences (Legge & Mumford, 1978, p.54).

Lawler (1983) concurred with the notion that satisfaction is comprised of attitudes at work. Individuals develop a set of attitudes toward job characteristics, including duties, supervisors, pay, and coworkers (Lawler, 1983, p.273). The result is seen as affective attitudes or orientations towards the job, which determine the degree of satisfaction. Vroom (1964) identified job satisfaction as a positive affective orientation by an individual toward his/her work role. Warner (1981) viewed job satisfaction as the degree to which a job provides a person with positively valued outcomes. Lawler and Porter (1967) envisioned satisfaction as an independent variable, concluding that good work performance (productivity) leads to satisfaction with the job.

Waters (1978) argued that job satisfaction was a larger and more important issue for organizations than productivity. He also indicated that good human relations were part of an overall socioeconomic productivity measure. Sergiovanni (1969) thought that satisfaction factors identified for teachers could not be separated from performance and extrinsic recognition for success. He concluded that satisfaction focused on work itself, while dissatisfaction focused on working conditions. Campbell (1977) similarly

thought that teacher job satisfaction was the extent to which teachers were pleased with the various job outcomes they were receiving.

Theoretical Constructs of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined in various ways (Cambell, 1977; Hoppock, 1935; Lawler, 1983; Mumford, 1978; Sergiovanni, 1969; Vroom, 1964; Warner, 1981; Waters, 1978). Likewise, a variety of theoretical frameworks have been presented which provide perspectives on the nature, origin, measurement, and importance of job satisfaction (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Job satisfaction is an elusive topic for definition; therefore researchers have frequently cited theories of work motivation when addressing job satisfaction theory (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick, 1970; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). While motivation and satisfaction are not synonymous, they are clearly related (Owens, 1995).

Two theoretical constructs of job satisfaction and motivation dominate the literature. Content (or substantive) theories focus on what energizes behavior-individual factors which arouse, direct, or terminate behavior (Waters, 1978). Process (or mechanical) theories address motivation in terms of why individuals choose behavior patterns and analyze how variables interact to influence job satisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1969).

Content Theories of Job Satisfaction

Maslow (1943, 1954) formulated a theory of behavior drawn from assumptions about basic human needs. Needs produce drives in a person, which upset internal balance and produces tension. Tension in turn yields motivation to behave in such a way as to reduce tensions and thereby restore balance (Maslow, 1943, 1954). Basic biological and psychological needs comprise a hierarchical order which leads individuals who successfully meet those needs toward self-actualization. The hierarchy of needs includes:

physiological needs - the fundamental need for existence, including water, food, and so forth;

security-safety needs - the need for freedom from fear, pain, or threat;

social need - the need to be accepted, feels part of a group, be loved, and engage in social activity;

self-esteem needs - the need for respect and recognition, and a sense of achievement, and competence; and

self-actualization - the need for personal fulfillment and intrinsic satisfaction by maximum personal potential (Maslow, 1954 p.45).

Maslow's theory presupposed that individual behavior is motivated by desire to satisfy the most pressing need at the moment. The strength of a need is dependent on the fulfillment of other needs lower on the hierarchy. When lower order needs are sufficiently satisfied, higher order social-psychological needs motivate the individual to behave in ways congruent to the need. As applied to the work setting, Maslow suggested that lower order needs, such as safety, security, and pay, must be met before the employee is motivated to seek satisfaction and achievement (Maslow, 1954, p. 77-79).

White (1959) explored the competence motive of self-esteem needs. He observed that individuals desire to control and actively participate in their environment (p.24). As they succeed in fulfilling this need, people gain confidence and develop competence. As one's needs for competence are satisfied the individual must continually receive new challenges for mastery over the environment. Continual challenges to engage in new employment activities may therefore impact job satisfaction (p.24).

The most common usage of need orientation theory stems from the work of Porter (1962, 1963) who developed the Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire NSQ. His modification of Maslow's hierarchy included autonomy needs, which are placed between self-esteem and self-actualization. He further assumed that physiological

needs are sufficiently at higher levels of employment. Not surprisingly, he found that self-actualization was most important for management level positions.

Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) and Carver and Sergiovanni (1971) applied an adapted version of NSQ to education. The largest deficiencies reported for educators were self-esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization. Teachers were most satisfied with lower level needs such as security and social needs. Anderson & Iwanicki (1984) did a comparison study with Trusty and Sergiovanni's earlier work. Their conclusions were similar, however, they discovered that higher order needs were deficient to a larger extent than reported in the earlier report.

Needs hierarchy theory has enjoyed wide intuitive appeal in educational circle (Wahbe & Birdwell, 1976). Consistent empirical verification of the five need areas has been inconclusive, largely due to definitional problems and instrumental weaknesses (Pierson, Archambault & Iwanicki, 1985; Wahbe & Birdwell, 1976). The best use of need orientation in education may be at the theoretical level.

Two Factor Theory (Motivation-Hygiene)

Human needs orientation was described by Herzberg (1966) as fitting into two categories; the need to avoid pain and the need for psychological growth. Among the postulates developed by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell (1957), was the concept that origins of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are distinctly different. Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman (1959) conducted subsequent study of work motivation based on this construct. This study involved over 200 accountants and engineers who were asked in interviews to describe specific work experiences (critical incidents) which improved job satisfaction and those experiences which significantly reduced job satisfaction. This method is known as critical incident reporting (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959).

Satisfying or motivational factors are intrinsic job conditions, which influence good job performance (Jones & James, 1979). Included in the list of factors related to work motivation is (a) achievement (b) recognition (c) responsibility and (d) work itself. Extrinsic job conditions are known as hygiene factors or dissatisfies, including (a) interpersonal relations (b) quality of supervision (c) company policies (d) working conditions and (e) salary.

The presence of these dissatisfiers does not always or automatically motivates employees. The absence of these conditions, however, may result in dissatisfaction (Owens, 1995). Work satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not really opposites. They are instead separate dimensions of work orientation. Hygiene factors cause dissatisfaction, while motivators cause satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966).

Sergiovanni (1987) reported that testing of the factor theory in educational settings "consistently confirms this general pattern and establishes the same general motivation and hygiene factor sets" (p.247). The concept of a "fair day's work for a fair day's pay" affects a teacher's decision to participate in and perform on the job (Sergiovanni, 1987, p.256). Hygiene factors (work conditions) must be satisfied at a base level in order for motivational factors (concerned with the work itself) to result in greater job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

The greatest support for the two factor theory has resulted when the critical incidents approach was utilized (Sergiovanni, 1987). Holdaway (1978) reported that the major source of teacher job satisfaction was working with students. Other satisfiers were consistent with Herzberg's official findings: job security, achievement, responsibility, and potential for advancement. Other replications of Herzberg's study indicated teachers who wish to obtain administrative positions experienced a greater need for motivator rewards than those who planned to remain in teaching did. In other words, people who wish for promotion to higher levels adopt the attitudes of people at

that level, prior to actual promotion. Motivation therefore may extend beyond one's present employment station (Holdaway, 1978, p. 29).

Researchers have criticized Herzberg's theory because it lacks flexibility in methodology (Holdaway, 1978; Miskel, 1973; Sergiovanni, 1987). Divergent methods have produced inconsistent results. Critical incident interviewing tends to diminish the impact of past events in the job history (Szilagyi & Wallace, 1983). King (1970) who found several versions of two-factor theory reported in literature has noted the lack of precise statement of theory. Studies which use rating scales have indicated that motivators are better predictors of job attitudes and involvement than hygiene factors (Armstrong, 1971).

Sergiovanni (1987) summarized the importance of the content theories of job satisfaction when he issued a challenge to school administrators. The use of needs orientation and two factor theory can provide administrators with an important dimension of reflective practice: "Taken together, teacher motivation, climate, and change are the processes of administration representing the roads to school improvement" (Sergiovanni, 1987, p.252). In spite of some weaknesses, the content theories provide researchers with a systematic and understandable approach to understanding job satisfaction (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

Process Theories of Job Satisfaction

In contrast to the content theories of satisfaction, process (or mechanical) theories address how the variables of the work environment interact (Carver & Sergiovanni, 1971; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The relationship between an individual and his environment results in conscious behavioral choices (Cole, 1977). The processing of these choices may be described and analyzed in order to better understand how behavior is energized, directed, and sustained (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The prevalent

process theories in literature are expectancy theory, the job characteristics model, goal theory, and equity theory (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Expectancy Theory

Expectancy theory was initially proposed by Vroom (1964). The theory is a contingency approach which views work motivation as a response to an individual's needs in relation to sought-after goals (Vroom, 1964, p.61). Motivation, therefore, is a highly individualistic process since personal goals differ for each person. An individual chooses behavioral strategies, which are likely to result in perceived job related rewards. The amount of effort and the quality of performance on the job are driven by the expected value of potential outcomes (known as valence)(Vroom, 1964, p. 123).

The theory is often called instrumentality theory (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Instrumentality refers to the extent to which the job is instrumental in fulfilling goals and creating satisfaction (Gay, 1981; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Job performance and achievement are expended in proportion to the perceived probability that potential outcomes (valence) are obtained. The individual's subjective expectancy directs performance and satisfaction (Vroom, 1964).

In the educational setting, expectancy theory has been substantiated by Miskel, Defrain, and Wilcox (1980). In their study of secondary and higher education teachers, it was concluded that anticipation of successful performance was essential to job satisfaction. Teachers were shown to be more motivated when the probability of being successful and obtaining desired outcomes was high. Miskel, McDonald & Bloom (1983) showed a significant relationship between teacher motivation and student achievement, interpersonal communication with peer educators, and both teacher and student attitudes. Their longitudinal study revealed a consistency in expectancy motivation over a school year period.

Criticisms of expectancy theory are rooted in both theoretical and methodological problems. It has been argued that the model over-intellectualizes the cognitive processing used by individuals when making job related choices (Schwab, Olian-Gottlieb & Heneman, 1979, p.47). The complexity of this process makes it difficult to measure the intended valences with support work motivation. In reality, individuals do not internalize work situations and calculate probabilities and values in order to make such choices (Schwab et al., 1979, p.62). The methodology of the theory has been criticized as lacking the power to explain large percentages of variance in criterion variables such as effort and performance (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988, p. 153). Relationships are much stronger for the within-subjects models than for the between subjects models.

Criticisms of expectancy theory have not detracted from its widespread popularity as a useful method of explaining employee effort, performance and satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Practitioners may find the theory valuable in matching employee effort, performance and satisfaction. Practitioners may find the theory valuable in matching the personal goals of employees with specific rewards offered within the organization (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). In agreement with the two-factor theory, expectancy theory espouses that the work itself is an important source of desired outcomes. Satisfaction is viewed as a function of actual performance (Vroom, 1964).

The Job Characteristics Model

The concept of job enrichment is designed to provide stimulating and challenging work opportunities which increased the intrinsic satisfaction individuals obtained from work (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). The theory of job characteristics assumed that improved performance and additional responsibilities would result in increased satisfaction and high morale. Hackman & Oldham (1976, 1980) presented the job characteristic model as the primary articulation of job enrichment needs.

The job characteristics model posits that three psychological states are critical in determining a person's work motivation and satisfaction:

1. experience meaningfulness - the degree to which the individual perceived the work as worthwhile;
2. experience responsibility - the extent to which the individual believes he is personally accountable for efforts;
3. knowledge of results - the extent to which a person is able to determine whether or not performance is satisfactory and efforts leads to outcomes (Hackman & Oldham, p. 54-56).

Hackman and Oldham (1980) suggested that the content of one's job is a determiner of work motivation and that by enriching certain job characteristics motivation may be increased. Among the core job dimensions are skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback (p.71). Jobs, which are high in motivating potential, reinforce employees who have high performance levels (Hoppock, 1935; Lawler, 1983). Generally it is job characteristics which motivate employees (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

Hackman and Oldham (1976, 1980) developed the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS). Pastor & Erlandson (1982) used the higher-order-needs portion of the JDS and supported the theory that secondary teachers were predominantly higher order in nature and their needs were positively related to job satisfaction. Sashkin and Morris (1984) explored the dimensions of friendship opportunities, and development of close contacts among teachers. Successful work completion was related to the extent to which the accomplishment of tasks required interactions among teachers (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Overall satisfaction and quality of work seems related to worker's involvement on the job (Sashkin & Morris, 1984). The job characteristic model received criticism in the initial usage. The original researchers admitted that the definition and measurement of

individual differences among workers posed problems (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Variations among individuals are treated as independent by this model.

Goal Theory

Work motivation based on the pursuit of goals is similar to expectancy theory. The underlying assumptions in goal theory include:

"a) human behavior has purpose b) behavior is controlled by intentional goal setting c) actions are directed toward fulfillment of some end rather than another" (Locke, Cartledge & Knerr, 1970, p.45). The theory formalized the goal theory to include seven characteristics, which energized, maintained, and regulated behavior.

The rationale for goal theory rests on human reasoning (processing) and cognition. Individuals evaluate alternatives and chose behaviors which satisfy subjective goals and needs (Locke, Cargledge & Knerr, 1970). Locke (1976) insisted that motivation be rooted in need fulfillment and value orientation. Job satisfaction, therefore, is the discrepancy between what an individual wants and what he perceives himself as getting and the importance of what is wanted. Locke, Shaw, Saari and Latham (1981) claimed that the goal setting approach to motivation has shown a positive effect on work performance in ninety percent of reported studies.

The simplicity of goal theory is an asset for its application in an educational setting. Prediction of performance for tasks which are not complex is consistently measurable (Locke, 1976). A criticism of the simplicity is that goal theory fails to explain how acceptance of goals, difficulty of goals, and other variables actually combine to determine effort (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

Equity Theory

According to equity theory, discrepancies exist in the workplace (Hoy & Miskel, 1997). Motivation and job satisfaction are determined by the extent of the discrepancy between what the job offers and what the employee expects, wants, and values. Porter (1962) used this internal discrepancy between actual and desired need fulfillment as an indicator of job satisfaction. Satisfaction is highest when need deficiency is lowest, and so forth. Equity theorist suggest that individuals are motivated to reduce any perceived discrepancy between the amount of reward they receive and the amount of effort expended (Homans, 1961).

Equity theory was further expanded to involve perceived equities/inequities between fellow workers. Homans (1961) and Adams (1963) provided the foundation for equity theory in studies of cognitive dissonance and social comparison. Individuals compare their own inputs (e.g., skills, aptitude, education, etc.) and outputs (e.g., promotion, compensation, rewards, etc.) to those of fellow employees (p.74 and p. 423).

