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While the State of Florida rushes to outsource its juvenile justice and rehabilitation responsibilities to private schools and companies, questions about the effectiveness of such programs plague researchers and stakeholders. One way to think about the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs is through teacher satisfaction.

I propose that teachers are more satisfied, thus more likely to perform their jobs well, in organizations that are effective. Organizational effectiveness can be defined by the management’s capacity to supervise the faculty and staff of a school or program. Here, I define management capacity as an adherence to policies and procedures, a commitment to training, and careful management of employee performance. I posit that teachers’ perceptions of how these obligations are met can begin to paint a picture of the overall situation. These stories, these voices, tell a vital component of beginning to understand the organizational effectiveness in private, juvenile justice facilities.
This research uses an explanatory, theory building case study design. I administered a self-completion questionnaire and a structured oral interview designed specifically for this investigation. The self-completion questionnaire obtained demographic information as well as perceptual data as measured by scalar questions. The questionnaire used a scalar response format because it offers the respondent a range of choices and measures intensity of a variable (satisfaction).

The theoretical population for this study is all teachers who work in juvenile justice education programs. The accessible population for this research is teachers who live and work in Florida for private providers of juvenile justice education. The sampling frame consists of teachers who work at schools in Florida run by what I will refer to as Parent Company X.

I chose three cases with low, three with medium, and three with high performing formative evaluation scores as determined by the Quality Assurance reports. The schools were considered units of analysis, with teachers as the embedded units within the cases.

Results revealed that relationships with the administration, perceptions of management performance, and perceptions of employee training did not necessarily detract from job satisfaction with the teachers in these juvenile justice schools. Perceptions of organizational infrastructure did seem to affect job satisfaction in a negative way. This aspect of management capacity seemed to frustrate teachers. Some even felt like a lack of organizational infrastructure detracted from their main mission, helping students.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

While the State of Florida rushes to outsource its juvenile justice and rehabilitation responsibilities to private schools and companies, questions about the effectiveness of such programs plague researchers and stakeholders. One way to think about the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs is through teacher satisfaction. When professional teachers are satisfied in their working environment, they are more likely to perform at optimum levels, thus passing quality services directly to the students in need. When these programs rested under the auspices of the state, stakeholders might easily recognize the model of operation – a traditionally conceptualized school model. However flawed, the public school system remains a powerful horse with familiar, open policies and procedures.

Legislation ensures that everyone under the age of eighteen will have the opportunity to receive an equal education. Private facilities may provide that equal education, care must be taken to ensure that the education bestowed upon marginalized citizens does not itself become marginalized. Clarke (2004) theorizes that we have, as a society, a strong traditional understanding of what services certain public institutions provide. The public school system has established a dependable reputation for the level and amount of services provided to students. While inequalities still may exist in this institution, the public maintains a certain expectation when participating in the institution.

According to Jensen (2003, pg. 99), “there are unique challenges in implementing and maintaining a bona fide education program constrained by a system dedicated to the
control and management of its students.” When services conventionally provided by a public entity are rendered to a private one, the public cannot maintain the same expectation based on previous experience. However, the state ensures that education provided under the auspices of Department of Juvenile Justice, either through public or private programs, is as valuable as that provided in the traditional school system. The state or other evaluative agency must also monitor the expression of conflicting organizational cultures when programs are asked to operate as educational facilities, correctional facilities, and businesses. As Jensen (2003, pg. 99) observes, “differing mandates and divergent areas of focus produced significant potential for inconsistency, confusion, and disagreement.”

Restructuring organizations such as schools often comes with a hefty price played out in human costs. Often, disruptions in relationships can contribute to teacher attrition. Almost one-third of teachers leave the profession in the first five years (Houchins et al. 2004; O’Keefe 2003). This attrition rate increases with teachers who work with difficult populations in difficult settings, including special education and juvenile justice (Houchins et al. 2004). The reorganization deserves careful contemplation to understand whether or not the same relationships and expectations will remain – indeed, whether the teachers will remain on staff. The absence of quality peer and administration relationships and procedural justice can cause teachers to become dissatisfied in their profession. This dissatisfaction may have a negative influence over job performance, retention, and the professional community. According to Houchins and others (2004), when the general school climate is positive, teachers are more satisfied and more likely to stay on the job. “Several researcher have found positive job satisfaction is significantly
related to teacher intention to stay on the job” (Houchins et al. 2004, pg. 379). It follows, then, that concern extends to not only service provision, but also to service providers.

However, as the state farms out these programs to other entities, the structures inside those organizations beg to be questioned. The entities, as market competitors, are forced to act partially on a business model and partially on an education model. The cohesion of these models has existed for such a short time in juvenile justice education that we might fairly wonder about the effectiveness of the organization. The need to ensure this effectiveness stems from a fundamental desire to provide quality educational services to all minors, regardless of their legal statuses. If education has been identified time and time again as the foremost deciding factor in recidivism, is it not a public mandate to ensure these children receive quality educations from highly skilled, satisfied teachers in productive environments?

I propose that teachers are more satisfied, thus more likely to perform their jobs well, in organizations that are effective. Organizational effectiveness can, in one sense, be defined by the management’s capacity to supervise the faculty and staff of a school or program. The relationship between managers and faculty serves as the backbone of a strong, successful school. Here, I define management capacity as an adherence to policies and procedures, a commitment to training, and careful management of employee performance. In evaluation literature, there exists many ways to measure this type of capacity, both objectively and subjectively. I posit that teachers’ perceptions of how these obligations are met can begin to paint a picture of the overall situation. Objective measures show up often in program evaluations. However, the stories from direct care workers – in this case, teachers – are often drowned by paperwork counts and tallies.
These stories, these voices, tell a vital component of beginning to understand the organizational effectiveness in private, juvenile justice facilities.

![Figure 1: Chi and Jasper’s (1998) review of privatization in state governments shows a marked increase in privatization activity.](image)

Clarke (2004) identifies two main currents in privatization in current social policy: 1) a shift in activities, resources, and the provision of goods and services and 2) a shift in social responsibility. Both of these aspects inform recent decisions in the privatization of education specifically through the Department of Juvenile Justice. The following charts from “A Review of Privatization in State Governments” shows that sixty-eight percent of states have showed increased activity towards privatization in the area of juvenile rehabilitation (Chi and Jasper 1998). Of the states that are moving towards privatization in this area, forty-five percent of the respondents listed cost savings as a reason, while only twenty-two percent listed quality of service (Chi and Jasper 1998).

One might intuitively ask what the impetus for this trend is. While individual states list a variety of reasons for privatizing, forty-five percent of the organizations who responded to the survey listed cost savings as a reason. Contrast this figure with a mere twenty-two percent of respondents who listed quality of service. Building Blocks for
Youth, an advocacy group, claims that proponents of privatization insist that free enterprise and competition will force prices to drop, providing the state with a less expensive solution. While costs savings seems to be a major concern for many, advocacy groups such as this one, as well as community stakeholders, will rightfully question what we as a community are willing to forsake in favor of a lower bill. Quality of education, educational outcomes, and teacher satisfaction are a few of the many factors that may rank higher than cost savings on some agendas. Ostensibly, the constant battle to balance the budget, spend less, and serve more makes privatization look like a fast, easy option.

Figure 2: Cost savings in the most often cited reason for increases in privatization in state governments.

This dependence on private providers takes many forms, from direct privatization all the way to public/private partnerships, outsourcing (through contracting), and creating competition for resources (Clarke 2004). According to Clarke (2004), these types of market readjustments disrupt the traditional understandings of relationships (as with peers), structures (or the environment), and systems (within the organization). Few quantitative studies examine this disruption, and almost all that have focus on educational or product outcomes. The research body clearly lacks any examination of how the shift from public to private affects people, namely teachers. Advocacy groups like Building Blocks for Youth blame deteriorating conditions for youth in juvenile justice facilities on
the competitive nature of privatization, but the public has yet to take up meaningful
discourse on the effects on teachers and staff.

How does the situation of privatizing public institutions like juvenile justice look in
Florida? Fortunately, a current impulse to increase accountability on the state’s part has
increased the type and amount of information available on state government websites.
The Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement Program (JJEEP) is a joint project between
the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice and Florida State University designed to
research, organize, and evaluate education services provided in juvenile justice facilities.
Its 2002 annual report states that, “52% of the education programs were public, 42% of
the educational programs were private not for profit, five percent of the educational
programs were private for profit, and 1% were operated by the government” (pg. 109).
Contrastingly, the for-profit programs educated fourteen percent of the students that year,
and not for profit programs educated thirty-nine percent of the students. So, even though
private programs have not surpassed public programs in terms of numbers of facilities,
they are already serving a majority of students in Florida’s juvenile justice system.

Importantly, the quality of service these programs provide has yet to be determined.
According to JJEEP’s 2002 annual report, the publicly run programs consistently score
higher on evaluations than private providers. Furthermore, private for profit programs
scored the lowest of all three provider settings (public, not for profit, and for profit). For
profit programs would have to improve evaluation scores by twenty-one percent in order
to perform at the same level as public programs. JJEEP reports the largest difference in
scores between public and private for profit education providers occurred in the areas of
administration and contract management. Although yearly scores on quality assurance
evaluations illustrate some indicators for program success, it is necessary to consider the evaluations in greater detail.

In fact, according to the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice 2003 Quality Assurance Report, private providers ran a majority of programs tendering educational service, and these programs all scored average or above on their evaluations. However, the Quality Assurance evaluation that the state conducts is formative in nature and does not measure program outcomes. The question of whether private providers can establish greater gains in student improvement and achievement, and, more importantly, teacher satisfaction remains to be answered.

While its website indicates that it is in the process of initiating statewide recidivism studies, the Department of Juvenile Justice does not conduct summative evaluations on a program-by-program basis. Many programs cannot afford or do not know about summative evaluations that might better predict effectiveness. Even so, programs rely on the state’s quality assurance evaluations as benchmarks of success since the audits are directly linked to continued funding. However, it is important to remember that formative evaluations do not illustrate the whole picture. The question of whether private providers can establish greater gains in teacher satisfaction remains to be answered due to a lack of input from teachers in the existing evaluation process.

Using more holistic evaluative measures may be costly and too new to have been widely implemented, but we are on the way to establishing a strong body of research surrounding systemic program evaluation. Researchers, as well as practitioners, recognize the importance of examining programs from many different perspectives. Research by Selden and Sowa (2004) outlines a multi-dimensional model for evaluating programs.
Their model considers many facets of management and program capacities when assessing the effectiveness of an organization both in terms of outcomes and processes. This research defines management capacity as the degree to which processes are in place to sustain an organization (Seldon and Sowa 2004). Evaluating this capacity may have many benefits, considering that many effective nonprofit and public organizations have similar management practices and structures. As direct care workers, teachers’ perceptions of these “best practices” may illuminate important aspects of management capacity, in turn strengthening programs’ effectiveness.

Why is it important to consider teacher satisfaction when evaluating programs? Research cited by Kelley and Finnegan (2003, pg. 604) indicates that teacher expectancy is “the key motivational factor that distinguished schools with improved student performance from schools in which student performance failed to improve.” They define teacher expectancy as the belief that individual effort will result in the achievement of goals and go on to suggest that expectancy may be informed by perceptions of program fairness and goal clarity. Teachers, as the direct care staff at these programs, have a tremendous amount of influence over the success of the school and the students at the school.

Many researchers have examined the relationship between outcomes and indicators of teacher satisfaction. However, very little research has explored teacher satisfaction with the population of teachers that are the focus of our study, those who teach at private juvenile justice schools. Public perception and trends in policy seem to indicate dissatisfaction with the way public schools have served juvenile offenders, leading to an increased dependence on private providers.
Researchers have explored satisfaction, as a psychological effect, in four general tendencies. Foundational work in teacher satisfaction identifies two contributing factors to satisfaction (Bogler 2001). Motivators, or intrinsic factors, refer to relationships, perceptions of performance, and feelings of the teacher. Hygiene factors, mainly extrinsic, refer to the organization, pay, and the physical environment. More recent work (Kelley and Finnegan 2003) identifies expectancy, or the belief that individual effort will result in the achievement of specified goals, as a key indicator of increased student performance. Perceptions of program fairness and goal clarity (highly related to satisfaction) are the largest predictors of high levels of expectancy. Finally, Bogler (2001) defines occupation perception as the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of the teachers’ occupation, and his study identifies it as well as the principal’s behavior as major predictors of teacher satisfaction.

This framework mapping teacher satisfaction has largely been explored in the public realm. It is our intent to purport that a private provider setting may drastically influence these motivators that indicate satisfaction in the peer, organizational, and environmental contexts. In Clarke’s (2004) criticism of privatization, he outlines how shifting public responsibility to the private realm can fragment service provision, increase the number of agencies involved and increase the number of decision making settings; this “dispersal” creates new problems of coordination and regulation.

Trends in privatization are developing at an alarming rate. Proponents of the trend cite increased cost effectiveness, flexibility, and less bureaucracy as benefits for programs and their stakeholders. Opponents contend that privatization fragments organizations without considering major implications in the capacity to manage
resources, including teachers. The outcomes of this process remain to be seen, but along the way, researchers have obligation to examine the complex dimensions that arise. I have indicated how previous research delineates teacher expectancy and management capacity as important factors in organizational success in other domains. Therefore, I intend to examine how perceptions of management capacity in private juvenile justice settings interplay with teacher satisfaction.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Preliminary Research – Pilot Study

A colleague and I conducted research during Summer 2004 that explored three dimensions of teacher satisfaction in the private sector setting: satisfaction with peers, satisfaction with the environment, and satisfaction with the organization. We presented six case studies of teachers who work in juvenile justice schools in the private sector. In this article, private schools referred specifically to secular schools not affiliated with religious education. Juvenile justice schools referred to private companies that provide educational services to adjudicated youth in both residential and non-residential settings. Teacher satisfaction referred to individual perceptions of performance in the peer, environmental, and organizational contexts.

