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The purpose of this study was to describe the level of satisfaction with organizational climate factors and characteristics of the teaching position variables in a suburban Florida school district. A further purpose of the study was to investigate whether differences exist in the measures of satisfaction when compared by school level and union affiliation.

A questionnaire was distributed to 1,685 teachers on the elementary, middle, and high school levels in the district. This questionnaire was developed from the original works of Sharon Levy at Lehigh University. Four basic questions were asked:

1. What are the mean levels of satisfaction of teachers on each of the seven measures of organizational climate reported by the total group, by level of school, and by union affiliation?

2. Are there significant differences in the level of satisfaction with organizational climate factors when compared by school level and by union affiliation?
3. What are the mean levels of satisfaction of teachers on each of the seven measures of teacher position characteristics reported by the total group, by level of school, and by union affiliation?

4. Are there significant differences in the mean level of satisfaction with the characteristics of teachers position when compared by level of school and union affiliation?

The data analysis consisted of two different statistical techniques. Questions 1 and 3 used descriptive statistics to report the results. Questions 2 and 4 used an analysis of variance along with Scheffé's post hoc test to report results. Descriptive statistics were also used to report the responses teachers gave to such questions as gender, ethnic classification, total years teaching, and salary.

Significant differences were found among school levels on all seven position characteristics and all seven organizational climate factors among the levels of schools. A difference was found between union membership with one organizational climate factor and two teacher position characteristics. Salary was the factor with the lowest level of satisfaction, and relationship with peers was the factor with the highest level of satisfaction.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Excellence in education is a major issue for educators of children, youth, and adults. The decade of the 1980s was characterized by an intensified desire for greater effectiveness in public education. Widespread discussion about school effectiveness raised public consciousness of educational concerns to a high level. Gardner (1983) stated that concern about falling standardized test scores was among the issues accentuated in the media with reports such as A Nation at Risk. The public is calling for more accountability in the 1990s. The state of Florida through the program Blueprint 2000 is calling for reform and accountability in education.

Organizational or school climate and its relationship to teacher job satisfaction can greatly influence the outcome of the educational process. One key component of organizational climate studies is measurement of teacher job satisfaction. As the organizational climate of schools becomes more open or participative, levels of job satisfaction increase (Grassie & Carss, 1973; Miskal, McDonald, & Bloom, 1983). LaFollette and Sims (1975) found that organizational climate is a causal factor in job satisfaction for teachers. A positive school climate is seen as a platform upon which productive learning and teacher job satisfaction can be built (Flanagan, 1983). In recent years, attention to how organizational climate and job satisfaction affect institutional effectiveness has grown in light of criticisms involving quality and accountability in education (Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993).

Climate and culture are inherent in every organization, including schools. Climate and culture are difficult to define and even more difficult to change, yet any reform effort
must address them first if it is to succeed. Gonder and Hymes (1994) defined climate as "a term that refers to current feelings and attitudes. It reflects on how students, staff, and parents feel about the school " (p. 43). Climate characteristics affect the morale, productivity, and satisfaction of persons involved in an organization.

School climate consists of three organizational conditions: an emphasis on academics, an orderly environment, and expectations for success (Lee, 1983). The success of an organization is related to the underlying values, beliefs, and expectations that exist in it (Owens, 1991). The pattern of development is known as the organizational climate and culture.

Over the last two decades public opinion of schools declined (Gallup, 1985), yet demands for productivity increased. During the same period an extensive amount of research about the organizational climate of schools was conducted. Some researchers regard climate as a way of explaining differences between schools. Indications of healthy school climate are commonly linked with the so-called effective school movement (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

Productivity and satisfaction are two goals that are included in an effective school climate. Satisfaction is seen through high morale, trust, and cohesiveness. Schools with high levels of satisfaction clearly are schools with good climates. The cornerstone of management theory in business for decades has been the relationship between satisfaction and productivity (Huseman & Harfield, 1989; Vroom & Deci, 1970). Pardee (1990) stated that understanding job satisfaction and work motivation can be key elements to improving educational productivity.

Organizational managers have been interested for decades in how to motivate workers and increase productivity. In the late 19th century and early 20th century, several management theories emphasized efficient production methods and impersonal treatment of workers (Weber, 1964).
Job satisfaction has been defined in a variety of ways. Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as "the affective orientation of individuals toward work roles they are presently occupying" (p. 99). Strengthening job satisfaction in the school environment results in improved productivity in the schools (Brodinsky, 1984). Studies show that teachers who feel good about themselves and their abilities are more likely to experience success in their teaching careers (Bailey, 1989). Leslie (1989) found that dissatisfied teachers weaken educational programs and that basic human relations principles can help administrators meet teachers needs.

There were opposing views to the impersonal treatment theories of management. Mary Parker Follett argued that the nature of human relations was an important ingredient, and she advocated a recognition of the motivating desires of the individual and of the group in order for an industrial organization to be productive (Metcalfe & Urwick, 1940). Interest in systematic study of the nature and causes of job satisfaction dates back at least to the human relations movement of the 1930s. Although the first intensive study of job satisfaction was conducted by Hoppock in 1935, it was the Hawthorne studies that shaped the trend of study for the next two decades.

The "human relations school of thought" emerged as a result of these studies. According to this position, an individual's perception of the organization and attitudes toward his job were formed by the interrelationships that existed in the informal group of which he was a member (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939). Norms established among workers influenced worker behavior more than the controls imposed on the physical working conditions. There are other contributors to the human relations approach. Kurt Lewin emphasized field theory and research known as group dynamics. Lewin (Lunenberg & Orstein, 1991) concluded that democratic groups are generally more productive than authoritarian groups. Carl Rogers worked with Mayo at the Western Electric plant, and his
client-centered therapy provided the skeletal framework upon which the human relations approach is built.

The human relations school remained the most influential and prevalent framework for job satisfaction studies until the appearance of Herzberg's two-factor theory. Prior to this, theorists viewed degrees of motivation as falling on a single continuum, with job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction being at the extremes. The research of Frederick Herzberg and his associates (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), conducted on accountants and engineers, produced findings that led to a more precise way of evaluating satisfaction. For Herzberg, job satisfaction was the result of factors or elements he called "motivators," while dissatisfaction with the job was caused by "hygiene" factors (Locke, 1976).

Factors that caused dissatisfaction to the job were generally referred to as extrinsic factors. Factors that caused satisfaction were regarded as intrinsic factors. This discovery caused Herzberg to separate the factors that he believed caused dissatisfaction (hygiene factors) from those he believed contributed to motivation (motivation factors). Herzberg conducted a study where he analyzed the responses of 200 accountants and engineers. They were asked to describe situations in which they felt exceptionally good and exceptionally bad about their jobs. This is called a modified critical incident technique. Herzberg developed from this his two factor theory of motivation. An important supportive replication in the field of education was done by Thomas Sergiovanni.

For many years managers in the private sector assumed that if one had satisfied employees, then one could expect that they would be more productive (Pinder, 1984). This assumption remains a source of controversy. Some researchers have found such a relationship (Lawler & Porter, 1967; Vroom, 1964), whereas others have not (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955). A similar assumption is often made by educational managers. They link
job satisfaction and productivity and attempt to improve teacher satisfaction with the hope that job related behavior will improve and result in greater teaching effectiveness.

Educational settings differ from corporate settings in the following way. Historically, education focused less on efficiency and productivity and more on student learning, growth, and development (Pace, 1968). This is changing in education. The rapid change of pace requires educators to find new and better ways of conducting business (Katz & West, 1992; National Symposium on Higher Education Finance and Management Issues in the 1990s, 1991).

In recent years, concern for employees and their attitudes toward work has further expanded and evolved; what was once called motivation theory is now often referred to as job satisfaction theory. Different views of motivation are important because, among other things, they suggest that alternate forms of organization and management are necessary.

Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) divided the theories of job satisfaction into two groups. The first, content theories, including Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory and Herzberg's two factor theory, try to determine factors within the individual or his environment that initiate, sustain, and modify his behavior. Many studies are based on Herzberg's two factor theorem. Engelking (1985) used a critical incident questionnaire adapted from Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory to identify sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Other studies relate Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Warren (1982) used a Maslow needs hierarchy instrument to assess the needs levels of teachers. A few researchers have investigated the relationship of expectancy work motivation to teacher job satisfaction. The second, process theories, like equity or expectancy theory, are concerned with the way variables are related, leading to the satisfaction of an individual.
Different levels of public schools are now often divided into elementary, middle, and high schools. Researchers frequently have compared levels of job satisfaction among elementary schools. Many have identified sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, such as organizational structure (Williams, 1981), decision making (Henderson, 1976), and planned educational change (Cole, 1980). A large number of studies have examined the types of intrinsic rewards of teaching and their relation to teacher characteristics and variables in the work setting.

Research on secondary school teachers has included junior high school, middle school, and senior high school teachers as subjects. Some have identified sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among senior high school teachers using the research of Herzberg. Some have analyzed internal and external job factors related to teaching. Some research have discussed organizational incentives that are valued by secondary teachers and attempted to discover what organizational incentives are valued by secondary teachers (Metzdorf, 1984). Kries (1983) explored the relationship between security, affiliation, self-esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization, and levels of job satisfaction among high school teachers.

Pardee (1990) stated that satisfying extrinsic forces is an all too commonly accepted method for motivating workers, but there is theory that shows that these efforts cannot lead to motivated workers. Typical reward systems in public schools satisfy only the hygiene factors and do not address the higher level needs that truly motivate people. Some studies surveyed higher order needs that truly motivate people. Some studies surveyed higher order needs (autonomy) or low order needs (pay) and job satisfaction. The studies showed that teacher job satisfaction is significantly related to higher order needs. Hersey and Angelini (1982) felt that direction and control may not succeed because this is a questionable method for motivating people whose physiological and safety needs are
reasonably satisfied and whose social, esteem, and self-actualization needs are becoming prominent.

Collective bargaining has changed over the last 10 years. There has been less money for salary increases, and because of this, it is important to know what teachers feel is important. Jewell Gordon of the American Federation of Teachers feels the trend recently is to see how unions and management in education can work together on items other than just maintenance items such as salary and benefits. Studies involving collective bargaining are important because, as Lunenburg (1990) said, over 80% of the nation's teachers belong to either the National Education Association (NEA) which has over 1.5 million members, or the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) which has above .5 million members. It is important that both labor and management address issues in collective bargaining that can keep teachers satisfied and motivated.

Paying teachers a good salary is important but is not by any means the only way to motivate people. Hilgert (1971) had workers rank order 10 job factors, from most important to least important. The most important factor contributing to job satisfaction was found to be good supervision, and the least important factor was good pay. Others see pay as a more important factor. Some see pay as both a hygiene and motivator. Katzell and Yankelovich (1975) saw the following strategies as useful for improving job satisfaction: (a) pay people more, (b) give people work that uses their skills, (c) provide helpful supervision, (d) provide harmonious work groups, (e) provide opportunities for mobility, (f) provide a chance to take part in decision making. Overall, attempts to relate wages to job satisfaction have resulted in contradictory and ambiguous findings.

Teacher participation in unions is an area that needs to be studied. The Peter Hart research conducted for the Florida Education Association (FEA) United in 1994 is one of the few studies examining teacher job satisfaction. This study focused on different factors
classifying teachers as union members and nonunion members. The highest priority in Florida for both sets of teachers was salary and benefits.

The Peter Hart research examined reasons for teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their jobs in Florida. The results may be laden with implications for other states and localities as well. Vest (1986) said it is generally recognized that schools are under pressure to perform well. School districts must efficiently use scarce resources (money and people) to accomplish their goal of educating children, for which the public demands accountability (Olmsted, 1972). The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction is very important to the way teachers perform.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to describe the levels of satisfaction with organizational climate factors and characteristics of the teaching position factors in a suburban Florida School District. A further purpose was to investigate whether differences exist in the measures of satisfaction when compared by school level (elementary, middle, and secondary) and by union and nonunion membership. The study was conducted as a part of a larger study of the measure of satisfaction among teachers in the school district.

A questionnaire that addressed seven organizational climate factors and eight job satisfaction variables was sent to every teacher in school district. It included the following items.

Organizational Climate Factors:

1. Internal Communication: Districts or schools formal and informal process and style.

2. Organizational Structure: Districts or schools administrative operation, or its hierarchical lines of authority and requirements for operating within that hierarchy.
3. Political Climate: Nature and complexity of the districts or schools internal politics.

4. Professional Development Opportunities: Opportunities to pursue activities to enhance job performance.

5. Evaluation: How fair and supportive is it?

6. Promotion: Districts or schools commitment to advancement from within.

7. Regard for Personal Concern: Districts or schools sensitivity to and regard for the personal concerns and well being of employees.

Job Satisfaction Variables:

1. Participation in decision making: How much opportunity for the employee to be involved.

2. Autonomy, power, and control: Amount or degree of jurisdiction that an employee is able to exercise while performing the tasks of his or her position.

3. Relationship with peers: How the teachers get along with their peers.

4. Relationship with superordinate: How the teachers get along with their supervisors.

5. Salary: How the employees see the equity and adequacy of their salary.


7. Professional Effectiveness: How much the employee sees his or her effectiveness in his or her position.

**Significance of the Study**

Organizational climate has been seriously studied by business management researchers for decades. In the last three decades studies of organizational climate of schools has increased dramatically.
Jean Vest (1986) recommended that studies be conducted to see if there is a correlation among organizational climate, job satisfaction, and job performance. Stiles (1993) concluded that studies in the area of organizational climate and job satisfaction should be conducted every 3 to 5 years in Gwinnett County, Georgia. This study included only elementary schools, and Stiles notes that it should be expanded to include middle and high school levels. Stiles also felt that inclusion of new instruments to measure organizational climate and job satisfaction would be beneficial. He further recommended that studies should include other school districts in Georgia.

Most research in public schools concerning organizational climate and job satisfaction had been done in elementary schools. Schwandt (1978) found that a majority of studies focused on elementary schools. Vest (1986) found a similar emphasis on elementary school studies.

Kaiser (1991) suggested after studying teacher satisfaction in Orange County middle schools that a study should be done on this topic in high schools. Cole (1977) addressed the question of job satisfaction among elementary, middle, and high school teachers. The major questions he asked were as follows: (a) Are classroom teachers satisfied with their jobs? (b) What are the explanations if differences occur between levels of teaching?

The study of the relationship of organizational climate factors discussed in the statement of the problem and eight job satisfaction variables was conducted by Chappell (1995) and Levy (1989) on the college level. The study of this relationship can be useful involving public school teachers. Schools can have expectations for teachers to participate in decision making, to communicate effectively, and to act autonomously. This would require staff development to provide teachers opportunities to learn these skills. Teacher performance assessment may indicate a need for teachers to learn how to be effective communicators, and how to contribute to group decision-making activities. Long-
term commitment to staff development would be required for improvement results to be lasting (Wood, Treeland, & Szado, 1985).

Davis (1976) concluded that teachers must participate in the decision-making process if the programs are to be considered effective by the teachers and the organization as a whole. Creating procedures for teacher input into staff development programming while using performance assessment evaluation data as one determiner would combine the most important aspects of teacher organizational climate perceptions and teacher attitudes about professional growth and development. This would support Getzel's (1954) model of congruency for achieving organizational efficiency and individual needs satisfaction.

Research is needed regarding job satisfaction and union affiliation. Divers (1980) stated that teachers who are active in the union enter teaching for extrinsic factors such as salary. Teachers that are not members of the union are more interested in intrinsic reasons such as interpersonal relationships. Public collective bargaining can have a large impact on items such as salary schedules, benefits, promotion, and evaluation procedures. Studies are not prevalent in these areas. The rapid change in education indicates a need for more studies involving union participation and job satisfaction.

Lester (1988) stated that more research needs to be conducted regarding the relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. Studies should also be conducted to determine whether teachers who have been involved in the collective bargaining process for varying periods of time differ in their levels of job satisfaction.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Schools have historically been organized according to the classical bureaucratic model outlined by Weber (1952). This is a type of management system that may be used by different organizations. A division of labor, a defined authority hierarchy, job specialization, and a set of rules and procedures for operations and relationships in the organization characterize the bureaucratic model (Bennis, 1966; Litwak, 1961; Weber, 1952).

Secondary group relations and the traditional areas of knowledge rather than social skills are stressed by the bureaucratic model (Litwak, 1961). The administration of an organization according to an abstract set of rules results in formal and impersonal relationships (Weber, 1952). Behavior becomes regularized in the organization relative to the conditions and the people in the organization (Blau & Scott, 1962).

Part of an individual's definition in an organization is a set of expectations developed by other organization members (Gouldner, 1957, Getzels & Guba, 1954). Teachers do conform to the expectations of the school bureaucracy and the community (Washburne, 1956). Teachers are confused when the bureaucracy does not support their role concept (Washburne, 1956). Teachers are individuals with personal needs and goals and may expect these needs to be met within their role. They become less effective members of an organization if their personal needs are not met within the definition of their role (Argyris, 1957, Getzels & Guba, 1954).
Organizational Climate

There is not agreement among researchers regarding a common definition of organizational climate. It can be said organizations and people depend upon each other (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Organizational climate reflects the history of internal and external struggles, the types of people the organization attracts, its work processes, the modes of communication, and the exercise of authority within the organization. Just as a society has a cultural heritage, so social organizations possess distinctive patterns of collective feeling and beliefs passed along to new group members. Educational institutions also show marked differences in climate and culture.