In theory, any extremes of inputs and outputs will result in cognitive dissonance and therefore dissatisfaction (Homans, 1961). Both under-compensation and over-compensation are expected to cause inequity and dissatisfaction (Patchen, 1961). Research on equity theory of under-compensation situation has been supported by indicating that underpayment leads to job dissatisfaction (Pritchard, Dunnette & Jorgenson, 1972). The effects of overpayment lead to job dissatisfaction (Pritchard, Dunnette & Jorgenson, 1972). The effects of overpayment on perception of equity are not conclusive according to Carrel & Dietrich (1978). Only partial support for theoretical predictions of under-rewarding situations was noted in a study involving job satisfaction of teachers (Miskel, Glasnap & Hatley, 1975). According to the literature, there is a discrepancy between job satisfaction of junior high teachers and job satisfaction of middle schoolteachers, (Draud, 1978; Fawley, 1980; Kidd, 1976; McGee & Krajewski, 1979; and Pook, 1980).

Job Satisfaction of Middle School Teachers

Fielder (1978), in his discussion of middle school staffing, suggested that teacher morale is of key importance to the effective middle school administrator. The effect of middle school characteristics and how they interact with job satisfaction of middle school teachers is relevant to the future of the middle school movement. Several proponents of the middle school movement have suggested that the middle school may offer unique opportunities for increased intrinsic job satisfaction of teachers. Alexander, Williams, Compton, Hines, Prescot and Kealy (1968) suggested that the teacher in the middle school might experience a higher degree of professional fulfillment and self-satisfaction than the teacher in a conventional school. They related that one of the factors which should contribute to teacher morale and teacher satisfaction with the human relations aspect of his job is significant interaction with other teachers (Alexander, Williams, Compton, Hines, Prescot & Kealy, 1968, p. 247-259). The plan of the middle school is to call for this type of interaction more often than teachers might experience in more conventional elementary or junior high schools (Kealy, 1968, p. 144).

Demps (1978) proposed that the successful implementation of middle school characteristics, such as independent study require self-direction and autonomy on the part of the teacher which may lead to an increased sense of achievement. A study by Klingele (1979) demonstrated that student-oriented instruction that is advocated for middle school students by many middle school proponents leads to increased satisfaction for teachers.

Studies of the job satisfaction of middle school teachers have compared junior high and middle school teachers. Kidd (1976) found that junior high school teachers and middle school teachers did not differ in their attitudes toward their jobs. These two groups of teachers both held negative attitudes toward their jobs. Draud (1978)

compared junior high school and middle school teachers in Hamilton County, Ohio, in their attitudes toward school. He found that middle school teachers were more satisfied with salaries, status, and community support; whereas, junior high school teachers were more satisfied with curriculum issues and the rapport among teachers (p. 4620A).

McGee and Krajewski (1979) found teachers who had taught at the junior high school, before the schools' transition to a middle school, indicated that their attitudes toward teaching and education were more positive under the middle school concept. Fawley (1980) however, determined that middle school teachers exhibited less job satisfaction than either secondary or elementary teachers did. Pook (1980) found that middle school job satisfaction was higher for teachers who wanted to teach at the middle school and who taught in schools of approximately 300 to 550 students. She also found that teachers in middle schools were more satisfied with the curriculum in schools, which had implemented recognized middle school principles and practices.

Variables Associated with Job Satisfaction of Teachers

The literature revealed that many variables have been associated with job satisfaction of teachers; however, the following variables are most relevant to this study.

Teaching Experience

Cole (1977) and Kaufman (1984) found no differences in teaching experience and job satisfaction of teachers. Other studies have found some differences. Perry (1980) found that teachers with less than two years of experience had higher levels of satisfaction than those whom had taught three to five years. Teachers with ten or more years were less satisfied than those who had taught one to five years. The results of a study by Kalis (1980) mirror the findings of Perry. Devault (1981) found that as the number of years of teaching experience increased from under five years to twenty years, work site satisfaction decreased (p.17).

Current Degree Status

Bergeth (1971) determined that teachers with bachelors degrees had higher morale levels than teachers with master's degrees. He indicated that those with less education probably were more content with their teaching situation than teachers with more education. Researchers reporting no significant differences between job satisfaction and degree status, include Cole (1977), Kaufman (1984) & Murphy (1985).

Certification Level

The recent Carnegie Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents (1989) report called for middle schools staffed with teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents and who have been specially prepared for assignment at the middle school. A study by Gillan (1979) determined that certified middle school teachers were more satisfied than middle school teachers certified at either elementary or high school levels.

Size of School

The results of studies reporting the relationship of school size and teacher job satisfaction have been mixed. Hussein (1969) study discovered that there was higher job satisfaction in smaller schools. Bergeth (1970) discovered the opposite in his study. Pook's (1980) study indicated that middle school teachers were more satisfied when the number of students in their school fell between 300 and 550. Howerver, Cole (1977) reported that there was no significant relationship between school size and teacher job satisfaction.

Age

Demps (1978) indicated that, in general, older teachers seemed to be more satisfied with their jobs than younger teachers. Sweeney (1981) pointed out that teachers over thirty-five were more satisfied than teachers between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-four years of age were. Lowther, Coppard, Gill, and Tank's (1982) study indicated teachers over fifty to be more satisfied with their jobs than teachers under thirty-five. However, in a subsequent study, Lowther, Gill and Coppard (1985) analyzed the

determinants of job satisfaction in teachers at different ages and revealed: "(1) job satisfaction increased with age, (2) job values remained constant with age, (3) job rewards increased with age, and (4) the major determinants of job satisfaction were intrinsic to teaching for younger teachers and extrinsic to teaching for older teachers" (Lowther, Gill & Coppard, 1985, p. 520).

Middle School Program Components

Middle schools have gained momentum as the most promising educational delivery system for adolescent children in the United States' public educational system. The concept of the ideal middle school continues to evolve since its inception in the 1960s (Lousbury & Vars, 1978). The Carnegie Task Force on Adolescent Development (1989) released its report, Turning Points: Preparing American Youth For the 21st Century, in June 1989. This task force was convened in 1986 for the purpose of placing the compelling challenges of the adolescent years higher on the nation's agenda. The task force called upon all sectors of society to mobilize to build a national consensus to make transformation of middle grade schools a reality and to form partnerships that will create for young adolescents to a time of purposeful exploration and preparation for constructive adulthood.

Drawing upon the most pertinent information and current middle school practices, the task force called for middle schools that:

> Create small communities for learning where stable, close, mutually respectful relationships with adults and peers are considered fundamental for intellectual development and personal growth. The key elements of these communities are schools-within-schools or houses, students and teachers grouped together as teams, and small group advisories that ensure that every student is known well by at least one adult.

Teach a core academic program that results in students who are literate, including in (sic) the sciences, and who know how to think critically, lead healthy life, behave ethically, and assume the responsibilities of citizenship in a pluralistic society. Youth service to promote values for citizenship is an essential part of the core academic program.

Ensure success for all students through elimination of tracking by achievement level and promotion of cooperative learning, flexibility in arranging instructional time and adequate resources (time, space, equipment, and materials) for teachers.

Empower teachers and administrators to make decisions about the experiences of middle grade students through creative control by teachers over the instructional program linked to greater responsibilities for student's performance, governance committees that assist the principal in designing and coordinating school-wide programs, and autonomy and leadership within sub-schools or houses to create environments tailored to enhance the intellectual and emotional development of all youth.

Staff middle grade schools with teachers who are expert at teaching young adolescents and who have been specially prepared for assignment to the middle grades.

Improve academic performance through fostering the health and fitness of young adolescents, by providing a health coordinator in

every middle grade school, access to health care and counseling services, and a health-promoting school environment.

Re-engage families in the education of young adolescents by giving families meaningful roles in school governance, communicating with families about the school program and students' progress, and offering families opportunities to support the learning progress at home and at the school.

Connect schools with communities, which together share responsibility for each middle grade student's success, through identifying service opportunities in the community, establishing partnerships and collaborations to ensure students' access to health and social services, and using community resources to enrich the constructive after-school activities (The Carnegie Task Force of Adolescent Development, 1989, p. 9-10).

Major middle school components that are common to the middle school organization are: (a) team organization (b) schedule flexibility (c) core academic program (d) teacher advisory program (e) diverse exploratory program and (f) effective and varied instructional methodology designed to meet the unique needs of adolescents (Alexander & George, 1981; Alexander & McEwin, 1989; Carnegie, 1989; Clark & Clark, 1970; George & Alexander, 1993; George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992; Magana, 1987; Manning, 1994; Strahan, 1992).

During the past thirty years, the middle school movement has been a driving force in public education (Brookover, 1981; Curtis, 1977). What began as a better way to handle rapidly increasing numbers of students has developed into a formalized program to better meet the educational needs of transient students (Clark, 1977; Erb,

1988; Mergendiller & Mitman, 1985; George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992). Today's formal middle school program assists students to make a successful transition from the nurturing environment of the elementary classroom to the departmentalized environment of the high school (Connors & Irvin, 1989; George & Alexander, 1993). The keys to this successful transition, and to positive teacher leadership in middle schools, are the major middle school program components that are implemented in "true" middle schools (Seghers, Kirby & Meza, 1997).

Theoretically, students should be happier and experience more school success in the middle school environment than in the junior high (Aspy, 1977; George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992). Teachers who have positive attitudes toward leading their students to succeed create the successful middle school environment. There are factors that affect the attitudes of middle school teachers in a positive way. Identification of the factors that affect positive middle school teacher attitudes can lead to the production of a profile of the successful middle school teacher (George & Shewey, 1994). A teacher's profile could be used by middle school principals and personnel directors at some point in the teacher selection process to hire the best teachers for middle school children (Manning, 1993).

Summary

This review of literature focused on four topics: organizational climate, job satisfaction, variables associated with job satisfaction of teachers, and middle school program components. The organizational climate of schools presented in this review was viewed as the personality or feel of the school (Halpin & Croft, 1963). Perception by members within and non-members outside the school are the most common indicators of climate (Keefe, Kelly & Miller, 1985). The climate of a school distinguishes it from other schools and influences the behavior of the people within the school (Halpin & Croft, 1963). The goals of good or positive school climate include

satisfaction and productivity (Howard, et al., 1987). Two constructs dominate recent literature: the climate of schools as organizations and the climate of effective schools (Edmonds, 1979; Goodlad, 1979; Lidelow & Mazarella, 1985). Schools as organizations have climates ranging from open to closed (Halpin & Croft, 1966). The climate of effective schools has been linked to increases in student achievement (Edmonds, 1979).

Research related to job satisfaction has consisted of studies involving work motivation and morale (Miskel, McDonald & Bloom, 1983; Schwab et al., 1979). Satisfaction has been described in terms of the employee's affective attitudes toward work (Hoppock, 1935). Satisfaction is a personal perception and involves motivation, performance, and recognition (Sergiovanni, 1969). Content theories of satisfaction investigate what energizes behavior; process theories focus on why behavior is chosen (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Among the factors associated with satisfaction is needs fulfillment, internal motivator, extrinsic motivator, work environment factors, employee expectation/needs, and equity. Theoretical treatment of satisfaction is included in the overall assessment of organizational climate (Owens, 1995).

The organizational climate of schools and job satisfaction of teachers has been frequently studied since the 1950s (Berrien, 1968; Halpin & Croft, 1963; Halpin, 1966; Steinhoff, 1965; Stern, 1970; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968; and Willower, Eidell & Hoy, 1967). Many studies related to organizational climate have been conducted since the 1960s (Chance, 1992; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Howard, Howell & Brainard, 1987; Hoy, Wayne, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Kelly, 1980; Krenshaw, Bellon, Blank, Brian & Perkins, 1990; O'Neal, O'Neal, Short, Holmes, Brown, Deweese & Carter, 1987).

Teachers who have positive attitudes assisting in the success of students create the successful middle school environment. There are factors that affect the attitudes of middle school teachers in a positive way (Alexander, 1993; Carnegie, 1989; George & Manning, 1994; Strahan, 1992). Identification of the factors that impact positive middle

school teacher attitudes can lead to the production of a profile of the successful middle school teacher (George & Shewey, 1994). Such a profile could be used by middle school principals and personnel directors at some point in the teacher selection process to hire the best teachers for middle school children (Manning, 1993).

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

Introduction and Review of Study

Organizational climate is the measurement of an individual's relationship with other employees in the work environment (teacher-principal or subordinate - superordinate relationships) (Halpin & Croft, 1963). When students, parents, teachers or administrators enter a school they immediately sense the personality of the institution (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Instant though lasting impressions are formed. Opinions are quickly made about the worth and quality of programs without the benefit of direct observations and classroom instruction (Halpin & Croft, 1963). Schools are determined to be good or bad, warm or cold, personal or impersonal, friendly or unfriendly, under control or out of control (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Hoy & Forsyth (1986) stated that teachers' performance in schools is determined by the climate in which they work.

Job satisfaction is an important aspect reflective of organizational climate. According to the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire MSQ, job satisfaction is divided into three categories - extrinsic satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction and general satisfaction (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965, 1967).

Today's formal middle school program helps students make a successful transition from the nurturing environment of the elementary classroom to the departmentalized environment of the high school (George, Stevenson, Thomason & Beane, 1992). The keys to this successful transition and to positive teacher leadership in middle schools

are the major middle school program components that are implemented in "true" middle schools (Johnston, 1991).

Purpose of the Study

This study provided educators and researchers with data concerning the relationship between the perceptions of teachers of organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. The data concerning organizational climate indicators and job satisfaction components of one school district may be useful for administrators of middle schools in that system. Other school districts may use these findings for comparative and analytical purposes. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) and Glesne and Peshkin (1992) explained that one of the objectives of quantitative research is to reveal understanding, not pass judgment.

The following research questions were proposed as appropriate for this study:

1. What are teacher perceptions regarding the organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) of selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District (CCSD)?
2. What are teacher perceptions regarding the job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
3. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
4. Is there a relationship between teacher gender and perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

5. Is there a relationship between teachers educational degrees and their perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
6. Is there a relationship between teachers' experience (years in teaching profession both in and out of the Clark County School District) and perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?
7. Is there a relationship between ethnicity and teacher perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and perceptions of job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools of the Clark County School District?

Population/Sample

The population for this study was a selected urban middle school teachers in the Clark County School District (CCSD). According to information from the Clark County School District public information office, during the 1998-99 school year there were 1,723 urban middle school teachers in the Clark County School District. Nineteen urban middle schools in Clark County participated in this study. Fifteen teachers were selected from each selected urban middle school by a simple random sample procedure to participate in the study for a total population of two hundred eighty-five (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 164). McMillan & Schumacher (1997) concluded that in situations in which a simple random sample is selected, a sample size that is a percentage of the population can approximate the characteristics of the population satisfactorily (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 165-66, & p. 172). Bias was avoided with simple random sampling, as there was a possibility of all characteristics of the

population being represented. The fifteen randomly selected teachers from the nineteen selected urban middle schools received copies of the two questionnaires.

The selection was obtained from a listing of teachers provided by principals from the nineteen urban middle schools that responded in the Clark County School District. According to Gay (1987), using a table of random numbers to select a sample involves the following specific steps.