We intended this case study to be an initiation point in the discussion of teacher satisfaction with peers, the environment, and the organization in the private sector setting. Our results lend contributions to the teacher’s perspective in the peer, environmental, and organizational contexts in private, juvenile justice facilities, but they also suggest some more in depth contexts that would benefit from further study.

The results indicate a thorough understanding of peer relationships on the part of teachers. Clarke’s (2004) fear that privatization would disrupt the social networking and relationship building inherent in public systems did not hold true in this situation. Instead, teachers seem to have an overwhelming satisfaction with each other and report that their peers most often support what they do and use the appropriate established procedures.
Perhaps this stems from assimilation in teacher training, as states begin to standardize certification and teacher training programs, and it certainly stems from a basic understanding of what teachers do and how they behave, as far as it is ingrained in our social experiences.

Conversely, the same levels of satisfaction are not extended to relationships with administrators, indicating that teachers do not view administrators within the peer context. Ideas that administrators do not value education develop from perceptions that administrators do not treat teachers with respect, do not respond opportunistically to requests, and do not motivate or retain teachers. Perhaps the dual role that administrators must play as business people and school leaders detracts from the teachers’ main goal of education.

In the event that the administrators are not trained educators, unlike public school administrators, teachers may perceive this difference in goals as detrimental to the children. Differences in backgrounds on the part of administrators may, as a result, create a clash of cultures where the business model emphasizes values somewhat different than the education model. Certainly, questions of expertise and judgment may plague a team that lacks mutual agreement in goal clarity. According to Kelley and Finnegan (2003), this disparity in goals impacts teacher expectancy, or the belief that one is making adequate progress. In turn, a lower rate of satisfaction ensues. In any case, administrators do not contribute to satisfaction in the peer context for teachers, and teachers sense a great schism between their teacher teams and the administrative team.

Teachers’ perceptions of the environmental context are somewhat more difficult to interpret because they are very closely intertwined with the organization context, there being a strong connection between facets of the organization and the feeling that those
facets inhibit an appropriate environment. While some teachers were not unhappy with their spaces or supplies, almost all at some point indicated that a lack of sufficient resources hindered some part of the educational setting. Resources, to the teachers, included textbooks, supplies for projects, classroom size, stipends for teachers, and – intangible yet valuable – respect for teachers. One of the most recurring disadvantages to teaching in their current setting is a lack of resources, but this contrasts the fact that most teachers report being somewhat satisfied in their current position. If a lack of markers and construction paper, for example, does not lower satisfaction rates, what does?

From the teachers’ perspective, satisfaction at an environmental level indicates a deep satisfaction at the organizational level. Privatization has disrupted traditional understandings of how systems function (Clarke 2004), so that private schools, in attempts to be more efficient and less wasteful, often do quite the opposite. Comments from the teachers indicate that there is a poor distribution of resources that undermines efforts to be efficient and effective. In the long run, cutting corners does not save money, especially considering the human costs that accompany reconstituting established systems (Rice and Malen 2003). Even though teachers overall think that other teachers followed routine, established procedures, they do perceive administrators as doing so. This also may reflect differences in training procedures and backgrounds, strengthening the rupture between educator and administrator relations.

The four dimensions of teacher satisfaction that we outlined previously – intrinsic motivators, extrinsic motivators, expectancy, and occupational perceptions – borrow from each other’s steam and influence each other’s deflation. Generally, teachers in this setting report high levels of satisfaction with intrinsic motivators, noting helping children and
bonding with students repeatedly. Hygienic, or extrinsic motivators, in regard to the environment and the administration, seem to detract rather than contribute to satisfaction. However, extrinsic factors like relations with peers make great contributions to teacher satisfaction. Perhaps the chief detriment to teacher satisfaction is a disintegration of occupational perceptions and expectancy due to a miscommunication of goals and values with administration. Certainly, the complexity of the issue of teacher satisfaction calls for a more in depth examination of contributing factors.

I consider several major variables that may contribute to teacher job satisfaction including social conditions the process of privatization organizational justice and commitment satisfaction, motivation, expectancy and perception, and organizational effectiveness.

**Social and Organizational Conditions**

The United States incarcerates more people than any other industrialized county in the world. For a period of fifteen years, between 1975 and 1990, the number of inmates in state and federal prisons increased by 200% (Vacca 2004). The New Jersey Department of Corrections reported that its prisons grew from 6,000 inmates in 1975 to more than 25,000 in 1997 (Vacca 2004). Similar statistics emerge in almost every state. Although these numbers reflect federal prison populations, comparable trends are found in state, local, and juvenile facilities.

The two largest growing populations in incarceration are women and juveniles. Children involved in the justice system are at an increased risk to become adults in prison. Vacca (2004) also reports that an estimated 70% of the federal inmates were functioning at the two lowest literacy levels. These findings do not establish low literacy as a causative factor of incarceration, but they do show a positive relationship between
literacy and incarceration. If society wants to decrease the overall prison population, the education of incarcerated juveniles deserves special consideration. Policy makers and program directors must ensure that they receive the same educational benefits afforded by law to non-incarcerated minors in the public school system. As a society, we must consider their education to be not only their legal right but also a social justice mandate to improve their overall quality of life.

Educational research indicates that juvenile justice education can produce positive modifications to delinquent trajectories. Many juveniles’ last contact with formal education will be in a juvenile justice facility. Therefore, in many cases, correctional education is the last meaningful opportunity to reverse a student’s history of poor academic proficiency, employment preparation, and social relationships by equipping adolescent offenders with the skills necessary to succeed in the community after release (Monk-Turner 1989). Recidivism rates of delinquent youth decrease when literacy improved.

Education research consistently supports the conclusion that well-prepared and professionally certified teachers who teach in their area of certification are the most effective classroom instructors for diverse learners. The public school system tries to ensure that teachers in public schools have the appropriate certification, which requires training, college courses, and demonstration of knowledge. While this system may not be ideal, it does attempt to standardize the quality if education afforded to public school students. Private juvenile justice providers have not always had the same requirements. Youth sometimes have no choice about their incarceration placement, i.e. whether they
stay in the state or county run detention center or in a private facility. Therefore, the quality of their education may be in jeopardy.

Fueled by state statutes since the emergence of juvenile justice privatization in Florida in 1974 with Associated Marine Institutes, a not-for-profit private-operated juvenile justice initiative, the number of private providers and private-operated educational programs has grown (Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement Program 2003). In 2003, 45% of the juvenile justice youths in residential and day treatment programs received educational services from a public provider while 48% received educational services from a private not-for-profit provider, and six percent from private for-profit providers (JJEPP 2003). In light of these statistics, the need to insure quality service provision increases.

Quality juvenile justice education is not achieved by means of a simple formula composed of quality teachers, using quality resources in a quality environment. While these may be the most important, or certainly among the most important, there are myriad other factors than shape and influence the quality of educational services in Florida’s juvenile justice system…such as student transition, service delivery, administration… size of the facility, gender of the student population, the public/private and profit status of the education provider [emphasis added], and teacher certification. (JJEPP 2002, pg. 109)

The Florida Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement Program (hereafter called JJEPP), a joint effort between researchers at Florida State University and the Department of Juvenile Justice, seeks to evaluate this problem and these factors. Through Quality Assurance evaluations, JJEPP collects data about some of these factors. They compile this data into yearly reports that outline and analyze the findings. The Quality Assurance evaluation that the state conducts is formative in nature and does not measure program outcomes.
The Process of Privatization

Clarke (2004) has theorized about how privatization disrupts traditional agreements in the public and private realms. This disruption can cause serious impact for communities, such as economic loss and lower morale.

He identifies two main currents in privatization in current social policy: 1) a shift in activities, resources, and the provision of goods and services and 2) a shift in social responsibility. The first shift represents a dependence on private providers that takes many forms, from direct privatization all the way to public/private partnerships, outsourcing (through contracting), and creating competition for resources. This shift is often considered in business reports, on the news, and in discussions on privatization. It is a tangible shift that the public may notice in day-to-day functioning.

However, the second shift Clarke (2004) talks about, the shift in social responsibility is absent from much public discussion. We make assumptions about this idea, but lack significant public discourse on the topic. Whose responsibility is it to rehabilitate at risk youth? Who should have a say in how it’s done, how much it costs, and what ends the rehabilitation achieves? These questions often go unanswered. A significant public dialogue would include town meetings, local referenda and local voting.

According to Clarke (2004), these types of market readjustments disrupt the traditional understandings of relationships (as with peers), structures (or the environment), and systems (within the organization). In Clarke’s (2004) criticism of privatization, he outlines how shifting public responsibility to the private realm can fragment service provision, increase the number of agencies involved and increase the number of decision making settings. This dispersal creates new problems of coordination.
and regulation. While bureaucracy is often blamed for clumsy, inefficient red tape associated with governmental departments, it is actually a necessary and beneficial component of any large entity.

It ensures that services, procedures, and policies cover all program constituents in the most fair and legal way. Bureaucracy provides a backbone to large-scale operations (such as educating our children or issuing our drivers’ licenses) so that they may reach a maximum of the target population. Programs, in attempts to be more efficient and less wasteful, often do the opposite because they lack the organization and established procedures of entities with bureaucratic support.

Bogler and Somech (2004) argue that the structure of an organization may interact with the level of commitment felt by teachers or employees. According to Bogler and Somech (2004), teachers’ perceptions of their level of empowerment are significantly related to their feelings of commitment to the organization and to the profession. Professional growth, status and self-efficacy were predictors of organizational and professional commitment. Research conducted by Rosenblatt (2001, pg. 690) defines organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with an involvement in a particular organization.” Commitment is correlated with job satisfaction, presumably because teachers who are more satisfied are also committed to their schools and the tasks they are responsible for.

Bogler and Somech ask what it means to be committed to your profession, and what it means to be committed to the organization. Their research seeks to identify a connection between level of commitment and organizational structure by examining
teachers’ levels of satisfaction with the structure of the administration and the organization as a whole.

We know that this shift from public to private responsibility is happening in Florida. We do not yet know how this shift will affect the quality of service provision. Since the quality of service provision both depends on and influences job satisfaction for teachers, this shift deserves to be examined.

**Motivation, Satisfaction, Expectancy, and Perception**

Scott and Dinham (1999) consider occupational motivation and satisfaction of teachers in elementary and secondary schools in England. However, their research also relies heavily on the social and economic trends towards centralization, free market activity, and competition. The authors indirectly indicate that they want to test this idea that ideological changes in the education system, namely the rise of neo-liberalism and the free market, is truly beneficial to educational outcomes, including teacher satisfaction. They clearly outline the philosophy that the British government has been shifting towards by citing actual historical documents and theorists who have written about the situation. The authors hint that this structure may have negative impacts on equity in education.

This research attempts to make a connection between historical shifts in economic policy and perceptions of the public market and teacher satisfaction. While I do not believe that the authors were entirely successful in validating the connection between these two variables, I do believe that this is an important theory to be thinking about. Even though five years have past, not much time has been dedicated to linking these specific variables (organizational structure and teacher satisfaction).

Elements of teacher satisfaction in the workplace have been examined for years. Beginning as far back as 1959, researchers Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman defined
satisfaction as a two-fold concept (Bogler 2001). Intrinsic needs like achievement, recognition, responsibility, and opportunity have been considered in more recent years in terms of expectancy, efficacy, attitudes, and commitment. Although these factors have been established as important through quantitative and qualitative measures, stopping at these intrinsic factors may absolve the organization from its proper responsibility. Buzzwords in satisfaction research reiterate contributing factors, like expectancy and attitude, which focus on individual responsibility. Often, our society silently assumes that personal satisfaction is derived only from intrinsic factors.

The extrinsic, or hygienic, factors outlined by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (Bogler 2001) such as work conditions, supervision, work policy, salary and interpersonal relationships have been pushed aside in recent work. Maybe researchers and the general public assume teachers will always be unhappy with their stereotypically low pay. Maybe they suppose a natural dissatisfaction will always exist between the employee and the boss.

More current research indicates a few variables that greatly affect teacher satisfaction gained from performing the task of teaching. Bogler (2001) catalogues many of these factors that promote satisfaction: higher autonomy; relationships with students, colleagues and parents; student achievement. He also identifies some factors that contribute to teacher dissatisfaction – mostly relating to structure and administration.

Some theorists maintain that expectancy is another teacher-related sentiment that can contribute to school success. In fact, some say it is the key factor that distinguishes schools with improving student performance from schools with failing students (Kelley and Finnigan 2003). “Expectancy is the belief that individual effort will result in the
achievement of specified goals. Expectancy theory is a cognitive theory of motivation suggesting that the motivation to act is a function of expectancy, instrumentality (the probability that achievement of goals is likely to result in specific rewards or outcomes), and valence (the value placed on those outcomes)” (Kelley and Finnigan 2003, pg. 603). In other words, teachers who perceive the probability of achieving a goal that has a high value (either intrinsic or monetary) are more likely to be motivated to act.

Simultaneously, this motivation to act increases the probability that the goal will be met.

As previously illustrated, many program evaluations, including the ones performed by JJEEP for juvenile justice programs in Florida, rely on objective, quantifiable data. That sort of methodology provides what people perceive as “facts” that can help make decisions about programs, their effectiveness, and the retention of people who work for them. Especially in a humanistic profession like teaching, perception might strongly influence how people act and react in certain situations. “Research on expectancy and motivation suggest that perceptions of program fairness and goal clarity may also be important predictors of expectancy. Fairness can include perceptions about procedural, distributive, or interactional justice” (Kelley and Finnigan 2003, pg. 607). Negative perceptions about fairness can induce stressors that cause people to act against the organization; in extreme cases this includes leaving the organization (Greenberg 2004).

“Procedural justice refers to the perception that the underlying process for administering the system is fair” (Kelley and Finnigan 2003, pg. 607). Employees pay close attention to these processes because it indicates to them an organization’s commitment to “doing the right thing, and in keeping with this, what the future holds for
“Distributive justice refers to beliefs about the amount and distribution of the
bonus” (Kelley and Finnigan 2003, pg. 608). Greenberg’s (2004) research found that
employees with a high perception of distributive justice suffered less exhaustion, anxiety
and depression. The key, he reports, to maintaining high perceptions of both distributive
and procedural justice is to be open, honest, and clear about the expectations and
procedures surrounding performance management. Therefore, even if the procedures are
in place, if teachers do not perceive the effective use of the procedures, their satisfaction
may be jeopardized.