Anderson (1982) pointed out that organizational climate has been studied with a multitude of variables, methodologies, theories, and models leading to a rather diverse and loosely associated body of research. The growth of a wide variety of climate topologies, climate instruments, and climate definitions is evidence of the difficulty to conceptualize school climate. School climate, like other constructs used for studying human behavior, involves ordering and conceptualizing simultaneously existing, multilevel mutually interacting variables (Argyris, 1958).

An early school climate researcher, Halpin (1966), described the "feel" of a school, its "personality," as its climate. Sargent (1967) pictured climate as a "personality sketch" of a school with characteristics that are assumed to affect the successful achievement of the organization's objectives. Argyris (1958) defined climate as a feedback system dependent upon the organization's formal policies, procedures, and positions, the personality of the individual, and the individual's effort to accommodate his own ends within the organization. Halpin and Croft (1963) described organizational climate as the organizational personality of the school. Gilmer (1966) described organizational climate as "those characteristics that distinguish the organization from other organizations and that influence the behavior of people in the organization. It is, in effect, what we react to. . ." (p. 57).
Nwankwo (1979) wrote that climate is "the general 'we-feeling,' group sub-culture or interactive life of the school" (p. 268). More simply, organizational climate is a set of characteristics that distinguish one organization from another and that influence the behavior of the people in the organization (Owens & Steinhoff, 1969). Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) stated organizational climate is the total environmental quality within an organization. Often organizational climate and organizational culture are overlapping concepts.

**Characteristics of Organizational Climate**

Organizational climate is a concept that is concerned with the total environmental quality within the organization (Tagiuri, 1968). This viewpoint says climate has four distinct dimensions. These dimensions comprise a taxonomy: ecology, milieu, social system, and culture. Ecology includes the physical and material aspects of the climate of the organization. Presence of individuals or groups who have specific attributes represents milieu. Social system is the pattern of relationships between individuals or among groups. Culture involves belief systems, values, and meaning.

Anderson (1982) found the topology formed by these broad environmental dimensions to be useful in organizing her delineation of school climate literature. Tagiuri's dimensions are perhaps too broad to be precisely defined. Some of these concepts would seem to overlap but can be useful in the organization of instruments to measure organizational climate.

School climate characteristics may be described from another perspective. Nwankwo (1979) studied causal relationships in schools which produced conflicts among students. Schools with closed climates had poor discipline among students, while schools with open climates had good discipline. Nwankwo's definition of climate supports the social system construct.
Halpin and Croft (1963) looked at climate on a continuum going from an open climate to a closed climate. They described what characteristics these types of climate would possess. The open climate is characterized by teachers who work well together and have high esprit. Good relations are enjoyed by groups in open climates. The principal exhibits a behavior that allows for leadership to emerge from the faculty.

The closed climate is one in which members of the group enjoy neither high task achievement nor high social cohesiveness. Teachers do not work well together. Apathy abounds and the principal is ineffective (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy & Miskel, 1982; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991).

There are other types of climate that exist on the continuum. These climates are the following: the autonomous climate which is characterized by almost complete freedom afforded by the principal to the faculty; the controlled climate which is characterized by a sense of urgency for task achievement, often at the expense of social needs and satisfaction; and the familiar climate characterized by a conspicuously friendly atmosphere. Little control is exerted by the principal in the familiar climate. The paternal climate is characterized by ineffective attempts by the principal to control the faculty (Chappell, 1995).

A concise overview of climate types was presented by Anderson (1982). These included coherent versus noncoherent climates (Wynne, 1980), open versus closed climates (Halpin & Croft, 1963), Brookover climate dimensions (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schwertzen, & Wisenbaker, 1977), elementary school environment types (Sinclair, 1970), and the robust versus nonrobust climates (Willower & Licata, 1975).

Many different instruments have been used to measure climate types. These include the organizational climate questionnaire (Halpin & Croft, 1963), the high school characteristics index (Stern, 1961), my school inventory (Anderson, 1973), elementary school environment survey (Sinclair, 1970), the school survey (Coughlin, 1970), the pupil
control behavior form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967), the school description inventory (Anderson, 1970), and the quality of school life scale (Epstein & McPartland, 1976).

Taquiri (1968) contended that most measures of school climate only focus on particular aspects of the organization. Because of this only some of the dimensions of climate are delineated by any given instrument. Despite the efforts of people such as Halpin and Croft, capturing the essence of the full domain of school climate in a single instrument remains elusive.

**Measurement of Organizational Climate**

A definition for organizational climate cannot be agreed upon. Disagreement also exists trying to conceptualize an organizational variable for the purpose of research. Organizational climate is admittedly difficult to conceptualize (Dachler, 1974). Lau (1976) found in a literature review of organizational climate that climate has been conceptualized as an intervening variable or individual perception linking the organization and the individual through descriptive measures.

School organizational climate is recognized as organization-oriented, not individual-oriented (Lau, 1976). Measurements of school organizational climate are mainly descriptive. Existing measures are individual-oriented with less consideration for task, structure, technology, or other organizational indications (Lau, 1976).

One of the earliest conceptualizations of organizational climate was developed by Halpin and Croft (1963). The construct was drawn upon Halpin's earlier work in leadership studies. School climate is described as the quality of relations between teachers and administrators.

Halpin and Croft (1963) developed the **Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire** (OCDQ) to identify and describe the elementary school climate. The OCDQ was designed to determine the interpersonal relationships of elementary teachers with each
other and the school principal. The OCDQ has had limited use to determine school organizational climate in high schools (Cottingham, 1971). In theory, they constructed a continuum of six climate types which were to be derived from the school's average scores on eight subtests. The subtest, or climate factors, are concerned with teacher relationships and attitudes (group characteristics) and principal-teacher relationships (leader characteristics).

The OCDQ lacks clarity regarding the "middle climates" of the continuum. Halpin and Croft themselves recognized this as a rather crude ranking. Hoy and Miskel (1982) wanted to categorize schools by openness and closedness. The OCDQ is not suited for studying urban or secondary schools. This is seen as another criticism of the instrument as it raises questions about the appropriateness of the instrument and how it relates to secondary schools (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988).

The revisions of the OCDQ have tried to resolve questions about reliability and validity of the items and subtests of the instrument. Mulhern (1985) stated that the OCDQ developed by Halpin and Croft had been used extensively in research on public schools. Mulhern (1985) saw the development of a reliable instrument for measuring organizational climate in secondary schools as something of practical value at a time when secondary school climate is a focal point of concern in education. Mulhern saw this study as an update and expansion of Halpin and Croft.

Mulhern (1985) concluded that the items of the original subtests used by Halpin and Croft (1963) were modified to use items appropriate for the secondary schools. This was done to improve the measurement characteristics of the items. The OCDQ-RS describes a secondary school's openness by examining the interaction of principal behavior and teacher behavior. Teacher behavior is defined in terms of frustrated, engaged, and intimate behavior (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991).
One of these modifications was a pupil control behavior subtest that maps the domain of organizational climate in secondary schools. Hoy (1972) stated that it seems reasonable to expect that social interaction between teachers and students would be of particular importance when assessing the climate of secondary schools. Involving interactions with students was seen as a limitation of the Halpin and Croft model.

The climate of the elementary school is described by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-Revised Elementary by the interaction of the openness of the principal and teacher. Teacher openness comes from subscale scores of collegial, intimate, and disengaged behavior. Principal openness is derived from scores on subscales of supportive, directive, and restrictive behavior. Open, engaged, disengaged, or closed may describe the overall school climate (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991).

Likert's Profile of a School focused on interpersonal relationships. Management style and relationships of management with faculty at the secondary level have been looked at using this instrument (Conway, 1976; Schrech, 1977; Welch, 1976). Interpersonal relationships are seen as intrinsic behaviors.

The Organizational Climate Index (OCI) by Stern has been used in conjunction with other instruments in gaining information about the dynamics of intrinsic organizational behavior in relation to self-actualization concepts (Davis, 1979; Troia, 1978). This instrument has been used at the secondary level (Baccus, 1978). Stern drew much of his instrument from earlier works by Lewin (1935) and Murray (1938). Like Halpin and Croft, Stern asserted that excellent schools were characterized by a distinct type of organizational climate.

The Syracuse Indexes (Kelley, 1980; Steinhoff, 1965; Stern, 1970) consisted of a number of instruments, the Organizational Climate Index (OCI), the High School Characteristics Index (HSCI), the Elementary and Secondary School Index (ESI), and the Classroom Environment Index (CEI). These instruments state that school climate is related
to satisfaction and productivity. The HSCI, CEI, and ESI are used to measure student perceptions of climate.

**Job Satisfaction**

Studies that pertain to job satisfaction of employees were rare until well into the 20th century. An emphasis on production without respect to employee working conditions and morale was a carry over from the 19th century. Frederick Taylor was one of the first to advocate treatment of people as individuals. Elton Mayo furthered this field when his studies at the Hawthorne plant of Western Electric showed a relationship between productivity and expectations from others. Job satisfaction research has expanded to include almost all fields, including education.

There have been literally several thousand studies of job satisfaction. Locke (1976) estimated that there have been over three thousand articles and dissertations produced on the topic, and the number is increasing. Herzberg, Mausner, Pearson, and Capwell (1957) have analyzed 50 years of research on job attitudes. The conclusion they came to was that multiple characteristics of job satisfaction exist, because workers can be affected by many factors. Multiple characteristics can be present depending on the type of survey being used. Surveys measuring dissatisfaction identify different factors than do surveys measuring worker dissatisfaction.

Definitions of job satisfaction are as numerous as the different types of occupations studied. Hoppock (1935) stated that job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that result in the employee's admission that he is "satisfied" with the job. Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as "the affective orientation of individuals toward work roles they are presently occupying" (p. 99). Locke (1976) defined it as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state, resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Legge and Mumford (1978) defined job
satisfaction as an employee’s positive attitude towards his work, when his needs, expectations, and aspirations in work match their jobs experiences.

It is important to explore why and how people respond to their jobs since the quality of work life is dependent on factors affecting employee satisfaction (Hopkins, 1983). Hopkins reported that the two determinants of job satisfaction are the nature of the work situation and the orientation brought by the person to the job. Hopkins (1983) pointed out that most job satisfaction studies indicated that the work situation is the primary factor affecting job satisfaction.

Knoop and O'Reilly (1978) found that perceived school effectiveness is related to satisfaction of teachers with coworkers, with supervision, and with work itself. Job satisfaction is a variable associated with less absenteeism and is related to motivation and work environment.

School climate and teacher satisfaction are areas that greatly influence the outcome of the educational process. Flanagan (1983) stated that a positive school climate is seen as a platform upon which productive learning and teacher job satisfaction can be built. Studies show that teachers who feel good about themselves and their abilities are more likely to experience success in their teaching careers (Adams & Bailey, 1989).

Results of an American Association of School Administrators study indicated that professional autonomy, daily recognition, and involvement in decision making help build teacher job satisfaction. Strengthening job satisfaction in the school environment resulted in improved productivity in the schools (Brodinsky, 1984). Leslie (1989) found that dissatisfied teachers weaken educational programs and that basic human relations principles can help administrators meet teachers needs. Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger, William Foote Whyte, and eventually Rensis Likert were among the best known writers of the human relations school. Human relations theory in its many popular versions emphasizes that a good leader sympathizes with the personal problems of his subordinates, lets the
subordinates participate in decision making, and listens to them. Dodge (1983) investigated selected personal and organizational variables related to job satisfaction. She concluded that organizational factors such as emotional support and participation in decision making were stronger contributors to job satisfaction than personal factors such as age and experience. The findings were consistent with previous findings that indicated that an individual's attitude toward work was more associated with organizational characteristics of the job environment than the individual traits of the person (Herman & Hulin, 1972; O'Reilly & Roberts, 1976).

The terms intrinsic and extrinsic factors, satisfiers and dissatisfiers, and motivators and hygenes are used to describe characteristics of job satisfaction. Blum (1961) stated that security is one of the most important determinants in selection of a career. Individuals that select jobs that contain hygiene factors look for such items as job security, financial provision, and tenure. People who select motivators or satisfiers look for jobs that provide opportunities for advancement, achievement, recognition, and responsibility.

Wernimont (1966) stated that achievement, responsibility, and the work itself were often reported as satisfiers. The absence of recognition and advancement were reported as dissatisfiers. Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakel (1967) found supervision, responsibility, achievement, and recognition to be both satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Griffin (1991) stated that the motivation-hygiene theory consists of three dimensions instead of two. This third dimension consists of ambients. Ambients contained factors that were mentioned both equally as motivators and hygenes.

Research answers the question of what conditions lead to intrinsic job satisfaction. It finds that autonomy, complexity of the job, variety, and responsibility lead to intrinsic job satisfaction. Gurin, Veroff, and Field (1960) found that the greatest amount of job satisfaction occurred among the professional, technical, and managerial personnel, and the least amount among unskilled workers.
Reaction to Maslow's theory was questionable and suspicious. McClelland (1955) suggested that Maslow's (1954) study of self-actualized people was subject to questions of validity. This was due to objectivity, lack of selection criteria, and operational definitions. Cofer and Appley (1964) concluded that Maslow's emphasis on self-actualization suffered from vague concepts and inadequate evidence related to its major contentions.

McClelland proposed that needs were learned through the environment. If a person experienced a strong need, it served as motivation to trigger behavior that would satisfy that need (McClelland & Atkinson, 1976). Important to McClelland's theory is that persons possessing a high need for achievement are satisfied when this need is met. Motivation to work hard is diminished when there is failure to achieve.

Alderfer (1969) upon study of workers responses about their needs indicated that Maslow's hierarchy was an observable phenomenon. He further stated it could be put into a hierarchy of three levels. These levels were (a) existence needs such as safety and security, (b) relatedness needs such as affiliation and love, and (c) growth needs such as esteem and self-actualization. Alderfer (1972) called this theory environment-relatedness-growth theory. Although not much research has been conducted on ERG theory, Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) reported that the ideas presented by Alderfer appear to be gaining support.

A theory related to the more comprehensive motivational theory of Maslow is the two-factor model of job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). This theory is based on the assumption that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are independent of one another. The aspects of the job that produce dissatisfaction differ from those aspects that produce satisfaction. A worker that is satisfied is not one where dissatisfaction is minimal. Dissatisfaction can be caused by extrinsic factors such as supervision, pay, working conditions, and company policies. Motivation and satisfaction come from a different set of factors. These factors
meet the needs for achievement, recognition, responsibility, and personal growth. Herzberg accepts Maslow's theory of lower and higher needs. He draws a line between the two. One is satisfiers and the other is dissatisfiers. He called them motivators and hygienes.

Among the postulates developed by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) was the concept that origins of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are distinctly different. Herzberg (1959) and his associates conducted a series of interviews with 200 engineers and accountants working in the Pittsburgh area. Herzberg received a grant to conduct this research. He also reviewed 2,000 publications on motivation theory before conducting his research. The subjects were asked to try to describe an event or time when they felt especially satisfied with the job. They were then again asked to describe a time or event when they felt particularly bad or dissatisfied with the job. This technique that Herzberg used was a modification of Flanagan's critical incident technique. The analysis showed the results that two groups of factors emerged. These were called "motivators" and "hygiene" factors.

In 1966 Herzberg conducted a follow-up study. After this study he suggested that an increased level of autonomy, task significance, skill variety, and feedback would lead to better job performance and more satisfied employees.

There has been support for Herzberg's two-factor theorem. Sergiovanni (1967) in a study of 71 teachers in New York found strong support for the theory. Some have totally accepted this theory (Burr, 1980; Holdaway, 1978). Some have rejected the validity of the theory (Young & Davis, 1983).

Some of the criticisms of the two-factor theory are the lack of reliability of the research methods used by Herzberg and his associates. These methods tended to foreshadow the results and there are no provisions to account for the likely possibility that a person may get satisfaction from one part of the job and not from another part, and the
ambiguity of the theoretical position (Gruneburg, 1979; Owens, 1981). However, the two-factor theorem has been applied many times in school situations and appears to be well supported in such settings (Owens, 1981).

In Herzberg’s theory (1) there are certain conditions in work that teachers expect to enjoy. Teachers will be dissatisfied if these conditions are not adequately present. (2) The conditions that teachers expect as part of the traditional legal work relationship are called hygienic factors. Teacher dissatisfaction and poor performance occur if they are not present. Their presence does not motivate performance. (3) Factors which contribute to teachers exceeding the traditional work relationship are called motivators. The absence of motivators does not result in dissatisfaction. (4) Hygienic factors are associated with the conditions of work and are extrinsic in nature. Money benefits, fair supervision, and a feeling of belonging are examples. Motivational factors are intrinsic in nature. Examples are recognition, achievement, and increased responsibility. (5) Administrators and supervisors who consider job satisfaction as a goal that teachers seek through potent motivators (Sergiovanni, 1967). Work itself did not appear significantly more often as a contributor to satisfaction. Elements of the job of teaching are inherently less than satisfying. Poor interpersonal relations with students; inadequate, incompetent, insensitive, and close supervision; unfair, rigid, and inflexible school policies; poor interpersonal relations with other teachers and with parents; and incidents in their personal lives were the job factors found to contribute significantly to teachers’ dissatisfaction.

Herzberg (1959) showed that good feelings that were associated with responsibility lasted twice as long as those associated with work and advancement. He also showed that it lasted three times as long as those from achievement and recognition.

Lortie (1975) categorized major attributes to the teaching profession as (a) working with people, (b) continuation of interests developed as students, (c) time compatibility, and (d) material benefits. Lortie (1975) also classified three types of rewards in teaching:
extrinsic, ancillary, and psychic. Ancillary rewards are those which accompany the occupation and are perceived in terms of how they meet an individual's needs. These perceptions can be both objective and subjective. Psychic rewards are viewed completely subjectively. They are in respect to both content and context of a job. Salary, fringe benefits, level of prestige, and power over others are seen as extrinsic rewards.