1). Identify and define the population.

2). Determine the desired sample size.

3). List all members of the population.

4). Assign all individuals on the list a consecutive number from zero to the required number, for example, 0000-1723.

5). Select an arbitrary number in the table of random numbers.

6). For the selected number, look at only the appropriate number of digits.

7). If the number corresponds to the number assigned to any of the individuals in the population. If it does, that individual becomes part of the sample.

8). Go to the next number in the column and repeat step seven.

9). Repeat step eight until the desired number of individuals has been selected for the sample (p. 105).

A letter was sent to each participating principal asking that his or her school participate in the study. Nineteen principals agreed to participate in the study. The two hundred eighty-five participants were mailed (1) a letter asking them to participate in the study, (2) a copy of the OCDQ-RS, the MSQ, demographic questionnaire and, (3) a stamped return-addressed envelope. The process was repeated in two weeks to teachers who did not respond. One hundred-ninety-seven teachers responded to the

survey from nineteen urban middle schools. This was a response of seventy percent of the two hundred eighty-five teachers returned their questionnaires to the researcher.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument that was used in this study to measure organizational climate was the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - Revised Secondary (OCDQ-RS) and the instrument utilized to measure teacher job satisfaction was the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). They were selected because of their validity and for the purpose of this study (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Along with the two instruments, a cover letter, demographic questions and a stamped return-addressed envelope were sent to each individual in the population.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire - Revised Secondary - (OCDQ-RS) _Organizational climate was measured by the OCDQ-RS in this study. This instrument is a revision of a widely used climate measuring instrument piloted by Halpin & Croft (1963). The OCDQ-RS differs from the original OCDQ in significant ways:

1. It is easier to score;
2. It is more reliable and valid;
3. Climate types are well defined;
4. Teacher and pupil behaviors are clearly described;

Principal and teacher openness interacts to describe the overall climate type of school (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987).

Halpin's original work sought to identify characteristics of principals, which contributed to the climate of the organization (Halpin & Croft, 1963). The revised instrument included more input on the important element of teacher behavior in a

secondary setting (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987). The OCDQ-RS is a thirty-four-question instrument, which asks for responses to statements about the behaviors of secondary principals and teachers (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998). The instrument is self-administered and is easily completed in less than ten minutes (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987).

The OCDQ-RS describes five dimensions of the behavior of secondary teachers and principals. It measures two aspects of principal leadership-supportive and directive behavior, and three aspects of teacher interactions - engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior. These five aspects of school interaction form two basic dimensions of school climate-openness and intimacy (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp 1991; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987). The principal behavior is not measured in this study. Three aspects of teacher interactions (engaged teacher behavior, frustrated teacher behavior and intimate teacher behavior) were used in this study. The interaction patterns of teacher behavior are described by the OCDQ-RS in terms of the following three dimensions (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p. 54; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987):
Engaged Teacher Behavior - revealed enthusiastic teacher relations. Teachers were open and professional, proud of their school, enjoyed their work, and accepted responsibility. Open teacher behavior was characterized by sincere, positive, and supportive relationships with students, administrators, and colleagues; teachers were committed to their school and the success of their students (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p. 54; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987). Questions 3,4,10,11,16,17,20,28,33 & 34 addressed engaged teacher behavior (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.56).

Frustrated Teacher Behavior - describes a lack of purpose and focus for teachers. They went through the motions, were negative and critical; they shared no common goals or commitment (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.54-55; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987, p. 31-48). Questions 1,2,8,9,15 & 22 addressed frustrated teacher behavior (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.57). Intimate Teacher Behavior - was characterized by strong, cohesive social relationships among teachers. Teachers supported each other professionally and socially. Intimacy was the second general dimension of secondary school climate. Intimate teacher behavior reflected a strong and cohesive network of social relationships among the faculty. Teachers knew each other well, had close personal friends among the faculty, and regularly socialized together (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.54-55; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987, p. 31-48). Questions 14, 21, 26, and 27 addressed intimate teacher behavior (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.57).

The overall climate type of the school was derived from the interaction of principal openness and teacher openness. Open principal behavior was reflected in genuine relationships with teachers where the principal created a supportive environment, encouraged teachers to participate and contribute to the schools programs and activities, and freed teachers from routine busywork so they could concentrate on teaching (Hoy & Miskel. 1996; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Owens, 1995; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987). Open teacher behavior was characterized by sincere, positive, and supportive relationships with students, administrators, and colleagues; teachers were committed to their school and the success of their students (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy, Sabo, Barnes, Hannum & Hoffman, 1998; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987).

Validity of the OCDQ-RS

Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp (1991) and Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy (1987) reported that the OCDQ-RS was first tested for construct validity in a pilot study of seventy-eight high schools. School mean scores were calculated for each item and an item-correlation matrix from all seventy-eight schools was factor analyzed. A five-factor solution with a varimax rotation was performed, and the five factors (unrotated) with eigenvalues of 8.61 to 1.94 explained 63.1 percent of the variance (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.54-55). The stability of the factor structure supported the construct validity of the dimensions and the constitutive meanings of the constructs (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987). The relations among the items consistently held as theoretically expected. That is, the five hypothetical dimensions of climate and the individual items are systematically related to each other as expected in the test of the factor structure (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.55; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987, p. 31-48).

Reliability of the OCDQ-RS

Alpha coefficients of reliability on the five subtest of the OCDQ-RS were reported as follows (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987):

		Reliability (alpha)
a)	Supportive	.91
b)	Directive	.87
c)	Engaged	.85
d)	Frustrated	.85
f)	Intimate	.71 (p.57)

The correlation between the average expectancy motivation of teachers and climate openness was .32 ($p < .01$) and accounted for shared variance of about 10%. The confirmation of the climate motivation hypothesis provides additional support for the

validity of the OCDQ-RS (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991, p.60; Kottkamp, Mulhern & Hoy 1987, p. 31-48).

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Teacher job satisfaction was measured in this study by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). The MSQ was developed as a result of the Work Adjustment Project at the University of Minnesota (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). The MSQ measures satisfaction with various components of the work environment, including working conditions, security, creativity, independence, and social status (Weiss & Dawis, 1965). The short form MSQ consists of 20 items for respondents to answer and the questionnaire takes less than five minutes to complete. These involve job satisfaction in three subscales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Extrinsic Satisfaction are the values an individual receives from the environment surrounding the context of work, such as: pay, supervisory relationship, tenure, and praise (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Questions 5,6,12,13,14 & 19 addressed extrinsic satisfaction on the MSQ (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

Intrinsic Satisfaction are the values associated with the content of work tasks, such as competence, achievement, and self-actualization (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965 & 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Questions 1,2,3,4,7,8,9,10,11,15,16, & 20 addressed intrinsic satisfaction on the MSQ (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

General Satisfaction is when an employee is satisfied through both the values an individual receives that are from the environment surrounding the context of work and the values associated with work tasks (Bishop & Lester, 1997; Weiss & Dawis, 1965

& 1967; Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Questions 1 through 20 addressed general satisfaction on the MSQ (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

The MSQ was developed as a measurement tool for assessing the work adjustment potential of applicants for vocational rehabilitation and the evaluation of work adjustment outcomes. The origins of this instrument date to the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation Project and the Theory of Work Adjustment Project in 1964 by George England. The Theory of Work Adjustment, described the relationship between the individual and his/her work environment, has served as the guiding construct for numerous research projects, including the development of related instruments (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

1. Lofquist & Dawis (1969), who have worked with the project since its beginning, referred to satisfaction as a matter of correspondence. Correspondence represents the individual worker's appraisal of the extent to which the work environment fulfills his requirements" (Lofquist & Dawis, 1969, p. 45). The following statements are a synopsis of this theory as summarized from Dawis & Lofquist (1964):
2. Work is perceived as the interaction between worker and the work environment;
3. The worker brings certain skills to the work environment where certain tasks must be performed;
4. In exchange for environmental requirements, the individual requires compensation for performance and preferred conditions;
5. The environment and the individual must meet each other's requirements in order for the interaction to be maintained - this is known as correspondence;
6. Work adjustment refers to the process of obtaining and maintaining the correspondence (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964, p.10).

The MSQ is self-administering with easily understood directions for the respondent and took less than five minutes to complete (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

Responses are scored from the lowest to the highest in a Likert format using one as the lowest response (very dissatisfied) and five as the highest (very satisfied).

Validity of the MSQ

Gay (1981) noted that the validity of findings is a direct function of the validity of the test used. The degree to which a test measures an intended hypothetical construct which explains behavior is called construct validity (Gay, 1981). The validity of the MSQ is evidenced by its consistent performance according to hypothetical expectations reported (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1964) performed construct validation studies on the instruments developed in the Work Adjustment Projects. Each of the instruments was linked conceptually by the Theory of Work Adjustment (Weiss & Dawis, 1965). An exact factor score of general job satisfaction was tested as the dependent variable and the MSQ scale scores were independent variables in a multivariate prediction test (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Among twenty-five different occupational groups differences were shown to be significant at the .001 level of significance for both means and variances on the 20 MSQ short form scales (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

Reliability of the MSQ

Weiss et al., (1967) utilized Hoyt's Reliability Coefficient for each norm group and each subscale to determine the degree to which the MSQ consistently measured job satisfaction. Statistically significant correlations between general satisfaction scores and each item of the MSQ were reported (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Coefficients for the Intrinsic Satisfaction scale ranged from 0.84 for assembly workers to 0.91 for engineers. For the Extrinsic Satisfaction scale the coefficients for General Satisfaction varied from 0.77 for assembly workers to 0.82 for engineers. The

coefficients for General Satisfaction varied from 0.87 to 0.92. Overall, the median reliability coefficients were 0.86 for Intrinsic Satisfaction, 0.80 for Extrinsic Satisfaction, and 0.90 for General Satisfaction reported (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). A test-retest correlation of General Satisfaction scale scores resulted in a 0.89 coefficient over a one-week period. These high reliability indexes indicated minimal error variance (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964).

Coding of the Data

The participants responded to each question on the OCDQ-RS using a Likert-type scale. Responses to the OCDQ-RS items will be given on the following scale: 4 = very frequently occurs, 3 = often occurs, 2 = sometimes occurs, and 1 = rarely occurs. The responses to the items for the MSQ will be on a five-point Likert-type scale, as follows: 5 = very satisfied, 4 = satisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, and 1 = very dissatisfied.

The demographic characteristics of the sample were gathered from a list of questions included in the MSQ format. The demographic data were coded for analysis purposes in the following manner:

1. Educational preparation level was treated as a categorical variable as follows: 1 = Bachelor's degree, 2 = Master's degree, 3 = Educational Specialist, and 4 = Doctorate.
2. Gender was treated as a discrete variable with 1 = male and 2 = female.
3. Ethnicity was treated as a categorical variable as follows: 1 = Caucasian, 2 = African-American, 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander, 4 = American Indian/Alaskan Native, 5 = Hispanic.
4. Years of experience in and out of the school district was coded categorically as follows: 4 = More than 20 years, 3 = 11 to 20 years, 2 = 6 to 10 years, and 1 = 1 to 5 years.

Sample and Data Collection

The sample for this study was randomly selected urban middle school teachers in the Clark County School District (CCSD). According to information from the Clark County School District Public Information Office and Affirmative Action Office, in 1999 there were one thousand seven hundred and twenty-three urban middle school teachers in the Clark County School District. Fifteen teachers were selected from nineteen urban middle schools by a simple random sample procedure to participate in the study for a total sample of two hundred eighty-five (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 164). McMillan & Schumacher (1997) concluded, that in situations in which a simple random sample is selected, a sample size that is a percentage of the population can approximate the characteristics of the population satisfactorily (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 165-66, & p. 172). Bias was avoided with simple random sampling.

According to Frass (1983), a simple random sample has a greater chance of accurately representing the population and that random assignment is a critical element in designing a valid study (p.116). The random assignment enables the evaluator to control many of the factors that threaten the internal validity of the study. Frass (1983) also suggested that the external validity of the experimental design could be increased by randomly sampling the teachers in the study (p.127). The randomly selected teachers from each identified urban middle school received the two questionnaires, and demographic data form.

Gay (1987) stated that using a table of random numbers to select a sample involved the following specific steps:

1. Identify and define the population.
2. Determine the desired sample size.
3. List all members of the population.
4. Assign all individuals on the list a consecutive number from zero to the

required number.

5. Select an arbitrary number in the table of random numbers.
6. For the selected number, look at only the appropriate number of digits.
7. If the number corresponds to the number assigned to any of the individuals in
8. the population, then that individual is in the sample.
9. Go to the next number in the column and repeat step seven.
10. Repeat step 8 until the desired number of individuals has been selected for the sample (p.105).

This total sample consisted of the urban middle school teachers in the Clark County School District. The principals who agreed to allow their teachers to participate in the study provided a list of the sample. Using the teacher directory that was provided, each teacher was assigned a number from 0100 to one thousand seven hundred twenty-three (1723). An arbitrary number in the table of random numbers was selected. The last four digits of the number were used in the process. Each teacher was assigned a number and the ones who were chosen were placed in the sample. The process was repeated for each name until the selection was complete.

A letter was sent to each participating principal, a copy of each questionnaire, and the demographic data form. Principals were asked to fax a copy of their teacher roster if they were willing to participate in the study. Nineteen principals responded to the request to allow their teachers to participate in this study. Fifteen teachers from each school were randomly selected to participate in the study. The two hundred and eighty-five participants were mailed (1) a letter asking them to participate in the study (2) a copy of the OCDQ-RS and the MSQ and (3) demographic information and (4) a stamped addressed envelope.

Gay (1987) and McMillan and Schumacher (1997) determined that the minimum sample size was one hundred participants and a maximum sample was one thousand participants for any large population. They also conveyed that the determination of

sample size should take into consideration the type of research, financial constraints, the importance of the results, the number of variables studied, the methods of data collection, and the degree of accuracy needed (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 176). Borg & Gall (1996) proposed that in survey research, the smallest major subgroup sample should contain at least one hundred participants. Gay (1987) and McMillan & Schumacher (1997) addressed nonrespondents as those who failed to return the completed questionnaire.

The follow-up letters were sent in two weeks. The letters contained copies of the questionnaires, demographic questionnaire, a stamped return-addressed envelope, and a cover letter that again stressed both the importance of the study and the importance of the subject's contribution (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). One hundred ninety-seven (or seventy percent) of the participants mailed their questionnaires back to the researcher.

Analysis of the Data

This study investigated the perceptions of selected Clark County School District urban middle school teachers with respect to the following: organizational climate, their perceptions of job satisfaction, and demographic characteristics. Data analyzed in this study included scores on three sub-scales of the OCDQ-RS and the three sub-scales of the MSQ.