Based on previous research, we know that a link between organizational structure
and teacher satisfaction. Some factors that contribute to satisfaction levels in traditional
settings have been identified. Nevertheless, these factors have not been studied in a
private, juvenile justice setting. In order to create a high quality and equitable setting for
education of juveniles, we must seek to understand how teachers relate to job satisfaction

them” (Greenberg 2004, pg. 354). For example, a survey of almost 3,000 federal
employees revealed that concerns about the procedure to determine rewards and salaries
affected job satisfaction more than the level of salaries (Greenberg 1987). In a profession
like teaching, when low salaries is such a common complaint and focus of study, this
figure is particularly important. This type of research authenticates Selden and Sowa’s
(2004) idea that management capacity can be measured by perceptions of a fair,
equitable, and established performance management system. Therefore, teachers need to
believe that the organization cares about their performance and has clear procedures in
place to both reward and refine that performance. This belief is essential for a
conceptualization of justice in an organization (Greenberg 1987).

in these settings. We do not yet know how organizational structure, which must be inherently different from the public setting, can affect their job satisfaction.

**Organizational Effectiveness**

Commitment as it relates to job satisfaction is important because it often is an indicator of school effectiveness (Rosenblatt 2001). As research cited above indicates, teacher satisfaction links to organizational effectiveness. Then a contemplation of what constitutes organizational effectiveness is necessary to look at the interaction of satisfaction and the organization. Research from a wide range of disciplines provides a context for the variables that contribute to organizational effectiveness. Since a gap in knowledge specifically concerning juvenile justice programs exists, we must rely on organization research from other areas of education and nonprofits.

Griffith (2003) notes that most study designs in school effectiveness are correlational, thus making it difficult to identify which attributes or characteristics of the school actually lead to effectiveness. Most likely, the conjectures, “one size fits all” or the idea that one set of attributes will always produce an effective school is false. Instead, Griffith’s research looked at school effectiveness through four different models of organizational structure. The human relations model “is internally focused, emphasizing employee needs and promoting cohesion and morale among employees to achieve employee involvement, satisfaction, and commitment” (Griffith 2003, pg. 3). This type of model should, in turn, result in high teacher job satisfaction, performance, and commitment (or lower turnover). According to his study, Griffith (2003) reports that the human relations model provides the best fit for his school effectiveness data. By measuring supervisors’ job skill mastery and concern for employees, teamwork, cooperation, and employee training, he found strong associations with teacher job
satisfaction and organizational performance. “Thus, it is not surprising that more satisfied teachers would teach more effectively and that students would learn more effectively and perform better” (Griffith 2003, pg. 5).

Like Griffith (2003), Murray and Tassie (1994) also posit that there are a number of models that can be used to evaluate non-profits: goal achievement model, means achievement model, human resource effectiveness model, political model, institutional theory, resource dependence theory. However, they also note that no one model will answer a wide array of complex questions for all the stakeholders involved. Organizational effectiveness evaluation, then, depends on evaluators and managers to make decisions about what questions they want to answer for their particular organization.

Selden and Sowa seek a way to incorporate many variables (or dimensions) into a single evaluation model that will answer both quantitative and qualitative questions for more complete answers to program effectiveness questions. In this article, they refine this model by introducing a multi-level random coefficient to explore the proposed dimensions of the model.

The model Selden and Sowa (2004) present proposes to find relationships between two primary organizational dimensions: management and program. These two dimensions are further subdivided into the categories of (1) processes and structures and (2) outcomes. In order to evaluate the relationships between these dimensions, the authors use objective and perceptual measures. The concept they call management capacity expands Griffith’s (2004) discussion of measurement attributes for the human relations effectiveness model. Management capacity, like the human relations model, measures
infrastructure (adherence to policies and procedures, existence of written procedures, teachers’ perceptions of how the school operates, perceptions of the mission statement), a commitment to training (stipends, trainings offered, tuition reimbursement, support for certification, support for continuing education), and performance management (attrition, rewards, appreciation, evaluations, feedback, goals, assessment).

The previous research body illustrates that teacher satisfaction can contribute to organizational effectiveness. It also extensively examines other factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction. In addition, previous research has considered what indicators contribute to effective organizational structure. However, we do not know how these points intersect in the new, privatized setting.

**Hypothesis**

The Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement program asks two main questions focusing on the public versus private question. 1. Are there differences in educational services across provider types. 2. Which type of service provider had the least improvement? In their research conducted from 1999-2002, JJEEP discovered that public providers consistently scored the highest, private non profit scored in the middle, and for profit providers consistently scored the lowest. Additionally, “the largest difference between the public and private for-profit education providers occurred in the areas of administration and contract management” (JJEEP 2003, pg. 117). However, the research also indicated that both private and public providers had improved over the four years.

My research seeks to extend two major components of these findings. First of all, JJEEP does not consider in its evaluations how the structure of the organization differs between private and public providers. If the major difference between public and private institutions is the administrative score, we must ask why. We must seek to know what has
happened to the management capacity in this shift. One might expect that service
delivery, with a lack of certified teachers and qualified staff, to be the lowest scoring
category. However, administrative concerns seem to indicate some kind of dysfunction.
Are these discrepancies, as Clarke (2004) postulates, actually the result of privatization?

Secondly, I want to know what part of the administrative domain contributes to
low evaluation scores. Often teacher/employee satisfaction is a major indicator of
administrator success. Do teachers believe that these facilities have a high management
capacity (Selden and Sowa 2004)? If the Quality Assurance evaluations examine
objective measures of the administration’s processes, I feel like it is also important to
consider perceptual factors contributing to the administration’s success (outcomes).

I expect that many factors contribute to teacher satisfaction in the private juvenile
justice setting. From the literature review and a pilot study conducted last summer, I
expect that peer relationships and student/teacher relationships affect teacher satisfaction.
However, I anticipate the following to affect overall job satisfaction:

_Hypothesis 1_: Satisfaction with the administration will be positively related to
overall satisfaction.

_Hypothesis 2_: Teachers who perceive weak management capacity will be less
satisfied with their jobs.

_Hypothesis 2a_: Teachers who perceive weak infrastructure will be less satisfied
with their jobs.

_Hypothesis 2b_: Teachers who perceive a weak performance management system
will be less satisfied with their jobs.
Hypothesis 2c: Teachers who perceive a weak dedication to employee training will be less satisfied with their jobs.
CHAPTER 3  
METHODOLOGY

Concepts, Indicators and Variables

The concepts this research examines are teacher satisfaction and management capacity. Teacher satisfaction is defined as the attitudes of teachers affected by extrinsic factors (like relationships with peers and administration, salary, environment) and intrinsic factors (commitment, achievement, recognition and responsibility) (Bogler 2001). The area of teacher satisfaction conceptualized in this research focuses on relationships between teachers and their peers and administrators in a privatized environment.

Figure 3: Peer relationships, organizational effectiveness, and student relationships are three main predictor variables for teacher satisfaction.

The indicators for the relationship between these three concepts are management capacity and professional community. Management capacity includes both the way the administration is structured and the specific processes it uses to manage employees
(Selden and Sowa 2004). The specific variables I will use to measure this are perceptions of consistent policies and procedures, perceptions of consistent performance management, and perceptions of management’s dedication to professional development. These are the three variables that define management capacity in the multi-method evaluation model proposed by Selden and Sowa (2004).

**Design**

This research uses an explanatory, theory building case study design. This choice reflects a number of different factors. By using case studies, I could examine several variables that interact without having to isolate one factor (de Vaus 2001). Also, the stage of theory development regarding this subject implies that research has a descriptive and explanatory role at present (de Vaus 2001, Fowler 1993). Finally, the limited amount of research in the area of teacher satisfaction and privatization demands work that begins to build theories. The construction of theory is the most useful and powerful function of qualitative research (Morse 2002).

Primarily, this research uses a case study design because of the involvement of complex interacting variables (de Vaus 2001). In an organization, the elimination of external variables is impossible because of the necessity of daily functions. Additionally, the outcome variable I intend to study, satisfaction, does not occur independently of the myriad of external variables transpiring every day in an organization. In fact, the way external variables influence satisfaction is what I want to study. According to de Vaus (2001) case study designs are useful when complex, external variables should be examined instead of controlled for. Furthermore, this design allows me to conduct what Bryman (2001) calls an “intensive examination of the setting.” To achieve a complete
analysis of teacher satisfaction, or any variable, one must consider the whole, not just the part (de Vaus 2001).

In light of the pace of privatization in education and social services, relatively little research exists to tell us how private juvenile justice providers perform in education. The State of Florida Department of Juvenile Justice does, however, conduct yearly evaluations of juvenile justice programs through the Quality Assurance process and the Juvenile Justice Educational Enhancement Program.

The audits cover four main areas: student transition, service delivery, administration, and contract management. JJEEP articulates performance expectations for these areas in their annual publication of the Department of Juvenile Justice Standards, available both on the website and in written form by request. The expectations also include suggestions on how the performance indicators will be measured by visiting auditors. Both a review of these expectations and personal experience with the evaluation process have given me some insight on the mechanics of the evaluation process.

These four areas each have their own indicators that delineate what a successful program should be doing. For example, student transition covers student records, pre and post testing, registration and scheduling, guidance service, and exit transition to next educational placement. In order to assess this domain, the auditors scour open and closed student files, ascertaining adherence to time deadlines for registration, withdrawal, assessment administration, counseling, and records requests. The auditors might interview the education director to get a sense of the procedure; the auditors might also interview a student to see if there is a perceived benefit from the counseling and
assessments. However, the end score for this domain will be quantitative in nature, an accumulation of scores that reflect adherence to time deadlines.

Service delivery examines teaching style, lesson plans, classroom management, parent support, attendance, special education services, use of technology, and career education efforts. This domain might involve the most qualitative or narrative assessment of success, i.e. student and teacher interviews and observations might tell a more complete story of what happens on a daily basis at the program. However, as auditors experience increased time constraints in performing their evaluations, they rely to a greater extent on information and narratives that have already been quantified. For example, a program might provide a sort of scrapbook chronicling the number of parent night activities held in one school year or a notebook with lists of lesson plans in order by date. This information, although useful as a chronicle of past events, does not convey to auditors the effectiveness of said lesson plans or parent nights.

The administration indicators measure communication, instructional personnel qualifications, staff development, school improvement plans, policies and procedures and funding and support. Again due to time constraints, auditors depend on written records of these events. Again, these written records provide quantitative information such as frequency of occurrence (in the case of staff development days) or rate of income (in the case of funding and support). Brief interviews with key staff members might even illuminate what we would call the spirit of the administration (as opposed to the mere letter). However, the ending score does not reflect anyone’s satisfaction with the means with which the ends are achieved. The scores are numeric values that indicate how often events occur.
Finally, the contract management indicators measure contract management, oversight and assistance, and data management (JJEEP 2002). In the case that a private company runs the program, the company must have a written contract with the local Department of Juvenile Justice agency and the local school board. The individual contracts will outline services expected of the public agencies and the private programs.

These formative evaluations provide stakeholders with information on what is happening in programs from an operational standpoint. However, we know little about what happens from an outcome basis or why it happens. While these variables and indicators may reflect how the program operates on a day-to-day basis, they do not indicate effectiveness of the program, the satisfaction of employees including teachers, or the satisfaction of and benefit to students. This study seeks to understand why and how teacher satisfaction is influenced by the formative objectives that Quality Assurance and JJEEP measures. Therefore, research that has explanatory power is most appropriate at this time.

Finally, the case study design corresponds well with this research question because one way to achieve explanatory power is through theory building (de Vaus 2001). To engage in this theory building, one begins with observations, and uses inductive reasoning to develop theories based on those observations (de Vaus 2001). These derived theories would attempt to make sense of the observations collected. Not only is there a lack of research in the area of private juvenile justice programs, we also lack sufficient theories to conduct the research or make sound policy decisions. Drawing on theories from related fields such as teacher satisfaction, organizational development
and management, psychology, educational leadership, and social policy provides researchers with a starting place in this area.

However, it will be necessary to observe the current phenomenon, understand how it coincides with current theories, and begin to create new theories. This process of theory building is the best way to create external validity, according to Morse (2001). The case study design is most appropriate for research in need of this beginning process.

**Preliminary Research**

According to Dillman (2001), a pilot study is a pretest that can provide more information than cognitive interviews or instrument pretests. By emulating the research design on a smaller scale, one may identify correlations among variables, problems with the instrument, possible response rates, and issues with scalar questions.

A colleague and I conducted research during Summer 2004 that explored three dimensions of teacher satisfaction in the private sector setting: satisfaction with peers, satisfaction with the environment, and satisfaction with the organization. After pretesting the interview and questionnaire instrument on three teachers, we used a purposive sample selection to identify six teachers. We presented six case studies of teachers who work in juvenile justice schools in the private sector. Private schools referred specifically to secular schools not affiliated with religious education. Juvenile justice schools referred to private companies that provide educational services to adjudicated youth in both residential and non-residential settings. Teacher satisfaction referred to individual perceptions of performance in the peer, environmental, and organizational contexts. This pilot study fueled our interest in further examining how teacher satisfaction is affected in the private juvenile justice setting.
After compiling the results of the pilot study, we were able to answer some of the questions that Dillman (2001) suggests a pilot study may answer. For example, we found that increasing our sample size might be a problem due to teachers’ limited time and administrators’ reluctance to have teachers participate. Also, we were able to identify the specific concepts concerning satisfaction that we wanted to examine in depth. This identification guided the revision of our interview and questionnaire instrument.