**Attitude Theory and Measurement**

Some researchers in their definition of job satisfaction use job attitude. Many psychologists differ over the definition of attitudes. DeFleur and Westie (1961) considered attitudes in two categories: those attitudes based on a probability concept and those attitudes described as a latent process. Attitude based on probability could be consistently predicted to reappear given the same conditions and the same attributes. Attitude described as a latent process within the individual implies an inner process that shapes an individual's behavior and gives direction.

LaPiere (1934) showed that attitudes of people did not show up in overt behavior. Katz (1960) suggested that attitudes must be understood in terms of the needs of those attitudes. Katz stated that attitudes are when people see some aspect of their world in a favorable or unfavorable manner. People express opinions about an object or situation, and they overtly act out a belief based on attitudes structured in a value hierarchy. Katz (1960) suggested to researchers that they needed to look at the intensity, generalizability, and direction of an attitude to be precise about its measurement.

Attitude described as a latent process which gives direction to one's behavior in a normative context (DeFleur & Westie, 1963) and serves the need of the individual holding the attitude (Katz, 1960) can be measured by an instrument that utilizes indicators of the attitude to be measured.
Motivation

It is only since the 1950s that there has been much attention to the role of motivation in performance. The role of motivational processes in determining a workers level of performance is now widely recognized. Maier (1955) saw a greater need for greater attention to problems of motivation and frustration. McGregor (1960) and Likert (1967) have outlined theories of management based largely on assumptions about human motivation.

Motivation is a basic psychological construct used in understanding behavior. This construct interacts with and acts in conjunction with other mediating processes and the environment. Luthans (1981) viewed motivation as the most important process in the micro approach to organizational behavior.

Several theories of motivation evolved in the early part of the 20th century. Proponents of these theories attempted to formulate empirically verifiable relationships among variables which could be used to predict behavior.

Charles Darwin brought to the attention of the scientific world that human behavior could be determined by instincts. The first quarter of this century widely accepted instinct theories by James, Freud, and McDougall who argued that a more comprehensive explanation of behavior was necessary than simply assuming that a rational person considered the behavioral alternatives available and acted to maximize positive results. Instinct psychologists added two other variables, instinct and unconscious motivation (Steers & Porter, 1975).

Instinct theories came under attack beginning in the 1920s. Psychologists started wondering if unconscious motives were really learned behavior. This led to a second school of motivation, known as drive theory (Steers & Porter, 1975).

Thorndike (1911) and Hull (1943) assumed that decisions concerning behavior were based on the consequences or rewards of past behavior. There is no attempt in this
approach to motivation to understand intrapsychic conditions and processes. Behavior was viewed as directed by the effect of reinforcement.

Skinner (1971) continued the work of noncognitive theories. Behavior was understood and predicted by focusing on past overt actions and their consequences as provided by an individual's external environment.

Hull (1952) modified his theory to include incentive in response to contradictory empirical evidence. Hull hypothesized that motivation fluctuated in response to the size of the reward. This revision brought drive theory into some agreement with the cognitive theories (Steers & Porter, 1975).

**Job Satisfaction Theories**

Cognitive theorists view motivation as a function of past satisfactions. These theorists say the major determinants of human behavior were the anticipations, beliefs, and expectations individuals had concerning future needs. Behavior is seen as goal directed and based on conscious intentions. Behavior is also seen as purposeful.

In current motivation work most theorists have assumed the importance of understanding the internal process and states of individuals (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1979). Cognitive theorists have focused on internal aspects. This theory of motivation has been approached through two distinct dimensions. These dimensions are content and process theories.

Content and process theories of job satisfaction and motivation dominate the literature. Content (or substantive) theories focus on what energizes human behavior. What factors arouse, direct, and terminate behavior. Content theories concentrate on the specific environmental and personal factors which lead to job satisfaction. Content theories focus on the specific needs, goals, and drives that influence behavior. This could be internal needs or external conditions. Hanson (1985) stated that content theories assume that
1. Needs or drives initiate or sustain goal-directed behavior.
2. When an equilibrium balance exists needs or drives are activated.
3. Needs or drives have levels that are prioritized.
4. When a need is fulfilled it no longer generates motivation.
5. All individuals share basically the same prioritization of needs and drives.

Some of the more cited content theories of motivation in the literature are Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Maslow and Herzberg attempted to determine what it is that motivates people to work. They wanted to identify the needs and drives that people have and how they prioritize them.

Abraham Maslow (1954) referred to man as a wanting animal who achieved only fleeting periods of complete satisfaction. Maslow (1943), the founder of human relations psychology, outlined what he believed to be an overall theory of motivation. Relative to his own clinical experience Maslow identified the motivational needs of humans as arranged in a hierarchical manner.

The Maslow model (1954) assumes a hierarchy of human motives ranging from biological needs through security, love and belongingness, to ego needs of self-esteem, self-development, and self-actualization. Basic to the theory is the thesis that the motives at the bottom of the hierarchy are imperative in their demands and, until those demands are met, make the higher order needs relatively ineffectual. Once these lower level needs are assured satisfaction, however, the higher level needs take over and become all-important. Some organizational consequences of the Maslow approach become apparent when we look at today's motive patterns. Extrinsic awards such as pay, job security, fringe benefits, and what the conditions of work are no longer suffice. People are demanding intrinsic job satisfactions as well.

Maslow's theory had wide recognition. Despite this his theory has received little empirical support. Although Maslow was criticized for failing to provide empirical evidence
for his theory, his logic and common sense approach to motivation brought widespread acceptance among students of motivation theory. Wahba and Bridwell (1976) in their review of literature came to the conclusion that available research does not give unconditional support for the implications of need hierarchy theory. The proposition that fulfillment of one level of need activates the next higher level need found little support from Wahba and Bridwell in their research. Studies also indicate that size of the company, cultural background of the employee, person's age or race, and the job a person performs in the organization can make a difference in the relative importance of each level of needs and how they are fulfilled (Hellriegel, 1974).

According to the Maslow theory, lower level needs could again become dominant if they were not met satisfactorily on some regular basis. An economic depression, for example, could reinstate the importance of biological drives, and more people would again be interested in any job so long as it paid well enough to meet minimal living standards.

White (1959) explored competence motive of esteem needs. Pardee (1990) stated that in the last decade we have employees who wanted more money for less work and employers who have no regard for employees. He stated that individuals desire to control and participate in their environment. This has implications for the work setting. New activities that challenge workers' needs for competence are needed to challenge the worker for mastery over their environment. These new activities will ultimately affect their job satisfaction.

The most common usage of needs orientation theory stems from the work of Porter (1962, 1963) who developed the Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire (NSQ). His modification of Maslow's hierarchy include autonomy needs which are placed between esteem and self-actualization. He also thought that physiological needs are met at higher levels of employment. Sergiovanni (1970) used an adapted version of the NSQ and found that the largest deficiencies for teachers were esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization.
Teachers were most satisfied with lower level needs such as security and social needs. The Needs Hierarchy theory has enjoyed wide appeal intuitively in education. Due to definitional problems and weaknesses of the instruments, empirical verification of the five need areas has been inconclusiveness (Pierson et al., 1985).

**Process Theories**

Process (or mechanical) theories address how the variables of the work environment interact. The relationship between an individual and his environment results in conscious behavioral choices. The prevalent process theories in the literature are expectancy theory, discrepancy theory, the job characteristics model, goal theory, and the equity theory.

The process theories evolved in the 1960s, because process theorists believed there was a relationship between an individual and his environment. These theories rejected the assumptions that human behavior was a response to some underlying instincts and drives and that individuals possessed some common hierarchy of needs. This thinking was seen as too simplistic.

Process theories suggest that a greater understanding of motivation could be gained by attempting to identify a goal. Motivation may be initiated in many ways for different individuals, but the process of initiating behavior, sustaining behavior, and terminating behavior is the same for all.

Expectancy theory was initially proposed by Victor Vroom (1964). The theory is a contingency approach which views weak motivation as a response to an individual's needs in relation to sought-after goals (Vroom, 1964). Specific outcomes attained by people are dependent not only on the choices they make but also on events which are beyond their control. An individual chooses between alternatives which involve uncertain outcomes. It seems clear that his behavior is affected not only by his preferences but also by the degree
he expects these outcomes to be probable. Psychologists have referred to these beliefs as expectancies (Tolman, 1959; Rotter, 1955) or subjective probabilities (Edwards, 1954).

Vroom (1982) identified three variables, or determinant of job performance: (a) motivation, (b) abilities and traits, and (c) role perceptions or role clarity. Most of the research on expectancy theory focused on motivation (Steers & Porter, 1975).

Conceptually, expectancy theory was comprised of three key concepts: (a) valence, the extent to which a person values a particular outcome or reward; (b) expectancy, the perceived probability of an outcome occurring as was noted earlier; (c) instrumentality, the extent to which a person believes that his or her performance will lead to a specific outcome or reward (Lauffer, 1985; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991; Vroom, 1982). The theory is often referred to as instrumentality theory instead of expectancy theory.

A positive valence is when a person prefers attaining a particular outcome, and a negative valence is when a person prefers not attaining a particular outcome. It is also important to distinguish between the valence of an outcome to a person and its value to a person. An individual may desire an object but derive little satisfaction from its attainment. There are many outcomes which are positively or negatively valent to a person but are not in themselves anticipated to be satisfying or dissatisfying.

A model that extended the Vroom theory is the Lawler-Porter model. This model is more applications-oriented than the Vroom model. This is not suggesting it is easy to put into practice. It is still a complex procedure, and this theory says it is better to adjust the reward system than try and change the individual.

The expectancy theory has been substantiated in education (Miskel, Defrain, & Wilcoxon, 1980). That successful performance was essential to job satisfaction was concluded in a study of secondary education teachers. Miskel, McDonald, and Bloom (1983) showed a significant relationship between teacher motivation and student
achievement, and both teacher and student attitudes. This study revealed a consistency in expectancy motivation over a school year period.

The methodology of the expectancy theory has been criticized as lacking the power to explain large percentages of variance in criterion variables such as effort and performance (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). It has been argued that the theory over-intellectualizes the cognitive processing used by individuals when making job-related choices (Schwab et al., 1979). The criticisms of expectancy theory have not detracted from its popularity as a measuring instrument for employee satisfaction.

The discrepancy theory proposes that satisfaction/dissatisfaction is a result of the difference between the perceived outcome and the desired outcome. There are two versions of discrepancy theory. One formulated by Katzell and Yankelovich (1975) proposes that satisfaction is a result of actual outcome and what one feels he should get. The other, proposed by Locke (1969), sees satisfaction as a result of discrepancy between perceived outcome and what is wanted. The two approaches are reconcilable (Locke, 1976).

The need fulfillment theory first presented by Schaffer (1953) argued that the degree of job satisfaction depends on the extent to which an individual's needs are fulfilled through his job. Similar emphasis on the importance of differences in both individual motivational variables and work roles in determining job satisfaction may be found in the work of Tannenbaum and Allport (1956) and Ross and Zander (1957).

Hackman and Oldham (1976) presented the job characteristics model as the primary articulation of job enrichment needs. The theory of job characteristics assumes that improved performance and additional responsibilities will result in increased satisfaction and high morale. Hackman and Oldham (1976) suggested that the content of one's job is a determiner of work motivation and that motivation may be increased by enriching certain
job characteristics. The core dimensions are skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback.

Among the follow-up studies involving the job characteristics model are Sashkin and Morris (1984) exploring the dimensions of friendship opportunities and development of close contacts among teachers. The overall satisfaction and quality of work for teachers seemed related to worker's involvement on the job. Harper (1985) applied the job characteristics model of work motivation to elementary and secondary school teachers.

Miskel and Ogawa (1988) suggested that the objective properties of a job must be clearly related to an individual's perceptions of those properties. Some job characteristics are not clearly defined such as job-based feedback. This model should consider revision of tasks among employees to clarify relationships among job characteristics.

Another theory of work motivation similar to expectancy theory is one based on the pursuit of goals. Locke, Cartledge, and Knerr (1970) set as the basic assumptions of goal theory that human behavior has purpose, intentional goal setting controls behavior, and the fulfillment of some end direct actions.

The simplicity of goal theory is an asset for applications in education. Locke, Shaw, Saari, and Latham (1981) claimed the goal-setting approach to motivation has shown a positive work performance in 90% of studies reported. The other reason it has use in the educational setting is that prediction of performance for tasks which are not complex are consistently measurable.

The equity theory of job satisfaction has appeared in the literature under different labels and with some variations. Festinger (1957) labeled it as "cognitive dissonance." Homans (1961) labeled it as "exchange" or "distributive justice." Adams (1963) called it "equity" or "inequity" theory. All these theories argue that the perceived fairness of rewards an employee receives from his or her work determines the job satisfaction.
Homans (1961) and Adams (1963) provided the foundation for equity theory. This was done in studies of cognitive dissonance and social comparisons. Individuals compare their own inputs (e.g., skills, attitude, education, etc.) and outputs (e.g., promotion, compensation, rewards, etc.) to those of fellow employees.

According to equity theory, motivation is triggered by an employee's need for fair treatment (Katzell & Thompson, 1990; Pinder, 1984). Workers become dissatisfied if they perceive a discrepancy with the compensation received and how hard they feel they have worked. If inequity is perceived by workers, dissatisfaction will result (Beck, 1990). Witt and Nye (1992) concluded that fairness was an important part of job satisfaction.

Process theories have been criticized for a number of reasons. Locke (1976) criticized these theories for their limitations in recognizing the nature of man's needs. Because of this, a need can be seen for content theories such as Maslow's needs hierarchy. Another criticism is there is limited empirical data supporting the theories. Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) questioned whether subjects can or will consistently use the information they do have to appropriately make decisions concerning which actions are best. Process theories are difficult to apply, but Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) endorsed them as useful.

**Retention of Teachers**

Retention of teachers in the profession is a major concern for education. Many teachers love teaching, but it is clear frustrations are many. A majority of teachers by a margin of 53% to 47% say that they would not advise a young person to enter the teaching profession (Harris & Associates, 1984).

The relationship of specific skills and abilities to job satisfaction appears to be different for elementary and high school teachers. The greater importance of skills and abilities in the career satisfaction of high school teachers may reflect the basic difference between how high school and elementary school work environments are
structured (Chapman, 1983). Teachers at the high school level tend to make the content area more specific. Elementary teachers feel they have more opportunity to adjust (Chapman, 1983).

New attention to job satisfaction in the teaching environment will hopefully yield insights about teacher morale. Concern for beginning teachers, distress over teacher burnout, and turnovers have caused teacher educators to begin viewing the professional continuum as a paradigm for research and development (Driscoll, 1983).

Research Studies: Job Satisfaction of Elementary and High School Teachers

Elementary teachers who are the most satisfied assigned importance to recognition by administrators and supervisors. They assigned less importance to recognition by their peers. Lortie (1975) observed that teachers who rely on recognition from colleagues are apt to be disappointed and dissatisfied.

Wangberg, Metzger, and Leviton's study (1982) suggested that female elementary teachers are experiencing a significant amount of job dissatisfaction. Some of the reasons Wangberg et al. gave for this dissatisfaction are poor working conditions and the general perceptions of career options. Furthermore, this dissatisfaction is not explained by years of experience. Lortie (1975) reported that teachers are highly intrinsically motivated. Contact with students is the greatest source of satisfaction.

Keeping teachers from leaving the profession is a pertinent issue. Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) reported that those who left education stated that autonomy and salary were the main reasons.

Satisfaction for secondary school teachers is related mostly to recognition and approval of family, friends, and administrators. A basic difference between elementary and secondary teachers is the more elaborate justification for ideas presented by the secondary
teachers. Chapman (1983) stated that teaching at the high school level tends to be more content specific. The content is also confined to a specific time period.

Mason (1961) reported several factors that influenced job satisfaction in teaching. One of these factors is that males are less satisfied with their work than females. A strong commitment to service can be seen as an exception. Fruth (1982) stated that external rewards are not sufficient enough to sustain in teaching the motivation to continue to be satisfied. Fruth (1982) stressed that groups concerned about public schools need to address how the most powerful motivators of performance can be tapped to help improve education.

Organizational Climate Factors Under Investigation

Internal Communication

Communication is a vital component of any organization. Quality communication is crucial with the amount of change occurring today (Ginsburg, 1994). Internal communication is defined as an institution's formal communication processes and style. The communication process involves the exchange of information between a sender and a receiver. Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) saw communication as the lifeblood of an organization. It is the process that links the individual, organization, and groups in the organization. Addressing procedural concerns and solving problems on a group basis require effective communication between teachers and principals; between different teacher groups; and between principal, teacher and students. This process mediates inputs and outputs of an organization. In an open system communication can be defined as "an exchange of messages and meaning between an organization and its environment as well as between its network of interdependent subsystems" (Hanson, 1991, p. 253). Communication is the glue that holds everything together.
In organizations there are different directions for the flow of communication. Communication can travel vertically and horizontally. Anyone working in a hierarchical situation can see a difference in the tone and intensity of information that travels upward in contrast to information that travels downward.

Information that travels vertically is often distorted at each level it travels through. Horizontal communication within the same hierarchical level tends to be less distorted. Lawler and Twombley (1992) and Amey (1994) saw horizontal and vertical communication as equally important. Kornback and Cooke (1979) in their study found that the quality of work life varied between schools, but where vertical communication existed, job satisfaction was higher.