The independent variable in this study was organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior). The dependent variable was job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general). The moderating variables were gender, educational degree level, years of experience (in and out of the Clark County School District), and ethnicity. The raw data obtained from the instruments were entered into a computer and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Expanded (SPSS-X). The SPSS-X was used to generate measures of central tendency and discrepancy (i.e., means and

standard deviations). The data were analyzed using a correlational design. This correlational study was accomplished with the use of the Pearson r Correlation Coefficient. Tests of the level of statistical and practical significance for the correlation coefficients were applied to the organizational climate subscales and the job satisfaction subscales. The statistical significance level of 0.05 was used for both sets of correlation coefficients. This was appropriate for the Pearson Product Moment correlations because the direction of the relationships between the pair of variables were specified in advance of the analysis. The six by six matrix provided information on the existence, direction, and strength of relationships among the six categories on the OCDQ-RS (intimate behavior, frustrated behavior, and engaged behavior) and MSQ (intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction) instruments (Borg & Gall, 1996).

The data for this study were collected from a total sample of one hundred ninety-seven teachers or seventy percent of the sample surveyed in nineteen urban middle schools in the Clark County School District. The researcher assigned codes to the data collection instruments in order to facilitate quantitative analysis. A scoring sheet was constructed for each questionnaire returned. All responses were recorded onto one sheet per questionnaire. The data were entered onto a computer for transmission to a statistical analysis program. Each appropriate statistical analysis was run using the (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X).

"Data analysis involves organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p.127). Data analysis is a process requiring organizational, analytical, and synthesizing skills; deciding what to tell others from the multitude of information collected is a task of patience, persistence, and fortitude (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Bogan & Biklen (1992) defined data analysis as those researcher activities which involves "working the data,

organizing them, breaking them into manageable units, synthesizing them, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned (p.153).

Summary

This study provided educators and researchers with data concerning the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. The data concerning organizational climate indicators and job satisfaction components of one school district may be useful for administrators in that system. Other school districts may use the findings for comparative and analytical purposes. Replications in other districts may add to the literature as well. The data concerning organizational climate and job satisfaction components may be useful to higher leaning institutions in training future teachers and administrators.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results of the data analysis are presented in chapter four. The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) of urban middle schools in which they teach and their perception of job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction) within the Clark County School District. Additionally, perceptual differences that existed due to gender, educational degree level, teaching experience (both in and out of the CCSD), and ethnicity were examined.

Demographic Characteristics of the Research Sample

The data for this study were gathered during the Spring of 1999. There were twenty-one urban middle schools in the CCSD at that time. Data responses were collected from nineteen urban middle schools, as two schools elected not to participate. Two hundred-eighty-five surveys were mailed to selected teachers in nineteen urban middle schools. A total of one hundred ninety-seven surveys were returned after a second mailing, for a response rate of seventy percent.

The demographic characteristics of the teachers in the sample are reported in Table 1. Table 1 shows the responses were returned from one hundred ninety-seven urban middle school teachers (seventy percent) teachers (N=197). The characteristics of interest were each respondents' gender, years of experience in or out of the CCSD, education level, and ethnicity.

Table 1 reported for comparison purposes demographics related to ethnicity, gender, education levels, and teacher experience both inside and out of the Clark County School District. The sample population was representative of the CCSD population of teachers. The ethnic populations were seventy-five percent Caucasians, twelve percent African American, five percent Hispanics, four percent Asian/Pacific Islander and two percent American Indian/Alaskan Native Born. The gender population for female respondents were sixty-two percent and males were thirty-eight percent.

The education degree level of the sample were fifty-six percent with Master's Degrees, nine percent higher educational degrees, and thirty-five percent with Bachelor's Degrees. The fifty-six percent of teachers with masters degrees and the nine percent with higher degrees reflected the importance of education, a major accredited university and three other universities in the city, and the fact that CCSD teachers' income increases with the addition of more education and longevity incentives.

The number of years that respondents worked in the CCSD are indicated in Table 1 in ranges of 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-20 years, 21-30 years, and more than 30 years. Forty-four percent of the teachers indicated 1-5 years experience in CCSD, twenty-five percent 6-10 years experience, sixteen percent with 11-20 years of experience and four percent of teachers reported had 21+ years of experience. Forty-four percent were teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience this means that teachers with the least experience were working in urban middle schools. Teachers with 21-30 years of teaching experience were thirteen percent, this means that retention rates are low for teachers in the urban middle schools in Clark County School District.

Of the teachers with teaching experience out of the Clark County School District, seventy-three percent had 1-5 years of experience, eighteen percent had 6-10 years of experience, ten percent had 11-20 years of experience and four percent had 21+ years of experience. Teachers with 1-5 years of experience out of the CCSD are

heavily recruited and hired by the CCSD and placed in the urban middle schools. Teachers with 6-10 years of experience out of the CCSD are recruited and hired by this district at a rate less than twenty percent. Teachers with 21 or more years of experience are recruited and hired at only four percent by the CCSD.

Upon examination of means that describe differences between Gender, Experience, Education Level, and ethnicity in Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 there were no significant differences between scores on the OCDQ-RS or the three subscales of the MSQ for urban middle school teachers. Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 are located in Appendix V. Analysis of Variance tests were run on both the three supbcales of the OCDQ-RS and the MSQ and each of the demographics and no significant differences were found.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of the Sample and Comparison to the Clark County School District

Teacher Characteristics	Distribution by: Frequency	Percentage In Study	CCSD Urban Middle School
Ethnicity (N =197)			
Caucasian	149	75.6	78.0
African American	24	12.1	10.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	8	4.0	1.7
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	5	2.5	2.0
Hispanic	11	5.5	4.5
Other			3.0
Gender (197)			
Male	76	38.0	28.9
Female	121	62.0	71.1
Education Level 97)			
Bachelors	70	35.0	
Masters	112	56.0	
Educational Specialist or Doctorate	15	9.0	
			*
Teaching Experience In CCSD (N=197)			
1-5 years	88	44.7	
6-10 years	51	25.6	
11-20 years	32	16.1	
21 + years	26	13.1	
Teaching Experience Out of CCSD (N=125)			
1-5 years	81	73.8	
6-10 years	23	18.4	
11-20 years	13	10.4	
21 + years	08	.4	

*This information is unavailable from CCSD.

Reliability

Hoy Tarter & Kottkamp, (1991) utilized Hoyt's Reliability Coefficient for each norm group and each subscale to determine the degree to which the OCDQ-RS measured organizational climate. Statistically significant correlations between climate behaviors scores and each item of the OCDQ-RS were reported (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991). Alpha coefficients for Engaged Behavior score ranged at eighty-five percent. Coefficients for Frustrated Behavior was reported at eighty-five percent. Coefficients for Intimate Behavior reported at seventy-one percent. Alpha coefficients were utilized with the CCSD sample to determine reliability and for comparison purposes because only teacher behavior were utilized in this study. Coefficients for Engaged Behavior ranged at seventy-five percent. Coefficients for Frustrated Behavior was reported at sixty-five percent. Coefficients for Intimate Behavior ranged at seventy-one percent.

Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, (1964),utilized Hoyt's Reliability Coefficient for each norm group and each subscale to determine the degree to which the MSQ consistently measured job satisfaction. Statistically significant correlations between general satisfaction scores and each item of the MSQ were reported (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Coefficients for the Intrinsic Satisfaction scale ranged from eighty-one percent for assembly workers to ninety-one percent for engineers. The Extrinsic Satisfaction scale coefficients for General Satisfaction varied from seventy-one percent for assembly workers to eighty-two percent for engineers. The coefficients for General Satisfaction varied from eighty-seven percent to ninety-two percent. Overall, the median reliability coefficients were eighty-six percent for Intrinsic Satisfaction, eighty percent for Extrinsic Satisfaction, and ninety percent for General Satisfaction reported (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1964). Alpha coefficients were utilized with the CCSD sample to determine reliability and for comparison purposes. Coefficients for Extrinsic Satisfaction score ranged at eighty-

eight percent. Coefficients for Intrinsic Satisfaction was reported at eighty-one percent. Coefficients for General Satisfaction score ranged at eighty-nine percent.

Table 2 Hoyt's Reliability Coefficients for the OCDQ-RS, MSQ, and CCSD Urban Middle School Teachers

	OCDQ-RS Reliability	MSQ Reliability	CCSD Sample Reliability
OCDQ-RS			
Intimate Behavior	.71		.71
Frustrated Behavior	.85		.65
Engaged Behavior	.85		.75
MSQ			
Intrinsic Satisfaction		.86	.81
Extrinsic Satisfaction		.80	.88
General Satisfaction		.90	.89

Descriptive Analysis

The OCDQ-RS has a four-point scale where teachers were asked questions about their school and indicate the extent to which each statement characterized their school. The selection ranged from very frequently occurs, occurs, sometimes occurs, to rarely occurs. Rarely occurs was given a rating of one, sometimes occurs a rating of two, occurs a rating of three and very frequently occurs a rating of four. The scores were averaged according to the answers that teachers gave with 2.5 mean being the

midpoint. The mean score for Intimate Behavior was 2.62 that is above the midpoint of the scale. This means that teacher perceptions reflected a cohesive network of social relations among the faculty.

The mean score for Frustrated Behavior was 1.88. This means that teachers perceived themselves as not having Frustrated Behavior or not burdened with routine duties, administrative paperwork, and excessive assignments unrelated to teaching in urban middle schools in the CCSD.

The mean score for Engaged Behavior was 2.37 that is below the midpoint of the scale. This means that teachers perceptions reflected that they sometimes do not see themselves as being proud of their school, working with each other, supportive of colleagues or committed to the success of their students.

Table 3 OCDQ-RS Mean Scores for CCSD Urban Middle School Teachers

OCDQ-RS

Subscale	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intimate Behavior	197	2.62	.47
Frustrated Behavior	197	1.88	.54
Extrinsic Behavior	197	2.37	.66

The MSQ has a five-point scale where teachers were asked questions about their school and indicate to what each statement characterized their job satisfaction. The selection ranged from very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, dissatisfied and very dissatisfied. Very satisfied was given a rating of five, satisfied was given a rating of four, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied a rating of three, dissatisfied a

rating of two and very dissatisfied a rating of one. The scores were averaged according to the answers that teachers gave. 2.5 was determined to be the midpoint of the scale. Teachers reported Intrinsic Satisfaction 4.21mean score and General Satisfaction 4.00 mean score that is above the midpoint scale. This means that teachers were satisfied with their jobs and it also reflected a perception that their values were associated with the content of work tasks, such as competence, achievement, and self-actualization. The mean score for Intrinsic Satisfaction was 4.2. This score is above the midpoint of the scale. This means that teacher perceptions reflected that they were satisfied with their jobs and it reflected that teachers perceived that their values were associated with the content of work tasks, such as competence, achievement, and self-actualization.

The mean score for General Satisfaction was 4.0. Which is above the midpoint of the scale. This means that teacher reflections revealed that they get satisfaction from values derived from both Extrinsic Satisfaction and Intrinsic Satisfaction.

The mean score for Extrinsic Satisfaction was 3.59. This score is above the midpoint of the scale. This means that teachers perceived themselves as getting job satisfaction from the environment surrounding the context of work, such as pay, supervisory relationships, tenure, and compliments. All three subscales scored above the 2.5 mean midpoint of the scale.

Table 4 MSQ Mean Scores for CCSD Urban Middle School Teachers

MSQ Subscale	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Intrinsic Satisfaction	197	4.21	.48
Extrinsic Satisfaction	197	3.59	.84
General Satisfaction	197	4.00	.55

Correlations

There were significant positive correlations between urban middle school teachers' perceptions of organization climate and job satisfaction and significant negative relationships between frustrated behavior and all three subscales of job satisfaction. Engaged Behavior correlated significantly with Intimate Behavior .524. Engaged Behavior significantly correlated with all three subscales of job satisfaction Intrinsic Satisfaction (.292), Extrinsic Satisfaction (.348), and General Satisfaction (.364). Extrinsic Satisfaction (.157) and General Satisfaction (.201) significantly correlated with Intimate Behavior. There were significant positive correlations between Intrinsic Satisfaction and Extrinsic Satisfaction (.705) and General Satisfaction (.924). There were significant positive correlations between General Satisfaction and Extrinsic Satisfaction (.904).

There were significant negative correlations between Frustrated Behavior, Intrinsic Satisfaction (-.235), Extrinsic Satisfaction (-.250), and General Satisfaction (-.248).

Table 5 Pearson Moment Correlations Coefficients for the CCSD Urban Middle School Teachers, OCDQ-RS and MSQ

	Engaged OCDQ-RS	Frustrated OCDQ-RS	Intimate OCDQ-RS	Intrinsic MSQ	Extrinsic MSQ	General MSQ
Engaged OCDQ-RS	-	-	-	.292**	.348**	.364*
Frustrated OCDQ-RS	-	-		-.235**	-.250**	-.248**
Intimate OCDQ-RS	-	-	-	.199	.157*	.201**
Intrinsic MSQ	-	-	-	-	.705**	.924**
Extrinsic MSQ	-	-	-	-	-	.904**
General MSQ	-	-	-	-	-	-

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of urban middle school teachers in the Clark County School District. There were nineteen selected urban middle schools that participated in the study, with one hundred and ninety-seven teachers who were randomly selected to complete and return two instruments: the Organizational Climate

Description Questionnaire- Revised Secondary (0CDQ-RS) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The selected urban middle school teachers in the CCSD were used as the unit of analysis in this study. There was a strong and significant relationship between climate and job satisfaction at the 0.1 and 0.5 alpha levels.

The reduction of the data in this correlational study was accomplished with the use of the Pearson r Correlation Coefficient (Borg & Gall, 1996). Engaged Behavior correlated significantly with Intimate Behavior (.524). This means that there was a strong positive relationship between Engaged Behavior and Intimate Behavior. Teachers who value a strong and cohesive network of social relations among their faculty also value their school, working with each other, supportive of other colleagues, and are committed to the success of their students.

Engaged Behavior correlated positively and significantly with all three subscales of job satisfaction. This means that there is a strong positive relationship between Engaged Behavior, Intrinsic Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction and General Satisfaction. Teachers who perceive themselves as being proud of their school, working with each other, supportive of colleagues, and committed to the success of their students also achieve Intrinsic Satisfaction. They have values associated with the content of work tasks, such as competence, achievement, and self-actualization. These teachers also perceive themselves as getting satisfaction from the environment surrounding the content of work, such as pay, supervisory relationships, tenure, and compliments from others.

Intimate Behavior correlated positively and significantly with Extrinsic Satisfaction and General Satisfaction. This means that there is a strong relationship between Intimate Behavior and Extrinsic Satisfaction and General Satisfaction. This also means that teachers who value a strong and cohesive network of social relations among their faculty also achieve job satisfaction from the environment surrounding the

content of work, such as pay, supervisory relationships, tenure, and compliments from others.