Data Collection

Instrumentation

The instrument went through several revisions before it was used with participants. First, during the 2004 pilot study, my co-researcher and I used a version of the instrument. That experience gave us an understanding of pacing, question order, word choice, and clarity that helped in writing the new instrument. According to Fitchen (1990), researchers should listen to the sample population before designing or administering a questionnaire in order to discover the ways in which people describe and define themselves. She recommends “field reconnaissance” so that the researcher can pick up on cues and indicators that would help in the construction of a questionnaire. The pilot study afforded me this opportunity to talk with teachers in their own environment and understand their main concerns.

Upon completion of the new instrument, I tested it with an expert panel consisting of teachers who had experience at juvenile justice facilities and professors with experience in research methods.

I administered a self-completion questionnaire and a structured oral interview designed specifically for this investigation. The self-completion questionnaire obtained demographic information as well as perceptual data as measured by scalar questions. The
questionnaire used a scalar response format because it offers the respondent a range of choices and measures intensity of a variable (satisfaction) (Sullivan 2001). The closed answer response structure allows the researcher to aggregate ordinal data, which can have more statistical power than nominal data (Sullivan 2001). Also, allowing respondents to answer questions on their own instead of to an interview may produce less social desirability bias for some items (Fowler 1993). The respondents may feel a greater sense of anonymity and confidentiality when their answers are written on an anonymous paper with reminders in the instructions that answers will be available to the researchers only (Fowler 1993). The questions on the questionnaire were written in present tense and grammatically agreed with the response categories (Fowler 1993).

According to Fowler (1993), the researcher needs to ensure that questions directly relate to the concepts and indicators under consideration. Therefore, the self-completion questionnaire I administered was organized in sections that correspond to the indicators I wish to measure. Each time a new section was introduced, an introduction statement was placed at the beginning. Additionally, new instructions appeared each time the format changed (from agree/disagree question to high/low questions to demographic questions) (Fowler 1993).

In both the agree/disagree and the high/low sections, I provided four answer types, one extreme positive, one positive, one negative, and one extreme negative. Although traditional scalar response formats include five item responses (Fowler 1993), I chose to omit a “middle of the road” alternative. Converse and Presser (1986) suggest that to measure intensity, a questionnaire should force the person to decide on his/her opinion. They further suggest providing gradations in intensity such as very high, high,
low, very low. Thus, you avoid losing information about the direction in which some people lean.

Questions for the scale were devised from variables outlined by two main researchers. Selden and Sowa (2004) explained three main indicators – performance management, professional development, and policies and procedures – for management capacity and many variables that measure those indicators. Louis, et al (1996) outlined many variables to measure the main indicators of professional community – mission statement attachment, peer relationships, professional development, and administrative relationships. Demographic data was collected at the end of the questionnaire in order to reduce anxiety that might be induced by asking personal questions such as salary (Fowler 1993).

Table 1: Statements and questions included in the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Statement/Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administration relationships     | • I feel that I receive the cooperation I need from my administration to do my job effectively  
                                  | • The administration is responsive to my concerns 
                                  | • There is adequate communication between teachers and administrators 
                                  | • The school administration’s behavior toward the teaching staff is supportive 
                                  | • I feel the principal/director is interested in teachers’ ideas 
                                  | • I feel respected as a teacher by the administration 
                                  | • My opinions are considered when making decisions concerning education 
                                  | • My opinions are valued by the administration 
                                  | • The decisions made about education at my school are made by educators 
                                  | • The administrators at my school are educators 
<pre><code>                              | • The decisions about education at my school are grounded in scientifically based research |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Statement/Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer relationships</td>
<td>• I feel that I receive the cooperation I need from my peers to do my job effectively&lt;br&gt;• I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with other teachers&lt;br&gt;• I have the opportunity to participate in regularly scheduled planning time with other teachers&lt;br&gt;• I would be willing to participate in cooperative planning time with other teachers&lt;br&gt;• I feel like cooperative planning time with other teachers would be beneficial to reaching our vision&lt;br&gt;• I feel respected as a colleague by most other teachers&lt;br&gt;• I feel respected as a colleague by most other staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the mission statement</td>
<td>• A focused school vision for student learning is shared by most staff in the school&lt;br&gt;• Most of my colleagues share my beliefs about what the central mission of the school should be&lt;br&gt;• Goals for the school are clear&lt;br&gt;• In this school teachers and administration are in close agreement on the school discipline policy&lt;br&gt;• In this school teachers and administration are in close agreement on the school teaching philosophy&lt;br&gt;• My classroom environment reflects the mission statement of the school&lt;br&gt;• Day to day operations reflect the values contained in the mission statement&lt;br&gt;• Interactions between the faculty and the administration reflect the values contained in the mission statement&lt;br&gt;• Overall, this school adheres to its mission statement&lt;br&gt;• I believe that adherence to the mission statement improves the quality of a school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent policies and procedures</td>
<td>• Resources are distributed in a fair way&lt;br&gt;• Financial incentives are awarded in a systematic way&lt;br&gt;• I am knowledgeable about the way financial incentives are awarded&lt;br&gt;• I am aware of how financial resources are allocated&lt;br&gt;• The Quality Assurance auditing process motivates my performance&lt;br&gt;• The Quality Assurance audit scores reflect the quality of your school on a day-to-day basis&lt;br&gt;• Changes to policies and procedures are related to the teaching staff in a timely manner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Statement/Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance management</td>
<td>• I am likely to receive written congratulations for my work&lt;br&gt;• I am likely to experience oral congratulations for my work&lt;br&gt;• I am likely to experience a written reprimand for my work&lt;br&gt;• I am likely to experience an oral reprimand for my work&lt;br&gt;• The administration visits my classroom often to observe teaching practices&lt;br&gt;• I am aware of procedures in place to evaluate teachers’ performance&lt;br&gt;• I have received a performance evaluation according to the school procedures&lt;br&gt;• I receive meaningful feedback from the administration on my performance&lt;br&gt;• Most of the in-service programs I attended this school year dealt with issues specific to my needs and concerns&lt;br&gt;• Staff development programs in this school permit me to acquire important new knowledge and skills&lt;br&gt;• The administration helps me develop and evaluate professional development goals on a regular basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>• How would you rate the consistent use of established procedures by teachers&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate the consistent use of established procedures by administration&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate the level of professionalism of the administration&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate your satisfaction with your working relationships with your administration&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate the level of professionalism of the teaching staff&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate your satisfaction with your working relationships with other teachers&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate your satisfaction with the system of financial incentives at your school&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate your satisfaction with the quality of the feedback you receive on your teaching evaluations&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate your commitment to the school’s mission statement&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate your satisfaction with the school’s adherence to the mission statement&lt;br&gt;• How would you rate the organizational justice in this school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Statement/Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic information</td>
<td>• How long have you been employed at this school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In what range does your salary fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How much paid time off do you get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is your gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Type of Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Under the No Child Left Behind Act, would you be considered a highly qualified teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total years teaching experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structured interview gathered data about satisfaction relating to management capacity and professional community. The decision to include an open-ended section of the interview stemmed from two reasons. First, it allows for a sort of data triangulation. Collecting the information in more than one format provides reiteration of that data collected. One of the ways to increase validity in subjective questions is to ask the same question in different forms (Fowler 1993). Therefore, the open-ended questions approach the same indicators but in slightly different wording and a different format. Second, open-ended questions may more closely reveal the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of the respondents because they allow for unanticipated responses in the respondents’ own words (Fowler 1993).

The oral interview provides teachers a chance to freely comment on factors that may contribute to satisfaction. Again, the questions have been designed to lead teachers through a thought process. The first question asks about satisfaction and provides probes to the principal investigator to ensure thorough coverage of the subject. These questions also give teachers a chance to make suggestions for what would increase their levels of satisfaction. After having considered what contributes to satisfaction, their reflections might be more focused and revealing. This data was analyzed according to the principles of grounded theory (discussed below) for trends in answers. Because of the nature of the
research design, the data was not coded. It was, however, examined for trends that occur in multiple teachers’ responses.

Table 2: Questions and statements for each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Statement/Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administration               | • In this setting (organizational structure, i.e. private setting) how do these elements impact your performance as a teacher: Administrative support for teachers  
• Describe in your own words your working relationship with your administration  
• Who holds decision-making power for the educational program at your school  
• Does the presence of justice in the workplace have an effect on your performance |
| Peer relationships            | • Describe in your own words your working relationship with your peers  
• In this setting (organizational structure, i.e. private setting) how do these elements impact your performance as a teacher: Relationships (student/teacher bonds, coworkers, management) |
| Commitment to the mission statement | • In this setting (organizational structure, i.e. private setting) how do these elements impact your performance as a teacher: Mission statement  
• What is the mission statement of your school  
• Does your organization/setting/school reflect your idea of a space that promotes successful teaching |
| Consistent policies and procedures | • In this setting (organizational structure, i.e. private setting) how do these elements impact your performance as a teacher: Consistent policies and procedures |
| Performance management        | • Describe the policies and procedures that promote professional development  
• How are you preparing professionally to meet the No Child Left Behind Act  
• What percentage of your teaching staff is considered “highly qualified” under the No Child Left Behind Act  
• What does the administration do to retain teachers  
• How would you describe teacher turnover  
• What does the administration do to motivate teachers  
• What is your school doing to prepare for No Child Left Behind Act |
| Overall satisfaction          | • Considering our conversation, what would you describe as the most significant factor in your decision to continue teaching at your school  
• Describe the strengths of your school  
• Describe the weaknesses of your school |
Sampling

Several sampling issues deserve consideration for a case study design. Although a purposive, or judgmental, sample is often interpreted as a convenience sample, that assumption is erroneous. According to de Vaus (2001) when building theory through the case study design, we must select cases that will refine the propositions and help develop theory. Consequently, sample selection is just as important in qualitative research as it is in quantitative research. Sampling selection can pose control for internal validity threats in unique ways. Sampling response can also pose problems for the researcher. These sampling issues, if handled properly, help contribute to the validity of the research.

This research uses a purposive sample instead of a random sample. Purposive sampling is often more fitting for case studies because we want to look at cases that contain the characteristics, or variables, chosen to study (de Vaus 2001). In this case, theory and research design drive the selection of cases to examine (Curtis and Gesler 2000).

The theoretical population for this study is all teachers who work in juvenile justice education programs. Any attempts to generalize theories that may result from this research would affect teachers who work in these types of organizations. The accessible population for this research is teachers who live and work Florida for private providers of juvenile justice education. The accessible population is greatly dependent on working with Department of Juvenile Justice and the Juvenile Justice Educational Enhancement Program to endorse this research.

The sampling frame consists of teachers who work at schools in Florida run by what I will refer to as Parent Company X. Concerns about anonymity from study participants make it necessary for me to remove identifying names from this report. By
restricting the sampling frame to a single service provider, I will achieve a greater understanding of the philosophy, mission statement interaction, and policies and procedures. “Purposive or judgmental sampling involves selecting elements for the sample that the researcher’s judgment and prior knowledge suggests will best serve the purposes of the study and provide the best information” (Sullivan 2001, pg. 209). Prior knowledge in this case suggests that programs run by Parent Company X will provide the best information because this organization has the most experience operating juvenile justice education facilities in Florida. This parent company has been operating programs since the late 1960’s. Finally, threats of history can be reduced because the researchers can acquire in depth knowledge about the organization and its individual schools.

Case studies rely on strategic selection of cases rather than statistical selection in order to increase their validity (de Vaus 2001). Typical or representative cases show neither extremely good nor extremely negative examples of the organizations under consideration. However, de Vaus (2001) states that there is no way of ensuring typicality. Instead of typical cases, de Vaus claims researchers should focus on cases that present valid and challenging tests of theory. However, by using results from existing state evaluations, I can choose cases that show typical or representative performance.

According to the Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement Program Annual Report (2003), there are 137 private programs that provide educational services to Department of Juvenile Justice youth. Approximately 363 teachers are employed by all of the private programs in Florida. Parent Company X runs twenty-six of those programs, including both residential and day treatment facilities. Although these numbers fluctuate on a yearly, even monthly, basis due to attrition, program closures, and other events, it
could be extrapolated that Parent Company X employs approximately 19% (70) of the
teachers employed (363) in private juvenile justice facilities in Florida. Different facilities
in Florida may present curricula in different formats, which may make the experience for
teachers quite various. However, all facilities that receive funding from the state are
required to follow the Florida Sunshine State Standards for education and the Quality
Assurance Indicators for program procedures. This provides at least some assurance that
teachers have similar responsibilities at any facility in the state.

A further extrapolation of the above report would indicate that there are on
average three teachers at each Parent Company X facility. By interviewing as many
teachers as possible from at least seven schools, I feel that a wide enough range of
responses were collected to examine trends in data according to grounded theory. In
nonprobabilistic samples, researchers must use judgment and knowledge of the cases to
determine how many to look at (Sullivan 2001, de Vaus 2001). Furthermore, multiple
cases in a study contribute to a kind of replication, which gives more confidence in the
findings (de Vaus 2001).

I chose three cases with low, three with medium, and three with high performing
formative evaluation scores as determined by the Quality Assurance reports. Using
several cases from schools with different performance rates, I was better able to judge
outlying cases and explore situations that do not meet my expectations (de Vaus 2001).
The schools will be considered units of analysis, with teachers as the embedded units
within the cases (de Vaus 2001).

Targeted sampling ensures that participants with specific characteristics related to
the study will appear in the selection (Sullivan 2001). Because this research examines the
possible interactions of teacher satisfaction with several indicators of management
capacity, the sample selection must represent those characteristics. Current research does
not indicate levels of teacher satisfaction in these particular private juvenile justice
educational facilities. For the best assessment of the characteristics I want to explore, I
rely on the existing evaluation measures reported by JJEEP. Their evaluations at least
include an objective measure of management capacity indicators. To make this
determination, I rely on the overall program score reported by the most recent
evaluations, those conducted in 2004 (since the 2005 scores are incomplete).