A third type of communication is neither vertical nor horizontal but one that we call traveling through the grapevine. Lewis (1980) wrote that information traveling along the grapevine goes through three changes: (a) The first is leveling or simplifying what is contained in the message; (b) the second is sharpening of vivid details of what is happening; and (c) the last one is assimilation. This makes it fit the needs of an individual. Gould (1982) stated that both teachers and principals tend to perceive the grapevine as a negative aspect of the communication system. This resulted from a study done on two elementary schools in Virginia. She also found that upward communication is more frequent than downward communication in elementary school settings.

Jones (1981) in a study of four rural counties in Tennessee found dissatisfaction with communication of administrators with subordinates. In regard to horizontal communication and upward communication, the respondents felt a sense of satisfaction. Wilson (1981) in a study of 11 elementary schools in Norfolk, Virginia, found a significant relationship between horizontal communication and the motivation level of teachers. Wilson further recommended that administrators interested in developing higher levels of teacher work motivation should advocate and foster horizontal communication.
Communication has been documented as a key contributor to climate (Deas, 1994; Kelly, 1988). Duke (1981) found in a study of 308 business education teachers in Chicago secondary schools that only 38% were satisfied with communication in their school or school system. This study also indicated that teachers wanted improved communication climate. Wilson (1981) found in a study of 234 elementary teachers in Norfolk, Virginia, that there was a significant relationship between the school communication system and teachers' work motivation.


An instrument used often to measure communication satisfaction is the communication satisfaction questionnaire. This instrument was developed by Cal W. Downs and Michael Hazen in 1977. The CSQ consists of 40 organizational communication items which encompass eight components: general organizational perspective, personal feedback, organization integration, communication with superiors, communication climate, horizontal communication, media quality, and communication with subordinates (Nicholson, 1980).
The study of internal communication and other factors are still important today. A *Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983) left many stating a crisis existed. Dehart (1992) said that in the 1990s an argument still exists. Study of the approaches to the educational crisis can help us understand the factors that contribute to successful resolution of emergency situations.

**Organizational Structure**

Organizational structure is defined as the institution's structure and administrative operation. It is the school's hierarchical lines of authority and requirements for operating within that hierarchy. It is the formal arrangements for making and administering policy on education. The new emphasis of the educational reform movement is on redesigning organizational structures. The rationale of redesigning the structures is to use more efficiently human talents, expertise, and energy in providing suitable educational services (Swanson, 1989).

One method at making educational reform efforts productive and substantial was to target those efforts to the individual school. Blueprint 2000 enacted by the Florida Legislature said decisions about teaching and learning should be made as close as possible to the students impacted by those decisions and should reflect a shared responsibility among elected officials, parents, faculty, and community members. The reform movement encouraged professionalizing teaching, including teacher involvement in policy-making decisions at the school level (Carnegie Forum, 1986). Restructuring suggested the creation of institutional arrangements and organizational structures which maximize the effectiveness of the school center and included teacher involvement in policy decisions at the school level (Swanson, 1989).

Organizational structure variables have affected schools in many ways. A study of directors and scientists by Lawler, Hall, and Oldham (1974) focused on the ways climate
mediated the impact of organizational structure and management style, on the one hand, and performance and satisfaction, on the other. The results indicated that there was a strong relationship between management style and climate but very little relationship between structure and climate. Climate, in turn, was strongly related to satisfaction but less to employee performance.

Variable characteristics of organizations which determine organizational climate were described by Forehand and Gilmer (1964) as having direct affect upon individuals. One of these is the structure of the organization (Campbell, 1970). Listed as one of the most common characteristics affecting organizational climate is the degree of structure imposed.

Job satisfaction has been affected by organizational structure. Kast (1977) found six factors leading to both satisfaction and mental health. One of these is the structure of the organization. Relationship between organizational structure and job satisfaction did not always correlate significantly in studies. Jeanette Williams (1981) in a study of 275 elementary teachers in 21 elementary school in New Jersey found that, in general, school structure was not a significant factor on teacher job satisfaction.

Schools at different levels operate with different organizational structures. The relationship of specific skills and abilities to job satisfaction appears to be different for elementary and high school teachers. The greater importance of skills and abilities in the career satisfaction of high school teachers may reflect the basic difference between the structure of the elementary and high school work environment (Chapman, 1983).

**Political Climate**

A political process can be defined as "people shaping policy in the public forum to serve the greater good for most citizens." Chappell (1995) stated that political climate can be defined as the nature and complexity of an organizations internal politics. It can also be the degree to which an employee must operate within a political framework in order to
accomplish his or her task. Levy (1989) defined political climate as the nature and complexity of institutional politics.

What might be gained by political analysis? Baker (1994) outlined three benefits. First, exert one's influence in directions a person views as important and can change schools. Bolman and Deal (1991) saw influence as the use of power, and power to control outcomes is what politics is all about. Second, political analysis attempts to see organizational dynamics realistically. This accepts conflict as a normal part of human affairs (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Conflict can then be controlled. Third, political analysis is flexible. An organization can be examined holistically at the institutional level. This relates to its external environment. The organization can be dissected within at the group level. Finally, it can be looked at very closely at the individual level. Political analysis is a well established branch of educational policy research that has much to give to the understanding of any decision-making process which influences schools. Sisemore (1994) stated that one of the elements in the decision process is understanding the political realities.

Political systems handle conflict and issue ways to implement decisions that are reached. There would be small need for a political system if there were unanimity among people. A political system exists because people have differences.

Steyn (1988) stated that to have a thorough investigation of teacher job satisfaction, certain theories of the concept should be viewed. Job satisfaction or teacher job satisfaction is realized in an organization-education system. It is, therefore, important to understand theories of organizations to understand the education system as a type of organization.

Some factors cause satisfaction while other can cause dissatisfaction. Herzberg saw these on two separate continuums. Whitmore (1994) in research of female elementary teachers found that the main causes of job dissatisfaction are school policies and administration.

Teachers and administrators need to realize politics cannot be eliminated from organizations. Bolman and Deal (1991) noted that it would be naive to think politics
can be eliminated from organizations. Understanding the affect it has upon an organization is vitally important.

**Professional Development**

One of the responsibilities of leadership is to ensure that the followers grow as persons (Harlacher & Gollattscheck, 1994). Herzberg identified growth as a motivator.

Professional development opportunities were defined as the process of updating the technical skills and knowledge of an individual in a professional role (Vest, 1986). Teachers are identified as professionals who have a need to grow (Colombokos, 1963). Chappell (1995) defined professional development opportunities as opportunities for employees to pursue and participate in activities to enhance job performance.

There has been a recent demand by the public for effective performance in education. School districts must determine how to maintain teachers' competency levels in order to provide instruction for students requiring the skills and knowledge to keep pace with a society that is rapidly changing. The organizational need for teacher performance and the personal desire of the teacher to improve create a concern for schools and school districts to develop programs that maintain high teacher performance within schools that encourage high performance levels of both teachers and students (Argyris, 1957).

Professional development opportunities can interact with many variables and factors of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Steyn (1988) identified a number of aspects that can improve job satisfaction. Some of these were training of the teacher, staff development, in-service training, reward system, and school climate. Harr (1990) recommended that enhanced in-service and staff development activities should be provided so that attitudes and behaviors might be influenced. Harr's study implied that educational training level affected satisfaction in a positive direction. Participation in decision making should be offered. Skills in interpersonal communication and small group discussions
should also be developed. Sisemore (1994) found that the decision process depended on staff development. Warner (1981) found that a significant positive relationship exists between the levels of professional preparation and decisional issues.

How is professional development related to organizational climate and/or job satisfaction? Steyn (1988) said a thorough investigation of teacher job satisfaction should look at certain theories. The various ways in which the assessment of job satisfaction can be done deserve attention. Laber (1982) in research of secondary and elementary teachers stated that perceived encouragement in professional development did show association with job satisfaction. Harr (1990) found that in a study of public school teachers in Minnesota that the educational training level of teachers affected satisfaction in a positive direction. It was recommended that quality staff development be implemented. Williams (1993) in a theory based on Herzberg's theory stated that an increase in teaching experience was associated with a decrease in both a desire for professional development incentives and job satisfaction.

Vest (1986) concluded in a study of high school teachers in Knoxville, Tennessee, that a highly predictable and direct relationship was found to exist between teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate and their professional growth and development attitudes. It was also concluded from this research that if teachers' professional growth and development attitudes are known, one can predict the school organizational climate.

Procedures that promote teacher input about their own professional growth and the environment in which that growth takes place also create a climate that positively influences teacher attitudes about that growth (Norton, 1984). Schools that provide a climate encouraging teacher development may keep high standards of learning. Howard, Howell, and Brainard (1987) listed factors to look for in schools with good climate. One of these factors was that students and faculty are improving their skills and knowledge.
Stiles (1993) concluded that the professional growth of teachers will certainly lead to improved climate. Teachers should continually be rewarded as professionals with opportunities for professional growth in staff development.

**Evaluation**

Educational researchers have spent many hours trying to devise a satisfactory measure of teacher competence. This has been going on since the early 1900s. Evaluating teachers has become more and more fashionable. The latter part of the 20th century may be remembered as the period when our attention was focused on teacher quality.

Many states have installed a variety of teacher appraisal programs. They are defended as attempts to improve the quality of schools. These evaluation programs are also seen as either ways to reward good teachers or a way to eliminate incompetent teachers. Popham (1988) stated that all recently mandated teacher evaluation programs are predicated on the belief that we know how to evaluate teachers. Popham (1988) believed this is not true. He does not believe that a good appraisal program exists.

Chappell (1995) defined evaluation as procedures for evaluating employees through positive feedback intended to provide professional growth for the employee. Langley (1994) noted that regular employee evaluations is a process that openly communicated the organization's standards for quality. An organization needs a positive system of evaluation to promote organizational health. Langley also reported that pay systems based on job evaluations are advantageous to help organizations compare salary scales with the market. The collective bargaining process in education emphasizes this approach.

Crissman (1990) in a study of teachers in the initial certification program (ICP) in North Carolina stated that she recommends that supervisors be made aware of how performance is appraised and affects job satisfaction. Teachers might also be given the opportunity to participate as advisors to beginning teachers or as mentors in a staff
development environment for teachers in specific areas (Little, 1985). Mentors should be made aware of the beginning teacher and how the mentor's behavior contributes to the beginning teachers' job satisfaction and intent to remain in teaching. Brown (1990) felt that mentors were the most important persons in providing assistance to the beginning teachers, in relation to job satisfaction.

Education is going through many reorganization designs. Evaluation or appraisal of teachers is part of this process. Different pay systems, certification, and tenure must consider the type of assessment system (Odden & Allan, 1995). Critics of pay systems based on job evaluations, however, have charged that they are part of a bureaucratic ploy to control and manipulate pay scales. Building strong internal communications and trust among employees is one way to influence positively how employees perceive evaluations (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Singleton (1991) examined the relationship between the acceptance of the contractual rules of supervision and/or evaluation for teachers and the implementation of those rules. This research was done in selected public high schools in New York State. Singleton stated the following implication. Although the contractual rules may be working well, it would seem to be important to keep an open mind about the supervisor/evaluative process. There are many programs such as peer coaching, mentoring, and teacher portfolios which are growing. These programs deserve serious consideration as possible tools for the supervision and/or evaluation of teachers.

**Promotion**

Promotion is advancement from within the organization (Chappell, 1995). The idea of promotion from within is an important concept among workers. In a 1993 national study on attitudes in the work force cited by Einberg, advancement opportunity was cited by 37% of the surveys as a "very important" reason for accepting one's current position (Chappell, 1995).
McClelland (1961) described the achievement motive as one that explains teachers' strong need for achievement and their contribution to school effectiveness. Often if achievement needs cannot be expressed in the school, an individual seeks expression (a) organizationally in a negative fashion or (b) extraorganizationally in teacher organizations and unions. Teachers with a strong need for achievement can often be a problem for administrators, but they have the potential to give fully in a spirit of excellence to the school (McClelland, 1961).

Adams (1963) labeled a theory that the perceived fairness of rewards an employee receives from his or her work determines his or her satisfaction. According to equity theory, a person always makes a comparison between the equity of his input/output balance and that of others. Satisfaction is a direct result of this comparison. Atchison (1970) listed one of two outputs as promotion.

These expectations are not always consistent with realities. Pollock (1987) found significant discrepancies between the expectations and realities of job satisfaction expressed by secondary school teachers in the areas of pay, advancement, security, and colleague relations. Promotion or lack of promotion may be affected by different factors. Callas (1993) in a study of teachers salaries in Vermont found lack of education opportunities for teachers in areas far from colleges with graduate education programs may adversely affect their salary scale, promotion, and general staff development. Age and gender may affect promotion. The 25-34 age group seems well aware that promotions and advancements occur at this point in their careers. As chances diminish, they apparently rationalize job wants and needs, lower aspirations and expectations, and accept the available and prevalent reward system (Head, 1986). Sergiovanni (1979) concluded that men seem to have higher levels of aspiration than women and are expected to advance more than women are.

Some have seen promotion as not a high priority for all teachers. Cinaglia (1994) stated that teachers are less concerned with promotion and advancement than factors such as job security and correcting social inequalities.
Teachers can be satisfied with the job overall but dissatisfied with individual aspects of their job. Zeazek (1994) found that teachers were most dissatisfied with the level of support from parents and community, salary, fringe benefits, and opportunities for professional advancement. Forty-five percent of teachers surveyed that were union members and nonmembers in Florida were dissatisfied with promotion opportunities (Hart, 1994).

Promotion can affect absenteeism among teachers. Doran (1986) stated that low-absence teachers are more satisfied with the work itself, pay promotion, and their coworkers than high absence teachers. Stern (1980) concluded that teacher perception of promotion possibility and policy is an important factor in absence rate.

Promotions head the list of external rewards available to the organization because they mean higher pay, greater prestige, and more power. These reasons show the interrelationship that occurs with other factors that may affect job satisfaction.

**Regard for Personal Concern**

Regard for personal concern is defined as an organization’s sensitivity to and regard for personal concerns and well-being of employees (Duncan & Harlacher, 1991; Vroom, 1982). Thor (1993) regarded personal concern as an essential element in all organizations. Regard for personal concern has been associated with a high relationship leader style (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Ohio State initiated research at identifying leader behaviors that are important for the attainment of organizational goals. Two dimensions came from the research that characterize the behavior of leaders in the numerous situations investigating initiating structure and consideration (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991).

Consideration refers to the extent to which a leader exhibits trust, respect, support, and concern for the welfare of subordinates. Smith (1994) studied 30 elementary schools and 30 secondary schools in New Jersey. The findings indicated that principals could
initiate structure in nonauthoritarian ways, and those who did seemed to get the willing compliance of their teachers. Initiating structure, consideration, emotional detachment, influence, and nonauthoritarianism of the principal combined to predict a climate of trust. Consideration was clearly the single most important leadership variable in generating trust.

The Peter Hart survey (1994) in Florida for FEA United found some interesting concerns of teachers. Some of the areas that teachers were most dissatisfied with were discipline policies, salaries, employee input, and promotion opportunities. This study also found that less than 35% of the teachers surveyed were somewhat satisfied with their personal safety.

Pietro (1992) conducted a study to see if perceived level of job satisfaction was affected by their supervisors' high or low effectiveness, communication, consideration, and initiation of structure behavior. The findings indicated paraprofessionals showed the highest satisfaction with supervisors who were rated high in these areas.

**Job Satisfaction Variables Under Investigation**

**Participation in Decision Making**

The levels of teacher satisfaction have been linked with important organizational concerns (Belasco & Alutto, 1972). One of these concerns is participation in decision making. Researchers have demonstrated that participative decision making resulted in the following: (a) increased job satisfaction (Ambrosie & Heller, 1972; Morse & Reimer, 1956) and (b) acceptance of decisions (Melcher, 1976).

Participation in decision making is associated with job satisfaction and satisfaction with the organization in general. Lawler (1986) reported that organizations that provide managers and administrators with the opportunity to participate in decisions promote greater satisfaction in these employees. Thierbach (1980) found that job satisfaction was significantly related to the decisional condition of teachers. Warner (1981) found in a study
of Wisconsin elementary teachers that the level of overall job satisfaction is related to the decision condition of teachers. Flannery (1990) in a study of Wisconsin high school teachers found that job satisfaction was related to teacher interest in decision issues.

Participation or involvement in decision making, as encouraged by the Carnegie Forum (1986), did not distinguish between authority to make a decision and the ability to influence a decision. Authority referred to the legal right to make decisions governing others. Influence referred to the capacity to shape decisions through informal or new authoritative means (Bacharach & Lawler, 1980).

Researchers have been diverse and inconsistent concerning both the definition and implementation of shared decision-making processes (Schweiger & Leana, 1986). Fryer and Lovis (1990) stated power in an organization is exercised through decision making.

Participation in decision making, as described in Lawler's (1992) involvement-oriented approach to management, results in an environment that encourages its leaders to use their expertise rather than their positional authority to get employees involved. Likert (1961) specified eight organizational processes affecting an organization's climate and productivity. One of these factors is decision making.

Kehoe (1993) found in a study of New York middle schools that if schools dramatically create a climate that is too formal and centralize the decision-making power, then that climate may be an unhealthy one. Kehoe chose middle schools for the study because it has not been used before in a study of organizational health. The organizational health index (OHI) has been utilized in elementary school and secondary schools. Middle schools and their teachers are unique and deal with special organizational challenges different from their colleagues in elementary and secondary education.