General Satisfaction significantly correlated positively with Intrinsic Satisfaction and Extrinsic Satisfaction. This means that there is a strong relationship between Intrinsic Satisfaction and Extrinsic Satisfaction and General Satisfaction. This also means that teachers who receive job satisfaction from both the content of work tasks, such as competence, achievement, and self-actualization, will also get satisfaction of their jobs from the environment surrounding the context of work, such as pay, supervisory relationships, tenure, and compliments from others. The positive correlations indicated that the higher the engaged behavior the higher the intrinsic satisfaction and intimate behavior. A positive significant relationship was found in the relationship of climate and job satisfaction as expected.

There was a significant negative correlation between Frustrated Behavior, Intrinsic Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction, and General Satisfaction. This means that there is a strong negative relationship between Frustrated Behavior and the three subscales of Job Satisfaction. This also means that when a teacher experience Frustrated Behavior they are burdened with routine duties, administrative paperwork, and excessive assignments unrelated to teaching they also do not experience Intrinsic Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction or General Satisfaction. The negative correlations indicated the higher the frustrated behavior score, the lower the satisfaction scores and vice versa.

Analysis of Variance tests were run on both the three supbcales of the OCDQ-RS and the MSQ and each of the demographics and no significant differences were found.

Chapter 5 will contain a discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a summary of the findings of this study, provide conclusions, provide implications, and make recommendations for further research. This study was concerned with determining the relationship between the perception of climate and job satisfaction in the Clark County School District. In 1998-99, the Clark County School District served over 130,000 students and was located in Clark County Nevada. There were two hundred twenty-six schools in the district in the 1998-99 school year. Schools in the study are located in Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, and Boulder City and the data for the study were collected from randomly selected teachers in nineteen urban middle schools. Of the two hundred eight-five teachers selected, one hundred ninety-seven responded (seventy percent) by completing two instruments: the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire – Revised Secondary (OCDQ-RS) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Demographic data were also collected from each participant. A review of the literature revealed that a hypothetical relationship existed between climate and job satisfaction. This study examined that potential by analyzing data gathered during the Spring of 1999.

This correlational study utilized quantitative techniques to ascertain and measure data. The findings in this study indicated a correlation between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. Essentially, the high correlations mean that if a school leader has created a climate in a school that reflects interest, support, and praise, teachers will have higher levels of job satisfaction. Conversely, if a school leader creates a school climate that is alienating, non-supportive and impersonal, teachers will have lower levels of job satisfaction.

Summary/Interpretation of Findings

All seven research questions were addressed according to the three subscales of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) and the three subscales of job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general).

Research Question 1

What are teacher's perceptions regarding the organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior) of selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District (CCSD)?

Urban middle school teachers who responded to the questionnaire perceived themselves as having engaged behavior, which is characterized by sincere, positive, and supportive relationships with students, administrators, and colleagues; teachers are committed to their school and the success of their students. Teachers found the work environment facilitating rather than frustrating. The open school climate referred to one in which both teacher and principal behavior were authentic, energetic, goal-directed, and which satisfaction was derived both from task accomplishment and social-need gratification (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991, p.61). However, teachers agreed more with the responses to questions associated with Intimate Behavior indicated in Table 3 (mean 2.62). The goals of climate improvement have been generally stated simply as an effort to improve satisfaction and productivity (Howard, Howell, & Brainard Howell, &

Brainard, (1987). The theoretical assumption, then, was that when climate is good, both satisfaction and productivity are high (Kelly, 1980; Howard, Howell, & Brainard, 1987). Climate has been described as the personality of the school, the feel or the atmosphere one senses in the workplace (Halpin & Croft, 1963). Researchers have suggested that school climate is open or positive when basic human needs are met, such as, physiological needs, safety, acceptance and friendship needs, as well as achievement and recognition needs (Howard, Howell, & Brainard, 1987). Among the key factors which give meaning to a school's climate were respect, trust, morale, cohesiveness, caring, opportunities for input, and school renewal (Howard, Howell, & Brainard, 1987). The Clark County School District appeared to have teachers were generally supportive of among their colleagues.

Research Question 2

What are teacher perceptions regarding the job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

Urban middle school teachers perceived themselves as having Intrinsic Satisfaction (4.21 mean) and General Satisfaction (4.00) as indicated through the overall agreement with these two subscales. Teachers perceived themselves to hold values associated with the content of work tasks, such as competence, achievement, and self-actualization. General satisfaction has both intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction subscales, that may have accounted for the 4.0 mean.

The study of job satisfaction has a long history. Foundational research for modern satisfaction theory has been rooted in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1966). Factors which produced satisfaction were called motivators, while those which dissatisfy are called hygienes. While the two are not opposite, they were distinctly different. Motivators were composed of achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement. Hygienes included relations with superiors and peers, company policies,

working conditions, and administration. Maslow's Needs Hierarchy Model (1954) has also served to point researchers toward understanding job satisfaction. Basically, as needs were met from the lower order needs (physiological) to the higher order ones (self-actualization), satisfaction was attained. Sergiovanni (1987) reported that testing of the factor theory in educational settings "consistently confirms this general pattern and establishes the same general motivation and hygiene factor sets". The concept of a "fair day's work for a fair day's pay" affects a teacher's decision to participate in and perform on the job (Sergiovanni, 1987). Hygiene factors (work conditions) must be satisfied at a base level in order for motivational factors (concerned with the work itself) to result in greater job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The expansion of job satisfaction theories has led to greater understanding of its causes (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988), leading to the conclusion that satisfaction is determined by values the individual places on the context of the work environment as well as the content of the work itself (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Loftquist, (1964). Teachers reported Intrinsic Satisfaction mean score of 4.21 and General Satisfaction 4.0 mean score and both were above the midpoint of the scale. This means that although, in general, teacher relationships with their supervisors and colleagues are important, the sense of achievement and rewards of praise are also important, as well as individual self- actualization.

Research Question 3

Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

There were positive significant correlations found between the characteristics of job satisfaction and the characteristics of organizational climate. Positive significant correlations between the three climate subscales and the three job satisfaction subscales at the 0.01 and 0.05 alpha levels. As expected, Frustrated Behavior established a negative correlated relationship with satisfaction and negatively correlated with all of the

subscales of job satisfaction. Engaged Behavior correlated positive between Intimate Behavior (.524), Intrinsic Satisfaction (.292) and Extrinsic Satisfaction (.348) and General Satisfaction (.364).

The positive correlations indicated that the higher the engaged behavior the higher the Extrinsic Satisfaction and the Intimate Behavior. The negative correlations indicated the higher the Frustration Behavior the lower the satisfaction and vice versa. The strongest relationship became evident between Engaged Behavior and Extrinsic Satisfaction. This indicated that teachers perceived that they were committed to their school, the success of their students, and obtained their satisfaction from the context of work, such as pay, supervisory relationships, tenure, and compliments from their supervisors.

This study has assumed that while many factors may have contributed to the outcome of job satisfaction, organizational climate has established itself as a key process in establishing that outcome. The goals of climate improvement have been generally stated simply as an effort to improve satisfaction and productivity. The theoretical assumption, then, was when climate is good, satisfaction is high and so is productivity (Kelly, 1980; Howard, Howell, & Brainard, 1987). However, Lester (1988) explored extensively the literature on teacher job satisfaction and discovered a need for studying on the relationship between climate and job satisfaction.

This study found quantifiable support for the hypothetical relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Significant, high correlations were reported for the potential relationships. Open climate characterized schools where cooperation and respect existed between teachers and principals. The principal listened to teacher concerns, gave praise, and supported teacher innovativeness. The principal did not closely scrutinize teachers, but provided facilitative leadership. On the other hand, the teachers exhibited professional behavior, were collegial, and shared intimacy in their personal lives. These characteristics were associated with teachers who indicated

satisfaction in their jobs, particularly their extrinsic satisfaction (extrinsic satisfaction is the value an individual receives from the environment of work, such as pay, supervisory relations, and rewards).

These conclusions were similar to studies conducted in other school systems. Raisani (1988) & Stiles (1993) found a significant relationship between climate and job satisfaction using different instruments in Michigan schools. Lofland (1985) concluded that "open" schools have higher job satisfaction than "closed " schools in the district of Columbia. Generally, it was concluded that teachers derived satisfaction on the job from the environment of open climate.

Research Question 4

Is there a relationship between teacher gender and their perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

Little significance between gender and the variances of climate and satisfaction became evident. Overall, there was not a significant relationship between gender and climate or job satisfaction.

Gender did not have a significant relationship with the teacher's perception of climate or job satisfaction. It was logical to conclude that interpersonal relationships within the building between teachers and principals, and among colleagues, were the significant factors in determining school climate. Gender did not affect teacher perceptions of climate either positively or negatively. Trust, cooperation, recognition of achievement, intimacy in personal relations, and support for creativeness were more important to teachers in influencing their perception of climate than gender.

No relationship was found between job satisfaction of teachers and gender. Job satisfaction was an outcome determined by an individual's perceptions of factors in the work environment. Teachers responses indicated that gender did not affect their

perception of job satisfaction. Satisfaction was determined by values the individual placed on the context of the work environment itself. Relationships with supervisors and colleagues were important as was the sense of achievement and rewards of praise were important. Individual self-actualization was also important to teachers.

Research Question 5

Is there a relationship between teacher educational degrees and their perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

Educational degrees did not have a significant relationship with the teacher's perception of climate or job satisfaction. The conclusion was that interpersonal relationships within the building between teachers and principals, and among colleagues, were the significant factors in determining school climate. The educational degrees did not affect teacher perceptions of climate either positively or negatively. Trust, cooperation, recognition of achievement, intimacy in personal relations, and support for creativeness were more important to teachers in influencing their perception of climate than education degrees.

No relationship was found between job satisfaction of teachers and the variable educational degrees. Job satisfaction was an outcome determined by an individual's perceptions of factors in the work environment. Teachers responses indicated that educational degrees did not affect their perception of job satisfaction. Rather, satisfaction was determined by values the individual placed on the context of the work environment itself. Relationships with supervisors and colleagues were important. Additionally, the sense of achievement and rewards of praise were important. Individual self-actualization was also important to teachers.

Research Question 6

Is there a relationship between teacher's experience (years in teaching profession both in and out of the Clark County School District) and their perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

There was no relationship between years of teaching experience in or out of the CCSD and the variables of climate or job satisfaction. However, it became apparent that teachers' years of experience out of the CCSD and the subscale engaged behavior had no significant relationship at .05 alpha level. No relationship existed between experience in or out of the CCSD and the subscales of climate or job satisfaction. A teachers' years of experience in or out of the CCSD did not have a significant relationship with the teacher's perception of climate or job satisfaction. Therefore, it was logical to conclude that interpersonal relationships within the building between teachers and principals, and among colleagues were the significant factors in determining school climate. The teachers' years of experience in or out of the CCSD did not affect teacher perceptions of climate either positively or negatively. Trust, cooperation, recognition of achievement, intimacy in personal relations, and support for creativeness are more important to teachers in influencing their perception of climate than years of experience in or out of the CCSD.

No relationship was found between job satisfaction of teachers and the variable teachers' years of experience in or out of the CCSD. Job satisfaction was an outcome determined by an individual's perceptions of factors in the work environment. Teacher responses indicated that years of experience in or out of the CCSD did not affect their perception of job satisfaction. Satisfaction was determined by values the individual placed on the context of the work environment itself. Nevertheless relationships with supervisors and colleagues were important, as was the sense of achievement and

rewards of praise were important. Individual self-actualization is also important to teachers.

Research Question 7

Is there a relationship between ethnicity and their perceptions of organizational climate (engaged, frustrated, and intimate) and job satisfaction (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general) of teachers in urban middle schools in the Clark County School District?

Ethnicity did not have a relationship with climate or job satisfaction subscales on the OCDQ-RS and MSQ. Subsequently, ethnicity did not have a significant relationship with the teacher's perception of climate or job satisfaction. The conclusion was that interpersonal relationships within the building between teachers and principals, and among colleagues, were the significant factors in determining school climate. Ethnicity did not affect teacher perceptions of climate either positively or negatively. Trust, cooperation, recognition of achievement, intimacy in personal relations, and support for creativeness were more important to teachers in influencing their perception of climate than ethnicity.

Similarly, no relationship was found between job satisfaction of teachers and ethnicity. Job satisfaction was an outcome determined by an individual's perceptions of factors in the work environment. Teachers responses indicated that ethnicity did not affect their perception of job satisfaction. Satisfaction was determined by values the individual places on the context of the work environment itself. Relationships with supervisors and colleagues were important. The sense of achievement and rewards of praise were important. Individual self-actualization were also important to teachers. In summary, the Clark County School District appeared to have very good principals who worked hard to establish open climates. The urban middle school teachers were generally supportive of openness among their colleagues. Teachers and principals have relationships where teachers felt supported in progressive instructional methods. Also, the teachers derive satisfaction on the job from this environment of open climate.

Conclusions

The data analysis revealed that the more open the organization's climate, the higher the job satisfaction. Three subscales of climate were used for determining the type of behavior of teachers: engaged, frustrated, and intimate behavior. Similarly, three subscales of job satisfaction were used: intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction.

Open climate characterized schools where cooperation and respect existed between teachers and principals. The principal listened to teacher concerns, gave praise, and supported teacher creativeness. The principals did not closely scrutinize teachers, but provided facilitative leadership. The teachers exhibited professional behavior, were collegial, and shared intimacy in their personal lives. On the other hand, these characteristics also were associated with teachers who indicated satisfaction in their jobs, particularly their extrinsic satisfaction (the value an individual receives from the environment of work, such as pay, supervisory relations, and rewards).

Job satisfaction has been defined as an outcome determined by an individual's perceptions of factors in the work environment. Teacher responses indicated that the selected demographic variables did not affect their perceived job satisfaction. Additionally, satisfaction has been classically determined by values the individual places on the context of the work environment and the content of the work itself. Relations with supervisors and colleagues were important, as was the sense of achievement and rewards of praise, as well as individual self-actualization important to teachers.

In summary, the Clark County School District appeared to have teachers who were generally supportive among their colleagues. In short, the teachers derived satisfaction on the job from their environment.

The conclusions of this study provided support for the treatment of the constructs of organizational climate and job satisfaction as presented in the literature review.

Lester (1988), for instance, discussed the need to re-conceptualize the roles of principals and teachers. Specifically, she explained that assigning duties to them based on their needs might enhance the job satisfaction of teachers. She also insisted that teachers be included in administrative decision-making and curriculum reforms. Accordingly, teachers have been included on task forces for strategic planning and the writing of curriculum in the Clark County School District for the last four decades. In fact, teachers were the key contributors. Participative, collaborative input into decisions was vital in the designing of the curriculum. This study revealed that job satisfaction was evident among a majority of the teachers who participated in the survey. This study also revealed that a majority of the teachers who participated in the study experienced engaged or intimate behavior.