Sullivan (2001) describes another type of sampling procedure, dimensional
sampling, that I use as a basis for choosing the number of facilities to examine.
According to Sullivan (2004), small samples can enhance their representitiveness because
there is a more detailed knowledge of each case. Sullivan (2001, pg. 214) suggests
identifying the dimensions that are important characteristics in the study and choosing “at
least one case representing each possible combination of dimensions.” The dimensions,
or characteristics, as stated above would be based on evaluation scores reflecting
management capacity. The schools are considered units of analysis, with teachers as the
embedded units within the cases (de Vaus 2001). Sullivan (2004) recommends at least
one case for each grouping, but because of the small number of embedded units at each
school, I chose to increase that number to three for each grouping. That would provide
me with a more thorough understanding of the organizational setting without becoming
overwhelming.
Table 3: Sample selection grouping based on 2004 Quality Assurance evaluation reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Prog Man.</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>State Rating</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal Performance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Minimal Performance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Commendable Performance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptable Performance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Deemed**</td>
<td>Deemed</td>
<td>Deemed</td>
<td>Commendable Performance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Commendable Performance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Acceptable Performance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Acceptable Performance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores based on 2003 Quality Assurance Report due to inability to complete audit in 2004. **Deemed status means that the school scored high enough on the previous year’s evaluation so that they do not have to submit to full evaluation for three years.

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice 2004 Quality Assurance Reports

After a consideration of the facilities available and the current Quality Assurance audit scores, I determined that there were three high level, three medium level, and two low level facilities available for study. Overall program scores were compared to the overall state average, 76.2%. After some issues with contacting the sample selections (one facility closed the week of the scheduled interviews and one facility only had one certified teacher on staff), I decided to reorganize the groupings into a high and a low group, with four schools scoring higher than the state average and three scoring lower than the state average. Sullivan (2001, pg. 213) describes the theoretical sampling procedure that emerged from a grounded theory approach. “Then, as the theory is
constructed, it helps the researcher decide from which units or individuals it would be most appropriate to collect further data… because the emerging theory guides adjustments in the sampling procedures as data are collected.”

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited by contacting 9 selected schools asking administrators for their cooperation in the survey process. I asked teachers if they would be interested in participating. I interviewed all possible teachers due to the small staff at each school. No monetary compensation will be offered. Willing teachers will be contacted to schedule interviews at the work site. The interviews will be scheduled at the teachers’ convenience.

At the appointed time, respondents were provided with a letter of consent and given an introduction to the purpose of the research. I advised the participants concerning consent, instructions on how to answer written and oral questions, and the length of the interview. The participants were given the self-completion questionnaire to finish, and then I collected it. When the participants finished, I began the oral interview, which lasted approximately 45 minutes. At the end of the interview, I informed the participants that the results of the research will be made available to them.

This protocol involved no more than minimal risk ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. To protect the participants to the extent provided by the law, permission was obtained from the administrations, the interview was conducted at the work site, and the information obtained in the interviews will remain confidential. The only direct benefit for the participants is that they will receive a copy of the research report when it is finished.
The response rate for the cases was 77.8%. Of the nine schools selected, interviews were conducted at seven of them. One school closed before the interviews could be conducted, and one school did not have any certified teachers available at the time of the interviews. The response rate for the embedded units at the successful cases was 100%. All teachers were conducive to participating in the study. One teacher was reluctant at first because of time constraints, but ultimately decided to participate.

Data Analysis

According to Bryman (2001), grounded theory has become a popular framework for analyzing qualitative data. He defines grounded theory as that which has been derived from systematically gathered and analyzed data. Throughout the data collection process, constant comparisons between and within cases need to be made.

Perceptual data includes teacher perceptions of administration values, respect, value of education, training effectiveness, retention procedures, and performance management procedures. This data also included teacher perceptions of adherence, awareness, and acceptance of the mission statement. This data provides insight to the levels of satisfaction that can be correlated to the level of structure revealed by the ordinal data. This type of mixed method data analysis approach, typology development, uses quantitative data (Quality Assurance evaluation scores) to group quantitative data (responses to questions) (Caracelli 1993). Therefore, I used this method to examine whether or not trends emerged between equally performing schools, especially as relates to scores in the administration standard (communication, qualifications, professional development, school improvement, policies and procedures, and funding and support) and training standard (JJEEP 2004).
The goal of case study data analysis, according to de Vaus (2001), is theory
generalization, not statistical generalization. Analytical inductive strategies will help the
study explain causal indicators (de Vaus 2001, Curtis and Gesler 2000). Statistical
analysis is not appropriate for case studies, especially given the type and size of the
sample necessary for such careful and in depth consideration (de Vaus 2001, Sullivan
2001, Curtis and Gesler 2000). Since theory drives the selection of cases, examination of
the cases may lead to reformulation of the theory (Curtis and Gesler 2000).

Statistical analysis, in the case of this research, is inappropriate not only because
of the small sample size and research design (de Vaus 2001), but also because of the use
of subjective measures. Distributions can be compared when the stimulus is the same, but
in the case of open ended questions in a structured interview, there might be slight
variations in factors that affect participant answers (Fowler 1993). Instead, I seek
“patterns of association” between the answers of participants from the different cases
(Fowler 1993). First, I consider the patterns apparent in the nominal data.

One way to find this pattern of association is to use the nominal, quantitative data
I collected to create a “score” for each case. In other words, I wanted to create a
community vision of the state of satisfaction in a particular case to see if it matches with
other cases in the same typology group (Schwartz, et al. 2001). To do that, I aggregated
the information provided by the embedded units, or key informants as Schwartz and
others (2001) call them. The method of aggregation must meet three criteria: the
calculation should have some logical basis; the aggregation should maximize the number
of correct classifications; and classification errors should be random (Schwartz, et al.
2001).
Limitations

In a pilot study on teacher satisfaction, we experienced several threats to internal validity because of sampling response issues. Sampling non-response can indicate bias if the reasons for non-response are somehow related to the variables under consideration. Because I was trying to evaluate teachers’ satisfaction in their current work environment, some teachers might have felt uneasy about expressing their opinions. In addition, some school administrators we contacted might not have given teachers the opportunity to respond to our requests. In order to deal with this threat, I had to devise several ways to improve our response rate from the sampling frame. One researcher with whom I collaborated in this study joined a professional organization, Correctional Educators Association, in order to increase contacts and increase professional credibility. I obtained a letter from Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement Program endorsing the research; this letter might help administrators and teachers understand that the research goal is to improve conditions for teachers and organizations – not point blame. In addition, I read research on the snowballing technique and decided to use it once working in the sampling frame. According to Morse (2001) snowball sampling offers advantages in obtaining information about sensitive information.

Potential limitations for this study include many factors. Types of non-response is a major consideration that Barriball (1999) discusses. Unit non-response from schools might result from administrations that are hesitant about allowing teachers to speak freely or provide program information. I tried to reduce this threat with a letter of endorsement from JJEEP and a one page flier explaining my research.

Embedded unit non-response is a potential threat for several reasons. Teachers might not feel free to express their opinions. To combat this threat, I did what Dillman
(2001) suggests and made personal and prior contact to increase comfort levels and visibility. Also, teachers might not have time to participate in the study because they feel overwhelmed. This was avoided by spending a day or two at the school and being available before, during, and after school. I wanted the teachers to feel like their schedules were being accommodated, therefore reducing the feeling of stress. Ideally, administrators would provide coverage for the teachers to participate sometime during the school day.

Finally, teachers might be protective of their organizations and not want to speak out against them. Again, the letters of endorsement hopefully convinced the teachers that their input will be used to better schools in general, not point blame at one school or organization in particular. Additionally, what Barriball calls item non-response is a threat on the self-completion questionnaire because teachers might not understand a question or might not want to divulge sensitive information like salary.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Demographics

My final sample included six case units (two fatalities due to program closure and unavailable teachers) and 28 embedded units (individual teachers). Participants recorded the demographic information described here on the self-completion questionnaire.

Table 4: Demographic information related to teaching for the cases by facility. Missing information could not be calculated due to non response issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th># of Teachers Interviewed</th>
<th>Average Length of Employment</th>
<th>Average Teaching Experience</th>
<th>School Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.5 months</td>
<td>6.5 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6 years</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.25 months</td>
<td>5.6 years</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facility A was one of the schools I selected. However, this facility closed before my scheduled interviews. Therefore, there were not any teachers available to interview. The facility closed because of consistently low Quality Assurance audit scores and a failure to resolve the issues uncovered in the audit. Facility A was one of the lowest scoring schools based on state averages, and omission from this study may leave many key factors uncovered.

Facility B participants consists of four teachers. One teacher elected not to complete the demographic section of the self-completion questionnaire, so this description includes only information from three of the four teachers interviewed. There
is one male teacher and two female teachers. The average length of employment is five months, and none of the teachers had been at the facility for more than one year. This is the lowest length of employment of all the cases. The average teaching experience between the teachers is 1.5 years, and two out of three are first year teachers. One holds a bachelor’s degree and two hold master’s degrees. One teacher holds a professional certificate and two are temporarily certified. Facility B is grouped as a low performing school based on Quality Assurance state average scores (refer to Table 1 for percentages).

Four teachers participated in the interviews at facility C, a high performing school based on state average scores. Two female teachers, one male teacher, and one unidentified teacher compose units in this case. None of the teachers interviewed at this facility are first year teachers; they all have over four years of teaching experience. In addition, three of the four have been employed at the facility for two years or more. The fourth teacher has been employed at the facility for less than one year. Three of the teachers have master’s degrees and the other has a bachelor’s degree. Two hold temporary teaching certificates, one holds a professional certificate, and one did not answer the question. This school had the second highest average teaching experience and the highest average length of employment.

Facility D, categorized as a low school based on state averages, was the other fatality in the sample selection. At the time of the scheduled interviews, this school only had two teachers on staff. One teacher did not hold a professional or temporary certificate, which excluded this teacher from the parameters of the sample selection. The other teacher was out sick on the day of the scheduled interviews. Although I left a self-
completion questionnaire and interview form with the education administrator, I never heard back from the teacher.

At Facility E, six teachers participated in the interviews, five males and one female. All teachers hold a bachelor’s degree, and all hold temporary teaching certificates. The average length of employment at this facility is 10.6 months, the second lowest of the facilities included in the study. Only two of the teachers had been employed at the facility for more than one year. This facility is a high school based on state average scores.

Facility F had three male teachers and one female teacher available for interviews. Two teachers have a bachelor’s degree and two have master’s degree. Three out of four have temporary teaching certificates, while one has a professional certificate. The average length of employment at this facility is 19.5 months, and the average teaching experience shared by the teachers is 6.5 years. This facility is grouped with the high scoring schools based on state average scores.

At Facility G, all teachers have more than two years teaching experience for an average of 7.6 years, the highest teaching experience average of all the facilities. Two out of the five teachers interviewed had been employed for more than one year. All teachers currently had temporary certificates, four have bachelor’s degrees, and one had a doctorate degree. This facility is grouped as a high scoring school based on state average scores.

Facility H had four teachers available for interviews – three males and one female. Three teachers have temporary certificates and one getting his temporary certificate. Two teachers have bachelor’s degrees, one has a master’s degree, and one has
a doctorate degree. Three of the teachers had been employed for less than a year, for an average length of employment for the school of 10.25 months. The average teaching experience of this group is 5.6 years, but it is important to note that one teacher has 20 years experience, while one has one year experience and two have under a year. This facility is grouped as a low scoring school based on state average scores.

Data

Hypothesis 1: Satisfaction with the administration will be positively related to overall satisfaction.

At facility B, three out of four teachers felt like there was little administrative support for teachers. The fourth teacher said, “they seem to be supportive but if I addressed every concern I have I’d be talking all day.” A part of the problem seemed to be that even when the administration listens, it does not follow through or support the teachers in the long run. Although three teachers mentioned “having fun,” getting along well, and “genuinely approachable,” no teacher felt like the administration could adequately follow through on solutions for their concerns. No teacher named the administration as a major strength of the school, but one mentioned the administration’s disconnect from teachers as a major weakness of the school. On the self-completion questionnaire, the teachers all rated the overall level of professionalism of the administration low. One teacher related overall very high satisfaction with administrative relationship, but three gave a low score. In the administration section of the questionnaire, the satisfaction point average score for the school was 2.17. This indicates a disagreement with the sentiment that the administration increases job satisfaction at this facility.
At facility H, all of the teachers commented on at least an adequate level of support from the administration for teachers. One even called the level of support “wonderful.” One teacher expressed concern that the head administrator was not an educator himself. The teacher said, “the nuances of education are alien to him. Not only does he not understand education, he doesn’t understand children. He likes them, but he doesn’t really understand the developmental processes… he doesn’t understand education so he reprimands the teacher.” However, the same teacher indicated, as did the other three, that other members of the administration were highly supportive of teachers and helped to buffer the relationship with the head administrator. On the self-completion questionnaire, the teachers’ average ratings of overall satisfaction with administrative professionalism and support were high. With a satisfaction point average score of 3, the teachers at this facility agree that the administration has a positive influence on their job satisfaction.

At facility C, all the teachers interviewed expressed positive associations with the administration and its support for teachers. One teacher said, “they listen quickly in daily meetings” and another said there is a lot of flexibility. They were all happy with their relationships with the head administrator and said that it had a positive outcome on their performance as a teacher. “He has the management and people skills that motivate you.” None of the teachers reported the administration as a strength of the school, but none reported it as a weakness, either. On the self-completion questionnaire, all teachers agreed that the relationships with administration contribute to their overall satisfaction, and all but one agreed that the level of administrative professionalism contributed to overall satisfaction. This referred to the one member of the administration that was reported to be “difficult” by two teachers. In the administration section of the
questionnaire, the teachers’ satisfaction point average was a 2.76, a score that indicates agreement that the administration plays a positive role in creating satisfaction at their school. The only low scores in that section corresponded to the questions about the administration being educators, as one teacher strongly disagreed with these three items.