Whitmore (1994) in a study of female teachers found that centrally managed schools had decisions that were made at the top and filtered down. The current trend from centralized to site-based management at the local level has teachers involved in the decision-making process.
One goal of current reform efforts is to alter the organizational structure of schools so that teachers are included in decision making. This shows that various job satisfaction factors and organizational climate factors may cross over into each other's territory. Taylor (1991) found that there is not much empirical evidence concerning the relationship of decision making to restructuring.

**Autonomy, Power, and Control**

Autonomy, power, and control are the amount of jurisdiction or discretion an employee exercises while performing the tasks of his or her position. Katz (1968) stated that autonomy is not being held in control by other parts of the organization or even by the whole organization. Kaplan (1964) saw power as the ability of one unit to influence or impose its will on another unit. Hansen (1991) explained that teachers having autonomy do not necessarily have power. Corwin (1974) pointed out autonomy and control are independent dimensions. Teachers who are not controlled by outside forces do not have to have internal control. Autonomy is, however, generally necessary for power.

Davis (1981) defined autonomy as the need to do one's job as one sees fit. Power is defined as the ability to command a favorable share of resources, opportunities, and rewards for followers (Harlacher & Gollattscheck, 1994). Fischer (1994) described control as "jurisdiction or discretion in relation to daily events and situations" (p.29).

There are variable characteristics of organization that affect organizational climate. Campbell (1970) saw one of these characteristics as individual autonomy. Colobotos (1962) saw the organizational climate of teaching as autonomous. Halpin and Croft (1963) described the autonomous climate as one in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group. The leader exerts little control over the group members; high esprit results primarily from social needs satisfaction.

Job satisfaction can be affected by autonomy, power, and control. Organizations that gave managers and administrators control over their own work created a higher level of
satisfaction among these employees (Lawler, 1986). The amount of control through empowerment may affect job satisfaction (Kline & Boyd, 1991) Williams (1993) in a study of general and special education teachers found that teacher autonomy had a high effect on perceptions of job satisfaction.

Good teachers leaving the profession is a major concern. Wangberg et al. (1982) suggested that female elementary teachers are experiencing a significant amount of job dissatisfaction. This dissatisfaction appears to be a function of working conditions. Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) reported that those who left teaching indicated salary and job autonomy as the most important determinants.

Muffs (1988) in a study of elementary teachers reported that it indicated teachers who perceived low autonomy, but desired higher autonomy, were less satisfied with their work than other teachers. In addition, these teachers indicated a greater likelihood of defection from teaching. Muffs further stated that his study clearly showed the desire of teachers to have greater autonomy in their work. Such a lack of autonomy increased the likelihood of teacher defection.

Increasing teacher autonomy, power, and control will require the development of procedures that encourage teacher experimentation in the teaching learning process. It will also affect other variables such as teacher evaluation, professional development, shared decision making, and an opening of communication channels. A school's expectations of teachers to act autonomously may require staff development for teachers to learn those skills (Vest, 1986). Muffs (1988) stated that there is a need to address teacher job satisfaction and a need for organizational and staff development.

**Interpersonal Relationships**

Relationships with colleagues is defined as the quality of the affiliation that an employee maintains with his or her peers, subordinates, and supervisor. Herzberg (1959) concluded that some factors in the workplace served as deterrents to dissatisfaction, while
others served as motivators. One deterrent was interpersonal relationships. This has been shown today still to be true. Struble (1993) in a study of schools in northern New Jersey compared the 16 job factors of Herzberg's motivational-hygiene theory. She added five more factors. One was collegiality. The responses were also compared to Sergiovanni's (1967) study. The findings were that these new factors were significant measures of job satisfaction. Climate of an organization can be determined by interpersonal relationships. Vroom (1964) included interpersonal relationships among peers as an important determinant of climate. A review of literature by Hellriegal and Slocum (1974) listed relations, group cohesiveness, task involvement, and the like as determinants of climate.

The relationship of teachers to peers and administrators may affect job satisfaction differently. The more satisfied elementary teachers assigned more importance to recognition by administrators and supervisors but less importance to recognition by peers. Lortie (1975) observed that teachers are often isolated and cut off from each other. Teachers who rely on recognition from colleagues are apt to disappointed and dissatisfied.

Individuals remaining in teaching attached greater value to the recognition and approval of supervisor, family, and friends. Those leaving teaching assigned more importance to salary increases, job challenge, and autonomy (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1986).

Herzberg (1959) also referred to relationship with subordinates as a hygiene factor. Keeping teachers from being dissatisfied with their jobs is an important factor. Du Toit (1993) stated that important types of attitudes that teachers may have that affect their performance are job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment.

Negative attitudes are a cause for concern mainly because they have a detrimental influence on the progress of pupils. Negativism also affects interpersonal relationships of the teaching staff. It is essential that school principals perceive negative tendencies at an early stage (Du Toit, 1993). The ability of the school to operate as a productive
organization is vital. Knoop and O'Reilly (1978) found that school effectiveness is related to satisfaction of teachers with coworkers, with supervision, and with work itself.

Interpersonal relationships between subordinates and supervisors has along with other variables been a factor that influenced job satisfaction. Warr (1991) found in a study of elementary and secondary teachers in the Midwest that three variables were found to have a significant power to predict overall job satisfaction. These variables were pay satisfaction, teaching satisfaction, and satisfaction with supervision. Wippach (1983) stated that communication satisfaction is a significant predictor of teachers' job satisfaction. One of these factors that predicted satisfaction was the relationship with superiors.

The way subordinates perceive how superiors view their relationship with subordinates can also be vital in affecting job satisfaction. Braswell (1986), in a study of the relationship of Texas high school football coaches and their principals, stated that perceptions of subordinates and superiors may be different. He found that principals perceived that teacher-coaches were more involved in the decision-making process of the teaching role than was actually identified by the teacher-football coach. It was recommended that principals should attempt to understand the demands of the dual role and should help coordinate the link between each. Chapman (1984) found a significant correlation between teachers' perceptions of a principal's interpersonal skills and teachers perceptions of the success with which a principal handles other job-related responsibilities. Harlan (1980) found that subordinates perceptions of administrator leadership style do affect subordinate job satisfaction.

**Salary and Benefits**

Salary and benefits are defined as the perceived equity and adequacy of the salary and benefits package received by the employee (Chappell, 1995). The agenda for teachers who do not belong to the union does not differ greatly from that for teachers who do belong to the union. Nonmembers do place somewhat less importance on political action,
grievances, and salaries and benefits, but they still rank salaries and benefits at the top of their list and agree with union members on all other items (Peter Hart Survey, 1994).

Teacher turnover is a concern of present day education. Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) reported that those who left teaching indicated salary and job autonomy as the most important determinants. Martin (1979) mentioned pay, formal communication, centralization, and opportunity as predictors of turnover. A study of Louisiana and Mississippi teachers noted that by far the area they noted as the biggest problem facing teachers was salary and benefits (Cutrer, 1992)

According to Herzberg et al. (1959), salary was a hygiene factor. Herzberg came to an important conclusion that some factors in the workplace served as deterrents to dissatisfaction. These deterrents were referred to as hygiene factors. Head (1986) stated in a discussion of Herzberg that hygiene factors meet the human need to avoid unpleasantness and hardship.

Zelazek (1994) found that in a study of faculty, teacher candidates, education graduates from Central Missouri State University that salary and fringe benefits were one of the areas they were most dissatisfied with. Stecklein (1982) found that one of the major factors of dissatisfaction was salary. Similarly, in a study of Title I elementary schools, Lewis (1981) found that teachers who taught high-achieving students showed a high level of dissatisfaction with the item of salary and benefits.

Equity theory addresses the issue of dissatisfaction and salary. In equity theory, a person always makes a comparison between the equity of his input/output balance and that of the others. Pay is classified as output (Jananshahi, 1986). Equity theory argues that underreward and overreward can lead to dissatisfaction.

Satisfaction can be a product of pay. Kasl (1977) stated that wages and promotion are factors that lead to job satisfaction. Jacobson (1986) showed in her research that pay, promotion, and work itself cause the most job satisfaction. Lambeth (1991) in a study of high school teachers in Texas found that good wages, appreciation, and job security as the
top factors of job satisfaction. By contrast, with a sample that included elementary teachers in Florida, Taylor (1986) found that advancement, salary, and personal life did not contribute to job satisfaction.

Satisfaction with pay can be a predictor of overall job satisfaction. In a survey of teachers using the job description index that was organized into subscales, Warr (1991) found that pay satisfaction can be a good predictor of overall job satisfaction. Pollock (1987) came up with results that indicated that if there is a discrepancy between the expected pay satisfaction of the worker and the actual pay satisfaction, it could have an effect on job satisfaction.

Salary may be a variable that affects job satisfaction. The relationship of salary and benefits with organizational climate factors may also be important in improving performance. Raisani (1988) in an investigation of organizational climate and its relationship to certain job satisfaction factors found that pay and advancement were unrelated to any organizational climate dimension. He did find positive relationships between other factors and variables.

Professional Effectiveness

Professional effectiveness is defined as how the employee perceives his or her overall effectiveness in his or her position (Chappell, 1995). Herzberg et al. (1959) identified the work itself, achievement, and growth as factors that affected satisfaction.

McClelland (1953), in his need for achievement theory, stated that individuals with a high need for achievement are constantly driven to improve themselves and their organizations. Krahe (1981) evaluated the human motivation equation of McClelland within the context of job performance in an applied work setting. It assessed the effectiveness of combining two variables, a measure of perceived skill and a measure of conscious achievement motivation, in predicting job performance. The results indicated that McClelland's variables were modestly, but reliably, predictive of job performance.
Collective Bargaining

The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 or the Wagner Act and the Taft Hartley Act of 1947 provide the legal basis for the private sector collective bargaining. The public sector collective bargaining became much more involved later. In 1959 the first compulsory bargaining law was passed in Wisconsin. Between 1964 and 1974, 31 states passed public employee collective bargaining laws, and a large number of teachers became involved in collective bargaining. As of 1990, 44 states had collective bargaining. Florida passed a comprehensive public employees collective bargaining law in 1974. Collective bargaining in Florida is defined in Florida State Statute 447.201.

Private and public collective bargaining are substantially different. Public collective bargaining can have a substantial impact on such items as salary schedules, fringe benefits, retirement systems, promotion of teachers, and evaluation procedures. This, in turn, can affect organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Lunenburg and Ornstein (1991) summarized that procedures in collective bargaining can establish trust and a sense of collaboration to solve mutual problems. They saw some of the areas that can be handled through collective bargaining as promotion, salary and fringe benefits, professional development, and evaluation.

Kephart (1981) in research of teachers in Nassau and Suffolk counties in New York wanted to explore the relationship of teacher militancy to organizational structure and job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. A strong relationship of militancy to both of these variables was found.

Divers (1980) explored the relationship between job satisfaction and teacher activism in a union. This was conducted in Detroit. Some of the results were the following. Teachers who expressed the most job satisfaction with their work environment tended to be least active in the activities of the union. Conversely teachers who expressed the most job dissatisfaction with their work environment tended to be most active in the union. Teachers
at the high school level tended to be more active in the union than teachers at the middle and elementary school levels. Teachers who entered the teaching profession for extrinsic reasons tended to be more active in the union than teachers who entered for intrinsic reasons.

Omer (1983) studied collective bargaining and the job satisfaction of high school principals. Significant differences were found between the effects of master contract and personnel policy with the principal's role in evaluating teachers. No significant difference existed with respect to teacher morale.

Maupin (1992) looked at alternative bargaining methods in selected California school districts. The results showed that alternative methods brought more involvement of teachers in the budget process and more involvement in the decision-making process. Maupin (1992) felt the majority of districts studied are moving away from traditional, adversarial, industrial unionism and are moving toward cooperative relations.

Devlin (1986) conducted a study to see if a difference existed between levels of job satisfaction by teachers who are accorded collective bargaining rights and those who are not. This study was conducted in Kansas and Missouri. Kansas teachers are accorded bargaining rights while Missouri teachers are not. Results indicated Kansas teachers registered a significantly higher level of satisfaction of all items relating bargaining issues as a source of satisfaction. Missouri teachers were found to be less satisfied with supervisory personnel.

Duplantis (1993) studied the extent of teachers' union activities in the 11 states without favorable collective bargaining legislation and the impact of collective bargaining agreements on teachers' wages, employment rates, and per pupil expenditure. Specifically, six states that negotiated with unions without collective bargaining laws were studied. The results indicated that teachers' unions are actively engaged in collective bargaining with
school boards even though it is not required. It was also found that wage increases were significantly affected.

Faulk (1993) examined the extent to which the collective-bargaining process had influenced subsequent teacher job satisfaction levels within the Louisiana public school district of Vermilion Parish. Significant results were found. Teacher perceptions of teacher job satisfaction before the acquisition of collective bargaining appear to be negative. Teacher and principal perceptions of teacher job satisfaction after the acquisition of collective bargaining appear to be positive. Teachers and principals perceived teachers significantly more satisfied following the acquisition of collective bargaining.
CHAPTER 3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the design for the study. Included is a discussion of the population, a procedure for data collection, the research process, and the data analysis and reporting. Three groups of teachers were studied. These groups were elementary, middle, and high school teachers. These teachers were part of a larger study of the measure of satisfaction among teachers in the district.

Four basic questions were investigated. They are the following:

1. What are the mean levels of satisfaction of teachers on each of the seven measures of organizational climate, reported by the total group, by level of school and by union and nonunion membership?

2. Are there significant differences in the mean level of satisfaction with organizational climate factors when compared by school level and by union and nonunion membership?

3. What are the mean levels of satisfaction on each of the seven characteristics of a teacher's position, reported by the total group by school level, and by union and nonunion membership?

4. Are there significant differences in the mean level of satisfaction on the characteristics of a teacher's position when compared by level of school and union and nonunion membership?

The following are the organizational climate factors in the study.

*Internal communication* is defined as the district's or school's formal communication processes and style.
Organizational structure is defined as the district's or school's structure and administrative operation.

Political climate refers to the nature and complexity of district's or school's politics.

Professional development opportunities are the opportunities for teachers to pursue activities to enhance job performance.

Evaluation and promotion refer to the district's or school's evaluation and promotion process for teachers.

Regard for personal concerns refers to the district's or school's sensitivity to and regard for personal concerns.

The job satisfaction variables under investigation are the following:

Participation in decision making refers to the decision-making process and the opportunity for teacher involvement.

Autonomy, power, and control refer to the degree of autonomy, power, and control of the teachers in their present position.

Relationship with peers refers to how teachers get along with their peers.

Relationship with superordinate refers to how teachers get along with their supervisors.

Salary and benefits refer to the salary and benefits of the school district.

Professional effectiveness refers to the teacher's overall effectiveness in the position.

Population and Sample

The participants for this study were teachers employed in a suburban Florida school district. The population was drawn from all teachers in the district. The institutions included 5 high schools, 7 middle schools, 1 combination middle-high school, and 23 elementary schools.
Procedure for Data Collection

The data for this study were classified as institutional data as well as personal and professional data for each respondent. A descriptive institutional profile was obtained from the school district.

A survey instrument was used to gather data from teachers. This method was used because it can focus on the interrelations of sociological and psychological variables in an educational context (Levy, 1986; Wiersma, 1985). This research technique is effective in dealing with how individuals feel or perceive, how they behave, and their role or status.

This research used a population survey since it elicited the responses from the entire population of teachers in the school district. This population included schools at all levels in the district.

A letter was sent to the school district's county office. This letter provided a brief description of the study, the researcher's educational objective, a request to participate, an explanation of what participation required, the questions under study, an instrument, and a statement of appreciation for their cooperation.

Instrument

The instrument used in this study was found in the original works of Sharon Levy (1989) and Susan Chappell (1995). These instruments served as the basis for the instrument used in this study. Sections B, D, and the last page of the questionnaire found in Appendix A were used to analyze the data.

Levy developed and juried the instrument to find out if the questions under study and the information asked for were clear. Levy did this in two ways. Levy first selected five administrators that were at the community college level. These administrators were asked to jury the instrument. They were asked to address specifically the terminology,
clarity, and comprehension of the instrument in regard to this study. Recommendations were asked for and used if considered necessary.

The second part of the process was to select three administrators to use the instrument. Each one was sent a questionnaire. An interview was conducted to critique the instrument. Suggestions from these individuals enabled the researcher to modify the instrument for a more effective presentation in the study.

Chappell field tested the instrument to insure consistency, reliability, and validity. A t-test procedure was used to affirm that a variety of responses could be obtained when using the instrument and that the questions posed were clear and understandable.

Replication is one of the basic principles of competent research. Systematic replication is the replication of a study with slight modification. The instrument used in this study was developed from the works of Levy (1989) and Chappell (1995) and pilot tested to determine if questions under study and information requested were clear, understandable, and appropriate. This involved the following process.

The researcher selected six teachers in the school district. This included two each from elementary, middle, and high schools. These individuals were informed of the study and asked to jury the instrument. All material was forwarded to them for their review, requesting a critique of the instrument and the solicited demographic information. An interview with each individual teacher followed. These teachers were asked to address specifically the issues of terminology, clarity, comprehension, and appropriateness as they related to the instrument and purpose of the study. Recommendations were sought, considered, and incorporated as necessary.

**Analysis and Reporting Data**

The findings reported in this study were based on the analysis of the data collected from the population of teachers in a suburban school district. These results describe the
consensus of teachers on personal, institutional, and position characteristics related to job satisfaction.