Miskel and Ogawa (1988) discussed the need for studies which focused on organizational culture as well as climate. Culture involves the systems of beliefs, values, and meanings of organizations. Thus, the shared historical perspective of an organization's members affects climate and satisfaction. The cultural norms of a school system or an individual school building need to be considered in the overall analysis of climate. The culture of the Clark County School District should be an integral part of the discussion of its climate. While this is beyond the scope of the current study, system administrators should not neglect consideration of historical and cultural factors. The emerging emphasis on collaborative teacher participation, for instance, will certainly impact the teachers' perceptions of open climate and job satisfaction.

This study has shown that the analysis of organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction can yield meaningful and useful information. The relative ease of obtaining such data should encourage administrators to continually pursue climate assessment and enhancement projects. One danger, however, is that climate discussions will become just another part of the effective schools rhetoric. The true tests of its utility will be apparent when the data becomes part of a practitioner's reform effort aimed at

improving student achievement (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). The data, conclusions, and recommendations of this study have that potential. Lester (1988) concluded that additional research regarding the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction should be conducted at all levels of schools and in a variety of school districts. There is a need for this study to provide administrators with awareness of school level organizational climate and personnel characteristics that affect school effectiveness.

Data concerning organizational climate indicators and job satisfaction within one school district may be useful for administrators in that system; other school districts may also use the findings for comparative and analytical purposes. A review of educational articles indicated that there was no research where the OCDQ-RS and the MSQ instruments were utilized together to measure the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. Replications of the study in other districts may add to the research literature. Additionally, higher education institutions will be able to use the data obtained for the preparation of future educational administrators.

Recommendations

This study suggested that additional research should be conducted in the area of organizational climate and job satisfaction, as follows:

1. A study should be conducted to determine if a relationship exists between climate, job satisfaction, and student achievement, as suggested by the effective schools literature.
2. A study should be conducted comparing the climate and job satisfaction of other schools in the same state, particularly in the metropolitan Reno area.
3. A follow-up study should be conducted after specific staff development training initiatives, which address school climate improvement.

4. A replication study should be conducted in this school district every three-five years to ascertain the ongoing and long-term relationship of climate and job satisfaction.
5. A similar study should be conducted at the central office level to assess job satisfaction and perceptions of organizational climate, and then compared to school-based responses.
6. An ethnographic study should be conducted in the system to fully investigate both teacher and principal conceptualizations of climate and job satisfaction.
7. A longitudinal study should be conducted to assess the teacher's perception of climate and teacher's job satisfaction before being assigned to an urban middle school.
8. A study should be conducted that divides middle schools into different groups based upon age of school, amount of money spent per student annually, type of community, percent of student body receiving free or reduced lunches, national standardized test averages, or extent of Chapter I reading/and or math programs and the relationship of organizational climate and job satisfaction.
9. A study should be conducted comparing the relationship of organizational climate with both teacher behavior and principal behavior and job satisfaction.

Summary

This study was concerned with determining the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of middle school teachers in selected urban middle schools in the Clark County School District. An important goal in the study was to provide data which could be useful for this system. The data and analysis of this study have important implications, which may be utilized by officials in the Clark County School District.

A research-based body of literature existed prior to this study which suggested potential for a relationship between climate and job satisfaction. Similar studies with various instruments have been conducted in other school districts. It was proposed in this study that the relationship would be meaningful and that the results would yield useful information for administrators in the system.

This study has shown that organizational climate is a viable process in the system. Teachers have readily identified characteristics of climate in schools. Teachers placed value on those factors, which promoted open climate. Organizational climate was statistically related with job satisfaction. The study implied that open climate and higher job satisfaction were important goals for this district.

The school system should continue to recruit, hire, and reward administrators and teachers who are genuinely committed to building open climate. An assessment of school climate should be conducted for each school in the system. Principals should receive training in effective leadership techniques that promote open climate. Also, the human resource division should continue to focus on rewarding and reinforcing those who exhibit principal openness, while training should be provided for those lacking in these areas. Teacher training in innovative instructional methods, collegiality, building trusting relationships, mutual respect, and supportiveness are suggested. The professional growth of teachers in these attributes will certainly lead to improved climate and hopefully to improved student success.

It is evident from the conclusions of this study that the data collected can be useful to administrators. An analysis of climate and satisfaction characteristics should be meaningful for assessing the current perceptions of teachers and assist in planning for future studies of this nature. The OCDQ-RS and the MSQ are easy to administer and results may be quickly available. A district wide analysis would be invaluable for enhancing the openness of principals and teachers.

APPENDIX I

HUMAN SUBJECT STUDY AND APPROVAL LETTERS

UNLV

DATE: February 2, 1998

TO: Ouida M. Brown
M/S 3002 (EDL)

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze, Director
Office of Sponsored Programs (X1357)

RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol Entitled: "The Differences Between Organizational Climate and Teacher Job Satisfaction in Selected Urban Middle Schools in the Clark County School District"

OSP #303s0298-155e

The protocol for the project referenced above has been reviewed by the Office of Sponsored Programs and it has been determined that it meets the criteria for exemption from full review by the UNLV human subjects Institutional Review Board. This protocol is approved for a period of one year from the date of this notification and work on the project may proceed *after submittal* tc and approval by the Clark County School District (CCSD). Enclosed is the necessary paperwork for that procedure. Please contact Dr. Judy Costa at 799-5403 for any questions regarding their process. A copy of this memorandum must be submitted with the application to CCSD.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond a year from the date of this notification, it will be necessary to request an extension.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please contact Marsha Green in the Office of Sponsored Programs at 895-1357.

Enclosure A/S

cc: E. Chance (EDL-3002)
OSP File

Office of Sponsored Programs
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 451037 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-1037
(702) 895-1357 • FAX (702) 895-4242

February 11, 1998

UNLV

FROM: CINTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE, UNLV
RANDALL BOONE, DIRECTOR

TO: Ouida Brown

RE: APPLICATION FOR COOPERATIVE RESEARCH WITH CCSD

The CINTER Advisory Committee has found minor problems with your application based on our understanding of current criteria for cooperative research with the Clark County School District.

Do not return the revised application to the CINTER office. It is your responsibility to submit the application to: Dr. Judy Costa, Testing and Evaluation, Clark County School District. Remember that a copy of the UNLV *Protocol Form for Research Involving Human Subjects* must be attached to your application to CCSD. It is to your advantage to submit your proposal as soon as possible to Dr. Costa in order for it to be distributed to the CCSD committee prior to their meeting.

Revisions are suggested below.

1. Research questions 3-7 need to be rephrased. You ask the question are there differences between climate and job satisfaction. Of course there are...they are two different things! Perhaps what you mean is: What effect does organizational climate have on job satisfaction? This rephrasing needs to occur throughout your proposal, including the purpose of study section.

2. You are collecting appropriate data but are not using them to best advantage by using only descriptive statistics. There is opportunity for other more sophisticated data analyses and subsequently a more detailed set of results and conclusions. You might want to consult a statistician for help in this area.

3. You should perhaps include photocopies of the actual instruments rather than a word-processed reproduction.

4. There are no data collected to answer the secondary question of perceptual differences due to gender, education level, experience, etc.

5. Use the term "ethnic groups" not "ethnicity groups."

6. A more comprehensive description of data analysis is absolutely necessary.

7. Check the annotated copies for minor editorial changes.

College of Education
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 453001 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-3001
(702) 895-3374 • FAX (702) 895-4068

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
AL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

2832 EAST FLAMINGO ROAD LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89121 TELEPHONE (702) 799-5011

D OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
Bob L. Johnson, President
Mary Beth Scow, Vice President
Larry P. Mason, Clerk
Lois Tarkanian, Member
Sonia C. Bogue, Member
Shirley Barber, Member
Sheila R. Moulton, Member
Brian Cram, Superintendent

March 15, 1999

Ouida Brown
K.O. Knudson Middle School
2400 Atlantic Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104

Dear Ouida:

At its meeting on Tuesday, March 9, 1999, the Clark County School District C mittee to Review Cooperative Research Requests reviewed your proposal entitled, "The lationships Between Teacher Perceptions of Organizational Climate and Teacher Job Satis ion in Selected Urban Middle Schools in the Clark County School District." I am pleased to in m you that your request was approved. It is, however, still necessary for you to gain the co nt of the teachers whom you wish to study and the principals of the schools at which the each, since the approval of this committee does not obligate specific teachers or their principal participate. In addition, it was the consensus of the committee that your section on data ana is needs review and revision.

Thank you for inviting the Clark County School District to participate in your r arch.

Sincerely,

Judy Costa

Judy Costa, Chairman
Committee to Review Cooperative Research Requests

JC/js

cc:
Don Anderson
Randy Boone
Kevin Cruhan
LeRoy Hurd
Lauren Kohut-Rost
Charles Rasmussen
Tom Barberini
Ed Chance
Bill Hoffman
Craig Kadlub
Connie Krutky
Michael Robison

APPENDIX II

URBAN MIDDLE SCHOOLS

CCSD URBAN MIDDLE SCHOOLS THAT PARTICIPATED IN STUDY

1. Ernest Becker Middle School – Cathy Andrews, Principal
2. Jim Bridger Middle School – Jessie Phee, Principal
3. Harold J. Brinley Middle School – Alan McNulty, Principal
4. Malon B. Brown Middle School – Douglas Gougar, Principal
5. Helen C. Cannon Middle School – June Gunderson, Principal
6. John C. Fremont Middle School – Russ Ramirez, Principal
7. Elton M. Garrett Middle School – Shauna Zobel, Principal
8. Frank F. Garside Middle School – Sandra Metcalf, Principal
9. Robert O. Gibson Middle School – Denise Williams-Robinson, Principal
10. Walter Johnson Middle School – James Cavin, Principal
11. K.O. Knudson Middle School – Mary Ramirez, Principal
12. Lied Middle School – Dr. Patrice Johnson, Principal
13. Roy W. Martin Middle School – John Kelley, Principal
14. Mike O'Callaghan Middle School – Dr. Roberta Holton, Principal
15. Dell H. Robison Middle School – John Hummel, Principal
16. Grant Sawyer Middle School – Ronnie Smith, Principal
17. Theron L. Swainston Middle School – Susan Tsukamoto, Principal
18. Charles I. West Middle School – Dr. Andre Denson, Principal
19. C.W. Woodbury Middle School – Joe Murphy, Principal

APPENDIX III

SURVEY COVER LETTERS

Dear Principal,

I am a doctorial student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas who has reached the data gathering stage of my research. The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction of Urban Middle School Teachers in the Clark County School District is the subject of my dissertation.

I am writing to ask for your support and assistance in collecting this data. Your cooperation will help insure that a valid sample is received and the research is valid. Fifteen teachers will be randomly selected from the total population of your school to participate in the study. One questionnaire addresses teacher perceptions of the organizational climate of the school; the other relates to job satisfaction. Teachers will be asked to complete the surveys and return to me in a self addressed stamped envelope. The two surveys will take less than 20 minutes to complete. Confidentiality of all data, analysis, and results will be assured. Names will not be used on the letters or return envelopes.

As indicated by the research title, it is imperative that each urban middle school participate in order to obtain the necessary data. Again, I solicit your support and participation in this study.

Your school's participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. If you have questions, please contact me 642-2252.

Respectfully,

Ouida M. Brown

Dear Middle School Teacher,

I seek your assistance in completing two surveys that will be used to gather data for my dissertation in completion of my doctorate in the department of Educational Leadership at UNLV. The completion of the two surveys should take less than 20 minutes. I am conducting a research study titled The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction of Urban Middle School Teachers in the Clark County School District.

Your responses will be kept anonymous. No individual or individual school information will be gathered as a result of this study. Overall school district information will be tallied and averaged. No one will have access to an individual's responses. Your participation is strictly voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time.

Participation will require that you complete and return the questionnaires in the stamped addressed envelope. Your reply will enable me to initiate the next phase of my research. I am eagerly awaiting your reply and thank you in advance for your willingness to participate.

Respectfully,

Ouida

Ouida M. Brown

Enc.

APPENDIX IV

OCDQ-RS AND MSQ AND LETTERS

ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTIVE QUESTIONNAIRE - REVISED SECONDARY OCDQ-RS

Directions: The following statements are about your school. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school by circling the appropriate response.

RO=RARELY OCCURS SO=SOMETIMES OCCURS

O=OFTEN OCCURS VFO=VERY FREQUENTLY OCCURS

1. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying	RO....	SO	O	VFO
2. Teachers have too many committee requirements	RO....	SO	O	VFO
3. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems	RO	SO	O	VFO
4. Teachers are proud of their school	RO....	SO	O	VFO
5. The principal sets an example by working hard himself/herself	RO....	SO	O	VFO
6. The principal compliments teachers	RO	SO	O	VFO
7. Teacher-principal conferences are dominated by the principal	RO....	SO	O	VFO
8. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching	RO ...	SO	O	VFO
9. Teachers interrupt other teachers who are talking in faculty meetings	RO....	SO	O	VFO
10. Student government has an influence on school policy	RO....	SO	O	VFO
11. Teachers are friendly with students	RO....	SO	O	YF0
12. The principal rules with an iron fist	RO....	SO	O	VFO
13. The principal monitors everything teachers do	RO ...	SO	O	VFO
14. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school	RO ...	SC	O	VFO
15. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school	RO....	SO	O	VFO
16. Teachers help and support each other	RO ..	SO	O	VFO
17. Pupils solve their problems through logical reasoning	RO..	SO	O	VFO
18. The principal closely checks teacher activity	RO..	SO	O	VFO

19. The principal is autocratic	RO .. SO	O	VFO
20. The morale of teachers is high	RO .. SO	O	VFO
21. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members	RO .. SO	O	VFO
22. Assigned non-teaching duties are excessive	RO .. SO	O	VFO
23. The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers	RO .. SO	O	VFO
24. The principal explains his/her reason for criticism to teachers	RO .. SO	O	VFO
25. The principal is available after school to help teachers when assistance is needed	RO . SO	O	VFO
26. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home	RO.. SO.....	O	VFO
27. Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis	RO.. SO.....	O	VFO
28. Teachers really enjoy working here	RO.. SO.....	O	VFO
29. The principal uses constructive criticism	RO . SO.....	O	VFO
30. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the faculty	RO . SO.....	O	VFO
31. The principal supervises teachers closely	RO . SO.....	O	VFO
32. The principal talks more than listens	RO . SO	O	VFO
33. Pupils are trusted to work together without supervision	RO. SO	O	VFO
34. Teachers respect the personal competence of their colleagues	RO . SO	O	VFO

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210-1177

TEL 614-292-7700
FAX 614-292-7900
waynehoy@aol.com

WAYNE K. HOY
Novice G. Fawcett Chair
in Educational Administration

March 8, 1998

Ms. Oiuda Brown
320 Lance Ave.
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dear Ms. Brown:

I am in Florida for the winter quarter, but my graduate assistant e-mailed me your request to use the OCDQ-RS for you dissertation. You have my permission to use the OCDQ-RS in your research. Just copy the instrument and use it. There is no cost as long as you are using the instrument for research purposes. There are two books that you may want to take a look at:

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (1997). The road to open and healthy schools: A handbook for change, Secondary Edition .Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

My own experience is that the Organizational Health Index for Secondary Schools (OHI), which is described in both books above, provides a little more information that the OCDQ-RS so you may want to examine at that climate instrument also. Good luck in your research.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne K. Hoy
Professor

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

(short-form)

Vocational Psychology Research

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell **how you feel about your present job,** what things you are **satisfied** with and what things you are **not satisfied** with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people **like and dislike about their jobs.**

On the next page you will find statements about your **present** job.