Five out of seven teachers at facility E talked about positive relationships with administrators. They used words like “friendly,” “family,” and “amiable” to describe relationships. The other two were concerned that “they don’t always respond” and were annoyed because they felt that the administration is inconsistent. Two teachers had consistent responses to the question in the interview about how administrative support affects performance as a teacher. They felt lots of support and a “helpful” impact on performance. The two teachers who expressed concern about their relationships with administrators also thought that the level of support was inadequate in regard to having a positive impact on their performance. One teacher said, “it could be improved – the key is not clear communication,” and the other teacher said there is “lots of change and they support other things besides teachers and education.” The remaining three teachers expressed conflicting responses in these two interview items. Even though they reported positive relationships, they thought there was not enough support. One teacher said they “do not get support and it has a negative impact” on being a teacher. The other two reported a lack of communication as troubling, one saying it caused a “negative impact on my ability to educate.” None of the teachers reported the administration as a strength of the school, but none reported it as a weakness, either. One teacher said that a major contributing factor to staying at the school would be not falling into a negative rift with the management. Facility E’s aggregate satisfaction point average on administration
items was 2.64, indicating agreement that the administration is contributing to satisfaction at this school.

At facility F, half of the teachers interviewed said that lack of administrative support impacted their teaching performance in a negative way. One felt that the administrators had trouble relating to the needs of teachers because most of them were not teachers. “They don’t recognize us because they’re not teachers. They don’t give us bathroom breaks and we’re lucky to have 15-20 minutes at lunch.” The other two were more optimistic about the supportive intentions of the administration, especially the education administrator. All four teachers reported positive relationships with at least one or more administrators. None of the teachers reported the administration as a strength of the school, but none reported it as a weakness, either. None mentioned the administration in their decision to stay. Overall they felt a high satisfaction with the administration according to the self-completion questionnaire. The satisfaction point average score with administrative items for this facility was 2.56, corresponding to a moderately high level of agreement that these factors contribute to satisfaction.

Finally, at Facility G, the teachers had mixed emotions about the administration and its level of support. Three out of four teachers felt like the head administrator tried to be supportive but had issues with micromanagement and dealing with real life problems. All the teachers thought the education administrator was supportive but unable to provide the fullest level of support because the head administrator often got in her way. The teachers felt that they could talk to the administrators on personal levels, but that they might not get “a fair or thoughtful response” about serious issues. Also, “they tell you when you’re doing poorly and it’s not always nice.” They also expressed concern that the
head administrator lacked people skills, although he was always willing to provide support for funding or money issues. The satisfaction point average for this facility was 2.55.

To summarize, five out of six cases felt like overall, the administration’s support contributed to a sense of satisfaction. While this feeling did not resonate with every embedded unit, it was pervasive enough to create a general sense for the facility. At these five facilities, the satisfaction point average was above 2.5, indicating agreement. The only facility with a negative association between administrative support and job satisfaction was Facility B. Facility B also has the lowest Quality Assurance Overall score and the second lowest Program Management Score of all the cases. Facility B was the only school interviewed to earn a “minimal performance” on its 2004 audit.

Hypothesis 2: Teachers who perceive weak management capacity will be less satisfied with their jobs.

Table 3 shows that all of the high performing schools have high Satisfaction Point Averages. However, Table 3 also shows some disparity between Quality Assurance Scores and Satisfaction Point Averages, where Facility H has the highest Satisfaction Point Average but is designated as a low performing school. To understand this disparity and other important factors, the results must be examined in more depth. The numbers alone do not reveal the complexity of satisfaction, so we are compelled to examine the qualitative part of the interview process.

Table 6 shows that satisfaction averages for specific indicators of management capacity. Again, Facility B is the lowest performing school, and the indicator with the lowest level of satisfaction for that facility is infrastructure. Moreover, infrastructure and
performance management and training are the indicators that score the lowest in satisfaction averages for each facility. Again, the numbers do not tell the whole story. For example, Facility H has a high Satisfaction Point Average for infrastructure, but when the comments of the teachers are examined, one finds a unanimous agreement that inconsistency is a source of frustration.

Table 5: Average point score for teachers’ overall satisfaction with their jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>C (High)</th>
<th>E (High)</th>
<th>F (High)</th>
<th>G (High)</th>
<th>B (Low)</th>
<th>H (Low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale:** 0-1.50 = Very Low; 1.51-2.50 = Low; 2.51-3.50 = High; 3.51-4.0 = Very High

Hypothesis 2a: Teachers who perceive weak infrastructure will be less satisfied with their jobs.
The interviews explored two main factors that indicate a strong management capacity in terms of the infrastructure, a clear, enforced mission statement and clear, consistent policies and procedures. Overall, teachers at all but one of the facilities agreed that the school’s mission statement positively affected their job satisfaction and performance. In fact, at Facility H, every teacher indicated that the students say the mission statement every day. It is posted in various rooms, and the school’s operation has a strong connection to it. Many teachers summed up their feelings about the mission statement with comments like, “it’s what we do” and “it’s a goal post for what we want to accomplish.” While teachers could not always recite the mission statement word for word, all but the newest teacher at Facility F felt comfortable in locating the mission statement in a public place, explaining the “jist” of the mission statement, and talking about how the school uses the philosophies.

The exception to this trend was Facility B. The teachers there expressed concern that the mission statement was not driving the day to day processes of the school. One teacher said, “I believe the mission statement, but I don’t think it’s really being valued by the school.” Another said, “it’s not put into practice,” and another thought the focus of the mission statement should be on education and not behavior management. All four teachers could show where the mission statement was posted or explain it in their own words, but one teacher pointed out, “it’s posted in every room and it could help every student, but it’s not followed.” Incidentally, the teachers at this facility indicated the lowest satisfaction point average on the self-completion questionnaire, 2.31. The teachers at this facility also indicated the lowest overall satisfaction rating.
Another indicator of management capacity and infrastructure are clear, consistent policies and procedures. At two facilities (B and H), there was unanimous agreement from teachers that the facilities failed to operate with consistent policies and procedures. At Facility H, one teacher told the following story as an example of what can go wrong:

“They are somewhat consistent but the management doesn’t always do what they say and then they don’t communicate with us. They had a contest for homeroom of the month based on attendance, recidivism, and performance. At the end of the month the teacher with the best homeroom would get an incentive that was not clearly spelled out. No one ever knew who got the incentive or which homeroom won.”

Another teacher at the same facility indicated that consistent policies and procedures “help incredibly” because of the “special population,” but later in the interview cited “lack of consistency” as one of the school’s biggest weaknesses. Comments from teachers at Facility B revealed the same trend. One teacher noted that “there’s a rule of no profanity, however the students are allowed to use profanity and it’s ignored.” This teacher said that the inconsistency has been addressed with management but “it’s been ignored.” Every teacher at this facility noted disorganization and lack of consistency among the school’s biggest weaknesses. The dissatisfaction expressed by teachers at Facility B is echoed by the quantitative score (2.15). However, the quantitative score for Facility H was 3.1, which indicates a discrepancy between how the teachers rated policy and procedure use on the questionnaire and what they said about it in the interview.

Teachers at three facilities (E, F, and G) gave the use of policies and procedures mixed reviews. At Facility E, three out of seven teachers felt like consistent policies and
procedures existed and helped their job performance. However, one of the teachers who answered positively to question one went on to say when asked about the school’s greatest weakness, “everything that’s written is good but we need to bring it into practice in day to day operations.” The other four teachers called policies and procedures an “area of weakness,” and said they exist but aren’t followed. “They are not very consistent which makes it really hard to implement rules and run a classroom.” Six out of seven teachers mentioned something about lack of consistency in response to the question about the school’s weaknesses. The satisfaction point average was halfway between agree and disagree, which corresponds to an overall satisfaction score about halfway between low and high for this school.

Facility F revealed a similar split between teachers. Half of the teachers responded positively to question one, stating that policies and procedures are “useful and helpful and livable,” and “it’s not easy but we try.” The other half felt that staff turnover and administrative inconsistency made it difficult to maintain regular procedures. One teacher said “(you are) not prepared on procedures when you’re being trained. They’re not explained until you do it wrong. New staff don’t know so they don’t follow them, and the administration doesn’t enforce them equally.” The quantitative scores from this school also match very closely. (Satisfaction point average for policies and procedures was 2.71 and overall satisfaction was 2.78).

The final facility with disagreement about this indicator was facility G. One teacher said that policies and procedures were “pounded into us. Whenever there is a problem that is where we look.” The remaining four teachers complained about inconsistency and the difficulty that creates in doing your job effectively. “They’re not consistent for staff
because some people get breaks while others get ridiculed – some people could turn in lesson plans while others would be reprimanded for not doing it.” Two teachers said they heard the term constantly but weren’t sure that the whole staff was on the same page about what it meant. Four out of five teachers mentioned lack of consistency as a major school weakness.

At Facility C, all the teachers agreed that the school used consistent policies and procedures and it made everyone’s job easier. No one mentioned lack of consistency as a weakness, and one teacher mentioned the presence of consistency as a major strength of the school. The quantitative results from this school showed that their level of agreement about the use of policies and procedures matched their overall satisfaction level (2.89).

It is important to note that only one teacher at one facility (C) listed consistent policies and procedures as a strength of the school.

Figure 1: Comments During Structured Interview Referring to Consistency, Organization, and Structure

Figure 4: Negative comments occurred more often than positive comments concerning consistency, organization and structure.
The most glaring common complaint across all of the cases was inconsistent policies and procedures. Figure 1 shows that the number of negative comments about consistency, organization, and structure was highest at the facility that scored the lowest in its state evaluations, facility B. Also, no teacher had a positive comment about policies and procedures. The second highest number of negative comments came from Facility E. Most of the frustration with consistency in this case centered around a lack of clear communication between the administration and the staff. That Facilities E and G made high numbers of negative comments about consistency indicates a problem with management infrastructure. However, both of these schools scored high on state evaluations. This discrepancy reveals that state evaluations do not tell the whole story about an organization.

Teachers in some cases made some positive comments about consistency, too. At Facility E, those comments related to their relationships with each other, not with the administration. “Teamwork and consistency are of major importance to us,” said one teacher when asked to describe his relationship with peers. At Facility C, no teacher made negative comments about consistency in procedures. This school was one of the highest scoring programs on their state evaluations. Moreover, the teachers at this school seemed to be the happiest overall, so happy that issues of infrastructure rarely arose in the interview process.

To conclude, infrastructure did have an affect on job satisfaction for these teachers. All but one school felt like the mission statement was followed and was a positive influence on their situation. The exception to this finding was Facility B, which, as stated previously, is the lowest performing school according to the state evaluations.
The more interesting component of infrastructure proved to be policies and procedures. Facilities B and H both reported frustration with the level of inconsistency in following procedures. These schools had the lowest Program Management Scores on their 2004 evaluations. Facilities E, F, and G had mixed feelings about procedural affects on satisfaction, and they had the three highest scores for this indicator on their state evaluations. The evaluation, then, must be missing something that the teachers experience in their job performance. Finally, Facility C had the most positive experience with policies and procedures.

*Hypothesis 2b*: Teachers who perceive a weak performance management system will be less satisfied with their jobs.

Indicators for performance management were turnover, evaluation procedures, observation and feedback procedures, a reward system, and financial incentive system. There was very little consensus between teachers at some schools, and their perceptions seemed to be based on personal experiences that varied based on relationships and length of employment. For example, some teachers might not have been employed long enough to experience the annual or semi-annual evaluation.

Teachers at every facility except C felt that turnover was unnecessarily high. Most teachers attributed that turnover to low pay and less than favorable conditions surrounding consistency and planning time. Teachers at Facility C did not necessarily mention any of the indicators for performance management, but they did not seem unsatisfied with the administration in that regard. They noted low turnover, a comfort zone, trainings, and flexibility as things that the administration does to manage performance.
Teachers at Facility F also did not know what the administration did to manage performance. Two teachers mentioned an evaluation process, but did not seem particularly satisfied with the process. One teacher said, “the evaluation is set on performance and goals and whether you’re liked or not.” One mentioned a Christmas bonus, but most of the teachers at this facility felt that performance could be managed much better and result in lower turnover if financial incentives and pay raises were a part of the plan.

One teacher at Facility G made the intuitive comment that “it is ironic because the school is based on a reward system for kids. We just had a discussion at staff training about having staff rewards and we were told that it’s our job, do it.” This comment reflects the overall sentiment at the school that there were really no guidelines for performance management. One teacher mentioned that they were supposed to have performance evaluations this month.

Teachers at Facility H had a slightly more positive outlook on what was being done to manage the performance of teachers, although all their comments had to do with rewards and pay, and none mentioned evaluative measures or feedback. Positive motivation from administrators, offers of more money for advanced degrees, and Christmas bonuses are things mentioned by different teachers. No two teachers mentioned the same system; at least one teacher got a bonus that other teachers seemed unaware of or didn’t mention.

Finally, teachers at Facilities B and E had the lowest satisfaction with performance management. They all reported high turnover. Every single teacher at Facility B said “nothing,” “not much,” or “very little” when asked about measures in place to motivate
or retain teachers. None were familiar with any practices that helped the administration
manage the performance of teachers. One teacher mentioned never having had an
evaluation as a reason s/he might not stay at the job, and one teacher mentioned
inconsistent rewards for staff as a major weakness of the school. Similarly, teachers at
Facility E either did not know or did not see any measures in place to motivate and retain
teachers and manage their performance. Two mentioned financial incentives but didn’t
understand the policy for implementing those. Two teachers mentioned no financial
incentives as a reason they might leave the job, and one teacher said, “sometimes I feel
resentment because there’s no feedback between management and teachers.”

The results show that teachers in most cases were not dissatisfied with performance
management, although they did not necessarily articulate what the management did to
manage performance. The instrument did not make a distinction between financial
incentives and evaluation feedback, so teachers’ perceptions of those aspects of
performance management are unclear.

_Hypothesis 2c:_ Teachers who perceive a weak dedication to employee training will
be less satisfied with their jobs.