The data collection instrument was a job satisfaction questionnaire which measured seven institutional characteristics. These organizational climate factors were described as follows:

1. Internal communication--the formal communication system.
2. Organizational structure--the school's structure and administrative operation.
3. Political climate--the nature and complexity of institutional politics.
4. Professional development opportunities--the opportunities for teachers' professional development.
5. Evaluation--the school's evaluation process.
6. Promotion--the school's and district's promotion process.
7. Regard for personal concern--the school's and district's sensitivity to and regard for personal concerns.

The instrument also measured seven position variables specific to each respondent which relate to job satisfaction. These job satisfaction variables were the following:

1. Participation in decision making--the decision-making process and the opportunity for the teacher's involvement.
2. Autonomy, power, and control--the amount of autonomy, power, and control in the teacher's position.
3. & 4. Relationship with colleagues--the relationship with peers and supervisor.
4. Salary--the salary which accompanies the teacher's position.
5. Benefits--the benefits which accompany the teacher's position.
6. Professional effectiveness--the teacher's overall effectiveness in the position.
Analysis of Data

The data analysis consisted of two different statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics were used to describe and analyze the responses teachers gave to such questions as gender, ethnic classification, total years teaching at your current position, total years teaching, salary, and level of degree. These data were divided by level of teaching and by union affiliation.

Descriptive statistics were also used to analyze the level of teacher satisfaction with the organizational climate factors. The responses teachers gave to their seven organizational variables were analyzed to find the mean, standard deviation, and to show the number of teachers that responded to each question. These results were given for the total number of teachers. The results were further divided by the level of the school and by membership in the teacher union.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the level of teacher satisfaction with the seven teacher position variables. The responses teachers gave were analyzed to find the mean, standard deviation, and number of teachers that responded to each question. These results were given for the total number of teachers. The results were also subdivided by level of the school and membership in the teaching union.

An analysis of variance was used to see if a significant difference exists between levels of teaching and each of the organizational climate factors. If a difference was found, Scheffe's post hoc test was used to see exactly where these differences occurred. An analysis of variance was used to see if a significant difference exists between union membership and each of the seven organizational climate factors.

An analysis of variance was used to see if a significant difference exists between levels of schools and each of the job position variables. If a difference was found, Scheffe's post hoc test was used to see exactly where the differences occurred. An analysis
of variance was used to see if a significant difference exists between union membership and each of the seven job position variables.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter presents an analysis of the data gathered as a result of this study. The purpose of the study was to describe the level of satisfaction with organizational climate factors and characteristics of the teaching position factors in a suburban Florida school district. A further purpose was to investigate whether differences exist in the measures of satisfaction when compared by school level (elementary, middle, secondary) and by union/nonunion membership.

Table 1 shows that 1,685 surveys were sent to teachers in the district. A total of 769 were returned. This represented a 45.64% return rate. A small proportion of the surveys were returned with some responses missing. All recorded responses were used in the analysis of data.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Sent Out:</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Returned:</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Returned:</td>
<td>38.76%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>45.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This return was lower than 50% for two reasons. First, the study was at the end of the year, and some teachers reported that they were extremely tired and trying to meet deadlines. Second, the questionnaire was too long. The questionnaire passed out to the
teachers involved questions not used in this dissertation. Some teachers felt the questionnaire took too much of their time and would not fill it out for that reason.

Each school site was sent a form letter explaining the survey, a questionnaire that was to be used, and a description of how the survey would be administered. Out of 39 schools contacted, 37 gave permission for a contact person at the school to administer the survey. The remaining two schools were included in the study by using the following methods. One was a middle school. After talking to the principal, a self-addressed envelope with a survey included was put in every teacher's mailbox at the school. The other was an elementary school. All union members were given surveys, as this did not require approval by the administrator. A few weeks after the initial distribution of the questionnaire a follow-up letter was distributed to all teachers through their school mailboxes (Appendix D).

During the summer, one more follow-up was attempted. This was done by sending a form letter, return envelope, and survey to schools with summer school classes. A phone follow-up was also used during the summer. This was done by using a list provided through the school board of all teachers in the district. This list included the teacher's school, home address, and home phone number.

Table 1 shows that 420 surveys were sent out to the high schools, and 257 were returned for a 61.2% return rate. Three hundred seventy-five surveys were sent to the middle schools, and 167 were returned for a 44.5% return rate. Elementary schools were sent 890 surveys and returned 345 for a 38.76% return rate. The total number of returned surveys was 769 for a 45.64% rate of return.

Table 2 gives the frequency and percentage of male and female teachers at the high school level and by union affiliation. The percentages are in relation to the total number of teachers, and that number is 257. There are 93 males and 164 females in the study at the high school level. The mean is in relation to the gender of the teachers in the study at the high school level with 1 representing males and 2 representing females.
Table 3 gives the frequency and percentage of male and female teachers at the middle school level. The table is set up the same way as Table 2, but it is for the middle school. The majority of teachers answering this survey were female with a frequency of 119. The majority of these female teachers are nonunion members as evidenced by the count of 63. This is the largest amount in any one cell.

Table 2

**Frequency and Percentage of Male and Female Teachers at the High School Level by Union Affiliation. M=1.635, SD=.482, N=257**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male: Union Member</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Union Member</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>63.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

**Frequency and Percentage of Male and Female Teachers at the Middle School Level by Union Affiliation. M=1.717, SD=.452, N=166**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male: Union Member</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Union Member</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>71.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 represents elementary school teachers in the study. A total of 340 teachers indicated on the survey if they were male or female. There were 318 teachers that indicated union affiliation; 93.53% of the participants were female with a total of 318. A mean of 1.935 also showed a very high percentage of female teachers.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male: Union Member</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Union Member</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>56.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>34.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>93.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 gives the frequency and percentages for all the groups combined. This shows that 78.77% of the teachers in the survey who answered the section on what sex they were indicated female. The corresponding mean of 1.787 shows this high percentage of female teachers. It also shows that a high percentage of female teachers were union members while the male teachers were split 50/50.

Tables 6, 7, and 8 give the frequency and percentage of teachers by the level they are teaching, ethnic classification, and if they belong to the union or do not belong to the union. Each table also gives the mean for each level. The percentages are calculated according to the total number of teachers at that level. The ethnic classification was represented on the survey as follows:
1: Caucasian
2: Hispanic
3: African-American
4: Asian-Oriental-American Indian
5: Other

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male: Union Member</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Union Member</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>44.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Nonunion Member</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>31.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Total</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>78.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 gives the ethnic breakdown of high school teachers participating in the study. High schools had the highest percentage of minorities in the study with 17.63%. The only American Indian-Asian-Oriental participants were on the high school level.

Table 7 gives the ethnic breakdown of middle school teachers participating in the study. The highest number of African-American representation was at the middle school level with 12.35%. The mean score at the middle school level is 1.253. The percentage of Caucasians in the study at the middle school level was 86.42%. There was only one Hispanic in the study at the middle school level.
Table 6

Frequency and Percentage of High School Teachers by Ethnic Classification, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. $M=1.319$, $SD=.786$, $N=251$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Union</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Nonunion</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>83.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Nonunion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Union</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Nonunion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian: Nonunion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian: Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Nonunion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Frequency and Percentage of Middle School Teachers by Ethnic Classification, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=1.253, SD=.662, N=162

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Union</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Nonunion</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>86.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Nonunion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Union</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Nonunion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental American Indian: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental American Indian: Nonunion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental American Indian: Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Nonunion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows that elementary school teachers that claimed Caucasian as their ethnic background were represented by a percentage of 86.82%. Elementary school had the lowest percentage of African-Americans in the study with a total of 27. That represented 81.9% of the teachers at the elementary school level that participated in the study. The mean score of 1.198 indicated the majority of participants were Caucasian.

Table 9 represents descriptive statistics of the total number of teachers who participated in the survey that answered the ethnic portion of the questionnaire. This table shows that 747 teachers responded to this category with a mean score of 1.250. The frequency count of 650 Caucasians substantiates this mean score. The table also gives the union affiliation for each ethnic classification.

Tables 10, 11, and 12 give the descriptive statistics for teachers who participated in the survey according to salary, level of teaching, and union affiliation. The percentages are calculated according to the total number of teachers involved in that table. The categories are given numerical values from the survey as follows:

1: $20,000-$24,499
2: $25,000-$29,999
3: $30,000-$34,999
4: $35,000-$39,999
5: Over $40,000

The mean score and standard deviation for each level is derived from the preceding classification.

High school teachers had the highest mean score for salaries with a mean of 2.73. Middle school teachers had the second highest with 2.284, while the elementary school teachers were the lowest with a mean score of 2.18. All three levels had most of their teachers in the $25,000-$29,999 category. High school had the least amount of teachers in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Union</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>52.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Nonunion</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>86.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Union</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Nonunion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Union</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Nonunion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian: Nonunion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian: Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Nonunion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Frequency and Percentage of Elementary School Teachers by Ethnic Classification, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=1.198, SD=.572, N=334
Table 9

Frequency and Percentage of all Teachers in Study by Ethnic Classification, Level of School, and Union Affiliation, M=1.250, SD=.671, N=747

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Union</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>47.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Nonunion</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>37.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian: Total</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>87.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Union</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Nonunion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic: Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Union</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Nonunion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American: Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental American Indian: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental American Indian: Nonunion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Oriental American Indian: Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Nonunion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the lowest category with 16.13% and the highest amount in the over $40,000 category with 12.5% of all the high school teachers. This compares with 32.9% of the total middle school teachers in the lowest category and 28.44% of the elementary school teachers in the lowest category. Also, in comparison the middle school teachers only had 8.02% of their teachers in the over $40,000 category, and the elementary school teachers only had 1.8% of their teachers in this category.

Table 10 gives the descriptive statistics for high school teachers by salary, level of teaching, and union affiliation. The high school teachers had the highest mean score for salary with 2.73. This compared with middle school teachers with 2.284 and elementary school teachers with 2.18.

Table 11 gives the descriptive statistics for middle school by salary, level of teaching, and union affiliation. Middle school teachers have 32.09% of their teachers in the lowest pay category. This is in comparison to 16.13% of the high school teachers. The category with the most teachers is the second one. This is also the one with the most number of teachers on the other two levels. The coincides to the average salary in the district of $29,000.

Table 12 gives the descriptive statistics about the salary distribution of elementary school teachers. The highest number of elementary school teachers fall into the $25,000-$29,999 category. The mean score for elementary teachers is 2.18. This means they have lowest average salary among the three levels.

Table 13 represents the descriptive statistics for the number of teachers that answered the salary section of the survey. The mean score for the total teachers was 2.386. The actual average salary for the district is $29,000. This corresponds closely to the mean score for the survey. It is also interesting to note that highest percentage of teachers in the study fall into the number two category.
Table 10

Frequency and Percentage of High School Teachers Salary, Level of School and Union Affiliation. M=2.73, SD=1.268, N=248

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-34,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-35,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

**Frequency and Percentage of Middle School Teachers by Salary, Level of School, and Union Affiliation.** $M=2.284$, $SD=1.248$, $N=162$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-35,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable: Level</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-35,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13

**Frequency and Percentage of all Teachers in the Survey by Salary, Level of School and Union Affiliation. M=2,386, SD=1.183, N=744**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>26.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-29,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>34.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>21.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-35,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 14, 15, and 16 give the descriptive statistics for teachers that participated in the survey according to the level of their degree, their level of teaching, and union affiliation. The percentages are calculated according to the total number of teachers involved in that table. The categories are given numerical values from the survey.

The numerical values given to the categories are the following:

1: Bachelor's
2: Master's
3: Specialist
4: Doctorate

The mean and standard deviation for each table are derived from these categories. The middle school teachers have the highest mean score for any of the levels of teaching. It should be noted that they have the lowest percentage of teachers with a bachelor's degree of any level of teaching in the study.

Middle school teachers had the highest mean for degree obtained with a mean of 1.908. Only 24.54% of the middle school teachers had a degree no higher than a bachelor's. A total of 62.58% of the middle school teachers had a master's degree. Middle schools had the highest percentage of teachers in the study with a master's, specialist, and doctorate.

Table 16 gives the descriptive statistics for elementary school teachers by level of degree, level of school, and by union affiliation. Elementary school teachers had the lowest mean with 1.73. Elementary school also had the highest percentage of teachers with a bachelor's degree with 38.14%. Elementary school also had the lowest percentage of teachers with a master's degree with 48.35%. The mean score of 1.73 is the lowest among the three levels of teachers that participate in the study.

Table 17 represents the descriptive statistics for the number of teachers that answered the degree section of the survey. The mean score for the total teachers in the
survey was 1.816. The percentage of teachers in the survey with bachelor's degrees or lower is 32.44%. The level of degree with the most teachers is a master's degree with 56.07% of the teachers.

Table 14

Frequency and Percentage of High School Teachers by Level of Degree, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=1.87, SD=.642, N=253

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Frequency and Percentage of Middle School Teachers by Level of Degree, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=1.908, SD=.692, N=163

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>62.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Frequency and Percentage of Elementary School Teachers by Level of Degree, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=1.73, SD=.689, N=333

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>48.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable: Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>32.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>31.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>23.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>56.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunion:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency and Percentage of All Teachers by Level of Degree, Level of School, and Union Affiliation, M=1.816, SD=.694, N=749
Tables 18, 19, 20, and 21 give the descriptive statistics for teachers that participated in the survey according to the total number of years they have been teaching, their level of teaching, and union affiliation. The teachers were divided into 10 categories in the following manner:

1: 1 through 4 years
2: 5 through 8 years
3: 9 through 12 years
4: 13 through 16 years
5: 17 through 20 years
6: 20 through 23 years
7: 24 through 27 years
8: 27 through 31 years
9: 32 through 35 years
10: 36 through 39 years

The mean score for the teachers in the survey was 15.039 years. High school teachers had the highest mean with 16.899 years, and middle school teachers had the lowest mean with 13.849 years. The largest number of teachers in the study were in category 6. The largest number of high school teachers in table 18 were in category 7. Middle school had the highest percentage of teachers in the first two categories. Elementary school had the least number of teachers in the last three categories that participated in the study.

Tables 22, 23, 24, and 25 divide teachers that participated in this study by 6 categories that represent how long a teacher has been at their current position. The first three tables also represents what level that the teachers are working. The first three tables also divide the number of teachers by union, nonunion, and total number of teachers in each category. The percentages are in relationship to the total number of teachers at each level.
Table 18

Total Years Teaching of High School Teachers by Categories, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=16.899, SD=8.907, N=238

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Union:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nonunion:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Total:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Union:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Nonunion:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Total:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Union:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Nonunion:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Total:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Union:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Nonunion:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Total:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Total Years Teaching of Middle School Teachers by Categories, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. $M=13.849$, $SD=8.983$, $N=159$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Union:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nonunion:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Union:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Nonunion:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Union:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Nonunion:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Union:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Nonunion:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Total Years Teaching of Elementary School Teachers by Categories, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=14.230, SD=14.230, N=313

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total:</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total:</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total:</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Union:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nonunion:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Total:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Union:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Nonunion:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Total:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Union:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Nonunion:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Total:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Union:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Nonunion:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Total:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Total Years Teaching of all Teachers in the Study by Categories, Level of School, and Union Affiliation. M=15.039, SD=8.677, N=710

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total:</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total:</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total:</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total:</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total:</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total:</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Union:</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Nonunion:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Total:</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Union:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Nonunion:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Total:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Union:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Nonunion:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Total:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Union:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Nonunion:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Total:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The six categories are divided in the following manner:

1. The teacher has been there less than 1 year.
2. This represents 1 through 3 years.
3. The teacher has been there 4-7 years.
4. The teacher has been there 8-11 years.
5. The teacher has been there 12-16 years.
6. The teacher has been there over 16 years.

Table 25 represents the total number of teachers in each category and total number of teachers in each category by union affiliation. The percentages are figured in relationship to the total number of teachers that responded to the category of how long have you have been at your current position.

Table 22 is the frequency and percentage of teachers at the high school level that responded to how long they have been at their current position. The table shows that category 6 has the most respondents with 58. The table also shows that 248 teachers responded to this category. Category 6 represents teachers that have been at their position over 16 years. The percentage of 23.39 is in relationship to the total high school teachers of 248 that responded.

The mean is given at the top of each table. Table 22 has a mean of 3.891 which indicates that the teachers have been in their positions an average of almost seven years. A look at all three tables show that high school teachers have on the average stayed longer at their current position than elementary and middle school teachers that participated in the study.

Table 23 gives the descriptive statistics for middle school teachers and their total years at their current position. The mean score for middle school teachers is 3.107. The category with the most teachers is category 2 with 52 teachers. This category is 1 through 3 years.
Table 22

Total Years of High School Teachers at Their Current Position by Categories, Level of the School, and Union Affiliation. M=3.891, SD=1.632, N=248

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total:</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

**Total Years of Middle School Teachers at Their Current Position by Categories, Level of the School, and Union Affiliation. M=3.107, SD=1.482, N=159**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 gives the descriptive statistics for elementary school for the total amount of years at their current position. The mean score for elementary school teachers is 3.222. The most elementary teachers fall in category 2 which is 1 through 3 years.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total:</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total:</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total:</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 gives the descriptive statistics for high school teachers and total number of years at their current position. The mean score is 3.424. This is the highest for all levels. Category 2 has the most teachers but the other categories have high numbers also.