- Read each statement carefully.
- Decide **how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job** described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

—if you feel that your job gives you **more than you expected,** check the box under **"Very Sat."** (Very Satisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you **what you expected,** check the box under **"Sat."** (Satisfied);

—if you **cannot make up your mind** whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under **"N"** (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you **less than you expected,** check the box under **"Dissat."** (Dissatisfied);

—if you feel that your job gives you **much less than you expected,** check the box under **"Very Dissat."** (Very Dissatisfied).

- **Remember:** Keep the statement in mind when deciding **how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.**
- Do this for **all** statements. Please answer **every** item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your **present job.**

Ask yourself: How ***satisfied*** *am I with this aspect of my job?*

Very Sat. *means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.*

Sat. *means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.*

N *means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.*

Dissat. *means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.*

Very Dissat. *means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.*

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1. Being able to keep busy all the time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. The chance to work alone on the job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The chance to do different things from time to time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. The way my job provides for steady employment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The chance to do things for other people	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. The chance to tell people what to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. The way company policies are put into practice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. My pay and the amount of work I do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. The chances for advancement on this job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. The freedom to use my own judgment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. The working conditions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. The praise I get for doing a good job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Department of Psychology
College of Liberal Arts

Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344
612-625-2818
Fax: 612-626-2079

Mar 16, 1998

Ouida M. Brown
320 Lance Ave
North Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dear Ouida M. Brown:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form 1977 for use in your research.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research

Demographic Information

Please mark the most appropriate answer to the following questions:

1. **Teacher's Ethnicity.**

   A. Caucasian
   B. African American
   C. Asian/Pacific Islander
   D. American Indian/Alaskan Native
   E. Hispanic

2. **Education Degree Level**

   A. Bachelor Degree
   B. M.ED./MA
   C. Educational Specialist
   F. Doctorate

3. **Years of experience in the Clark County School District.**

   A. 1 to 5 yrs.
   B. 6 to 10 yrs.
   C. 11 to 20 yrs.
   D. 21 to 30 yrs.
   E. More than 30 yrs.

4. **Years of experience out of the Clark County School District.**

   A. 1 to 5 yrs.
   B. 6 to 10 yrs.
   C. 11 to 20 yrs.
   D. More than 20 yrs.

5. **Gender**

   A. Male
   B. Female

APPENDIX V

TABLES

Table 6 Differences by Gender for Urban Middle School Teachers in the CCSD on the OCDQ-RS and MSQ

OCDQ-RS		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Engaged Behavior	Male	76	2.59	.44
	Female	121	2.64	.49
	Total	197	2.62	.47
Frustrated Behavior	Male	76	1.97	.54
	Female	121	1.83	.53
	Total	197	1.88	.54
Intimate Behavior	Male	76	2.36	.63
	Female	121	2.37	.68
MSQ	Total	197	2.37	.66
Intrinsic Satisfaction	Male	76	4.15	.45
	Female	121	4.25	.50
	Total	197	4.21	.48
Extrinsic Satisfaction	Male	76	3.44	.88
	Female	121	3.69	.80
	Total	197	3.59	.84
General Satisfaction	Male	76	3.90	.53
	Female	121	4.06	.56
	Total	197	4.00	.55

Table 7 Differences by Education Level of Urban Middle School Teachers in CCSD,OCDQ-RS and MSQ

OCDQ-RS		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Engaged Behavior	Bachelors Degree	70	2.65	.47
	Masters Degree	112	2.58	.47
	Ed. Specialist or Doctorate	15	2.77	.49
	Total	197	2.62	.47
Frustrated Behavior	Bachelors Degree	70	1.92	.58
	Masters Degree	112	1.90	.51
	Ed. Specialist or Doctorate	15	1.60	.44
	Total	197	1.88	.54
Intimate Behavior	Bachelors Degree	70	2.44	.71
	Masters Degree	112	2.28	.63
	Ed. Specialist or Doctorate	15	2.66	.54
	Total	197	2.37	.66
MSQ				
Intrinsic Satisfaction	Bachelors Degree	70	3.55	.77
	Masters Degree	112	3.57	.85
	Ed. Specialist or Doctorate	15	3.96	.99
	Total	197	3.59	.84
Extrinsic Satisfaction	Bachelors Degree	70	3.55	.77
	Masters Degree	112	3.57	.85
	Ed. Specialist or Doctorate	15	3.96	.99
	Total	197	3.59	.84
General Satisfaction	Bachelors Degree	70	3.97	.46
	Masters Degree	112	3.98	.59
	Ed. Specialist or Doctorate	15	4.22	.67
	Total	197	4.00	.55

Table 8 Differences by Experience in the CCSD for Urban Middle School Teachers, OCDQ-RS and MSQ

OCDQ-RS		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Engaged Behavior	1-5 Years	88	2.62	.47
	6 or More Years	109	2.62	.48
	Total	197	2.62	.47
Frustrated Behavior	1-5 Years	88	1.88	.51
	6 or More Years	109	1.89	.56
	Total	197	1.88	.54
Intimate Behavior	1-5 Years	88	2.35	.66
	6 or More Years	109	2.38	.66
	Total	197	2.37	.66
MSQ				
Intrinsic Satisfaction	1-5 Years	88	4.22	.48
	6 or More Years	109	4.20	.49
	Total	197	4.21	.48
Extrinsic Satisfaction	1-5 Years	88	3.61	.78
	6 or More Years	109	3.58	.88
	Total	197	3.59	.84
General Satisfaction	5 or More Years	88	4.01	.54
	6 or More Years	109	3.99	.56
	Total	197	4.00	.55

Table 9 Differences by Experience Out-of-the CCSD for Urban Middle School Teachers, OCDQ-RS and MSQ

OCDQ-RS		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Engaged Behavior	1-5 Years	81	2.53	.48
	6 or More Years	116	2.68	.46
	Total	197	2.62	.47
Frustrated Behavior	1-5 Years	81	1.95	.55
	6 or More Years	116	1.84	.52
	Total	197	1.88	.54
Intimate Behavior	1-5 Years	81	2.31	.68
	6 or More Years	116	2.41	.65
	Total	197	2.37	.66
MSQ				
Intrinsic Satisfaction	1-5 Years	81	4.22	.49
	6 or More Years	116	4.20	.48
	Total	197	4.21	.48
Extrinsic Satisfaction	1-5 Years	81	3.58	.85
	6 or More Years	116	3.60	.84
	Total	197	3.59	.84
General Satisfaction	5 or More Years	81	4.00	.55
	6 or More Years	116	4.00	.56
	Total	197	4.00	.55

Table 10 Differences by Ethnicity of Urban Middle School Teachers in the CCSD. OCDQ-RS and MSQ

OCDQ-RS		Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
Engaged Behavior	Caucasian	149	2.59	.46
	Other	48	2.71	.46
	Total	197	2.62	.47
Frustrated Behavior	Caucasian	149	1.89	.52
	Other	48	1.86	.59
	Total	197	1.88	.54
Intimate Behavior	Caucasian	149	2.37	.61
	Other	48	2.36	.80
	Total	197	2.37	.66
MSQ				
Intrinsic Satisfaction	Caucasian	149	4.22	.46
	Other	48	4.19	.55
	Total	197	4.21	.48
Extrinsic Satisfaction	Caucasian	149	3.56	.78
	Other	48	3.70	1.01
	Total	197	3.59	.84
General Satisfaction	Caucasian	149	3.99	.52
	Other	48	4.03	.66
	Total	197	4.00	.55

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67,422-463.

Alexander, W.H., & George, P.S.(1981). The exemplary middle school. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Alexander, W.H., McEwin, K.C. (1989). Earmarks of schools in middle: A research report. (Report No. TM 014111). (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 312312).

Alexander, W.M., Williams, E.L., Compton, M., Hines,V.A., Prescot, D. & Kealy, R.(1968). The emergent middle school (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Anderson, C, (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 368-420.

Anderson, M., & Iwanicki, E (1984). Teacher motivation and relationship to burnout. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, 109-132.

Andrew, L., Parks, D., Nelson, L., & The Phi Delta Kappan Commission on Teacher/Faculty Morale (1985). Administrator's handbook for improving faculty morale. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Argyris, C. (1971). Management and organizational development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Armstrong, T. (1971). Job content and context factors related to satisfaction for different occupational levels. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 57-65.

Aspy, D., & Roebuck, F. (1977). Kids don't learn from people they don't like. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Austin, S. (1978). Process evaluation: A comprehensive study of outliners. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education.

Bergeth, R.L. (1971). An experimental study of teacher morale in selected school districts of North Dakota. Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 6293A. (University Microfilms No. 71-15).

Berliner, D. & Rosenshine, B. (Eds.) (1987). Talks to teachers. New York: Random House.

Berrien, K. (1968). General and social systems. New Brunswick, NJ:Rutgers University Press.

Bertalanffy, L. (1968). The effective principal (2nd edition) Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Bishop, L. & Lester, P. (1993). Instrumentation in education: An anthology. New York, Garland Publishing.

Bishop, L.& Lester, P. (1997). Handbook of tests and measurements in education and the social sciences. PA:Technomic Publishing Company.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bohlinger, T. (1978). A study to determine the current level of implementation of eighteen basic middle school characteristics in Ohio public schools housing grades 5-8 and 6-8. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 6587-A. (University Microfilms No. 78-01944).

Brookover, W.B. (1981). Effective secondary schools. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Brookover, W.B., Beady, C., Flood, P. Schweitzer, J. & Wesengaker, J. (1979). School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference. New York: Praeger Scientific.

Brookover, W.B., & Lezotte, L. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181005).

Campbell, J. (1977). On the nature of organizational effectiveness. In P. Goodman, J. Pennings, & Associate (Eds.), New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness (pp.36-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, J., Dunnette, M., Lawler, E., & Weick, K., Jr. (1970). Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). Report card on school reform: The teachers speak. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carnegie Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents, (1989). Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.

Carrell, F., & S Dietrich, J. (1978). Equity theory: The recent literature, methodological considerations, and new directions. Academy of Management Review, 3, 202-210.

Carver, F., & Sergiovanni, T. (1971). Complexity, adaptability and job satisfaction in high schools. The Journal of Educational Administration, 9, 10-31.

Cawelti, G. (1988, November). Middle schools a better match with early adolescent needs, ASCD survey finds. In J. O'Neil (Ed.), ASCD curriculum update (pp. 1-12). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Chance, E.W. (1992). Visionary leadership in schools: Successful strategies for developing and implementing an educational vision. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Clark, F. (1977). Improving the school climate: Operations notebook, Burlingame, CA: Association of California School Administrators.

Clark,S.N. & Clark, D.C.(1990 December). "Restructuring middle schools: Strategies for using turning points." Schools in the Middle Theory into Practice.

Clark, F. (1977). Improving the school climate: Operation notebook. Burlingame, CA: Association of California School Administrators.

Clover, S. (1984). Organizational climates of elementary schools in New Jersey: A revision and expansion of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.

Cole, D.W. (1977). An analysis of job satisfaction among elementary, middle level, and senior high school teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 2443A-2444A.(University Microfilms No. 77-24).

Coleman, J. (1966). Equity of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Connors, N.A., & Irvin, J.L. (1989). Is "middle schoolness" an indicator of excellence? Middle School Journal, 20 (5), 12-14.

Curtis, T.E., & Bidwell, W. (1977). Curriculum and instruction for emerging adolescents. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Dawis, R., & Lofquist, L. (1984). A psychological theory of work adjustment; An individual-differences model and its applications. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Demps, H.W. (1978). A study of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of job satisfaction and their perceptions of the level of implementation of

eighteen basic middle school characteristics. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 5833A. (University Microfilms No.79-07323).

Devault, J.A. (1981). A study of the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher morale in the secondary schools of Virginia. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3165A. (University Microfilms No.82-28662).

Draud, J.E.(1978). The effects of organizational structure of middle schools and junior high schools on the attitudes of teachers and students toward the school. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 4620A. (University Microfilms No. 79-03871).

Duckett, W., Park, D., Clark, D., McCarthy, M., Lotto, L., Gregory, L., Herling, J., & Burleson, D.(1980). Why do some urban schools succeed? Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Edmonds, R. (1979). A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling, Volume 6. St. Louis: Cremel, Inc.

Edmonds, R. (December 1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. Educational Leadership. V40, p.4-11.

Erb, T.O. (1988, June). Report on secondary reorganization year two: Part 1. Paper presented at the Summer Institute on Middle School Curriculum, Dillon, CO.

Fawley, S.M.(1980). Personality characteristics and job dissatisfaction among teachers on the elementary, middle and secondary levels. Dissertation Abstracts International,40, 3888-A. (University Microfilms No.80-02245).

Fielder, R.E. (1978). A solution to the middle school problem. Clearinghouse, 51,322-326.

Forehand, G., & Gilmore, B. (1964). Environmental variations in studies of organizational behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 62, 361-382.

Fox, R.(1978). School climate improvement: A challenge to the school administration. New York: Wiley Brothers.

Fraas, J.W. (1983). Basic concepts in educational research. New York: University Press of America, Inc..

Gall, M., Borg, W. & Gall J.(1996). Educational research introduction (6th ed.). New York: Publishers.

Gallup, A. (1985). The 17th annual Gallup poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappa, 67, 35-47.

Gardner, D. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gay, L.R. (1981). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application (2nd edition). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Gay, L.R. (1987). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application (3rd edition). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

George, P.S. (1990). From junior high to middle school: Principals' perspectives. NASSP Bulletin, 74(523), 86-94.

George, P.S., Stevenson, C., Thomason, J. & Beane, J. (1992). The Middle School and Beyond. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Getzel, J., & Guba, E. (1957). School behavior and administrative process. The School Review, 65, 423-441.

Getzel, J., Lipham, J., & Campbell, R. (1968). Educational administration as a social process. New York: Harper & Row.

Gillan, R.E. (1979). A national assessment of the effects of middle school teachers certification. Dissertation abstract International. 39, 46024-4603A.