Dedication to employee training is one area where almost all teachers at all
facilities seemed relatively satisfied. Every school at the least had a system for monthly
trainings. The one complaint that surfaced at least once at each facility was that the
trainings tended to focus on Department of Juvenile Justice policies instead of classroom
or subject area instruction. Almost all teachers were unsure about what types of training
or information they needed to stay current with new No Child Left Behind regulations,
although they all talked about getting certified in the proper areas.
Some of the teachers at facilities E and G felt like they were on their own regarding getting certified, although most teachers at those facilities and the others reported getting help with certification and potential tuition reimbursement if more classes were needed. A few teachers pointed out that long hours made taking extra classes difficult, even though necessary.

One facility stood out in terms of dissatisfaction with training – B. One teacher said they have many trainings, “however, the trainings are lackluster and classroom education is not the focus.” One teacher couldn’t think of anything done for professional development, and another said there weren’t any trainings. Another teacher said that there is monthly training, but “any other you have to find yourself.” It is worth noting here that this facility had the lowest overall satisfaction rating. Notably, Facility B was the only school with an exceptionally low score on its state evaluation.

An issue that teachers consistently raised at each school dealt with planning time. No facility provided teachers with adequate planning time, and most of the teachers saw this as a serious deficit in caring about professional development.

In summary, the cases examined in this study revealed that management capacity can influence job satisfaction. Employee training might not be foremost on teachers’ minds. Adherence to the mission statement also does not seem to be an issue for these teachers.

However, infrastructure might be the most influential factor in the level of job satisfaction that teachers experience. Specifically, teachers in these cases were dissatisfied with the implementation of policies and procedures. Additionally, the
understanding of performance management should be clarified in order to reveal what parts of that indicator teachers are truly dissatisfied with.
Hypothesis 1: Satisfaction with the administration will be positively related to overall satisfaction.

The interview data does not support this hypothesis, although the self-completion questionnaire shows at least a weak correlation between the administration and overall satisfaction. Only one case, the facility that scored the lowest overall satisfaction point average, indicated an overall dissatisfaction with the administration that seemed to negatively affect the performance of teachers. Perhaps because the belief that administration does not support the teaching staff was so overwhelming, the perception came through in both the interview and the questionnaire. The teachers in this case obviously felt comfortable expressing their concern with the fact that the administration shows little support for the teachers, as they were very candid in their responses. What is interesting is that they teachers also indicated this on the written questionnaire. Sometimes there might be a chance for biased answers when people feel like a written record of their expression could later implicate them. However, this case showed continuity between their oral and written responses in the case of the administration and satisfaction.

Even though the teachers showed solidarity in their dissatisfaction with the administration, Facility B still did not entirely support this hypothesis. When asked what the most important factor in staying at the school would be for them, no teacher mentioned increased support, satisfaction, or relationship value with administration. In
fact, only one case overall and one teacher in another case expressed anything about the administration when asked this question. Teachers at Facility G were not satisfied with the management style of the head administrator, and they mentioned that when asked about what could make them stay in their current positions. They very much disapproved of the amount of “micromanagement” that the head administrator engaged in, citing it as a practice that made them feel like children, not seen as professionals, and not trusted. Still, that was not the major determining factor for them. On the other hand, Facility C demonstrated the highest level of satisfaction from several different angles, and the teachers there seemed to appreciate the “human,” “cooperative,” and “nurturing” style of management shown by the administration. One teacher claimed that being treated as a human being was the most important factor in her decision to remain there. So while leadership style (Jung 2001) in some ways impacts teachers in these settings, it is not the single most weighty factor in their job satisfaction.

If the administration was not first and foremost on the minds of teachers’ in their decision to stay at their current job, what was? Mostly, teachers were concerned with one main intrinsic motivator – helping kids – and one main extrinsic motivator – pay. Consistently across all the cases, teachers talked about these two things that make them stay. Teachers in all cases iterated some version of what Scott and Dinham (1999) calls the “core business of teaching – working with students and seeing them achieve.” Even in the face of major dissatisfactions, teachers still remained satisfied with this part of their job, as corroborated by Scott and Dinham’s (1999) research. Houchins and others (2004) found in their research that stress resulting from student misbehavior and unmanageability contributed largely to juvenile justice teachers’ dissatisfaction, but the
teachers in these cases demonstrated a strong dedication and willingness to help students, to “see the lightbulb go off, even if it’s only one a year,” according to one teacher. The intrinsic satisfaction the teachers get from helping students learn and turn their lives around seems to fuel their overall satisfaction enough to help them deal with other unpleasantries (Bogler 2001).

The other factor teachers mentioned is the extrinsic factor, salary (Bogler 2001). When deciding whether they would stay at the facility, teachers repeatedly, in every case, mentioned an intense desire for an increase in salary. I find it interesting that teachers mentioned salary over and over again, but rarely related the issue of salary to the administration or the administration’s system of performance management. This dissociation stands out as a weakness of the interview instrument.

While some research indicates that a relationship with administration is a very important factor in teacher satisfaction (Bogler 2001, Houchins et al. 2004), the problems I noticed teachers had with the administration had more to do with the administration’s disorganized structure and inconsistency. While teachers did connect these factors to the responsibility of the administration, they did not seem to recognize them as specific indicators of performance management and infrastructure. Again, I consider this a weakness in the organization of the interview structure and wording.

Hypothesis 2: Teachers who perceive weak management capacity will be less satisfied with their jobs.

I find these results somewhat harder to interpret because teachers did not always code their comments in the language of “management capacity.” It is clear that much of
the unsatisfactory elements of teachers’ jobs relate to the indicators of management capacity, but unpacking those elements proves to be a complicated endeavor. A body of research addresses management style and relationship with employees, but since my research did not directly address these two variables, I cannot make any conclusions pertaining to them. The general feel, however, of the schools that participated in the study was that relationships with management were positive. Sometimes teachers made the distinction between positive personal relationships but more shaky working relationships.

In terms of my research, the complication comes not so much from understanding whether or not the capacity is in place in the organization, but understanding “how staff makes sense of that capacity” (Seldon and Sowa 2004). Every juvenile justice facility is required by the state to outline how they will demonstrate the indicators of management capacity, even if the requirements do not call it that by name. For example, each program must have policies in place to address staff development and performance management. The presence of these policies and procedures is easy to check. It is even relatively easy to assess whether or not students and staff know what the particular policies and procedures are. In several of the schools I studied, the staff could not iterate policies on such topics as performance management. But even in schools where the staff knew the policies or knew of their existence, they did not feel like those policies and procedures were being carried out by management in consistent, fair ways.

Still, beginning to understand how staff makes sense of management capacity has to begin somewhere. The comments of these teachers, stratified though they may be in some respects, begin to sketch pictures of what successful schools with satisfied teachers might look like.
Hypothesis 2a: Teachers who perceive weak infrastructure will be less satisfied with their jobs.

Selden and Sowa (2004) define infrastructure as an indicator of management capacity by using several different measurements. The measurements I focus on here are the use and belief in the mission statement and the use of clear, consistent policies and procedures. According to their organizational evaluation model, effective organizations have goal-oriented, clear mission statements. This presence and the belief to support it seem to be strengths of the private, nonprofit settings that I visited. Out of all the questions posed about satisfaction and organizational infrastructure, response to the mission statement questions received the most positive feedback.

Five out of six cases felt a positive connection to the mission statement; teachers felt like the mission was important and at least being worked towards. Sometimes complications arose, like difficulty in balancing the requirements of several influencing agencies (Department of Education, Department of Juvenile Justice, the parent company, the local school board). This conflict can sometimes pose problems in the day to day functions of a facility (Jensen 2003). However, this indicator did not affect teachers’ overall satisfaction.

That being said, the one remaining facility stands out as a counterpoint. At Facility B, the overall low satisfaction with the administration and infrastructure in general reflected a weak connection between the mission statement and the operations at the school. Teachers did, in fact, believe that a strong mission statement would contribute to their satisfaction and be an important part of the organization, but they felt that their particular school did not implement the mission statement it purported.
I think this hypothesis, while supported by the low levels of satisfaction at Facility B and the relatively mid range levels of satisfaction in the other cases, does not prove to be exceptionally important. The lack of differentiation between these indicators of infrastructure might account for misleading levels of satisfaction. Teachers were not so interested in commenting on the mission statement, especially when trying to explain the complex reasoning behind their multivariate satisfaction indicators. The mission statement can sometimes seem abstract to teachers who are struggling to accomplish daily activities with little success. It is for this reason that I think the teachers at this facility did not mention or harp on the lack of substance behind the written missions statement. They were trying to meet a lower level of need – that of clear, consistent policies and procedures.

The hypothesis and line of questioning could have been much more telling with an in-depth focus on the use of consistent policies and procedures. Here, the levels of dissatisfaction at Facilities B and H support both the hypothesis and the sample selection grouping. These facilities both ranked below the state average on their yearly evaluations – an indication that objectively, the schools are not maximizing effectiveness through the use of policies and procedures. Additionally, these two cases ranked the lowest in terms of policy and procedure and job satisfaction. This demonstrates that streamlined, clear operations contribute not only to program effectiveness but more specifically to employee satisfaction. Interestingly, Facility H had a relatively high overall level of satisfaction as indicated by the self-completion questionnaire and other comments in the interview process. I conclude that although the teachers in this case were disappointed with inconsistency in operations and financial incentives, they felt other aspects of
satisfaction – for instance support of the administration – outweighed this indicator. From the opposite side of the spectrum, Facility C proved to be the case with the highest state average rating for sample selection, the most satisfied teachers, and the most satisfaction with this indicator of management capacity.

The real questions lie in the cases where conflicting perceptions about what constitutes consistent and how policies are applied create discrepancies in the levels of satisfaction. The remaining three cases (E, F, and G) did indicate some level of dissatisfaction with the amount of disorganization, inconsistency, and change. Really, these cases also support the hypothesis because their levels of overall satisfaction were neither exceptionally high nor exceptionally low.

However, none of these three cases scored below the state average in their yearly evaluations, including indicators that measure the adherence to policies and procedures from more than one angle (in education, in management, in behavior policies, in financial decisions and matters). What causes this discrepancy between evaluation outcomes and the voice of the teachers? Clarke (2004) finds that, “controls over the quality, level and conditions of provision typically became attenuated in the process of privatization, raising new problems of contracting, regulating, and inspecting ‘at arm’s length.’” Perhaps the evaluating agency is too far removed from the expected or understood operations of the actual facility. The “dispersal” of the agencies involved in decision-making and service provision can disrupt previously structured organizational methods (Clarke 2004). Instead, many agencies have to interpret the policies from governing bodies (in this case, Department of Education, Department of Juvenile Justice, parent companies, and local school boards) and turn those policies into procedures of their own.
Inexperienced agencies with high turnover rates would be expected to have difficulty doing this effectively. This incompetence negatively effects the satisfaction of teachers fueling the agency, thus creating more turnover and less consistency.

What makes support for this aspect of the hypothesis interesting is that it suggests myriad of additional research that begs to be conducted regarding the difficulty in maintaining clear, consistent policies and procedures. My perception is that it might correlate strongly to teacher turnover, a driving force in the second indicator of management capacity, performance management.

*Hypothesis 2b:* Teachers who perceive a weak performance management system will be less satisfied with their jobs.

This hypothesis cannot be supported in full – for reasons very disturbing to the main tenets of the framework for management capacity. Performance management includes the indicators of financial incentives (including salary), rewards, evaluations, observations, and feedback. The most obvious, tangible indicator, financial incentives/salary, recurred extensively as a concern of the teachers. Even though low salaries are a sort of classic source of discontent for teachers, there is more to the story than just being a part of an underpaid occupation. The teachers were mostly concerned about distributive justice (Greenberg 1987) in terms of salary. In all but one of the cases the lack of distribution of funding for salaries was a major course of discontent. In at least one of the cases (H), the teachers were dissatisfied with the procedural justice (Greenberg 2004; Kelley and Finnigan 2003) that determined allocation of financial incentives. In other cases, teachers mentioned bonuses, but most seemed confused about the procedures for how bonuses would be distributed, concerned that bonuses were not consistently
distributed, and irritated that in one case (G) only the managers received a bonus for the school’s performance in the yearly evaluation process.

What is more telling about a general malaise surrounding salary are the cases where teachers could not articulate any methods in place to motivate, retain, or manage the performance of teachers. The Department of Juvenile Justice sets forth standards that should guide these activities, and Parent Company X also requires that facilities perform semi-annual evaluations on employees. Furthermore, quality management practices indicate that some fair system of rewards and their distribution improves the sense of organizational justice, thereby improving the attitudes and satisfaction of teachers (Greenberg 1987; Greenberg 2004), ultimately increasing the effectiveness of the school (Kelley and Finnigan, 2003; Griffith 2003). In the case of Facility B, teachers could not name any practice that supported performance management as a strength of management capacity. Of the sample selection, this facility scored the lowest on its state evaluations and overall satisfaction point average.

The interview comments reveal a startling gap in teacher perception about performance management – there was almost a total lack of comment on evaluation or observation feedback. Teachers from one case (Facility G) consistently mentioned an upcoming evaluation, which indicates that they have at least a sense of the procedure determining this process. However, a few teachers at that school did not perceive procedural justice regarding the process, given their comments that evaluations are based partially on whether or not you are liked (Greenberg 2004). The comment was not pervasive enough to be considered a major factor contributing to levels of satisfaction, but the comment did give some indication that although the teachers were aware of the
upcoming evaluations, the evaluations might not be used in the most effective or convincing way possible. In teaching, evaluating and providing feedback can be a strong tool of an effective administration, which in turn creates a better capacity to accomplish organizational goals (Selden and Sowa 2004).

*Hypothesis 2c:* Teachers who perceive a weak dedication to employee training will be less satisfied with their jobs.

Selden and Sowa (2004) define dedication to employee training as expenditures per staff member. The teachers did not talk about training in terms of cost with the exception of one or two teachers who remarked that training so many people (due to attrition) must be expensive. Overall, the satisfaction with training did not prove to be an important issue that teachers wanted to explore. Since they were mostly happy with the amount of training offered (with the exception of Facility B), dedication to employee training seemed to be present and did not detract from overall satisfaction scores.