Table 25

Total Years All Teachers in the Study at Their Current Position by Categories, Level of the School, and Union Affiliation. M=3.424, SD=1.54, N=731

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Union:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nonunion:</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Total:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Union:</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Nonunion:</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Total:</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>24.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Union:</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Nonunion:</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Total:</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>23.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Union:</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Nonunion:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Total:</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Union:</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nonunion:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Total:</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Union:</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Nonunion:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Total:</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1

Research question 1 asked the following question: What are the mean levels of satisfaction of teachers on each of the seven measures of organizational climate, reported by the total group, by level of school, and by union and nonunion membership?

The seven organizational climate measures were the following:

1. Internal communication
2. Organizational structure
3. Political climate
4. Professional development opportunities
5. Evaluation
6. Promotion
7. Regard for personal concern

Teachers rated their satisfaction with each one of the measures on a scale of 1 through 5. These scores were defined in the following manner:

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat satisfied
5. Very dissatisfied

Tables 26 through 33 use descriptive statistics to explain research question 1. Each table has the mean, standard deviation, standard error, count, median, and mode for the total number of teachers that participated in that particular category in the survey. The table also has the same information for each level of teaching included in the study. Each table that divides the teachers by level of teaching does it in the following manner:
1: High school  
2: Middle school  
3: Elementary  

Each table that divides the teachers by union does it in the following manner:

1. Union member  
2. Nonunion member  

Table 26 shows that the highest mean is with elementary school teachers while the lowest mean is with high school teachers. The table indicates that elementary school teachers in this study are more satisfied with the internal communication at their schools than are the middle school teachers and high school teachers. This table also indicates that middle school teachers are more satisfied than are the high school teachers.

Table 26 indicates that the means are very close to being the same regardless of union affiliation. It also shows that the standard deviations for both union and nonunion affiliation are also very close to being the same.

Table 27 shows that elementary school teachers have a higher mean than middle and high school teachers do. This indicates that they are more satisfied with the organizational structure at their job. Table 27 also shows that the means are also almost exactly the same whether the teacher belongs to the union or does not belong to the union. This indicates that the level of satisfaction is very close.

Table 29 shows that the highest mean for satisfaction with political climate by teachers in the study were for the elementary school teachers with a mean of 3.351 with the lowest mean being the high school teachers. The teachers that belonged to the union had a slightly higher mean than the teachers that did not belong to the union.

The descriptive statistics for the variable of professional development is given in Table 30. Elementary school teachers have the highest mean among the three levels with 4.087. The high school teachers have the lowest mean with 3.463. The mean score for all
Table 26

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction with Internal Communication at their Job by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.578</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.525</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

Descriptive Statistics: Teachers Satisfaction with Organizational Structure by Level of School and by Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.409</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.884</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 28

**Descriptive Statistics: Teachers Satisfaction with Organizational Structure by Level of School and by Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.409</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.884</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 29

**Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction with Political Climate at Their Job by Level of School and by Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.028</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction with Professional Development Opportunities by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.463</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.773</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.783</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

teachers in the survey was 3.767. The mean among union and nonunion members is almost identical.

Table 31 gives a descriptive statistical look at teachers' satisfaction with evaluation at their job. This is a very critical area at this time. This particular district is looking at revamping their evaluative tools. It is also a time that tenure is being questioned in public education. This makes this area extremely important.

Elementary school teachers have the highest mean score of 3.777. Middle school teachers have the lowest score with a mean of 3.443. Union members have a slightly higher score than nonunion members with a mean of 3.607 compared to a mean of 3.593 with nonunion members.

The overall mean for promotion is 3.170. Some of the comments by the teachers in the section about what you like and dislike most about teaching were that there is no promotion in this district. The low mean score reflects these comments. The highest mean score is among elementary school teachers with 3.201 and the lowest mean score is for
high school teachers with 3.039. Union members had a higher mean score than nonunion members with a score of 3.282 as compared to 3.034.

Table 31

**Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction with Evaluation by Level of School and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.443</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.777</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.607</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.593</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall mean for promotion is 3.170 reported in Table 32. Some of the comments by the teachers in the section about what you like and dislike most about teaching were that there is no promotion in this district. The low mean score reflects these comments. The highest mean is among elementary school teachers with 3.201 and the lowest mean score is for high school teachers with 3.039. Union members had a higher mean score than nonunion members with a score of 3.282 as compared to 3.034.

Regard for personal concern was another important area as noted by the comments of the teachers. Many of the teachers felt that the school board and administration did not care at all about the teachers. They also felt the community as a whole did not care about the teachers.

The overall mean of 3.421 reported in Table 33 was low when compared to the means of the variables. High school teachers had the lowest mean of 3.152 while the
elementary school teachers had the highest mean of 3.626. The means of the union and nonunion members was almost the same.

Table 32

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction with Promotion by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.039</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.144</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.201</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.034</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concern by Level of Teaching and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>1.3339</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.413</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.626</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

Research question 2 asked the following question: Are there significant differences in level of satisfaction with organizational climate factors when compared by school level and by union/nonunion membership?

The seven organizational climate factors were the following:
1. Internal communication
2. Organizational structure
3. Political climate
4. Professional development opportunities
5. Evaluation
6. Promotion
7. Regard for personal concern

Teachers rated their satisfaction with each one of the measures on a scale of 1 through 5. These scores were defined in the following manner.
1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat satisfied
5. Very satisfied

Tables 34 through 47 use an analysis of variance and Scheffe's post hoc test to see if there are differences between the levels of teaching with each one of the variables. An analysis of variance is also used to see if there is a difference between union members and nonunion members with their level of satisfaction with each variable. The significance is at the .05 level. If a significant difference was found, then the post hoc test was used to see where the actual differences occurred. Scheffe's test was used because it is generally regarded as the most conservative post hoc test.
Table 34 indicates that a significant difference exists between levels of teaching at the .05 level. It also indicates that there is no significant difference between union members and nonunion members in regard to internal communication.

The post hoc test in Table 35 indicates that a significant difference exists between high school and elementary level teachers in regard to satisfaction with internal communication. The post hoc test also indicates that a significant difference exists between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers with their satisfaction with internal communication. The test does not indicate a difference between high school and middle school teachers.

Table 34

Analysis of Variance: Teacher Satisfaction with Internal Communication by the Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.448</td>
<td>39.724</td>
<td>25.729</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.5702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 35

Scheffe's Post Hoc Test: Teacher Satisfaction with Internal Communication by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.1516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.717</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.476</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.0003 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 36 indicates that a significant difference exists between levels of schools in regard to satisfaction with organizational structure. The table also indicates that there is no significant difference between union membership in regard to satisfaction with organizational structure.

The post hoc test in Table 37 indicates that a significant difference exists between the high school and elementary levels with satisfaction with organizational structure. There is no significant difference between the other levels.

Table 36

**Analysis of Variance: Teacher Satisfaction with Organizational Structure by Level of School and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.127</td>
<td>17.563</td>
<td>12.567</td>
<td>&lt;.0001  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.285E-4</td>
<td>2.285E-4</td>
<td>1.576E-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 37

**Scheffe's Post Hoc Test: Teacher Satisfaction with Organizational Structure by Level of School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.4226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.475</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.00001  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.01610  *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
The analysis of variance in Table 38 indicates that a significant difference exists between level of school and satisfaction with political climate among the teachers that participated in the study. Table 38 also indicates that no significant difference exists between union and nonunion affiliation in regard to satisfaction with political climate.

The post hoc test in Table 39 indicates that a significant difference exists between high school and elementary schools when it comes to satisfaction with political climate at their jobs. The post hoc test also indicates that a significant difference exists between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers when it comes to political climate. The test does not indicate a significant difference between high school and middle school teachers in regard to satisfaction with political climate.

Table 38

**Analysis of Variance: Teacher Satisfaction with Political Climate by Level of School and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51.338</td>
<td>25.669</td>
<td>19.896</td>
<td>.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.3751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 39

**Scheffe's Post Hoc Test: Teacher Satisfaction with Political Climate Between Level of School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.7549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.549</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.464</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 40 indicates that a significant difference exists between levels of teaching when it comes to satisfaction with professional development opportunities at their job. Table 40 does not indicate that a significant difference exists with satisfaction with professional development opportunities between union membership.

The post hoc test in Table 41 indicates that a significant difference occurs between high school and elementary school when it comes to satisfaction with professional development opportunities. There also is a significant difference in the levels of satisfaction between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers when it comes to satisfaction with professional development opportunities. Elementary school teachers are more satisfied with their opportunities for professional development.

Table 40

**Analysis of Variance: Teacher Satisfaction with Professional Development Opportunities by Level of School and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.230</td>
<td>32.615</td>
<td>28.912</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.9007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 41

**Scheffe's Post Hoc Test: Teacher Satisfaction with Professional Development Opportunities Between Level of School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.5709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.624</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.512</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 42 indicates that a significant difference in the satisfaction with evaluation exists between the levels of teaching. The table also indicates that there is no significant difference between union affiliation in the area of satisfaction with evaluation.

The post hoc test in Table 43 indicates that there is a significant difference between high school teachers and elementary school teachers in regard to satisfaction with evaluation. The test also indicates that there is a significant difference between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers when it comes to satisfaction with evaluation, but not between middle school teachers and high school teachers.

Table 42

Analysis of Variance: Teacher Satisfaction with Evaluation by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.273</td>
<td>10.137</td>
<td>7.821</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.8741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 43

Scheffe's Post Hoc Test: Teacher Satisfaction with Evaluation Between Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.9943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.0029 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.0082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
The descriptive statistics in Table 3 show that the elementary school teachers have a higher mean score when it comes to satisfaction with evaluation. There mean is 3.777. Middle school teachers have a mean of 3.443, and high school teachers have a mean of 3.455. This indicates a higher level of satisfaction for elementary school teachers.

Table 44 indicates that a significant difference exists between levels of teaching and satisfaction with promotion and also indicates a significant difference exists between the levels of satisfaction with promotion and union affiliation. Many teachers in the study seemed to think that there was no chance for promotion in the district.

The post hoc test indicates that a significant difference exists between high school teachers and elementary school teachers when it comes to satisfaction with promotion. The mean of elementary school teachers is higher than the mean for high school teachers. This indicates a higher level of satisfaction with the elementary school teachers.

The post hoc test in Table 45 indicates that a significant difference exists between the union members and nonunion members when it comes to satisfaction with promotion. The union members have a higher mean score than the nonunion members. This would indicate a higher level of satisfaction for the union members.

Table 44

Analysis of Variance: Teacher Satisfaction with Promotion by Level of School and by Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.795</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>3.569</td>
<td>.0287 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.218</td>
<td>11.218</td>
<td>9.227</td>
<td>.0025 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 45

Scheffe's Post Hoc Test: Teacher Satisfaction with Promotion by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.6371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.0305 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.4225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 46 indicates that there is a significant difference between levels of teaching when it comes to satisfaction with the teachers' feelings of how the administration and community feel about the teachers. The regard that the teachers feel that administration and the community hold for the teachers is a major concern not only by the rating it receives but also by comments made by the teachers at the end of the survey. Many of the teachers feel one of the major problems that they face is a total disregard for the welfare of the teachers. They feel that the teaching profession is not held in high regard. The table also does not see a significant difference when it comes to this question according to union membership.

The post hoc test in Table 47 indicates that a significant difference exists between high school teachers' level of satisfaction with regard for personal concern and elementary school teachers' regard for personal concern. The mean score for elementary school teachers was 3.626 while the mean score for high school teachers was 3.152. The elementary school teachers seem to be much more satisfied with this area.
Table 46

Analysis of Variance: Teacher Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concern by Levels of Teaching and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.152</td>
<td>16.576</td>
<td>9.445</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.9562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 47

Scheffe's Post Hoc Test: Teacher Satisfaction with Regard for Personal Concern Between Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.471</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.2344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Research Question 3

Research question 3 asked the following question: What are the mean levels of satisfaction on each of the seven characteristics of a teachers position reported the total group by school level and by union/nonunion membership.

The seven organizational climate measures were the following:

1. Internal communication
2. Organizational structure
3. Political climate
4. Professional development opportunities
5. Evaluation
6. Promotion
7. Regard for personal concern

Teachers rated their satisfaction with each one of the measures on a scale of 1 through 5. These scores were defined in the following manner:

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat satisfied
5. Very dissatisfied

Tables 48 through 54 used descriptive statistics to explain research question 3. Each table has the mean, standard deviation, standard error, and count for the total number of teachers that participated in that particular category in the survey. Each table also has the same information for each level of school included in the study.

Each table that divides the teachers by level of school does it in the following manner:

1. High school
2. Middle school
3. Elementary school

Each table that divides the teachers by union does it in the following manner:

1. Union member
2. Nonunion member

Table 48 gives the descriptive statistics by level of school and by union or nonunion membership. Elementary school teachers have the highest mean score for satisfaction with
decision making. The mean score of elementary school teachers is 3.765. The standard deviation of elementary school teachers is also smaller than the other two levels.

Table 48

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction With Decision Making by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.445</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.195</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.168</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.765</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.512</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonunion members have a slightly higher mean score with satisfaction with decision making than union members. The standard deviation for nonunion members is also smaller. One of the goals going into the 21st century is to involve teachers more in decision making. This is a very important area of concern.

Table 49 shows that elementary school teachers have the highest mean score for teacher satisfaction with autonomy, power, and control; high schools have the second highest mean with 3.467; and middle schools are last with 3.299. The mean score for all the teachers is 3.567. Elementary schools have the lowest standard deviation among all three levels with 1.124.

Table 49 shows that nonunion members have a higher mean score than do union members. The mean score of nonunion members is slightly less than union members with a standard deviation of 1.189.
Table 49

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction With Autonomy, Power, and Control by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.299</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.517</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.658</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50 gives the descriptive statistics by levels of teaching and by membership in the union. The mean score for elementary teachers of 4.417 is the highest mean score for any level of any organizational climate variable. The mean score of 4.199 for all teachers in the survey is the highest mean score of any organizational climate factors. This underscores the importance that teachers consider the relationship with their peers in achieving satisfaction at their job.

Table 50 shows that nonunion members have a slightly higher mean score than do union members with satisfaction with the relationship with their peers. The mean score for nonunion members 4.242. The mean score for union members is 4.180.

Table 51 gives the descriptive statistics for the teachers' relationship with their supervisor. The mean score of 3.932 for all teachers is 3.932. This is the second highest mean score among all organizational climate factors. Elementary school teachers have the highest mean score of 4.174. High school teachers have a slightly higher mean score than middle school teachers. The standard deviation for all teachers in the study is 1.222. This
compares to a standard deviation of .978 for the relationship with peers variable. This shows more of a variance from the mean score for this organizational climate factor.

Table 50

**Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction With Relationship with Relationship with Peers by Level of School and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.199</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.930</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.162</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.242</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51

**Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction with Their Relationship with Their Supervisor by School Level and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.932</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.739</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.174</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.997</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonunion members have a slightly higher mean score for this factor than do union members. The mean score for nonunion members is 3.997. The mean score for union members is 3.889.

Table 52 gives the descriptive statistics for teacher satisfaction with salary. The mean score of 1.823 is the lowest mean score of any organizational climate factors. This shows the dissatisfaction teachers have with their salaries. The highest mean score for satisfaction with salaries is for elementary school teachers. This score is 1.936. High school teachers have a slightly higher mean score than middle school teachers.

Table 52 shows that nonunion members have a higher mean score than union members do with this factor. The difference is .224. This is the second largest difference between union and nonunion members among organizational climate factors.

### Table 52

**Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction With Salary by Level of School and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.723</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53 shows that teacher satisfaction with benefits has the second lowest mean score among organizational climate factors. High school teachers had the lowest mean score with 2.389 and the least variance with a standard deviation of 1.164. Elementary school teachers had the highest mean score with 2.643 but had the highest variance with a mean score of 1.289.

Table 53 shows that nonunion members had a higher mean score than union members. The mean score for nonunion members was 2.652 while it was 2.410 for union members. The difference of .242 was the most for any organizational climate factor for union affiliation.

Table 53

**Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction With Benefits by Level of School and Union Affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.515</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.389</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.443</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.652</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54 shows that teachers give their satisfaction with professional effectiveness as the third highest mean score among organizational climate factors. The highest mean scores are for relationships with peers and supervisors. The mean score for this variable is 3.736.
Elementary school teachers have the highest mean score among levels of teaching with a mean score 3.913. Elementary school teachers also show the least variance with a standard deviation of 1.047. High school teachers have the lowest mean score for satisfaction with professional effectiveness with a mean score of 3.576.

There is very little difference between the mean scores of union members and nonunion members with this variable. Nonunion members have a slightly higher mean score with 3.617. Union members have a mean score of 3.576.

Table 54

Descriptive Statistics: Teacher Satisfaction With Professional Effectiveness by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.736</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.576</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.617</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.913</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.735</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.739</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

Research question 4 asks the following question: Are there significant differences in the mean level of satisfaction with the characteristics of teachers position when compared by level of school and union/nonunion membership?

The seven teacher positional characteristic variables were the following:

1. Decision making
2. Autonomy, power, and control
3. Relationship with peers
4. Relationship with supervisors
5. Salary
6. Benefits
7. Professional effectiveness

Teachers rated their satisfaction with each one of the variables on a scale of 1 through 5. The higher the score, the more satisfied they were with the variable. These scores were defined in the following manner.

1. Very dissatisfied
2. Somewhat dissatisfied
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat satisfied
5. Very satisfied

Tables 55 through 68 use analysis of variance and Scheffe's post hoc test. The analysis of variance was used to see if there is a significant difference between level of school or if there is a significant difference between union membership in regard to satisfaction with the teacher positional variables. A post hoc test was used to follow if a significant difference was found between levels. The test is Scheffe's post hoc test. This was used to see where the differences would actually be.