Gilmer, B., & Forehand, G. (1975). Applied psychology adjustment and living in work. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Glasser, W. (1990). The quality school: Managing students without coercion. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Glasser, W. (1992). The quality school: Managing students without coercion. New York: Harper Perennial.

Goodlad, J. (1975). The dynamics of educational change: Toward responsive schools. New York: McGraw Hill.

Grace, L. (1986). Organizational climate: A synopsis of theory and research applied to educational environments (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 2872A.

Grassie, C., & Carss, B. (1973). School structure, leadership quality, teacher satisfaction, Educational Administration Quarterly, 9, 15-26.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: A test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 16,250-279.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Halpin, A. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: The McMillan Company.

Halpin, A., & Croft, D. (1963). The organizational climate of schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hansen, J.H., & Hear, A.C. (1971). The middle school program. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Hartley, M., & Hoy, W. (1972). Openness of school climate and alienation of high school students. California Journal of Educational Research, 23, 17-24.

Hawkins, J. (1973). A study to ascertain actual middle school practices as compared to reported middle school practices in selected middle schools and nationally prominent schools as perceived by teachers and principals. Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 4729-A. (University Microfilms No. 73).

Hellrigel, D., & Slocum, J., Jr. (1974). Organizational climate: Measures, research, and contingencies. Academy of Management Journal, 17, 255-280.

Hernon, P. (1991). Statistics: A component of the research process. New Jersey: Ablex.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. New York: World Publishing.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley.

Hinkle, D., Wiesma, W.,& Jurs, S. (1988). Applied statistics for the behavior sciences (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Holdaway, E.A. (1978). Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 30-47.

Homans, G. (1961). Social Behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper.

Howard, E., Howell, B., & Brainard, E. (1987). Handbook for conducting school climate improvement projects. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Hoy, W. (1972). Dimensions of student alienation and characteristics of public high schools. Interchange, 3, 38-51.

Hoy, W., & Clover, S. (1986). Elementary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22, 93-110.

Hoy, W.K. & Forsyth, P. B.(1986). Effective supervision: theory into practice. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Hoy, W.,& Miskel, C. (1982).Educational administration: theory, research and practice (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (1996). Educational administration theory, research and practice (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Hoy, W., Sabo, D.J., Barnes, K.M., Hannum, J.W., & Hoffman, J.D. (1998). Quality middle Schools: Open and healthy. California: Corbin Press, Inc.

Hoy, W., Tarter, C., & Kottkamp, R. (1991). Open Schools/Healthy Schools: Measuring Organizational Climate. London: Sage Publications.

Huseman, R., & Hatfield, J. (1989). Managing the equity factor. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

James, L., & Jones, A. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1096-1112.

Johnson, M. (1989). Organizational climate, discipline infractions, and student academic achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, 1989).

Johnston, R.H., (1991). The relationship between job satisfaction of Colorado middle school teachers and selected school and teacher characteristics. (Doctoral Dissertation), The University of Southern Mississippi.

Jones, A., & James L. (1979). Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individual an aggregated work environment perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 201-250.

Joyce, W., & Slocum, J., Jr. (1979). Climate in organizations. In S. Kerr (Ed.), Organizational Behavior (pp. 317-333). Columbus: Grid.

Kalis, M.C. (1980). Teaching experiment: Its effect on school climate, teacher morale. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (4), p. 23-25.

Kanner, L. (1974). Machiavellianism and the secondary schools: Teacher-Principal relations (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1974).

Kaufman, B.I. (1984). The relationship of perceived leadership practices to teacher morale in New York City public schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3165A. (University Microfilm No. 84-28662).

Keefe, J., Kelley, E., & Miller, S. (1985). School climate: Clear definitions and a model for larger settings. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 70-71.

Kelley, E. (1980). Improving school climate. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1984). Liberalism and conservatism: The nature and structure of social attitudes. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawerence Erlbaum Associates.

Kershaw, C. Bellon, E., Blank, M., Brian, D., & Perkins, M. (1990). School based research to improve the quality of school life. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 16, 1990.

Kidd, G.B (1976). A comparison of the attitudes of junior high school and middle school teachers in Louisiana. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 6157A. (University Microfilm No. 77-8685).

King, N. (1970). Clarification and evaluation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. Psychological Bulletin, 74,18-31.

Klingele, W. E. (1979). Teaching in middle schools. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kottkamp, R.B., Milhern, J.A., & Hoy, W.K. (1987). Secondary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23, 31-48.

LaFollette, W. & Sims, H.P., Jr. (1975). Is satisfaction redundant with organizational climate? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 257-278.

Lawler, E. (1983). Satisfaction and behavior. In R. Steers & L. Porter (Eds.), Motivation and Work Behavior (pp. 332-345). New York: McGraw Hill.

Lawler, E., & Porter, L. (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Industrial relations. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lester, P. (1988). Teacher job satisfaction: An annotated bibliography and guide to research. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Lezotte, L. (1980). School learning climate and student achievement. Tallahassee, FL: SSTA Center, Teacher Education Projects, Florida State University.

Likert, R.(1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw Hill.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization: Its management and value. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lindelow, J., & Mazzarella, J. (1985). School climate, school leadership: Handbook for survival. Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Litwin, G., & Stringer, R., Jr. (1968). Motivation and organizational climate. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 1294-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Locke, E., Cargledge, N. & Knerr, C. (1990). Studies of the relationship between satisfactory goal setting, and performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5 135-139.

Locke, E. Shaw, K., Saari, L., & Latham, G. (1981). Goal setting and task performance: 1969-1980. Psychological Bulletin, 90, 125-152.

Lofland, G. (1985). The study of the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in selected schools in the District of Columbia (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1985).

Lofquist, L., & Dawis, R. (1969). Adjustment to work: A psychological view of man's problems in work-oriented society. New York: Appelton Century Crofts, Education Division.

Lounsbury, J.H., & Vars, G.F. (1978). A curriculum for the middle school years. New York: Harper & Row.

Lowther, M., Coppard, L., Gill, S., & Tank, R. (1982). The mis-career malaise of teachers: an examination of job attitudes and the factors influencing job satisfaction in the middle years. (Report No. NIE-G-81-0084) Washington D.C. National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 218280).

Lowther, M.A., Gill, S.J., & Coppard, L.C. (1985). Age and the determinants of teacher job satisfaction. The Gerontologist, 25 *5), p. 520-525.

Magana, S.(1987). A study to determine the current level of implementation of eighteen basic middle school characteristics as perceived by teachers, principals and superintendents in selected Wisconsin middle schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 395A. (University Microfilms No. 88-7088).

Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation, Psychology Review, 50, (2), 370-396.

Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

Maudaus, G. (1979). The sensitivity of measures of school effectiveness. Harvard Educational Review, 49 (2), 207-230.

McGee, J.C., & Krajewski, R.J. (1979). Middle school effectiveness: A three-year study. Middle School Journal, 10(4), 16-17.

Mergendeller, J.R., & Mitman, A. L. (1985). The relationship of middle school program features, instructional strategy, instructional performance, and student engagement. Journal of Early Adolescence, 5(2), 183-193.

MacMillan, J. & Schumacher, S.(1997). Research in education: A conceptual introduction (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Miskel, C. (1973). The motivation of educators to work. Educational Administration Quarterly, 9,42-53.

Miskel, C.,& Ogawa, R. (1988). Work motivation, job satisfaction, and climate, in J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration, 294-299. New York: Longman.

Miskel, C., Defrain, J., & Wilcox, K. (1980). A test of expectancy work motivation theory in educational organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16, 70-92.

Miskel, C., Glasnap, D., & Hatley, R. (1975). A test of inequity theory of job satisfaction listing educator's attitude toward work motivation and work motivation and work incentives. Educational Administration Quarterly, 11, 38-54.

Miskel, C., McDonald, D., & Bloom, S. (1983). Structural and expectancy linkages within schools and organizational effectiveness. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19,49-82.

Moos, R. (1974). The social climate scales: An overview. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.

Mulhern, J. (1985). Organizational climate of secondary schools revision of the OCDQ. (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University,1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46,572A.

Murphy, M.L. (1985). An analysis of teacher incentives and disincentives relative to teacher retention. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 2154A. (University Microfilms No. 85-19723).

Murray, H. (1938). Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press.

Naylor, J., Pritchard, R. & Ilgen, D. (1980). A theory of behavior in organizations. New York: academic press.

Nwanko, J. (1979). The school climate as a factor in students' conflict in Nigeria. Educational Studies.

O'Neal, D., O'Neal, M., Short, M., Holmes, C., Brown, C. Deweese, L., & Carter, M. (1987). Improving school climate. Monographs in education series. Athens: University of Georgia.

Owens, R. (1995). Organizational behavior in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Parsons, T. (1951). The social system. Glencoe, IL: The Free press.

Parsons, T. (1968). Social systems. In D. Sillis (Ed.) International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (pp. 458-473). New York: The MacMillan Company.

Pastor, M., & Erlandson, D. (1982). A study of higher order need strength and job satisfaction in secondary pupil school teachers. Journal of Educational administration, 20, 172-183.

Patchen, M. (1961). The choice of wage comparisons. Eaglewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Payne, R., & Pugh, S. (1976). Organizational structure and climate. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 1125-1173). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Perry, M.E. (1980). The relationship between teacher morale and perceived leader behavior in the junior high schools of a selected metropolitan district in Oklahoma. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 251A. (University Microfilms No. 81-13248).

Pierson, D., Archambault, F., & Iwanicki, E. (1985). A cross validation of the porter needs satisfaction questionnaire for educators. Educational Psychological Measurement, 45, 683-688.

Pook, M.E. (1980). A study of the relationship of teacher job satisfaction and the level of implementation of recommended middle school practices. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3406A. (University Microfilms No. 81-03127).

Porter, L. (1962). Job attitudes in management: I Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. Journal of applied Psychology, 46, 375-384.

Porter, L., (1963). Job attitudes in management: II. Perceived importance of needs as a function of job level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 47, 141-148.

Powell, G., & Butterfield, D. (1978). The case for subsystem climates in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 3,151-157.

Pritchard, R., Dunnette, M., & Jorgenson, D. (1972). Effects of perceptions of equity and inequity on worker performance and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 75-94.

Purkey, S., & Smith, M.(1982). Too soon to cheer? synthesis of research of effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40,64-69.

Raisani, R. (1988). A study of the relationship of organizational climate and teachers' and school's selected demographic characteristics to teacher job satisfaction as perceived by the teachers in selected Michigan public secondary schools (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1988).

Raymer, J.D. (1971). A study to identify middle schools and determine the current level of implementation of eighteen basic middle school characteristics in selected United States and Michigan schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 2977A. (University Microfilms No. 35, 5801A-5802A).

Rutter, M. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sashkin, M., & Morris, W. (1984). Organizational behavior concepts and experiences. Reston, VA: The Reston Company.

Schneider, B. (1973). The perception of organizational climate: The customers' view. Journal of applied Psychology, 57, 248-256.

Schneider, B. (1975). Organizational climate: an essay. Personnel Psychology, 28, 447-479.

Schneider, B., & Bartlett, C. (1970). Individual differences and organizational climate Measurement of organizational climate by the multi-trait, multi-rater matrix. Personnel Psychology, 23, 493-512.

Schwab, D., Olian-Gottlieb, J., & Heneman, H. (1979). Between-subjects expectancy theory research: A statistical review of studies predicting effort and performance. Psychology Bulletin, 86, 139-147.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L.S. & Cook, S.W. (1976). Research methods in social relations (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1969). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. In F. Carver & R. Sergiovanni (Eds.), Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools (pp. 259-269). New York: McGraw Hill.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1980). The new school executive: A theory of administration (2nd edition). New York: Harper & Row.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Carver, F.D. (1980). The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T., & Corbally, J. (Eds). (1984). Leadership and organizational culture. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Silver, P. (1983). Educational administration. New York: Harper & Row.

Slezak, James (1985). Odyssey to excellence: How to build effective schools through leadership and management skills. San Francisco: Merritt Publishing Company.

Smith, W. & Andrews, R. (1989). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Steinhoff, C. (1965). Organizational climate in a public system. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Program Contact No.OE-4-225, Project No.S-083, Syracuse University.

Stern, G. (1970). People in context: Measuring person-environment in education and industry. New York: John Wiley.

Sweeney, J. (1981). Teacher dissatisfaction on the rise: Higher level needs unfulfilled. Education, 102 198-204.

Szilagyi, A., & Wallace, M. (1983). Organizational behavior and performance. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Tagiuri, R. & Litwin, G.H. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri and G.H. Litwin (Eds) Organizational Climate (P. 11-32). Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Tatsuoka, M.M. & Silver, P. (1988). Quantitative research methods in education administration. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration. (pp. 677-702). New York: Longman.

Thomas, A. (1976). The organizational climate of schools. International Review of Education. 22, 441-463.

Thorndile, E.L. & Barnhart, C.L. (1979). Scott, Foresman advanced dictionary. Palo Alto, California: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Trusty, F., & Sergiovanni, T. (1966). Perceived need deficiencies of teachers and administrators: A proposal for restructuring teacher roles. Educational Administration Quarterly, 2, 168-180.

Vroom, V. & Deci, E. (Eds.) (1970). Management and motivation: Selected readings. Kingsport, TN: Penguin Books.

Vroom, V. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wahba, M., & Birdwell, L. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 212-240.

Waters, E.(1978). Human relations for the educational environment. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Warner, W. (1981). Decision involvement and job satisfaction in Wisconsin elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1981).

Weiss, D., & Dawis, R. (1965). An influential approach to occupational reinforcement. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XIX.

Weiss, D., Dawis, R., & England, G. (1967). Manual for Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation.

Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1964). Construct validation studies of the Minnesota importance questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XVII.

White, R. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 66, 297-329.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1981). The essential middle school. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Willower, D., Edell, T., & Hoy, W. (1967). The school and pupil control ideology. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University.

Woodman, R., & King, D. (1978). Organizational Climate: Science as folklore. Academy of Management Review, 3, 816-826.

VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

OUIDA M. BROWN

Home Address:

2815 South Buffalo Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
(702) 642-2252

Degrees:

1967	Bachelor of Science Alcorn State University, Lorman, Mississippi Major: Home Economics Education
1980	Master of Education University of Nevada, Las Vegas Major: Guidance and Counseling
1982	Master of Education University of Nevada, Las Vegas Major: Educational Administration

Special Honors and Awards:
Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society, Member Since 1997

Dissertation Title: The Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction of Selected Urban Middle School Teachers in The Clark County School District

Dissertation Examination Committee:
Chairperson, Dr. Karl Steinhoff, Ed.D.
Chairperson, Dr. James Crawford, Ed.D.
Committee Member, Dr. Teresa Jordan, Ph.D.
Committee Member, Dr. Patti Brusa-Chance, Ph.D.