However, employee training and professional development might mean other things to teachers. Selden and Sowa’s (2004) evaluation model was not tailored specifically for teachers, thus it does not account for a part of teacher professional development that weighs heavily on the minds of all teachers – certification. The No Child Left Behind legislation mandates teacher certification in appropriate subject areas. Juvenile justice facilities used to increase their hiring pool by hiring uncertified teachers or teachers certified in areas other than their assignment areas (Houchins et al. 2004). This practice can no longer help juvenile justice facilities attract teachers. Instead, facilities must be prepared to help teachers acquire appropriate certification, given that a teacher shortage in most districts makes finding those willing to help with special
populations increasingly difficult (Houchins et al. 2004). The cases where teachers felt like they were being helped with certification elicited more positive responses in the employee training questions. At Facility B, teachers felt like they got no help in obtaining certification. A few teachers at Facility G and Facility E felt like they were on their own for certification, but it was not the overall sentiment of the whole case. The varying levels in employment length might explain these discrepancies. If teachers have not been employed for very long (as in cases B and E), they would not have had the opportunity to pursue new or professional certifications yet.

Another area of professional development that is unique to teachers and appeared repeatedly in the interviews is planning time. Traditionally, teachers maintain a paid a portion of their day that does not call for direct supervision/instruction time. This time can be used for grading papers, planning lessons, collaborating with other teachers or administrators, or organizing classroom structures. Some of these activities, especially lesson planning and collaboration, may contribute greatly to professional development and the sense that the administration cares for it. However, in these settings, teachers do not receive that open time. Five out of six cases reported the lack of planning time (which included a lack of regular meeting time with other teachers). Teacher attrition, lack of coverage, and unconcern from the administration were listed as reasons for the lack of planning time.

So, while on the surface, teachers seemed satisfied with dedication to employee training, this may be due to an incongruity between the model for management capacity and the situation specific to teaching.
In summary, relationships with the administration, perceptions of management performance, and perceptions of employee training did not necessarily detract from job satisfaction with the teachers in these juvenile justice schools. Teachers did indicate specific concerns in some situations regarding these issues, but a clear trend was not found in any one case. However, perceptions of organizational infrastructure did seem to affect job satisfaction in a negative way. This aspect of management capacity seemed to frustrate teachers. Some even felt like a lack of organizational infrastructure detracted from their main mission, helping students.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

Implications

I examined six cases of similarly structured private, nonprofit education providers in the state of Florida. The cases were composed of both high performing and low performing schools according to the only evaluative tool currently available, Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Quality Assurance audits (evaluations). The satisfaction levels in two cases matched with the performance evaluation scores. Facility B performs at a low level and exhibits an overall low level of teacher satisfaction regarding the administration and management capacity. Conversely, Facility C performs on the very high end of state evaluations and exhibits an overall high level of teacher satisfaction in terms of the variables examined. The remaining four cases proved more difficult to unpack because the schools varied greatly in their capacities to handle various indicators of the variables.

This inconsistency suggests that we need a more comprehensive, highly tailored way to evaluate the effectiveness of these specific kinds of programs. Where clashing cultures might exist, as in the combination of the educational model and the private business model, extra care must be taken to clarify the expected outcomes and the process for getting there (Jensen 2003; Greenberg 2004). State evaluation scores clearly do not always reflect what teachers experience on a day-to-day basis at the school. If they did, evaluation scores would be much lower, considering the amount of dissatisfaction surrounding clear, consistent policies and procedures, performance management, and
some aspects of employee training. Mainly, the state evaluations lack the capacity to evaluate perceptions, particularly those of the teachers involved in direct care. The perceptions and voices of those people can give us the sort of insight that files, record logs, and written information cannot convey.

Furthermore, the evaluation model that this case study uses to assess satisfaction with management capacity does not fully assess the issues that teachers voiced as most important. Selden and Sowa (2004) tested an evaluation model based on multi-dimensions and multi-approaches. The model does make use of both objective and subjective (perceptual) measures, an improvement from the state model of evaluation. However, the dimension of management capacity defined in their model does not specifically address the concerns of teachers as revealed in this case study. For example, teachers interpret employee training and professional development in slightly different ways than the Selden and Sowa (2004) model. Teachers felt a great need to include certification and planning time as indicators of that variable.

As another example, teachers in such small setting schools needed to make a distinction between their relationships with administrators, which often times were quite amiable, and their satisfaction with the administration’s performance. Measuring what they perceive as the support of the administration in terms of personal interaction proved vastly different than their perception of the administration’s organizational capacity. Teachers crave structure, and those policies and procedures that should provide that structure were largely absent in these cases.

Finally, the evaluative model needs to address the specific types of performance management practices that should be in place. While teachers were dissatisfied with their
salaries overall, they did not verbally blame the administration for this. They recognize that salary level is not always a capacity of the individual school. However, they did express deep dissatisfaction, or even disillusionment, with the way bonuses and other rewards were implemented.

However, the chief concern with teachers’ satisfaction regarding performance management lies not with a shortcoming of the model, but with the lack of comment on evaluation and feedback. This lack of comment means that either evaluations and subsequent feedback are not being performed, or teachers do not perceive them as a way to manage the performance of employees. This area should cause great concern for administrators and policy makers. Distributive, procedural, and interactional justice research shows us continually that incentives and feedback need to be in place in order to run successful organizations (Kelley and Finnigan 2003; Greenberg 1987; Greenberg 2004).

The voice of the teachers does not prove that private, nonprofit settings are incapable of providing educational services for juvenile justice students. What the voice does provide is a launch pad for more vigorous, in depth research to examine the specific needs of these kinds of teachers in the hopes of creating and maintaining the most successful organizations possible.

Further Research

Often students – including those in the juvenile justice system – who need the most services with the most highly qualified teachers end up getting quite the opposite (Houchins et al. 2004). To make a real difference in rehabilitation, we need to demand quality services, effective programs, and careful oversight for these students. While there
are other demands on services for this population like cost effectiveness and resource allocation, student achievement cannot be sacrificed for the chance to pare the budget. Researchers have linked student achievement repeatedly to organizational effectiveness. Florida must be constantly asking the agencies that provide these services (Department of Juvenile Justice, Department of Education, local school boards, private companies, and nonprofit providers) how they ensure organizational effectiveness.

The Juvenile Justice Education Enhancement Program and the Quality Assurance department at the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice share the bulk of this burden right now. However, the changes in market demands, specifically those changes that have lead to an increasing number of schools being run by private (for profit and nonprofit) entities, mean that the state cannot handle the level of investigation called for in this situation.

This type of private, nonprofit organizational structure responsible for traditionally state provided services is relatively new in the nation. Further research must examine the indicators of management capacity for program effectiveness more closely, especially evaluation, feedback, planning time, certification, and consistent procedures. Researchers must also explore ways to test the salience of these indicators with multi-method approaches. This research relies largely on perceptual, qualitative data to begin building the case for investigation. However, other types of research designs using many different data collection methods would best complete the picture overall. One serious question for researchers is the collection of quantitative data that accurately reflects both the perception and objective presence of studied variables. In this setting with high
turnover, passionate teachers, and volatile populations, the challenge of acquiring meaningful quantitative data will be a large one. Some areas revealed during the study that fell outside the scope of the research deserve attention as well. For example, a comparison between public, private for profit, and private nonprofit settings will be necessary to truly understand how the market is affecting organizational relationships.
APPENDIX
INSTRUMENT

Teacher Talk

1) In this setting (organizational structure, i.e. private setting) how do these elements impact your performance as a teacher?
   a) Budget/financial support
   b) Administrative support for teachers
   c) Relationships (student/teacher bonds, coworkers, management)
   d) Mission statement
   e) Consistent policies and procedures

2) What is your most important motivation for being a teacher?

3) Describe in your own words your working relationship with your peers.

4) Describe in your own words your working relationship with your administration.

5) Who holds decision-making power for the educational program at your school?
   a) Describe the chain of command

6) What does the administration do to retain teachers?
   a) How would you describe teacher turnover?

7) What does the administration do to motivate teachers?

8) What is your school doing to prepare for No Child Left Behind Act?

9) What percentage of your teaching staff is considered “highly qualified” under the No Child Left Behind Act?

10) How are you preparing professionally to meet the No Child Left Behind Act?

11) Describe the policies and procedures that promote professional development.

12) What is the mission statement of your school?

13) Describe the strengths of your school.

14) Describe the weaknesses of your school.
15) Does your organization/setting/school reflect your idea of a space that promotes successful teaching?

16) Does the presence of justice in the workplace have an effect on your performance?

17) Considering our conversation, what would you describe as the most significant factor in your decision to continue teaching at your school?
Teacher Talk

**Instructions:** Please take a moment to answer the following questions concerning job satisfaction using the scale provided. You do not have to answer any question you do not feel comfortable answering. Please mark **ONE** box for each question: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree.

How are your relationships with other teachers? This section of the questionnaire explores some aspects your rapport with other teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I receive the cooperation I need from my peers to do my job effectively.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make a conscious effort to coordinate the content of my courses with other teachers.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the opportunity to participate in regularly scheduled planning time with other teachers.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to participate in cooperative planning time with other teachers.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like cooperative planning time with other teachers would be beneficial to reaching our vision.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected as a colleague by most other teachers.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected as a colleague by most other staff members.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of the questionnaire looks at the use of consistent policies and procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources are distributed in a fair way.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives are awarded in a systematic way.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the way financial incentives are awarded.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of how financial resources are allocated.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quality Assurance auditing process motivates my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quality Assurance audit scores reflect the quality of your school on a day-to-day basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to policies and procedures are related to the teaching staff in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do your interactions with administrators affect your job satisfaction? These questions examine your relationships with administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>1=Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2=Disagree</th>
<th>3=Agree</th>
<th>4=Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I receive the cooperation I need from my administration to do my job effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration is responsive to my concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate communication between teachers and administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school administration’s behavior toward the teaching staff is supportive?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the principal/director is interested in teachers' ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel respected as a teacher by the administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My opinions are considered when making decisions concerning education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My opinions are valued by the administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions made about education at my school are made by educators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrators at my school are educators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions about education at my school are grounded in scientifically based research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does the mission statement of your school influence everyday practices? These questions assess how the relationship between your job satisfaction and the mission statement’s impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A focused school vision for student learning is shared by most staff in the school.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Most of my colleagues share my beliefs about what the central mission of the school should be. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

| Goals for the school are clear. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

| In this school teachers and administration are in close agreement on the school discipline policy. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

| In this school teachers and administration are in close agreement on the school teaching philosophy. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

| My classroom environment reflects the mission statement of the school. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

| Day to day operations reflect the values contained in the mission statement. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

| Interactions between the faculty and the administration reflect the values contained in the mission statement. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

| Overall, this school adheres to its mission statement. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |

<p>| I believe that adherence to the mission statement improves the quality of a school. | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ | ❌ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am likely to receive written congratulations for my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am likely to experience oral congratulations for my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am likely to experience a written reprimand for my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am likely to experience an oral reprimand for my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration visits my classroom often to observe teaching practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of procedures in place to evaluate teachers’ performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received a performance evaluation according to the school procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive meaningful feedback from the administration on my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the in-service programs I attended this school year dealt with issues specific to my needs and concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development programs in this school permit me to acquire important new knowledge and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration helps me develop and evaluate professional development goals on a regular basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instructions:** Please take a moment to answer the following questions concerning job satisfaction using the scale provided. You do not have to answer any question you do not feel comfortable answering. Please mark **ONE** box for each question: **Very Low, Low, High, Very High**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the consistent use of established procedures by teachers?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the consistent use of established procedures by administration?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the level of professionalism of the administration?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your satisfaction with your working relationships with your administration?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the level of professionalism of the teaching staff?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your satisfaction with your working relationships with other teachers?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your satisfaction with the system of financial incentives at your school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your satisfaction with the quality of the feedback you receive on your teaching evaluations?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your commitment to the school's mission statement?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate your satisfaction with the school's adherence to the mission statement?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the organizational justice in this school?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instructions:** Please take a moment to answer the following questions. You do not have to answer any question you do not feel comfortable answering. Please remember that this information, as with all other answers, is anonymous and confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been employed at your current school?</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what range does your salary fall?</td>
<td>☐ $20,000-$25,000 ☐ $25,001-$30,000 ☐ $30,001-$35,000 ☐ &gt;$35,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much paid time off do you get?</td>
<td>☐ 0-10 days ☐ 11-20 days ☐ 21-30 days ☐ &gt;30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>_________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your race?</td>
<td>_________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education background</td>
<td>☐ Bachelor’s ☐ Master’s ☐ Specialist (Ed.S.) ☐ Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Certification</td>
<td>☐ Temporary ☐ Professional ☐ None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the No Child Left Behind Act, would you be considered a highly qualified teacher?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years teaching experience</td>
<td>_________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Educator:

We are graduate students at the University of Florida in the Family, Youth and Community Sciences Department. As part of our research project we are conducting interviews, the purpose of which is to learn about educators’ job satisfaction in private schools. The interview will last no longer than 45 minutes. We also ask that you fill out a self-completion questionnaire. You do not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer. Your interview will be conducted in person at a time conducive to your schedule. With your permission we would like to audiotape this interview. Only we will have access to the tape that we will personally transcribe, removing any identifiers during transcription. The tape will then be erased. Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law and your identity will not be revealed in the final manuscript.

There are no anticipated risks, compensation or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this interview. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate and may discontinue your participation in the interview at any time without consequence.

If you have any questions about this research protocol, please contact us at (352) 376-3593 or (352) 375-9933 or our faculty supervisor, Dr. M. E. Swisher at (352) 392-2202, ext. 256. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant may be directed to the UFIRB office, University of Florida, Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611; ph (352) 392-0433.

By signing this letter, you give us permission to report your responses anonymously in the final manuscript to be submitted to our faculty supervisor for possible publication.

Melisa Toothman and Gloria Curry

I have read the procedure described above for the Teacher Satisfaction Survey. I voluntarily agree to participate in the interview and I have received a copy of this description.

________________________________________
Signature of participant                     Date
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