Each table divides the teachers by level of school. This is done in the following manner:

1. High school
2. Middle school
3. Elementary school
Each table that divides the teachers by union does it in the following manner:

1. Union member
2. Nonunion member

The analysis of variance for teacher satisfaction with decision making is reported in Table 55. The $p$ value of $<.0001$ is significant at the .05 level with regard to this variable by level of teaching. The $p$ value of .2837 for union affiliation is not significant at the .05 level. The means of union and nonunion members is very close. Nonunion members is slightly higher with a mean of 3.512.

Table 55

| Analysis of Variance for Teacher Satisfaction with Decision Making by Level of School and Union Affiliation |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|
| Source      | DF    | SS    | MS    | F Ratio | $p$ Value  |
| Levels      | 2     | 64.341| 32.170| 20.107  | $<.0001$*   |
| Union       | 1     | 1.918 | 1.198 | 1.151   | .2837       |

* Significant at $\leq .05$ level.

The post hoc test is Scheffe's multiple comparison test. The post hoc test in Table 56 indicates that a significant difference exists between the high school and elementary level with satisfaction with decision making. This test also indicates a significant difference exists between middle school teachers and elementary teachers in regard to this variable. No difference is found between middle school and the high school level.

The analysis of variance for teacher satisfaction with autonomy, power, and control is reported in Table 57. The $p$ value of $<.0001$ indicates a significant difference exists between levels of teaching in regard to teacher satisfaction with autonomy, power, and control. The $p$ value of .1116 indicates that no significant difference exists between union and nonunion members in regard to this variable.
Table 56

Post Hoc Test for Teacher Satisfaction with the Decision Making by the Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.9973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.443</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.0005 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at <.05 level.

Table 57

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Satisfaction with Autonomy, Power, and Control by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.892</td>
<td>14.446</td>
<td>10.190</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>.1116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at <.05 level.

The post hoc test in Table 58 indicates that a significant difference exists between the high school level and elementary level in regard to teacher satisfaction with autonomy, power, and control at the .05 level. The test also indicates that no significant difference exists between the high school level and middle school level with this variable. The mean of 3.771 for elementary school teachers is higher than both of the other two levels. This would indicate that they are more satisfied.
Table 58

Post Hoc Test for Teacher Satisfaction with Teacher Satisfaction with Autonomy, Power, and Control by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.3676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.0084 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.0002 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at <= .05 level.

The analysis of variance for teacher satisfaction with relationship with peers is reported in Table 59. The p value of <.0001 indicates that a significant difference exists between levels of school and teacher satisfaction with their relationship with peers. The p value of .3866 indicates that no significant difference exists between union and nonunion members in regard to this variable.

The post hoc test in Table 60 indicates that a significant difference exists between high school and elementary teachers in regard to teacher satisfaction with relationship with peers. The test also indicates a significant difference exists between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers in regard to this variable. No significant difference is found between the high school level and middle school level.

Table 59

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Satisfaction with Relationship with Peers by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.289</td>
<td>17.645</td>
<td>19.329</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.3866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 60

Post Hoc Test for Teacher Satisfaction with Relationship with Peers by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.0515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.487</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>&lt;.00001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.0181 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

The analysis of variance for teacher satisfaction with the relationship with supervisors is reported in Table 61. The p value of <.0001 is significant at the .05 level with regard to level of school. The p value of .2309 for union affiliation is not significant at the .05 level.

The post hoc test in Table 62 indicates there is a significant difference between high school and elementary school teachers with their satisfaction with the relationship with their supervisors. The test indicates a significant difference exists between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers with this variable. The test indicates no difference exists between high school and middle school teachers.

Table 61

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Satisfaction with Relationship with Supervisors by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.511</td>
<td>18.256</td>
<td>12.598</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.141</td>
<td>2.141</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.2309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 62

Post Hoc Test for Teacher Satisfaction with the Relationship with Supervisors by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.9973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>&lt;.0001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.443</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.0005 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

The analysis of variance for teacher satisfaction with salary is reported in Table 63. The *p* value of .0467 is significant at the .05 level with regard to level of teaching. The *p* value of .0077 for union affiliation also indicates a significant difference at the .05 level. The mean score for union members is 2.410. The mean score for nonunion members is 2.652.

The post hoc test in Table 64 indicates there is no significant difference between high school and middle school teachers in regard to teacher satisfaction with salary. The test also indicates no significant difference exists between high school and elementary school teachers pertaining to this variable. The post hoc test indicated no significant difference existed between middle school and elementary school teachers with this variable.

Table 63

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Satisfaction with Salary by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.014</td>
<td>4.007</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>.0467 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.201</td>
<td>9.201</td>
<td>7.152</td>
<td>.0077 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 64
Post Hoc Test for Teacher Satisfaction with Salary by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.9954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.1451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the <= .05 level.

The analysis of variance for teacher satisfaction with benefits is reported in Table 65. The p value of .0316 indicates a significant difference exists at the .05 level with benefits by level of school. The p value of .008 also indicates a significant difference exists at the .05 level with this variable according to union affiliation.

The post hoc test reported in Table 66 indicates a significant difference exists between the high school level and elementary school level with teacher satisfaction with benefits. No significant difference was found between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference was found between the high school and middle school levels with this variable.

Table 65
Analysis of Variance for Teacher Satisfaction with Benefits by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.631</td>
<td>5.316</td>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>.0316 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.716</td>
<td>10.716</td>
<td>7.067</td>
<td>.0080 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the <= .05 level.
Table 66

*Post Hoc Test for Teacher Satisfaction with Benefits by Level of School and Union Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.9081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.0451 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.2295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <=.05 level.

The analysis of variance for teacher satisfaction with professional effectiveness is reported in Table 67. The p value of .0003 indicates a significant difference exists with teacher satisfaction with professional effectiveness at the .05 level. Table 67 also indicates no significant difference exists with this variable according to union membership.

The post hoc test in Table 68 indicates a significant difference between high school and elementary teachers in their satisfaction with professional effectiveness. The test also indicates a significant difference exists between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers in regard to this characteristic. No difference was seen between high school teachers and middle school teachers. A look at the means of the three levels shows that middle school teachers and high school teachers have means that are very close in value. The mean of high school teachers is 3.576, and middle school teachers is 3.617. The mean of elementary school teachers is 3.913.
Table 67

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Satisfaction with Professional Effectiveness by Level of School and Union Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ration</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.777</td>
<td>9.889</td>
<td>8.166</td>
<td>.0003 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.9562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Table 68

Post Hoc Test for Teacher Satisfaction with Professional Effectiveness by Level of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrasts</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Critical Difference</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v2</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.9325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v3</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.0011 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v3</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.0173 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the <= .05 level.

Discussion of Teachers Comments

Part of the questionnaire filled out by the teachers was an optional page that included two questions. These questions were as follows: What do you like or dislike most about teaching? The answers were many and varied. This section discusses the comments of the teachers in this study.

Another source of teacher comments came from individual conversations with the author. Each school site had a person that organized the dispersing and collection of the questionnaire. Comments about each individual school came through these people at each
One more source of comments came from the phone follow-up conducted by the author. Some people offered a very detailed perception that they had about their profession.

One teacher at an elementary school would not immediately fill out the questionnaire because the teacher felt it would be used against them. The author assured this person that these questionnaires would never be seen by anyone else. The teacher said they had seen too many instances when the administration used comments made by teachers to retaliate against them. One other teacher talked for over one hour on the reason why they had not been rehired and had good evaluations. There were five more teachers agreeing to filling out the questionnaire if they were assured that no one would see their questionnaire. Many felt a low trust for the school board and county office.

There were essentially 13 broad headings that teachers put down as to what they liked most about teaching. The top four areas were working with students, interaction with students, making a difference in the life of students, and making students better. Table 69 lists their responses by level and gives the total for each response from all three levels.

Working with students and interaction with students in Table 69 might be seen as very close in meaning. The difference is seen that you could work with students and enjoy it but not have an overabundance of interaction with them. The headings, making a difference and making students better, are also seen as being very close in meaning. High school teachers answered the first two questions 106 times. This was out of 257 teachers or 42.02%. Elementary school teachers put down the first two headings 112 times out of 345 elementary school teachers in the study. This is a percentage of 32.46.

High school teachers used the heading, making a difference, 23 times. Elementary school teachers also used this heading 23 times. High school teachers used the heading, making students better, 18 times. This is 7% of the high school teachers in the study. Elementary school teachers used this heading 20 times for 5.79% of the total of 345
elementary school teachers in the study. Middle school teachers used this heading 12 times for 7.19% of the total of 167 middle school teachers in the study.

Table 69

Descriptive Statistics: What Teachers Like Most About Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working With Students</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>45.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction With Students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Difference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Students Better</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With Colleagues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge(Job)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Off</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (Intrinsic)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement In Decision Making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=456. Respondents to this question numbered 456 out of 769 teachers.
Autonomy was used as a comment 13 times. Out of this nine were high school teachers. Creativity was used by 11 teachers. Ten of these teachers were elementary school teachers. Working with colleagues was used 16 times. Nine of these were by elementary school teachers. Ten teachers mentioned time off. Six were middle school teachers.

Table 70 gives the descriptive statistics for what teachers dislike most about teaching. The area most often cited by teachers is salary. Seventy-three high school teachers named this area while 50 middle school teachers and 104 elementary school teachers named this area as the one they most disliked. This was a total of 227 teachers.

The second most named area was the discipline of the students. Thirty-seven out of 257 high school teachers named this area as the one they disliked the most. Thirty-one out of 167 middle school teachers saw discipline as a major problem. Only 30 out of 345 elementary school teachers cited this problem.

The third most named area for dislike was paperwork. Thirty high school teachers, 8 middle school teachers, and 39 elementary school teachers named this area as what they disliked about teaching.

Lack of respect from the community was the fourth most named area of dislike. Seventeen high school teachers, 14 middle school teacher, and 33 elementary school teachers named this area as the one they most disliked about teaching.

Politics was the fifth most named area for dislike. Forty teachers in the study named this area. Twenty of these teachers were on the high school level; 12 were on the middle school level; and 8 were on the elementary level. This was a much higher percentage of high school teachers than the other two levels.

Parents were seen as a problem by 40 teachers. Twenty-four of these teachers were on the elementary level; 10 were on the middle school level and 6 were on the high school level. This is a large proportion of elementary school teachers compared to high school teachers.
Table 70

Descriptive Statistics: What Teachers Dislike Most About Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Respect</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Appreciation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Apathy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Teaching Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=714. Respondents to this question numbered 714 out of 769 teachers.
Administrators was sixth in most disliked about teaching. Seventeen high school teachers out of 257 named this area while 14 middle school teachers and only 7 elementary school teachers cited this reason.

Seventh on the list was the lack of care and support from the school board. Many teachers felt the school board could care less about what went on in the classroom. This feeling was spread fairly evenly among the three levels of teaching.

Eighth was a dislike for your colleagues. Elementary school teachers named this as what they liked more than the any of the other levels. Likewise, they named this the least about what they disliked. Only three elementary teachers and three middle school teachers named this reason. Fourteen high school teachers named this as what they dislike most about teaching.

Other areas named in Table 70 were class size, lack of appreciation, student apathy, benefits, facilities, funding, moving teaching assignments, lack of involvement in decision making, and the legislature.

Summary

This study analyzed teacher job satisfaction in a suburban Florida school district. Four questions were asked. Questions 1 and 3 used descriptive statistics to analyze teachers' satisfaction with seven variables of organizational climate and seven teacher positional characteristics.

Question 2 used analysis of variance to see if there were differences between levels of teaching and satisfaction with organizational climate factors. Question 2 also used an analysis of variance to analyze if there was a difference with teacher satisfaction according to union membership with the organizational climate factors. All seven factors showed a significant difference between levels of teaching. Promotion was the only factor that showed a significant difference between union membership.
A post hoc test developed by Scheffe was used to find out where the significant differences existed between levels. A difference was found between high school and elementary teachers on all seven factors. A significant difference was found in five of the factors between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers. The two factors where no significant difference was found was promotion and regard for personal concern. No difference was found between middle school teachers and high school teachers with any of the factors.

Question 4 used analysis of variance to see if there were significant differences between levels of teaching and satisfaction with seven teacher position characteristics. An analysis of variance was used to analyze if there was a difference between union membership and satisfaction with seven teacher position characteristics. A significant difference was found with two position characteristics. These characteristics were salary and benefits.

A post hoc test was used to see where the significant differences existed between levels of teaching. A difference was found between high school and elementary levels in six out of the seven teacher position characteristics. Salary was the only characteristic where no difference was found. A significant difference was found between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers in five out the seven characteristics. Salary and benefits were the two characteristics where no difference was found. A significant difference was not found between high school and middle school teachers in any of the characteristics.

Tables 1 through 25 give descriptive statistics describing the population of the teachers in the study. Some of the topics in the tables were gender, ethnic classification, grouping by salary, level of degree earned, number of years taught, and number of years a teacher was at their current position. These tables were divided further by level of teaching and union affiliation.
Teachers were also asked what they liked and disliked most about teaching. Table 69 lists by the number of teachers and percentage of total teachers answering the question what they liked most about teaching. Table 70 lists by the number of teachers and percentage of the total teachers answering the question what they disliked most about teaching.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was an investigation of the institutional and position characteristics which contributed to the job satisfaction of teachers in a large suburban Florida school district. The study was part of a larger study on teacher job satisfaction being conducted. The population of the study was 769 teachers on the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

This chapter analyzes the results of the four questions reported in Chapter 4. Question 1 reports the mean level of satisfaction teachers in the district have with seven organizational climate factors. This information is reported for all the teachers in the district. It is also reported by school level and by union affiliation.

Question 2 uses an analysis of variance to find out if any significant difference exists between the three levels of school and the measures of satisfaction with the seven organizational factors. A post hoc test is used if a significant difference is found between levels of schools to find out exactly where the differences do exist. An analysis of variance is also used to find out if a significant difference exists between union affiliation with each one of the seven organizational climate factors.

Question 3 reports the mean level of satisfaction that teachers in the district have with seven teacher position characteristics. This information is reported for all the teachers in the district. It is also reported by school level and union affiliation.

Question 4 uses an analysis of variance to see if there is a significant difference in the measures of satisfaction with teacher position characteristics by the level of school and by union affiliation. If a significant difference is found between the levels of schools, then a post hoc test was used to find out exactly where these differences exist. An analysis of
variance was also used to see if a significant difference existed between union affiliation and each of the seven teacher positional characteristics.

The percentages of questionnaires returned in the study was 45.64% of the teachers surveyed. This ranged from 38.76% for elementary teachers to 44.5% for middle school teachers and 61.2% for high school teachers.

The return was lower than 50% for two reasons. First, the study was at the end of the year, and some teachers reported they were tired and trying to meet deadlines. Second, the questionnaire was too long. The questionnaire passed out to the teachers involved questions not used in this dissertation. Sections B, D, and the last page of the questionnaire found in Appendix A were used to analyze the data. Some teachers felt the questionnaire took too much of their time and would not fill it out for this reason.

The number of teachers answering the section on gender was 763. This compares with 1,685 teachers that were sent surveys. The number of female teachers in the study was 601. This represented 78.77% of the total teacher population that participated in the study. The number of male teachers in the study was 162. This represents 21.23% of the teachers in the survey. The actual female percentage in the district is 80.6%. The actual male percentage in the district is 19.4%.

The number of teachers that answered the question about union affiliation was 744. The number of union members was 422. The number of nonunion members was 322. The union membership represented 56.7% of teachers answering the question about union affiliation. The percentage of union members in the district is 57.6%.

The mean salary for the survey for all teachers was 2.386. Category two ranged from $25,000 through $29,999. The actual mean salary in the district was $28,669. This shows that the mean salary for the study is very close to what the mean salary is for the district.
The percentage of Caucasian teachers that participated in the study was 87.01%. The actual percentage of Caucasians in the school district is 83.36%. The African-American participation in the study was 10.31%. The district has 13.93% of its teachers that are classified as African-Americans. The study had 1.87% of the teachers that answered the part about ethnic classification that responded that they were Hispanic. The district has 1.75% of its teachers classified as Hispanic.

The number of teachers in the study that answered the section about the level of degree was 749. The number of teachers in the survey with a master's degree was 420. This is 56.07% of the 749 teachers. The percentage of teachers in the district that actually had master's degrees was 51.02%. The number of teachers in the study that had a specialist degree was 67. This represented 8.95% of the teachers in the study. The actual percentage of teachers with a specialist degree in the district was 6.09%. The number of teachers with a doctorate in the study was 19. This represents 2.54% of the teachers in the study. The actual percentage of teachers in the district with a doctorate was 2.42%.

Discussion of Question 1

Research question 1 asked the following question: What are the mean levels of satisfaction of teachers on each of the seven measures of organizational climate? These results are reported by the total group, the level of the school, and by union affiliation.

The means reported for the seven organizational climate factors ranged from a high of 3.767 reported for the factor of professional development to a low reported for the factor of political climate of 3.066. The high school level ranged from a high of 3.463 for professional development to a low of 2.802 for political climate. The middle school level ranged from a high of 3.575 for professional development to a low of 2.886 for political climate. The elementary school level ranged from a high of 4.087 for professional development to a low of 3.351 for political climate. Union members ranged from a high of
3.773 for professional development to a low of 3.104 for political climate. Nonunion members ranged from a high of 3.783 for professional development to a low of 3.028 for political climate.

Professional development reported a mean of 4.087 for elementary school, a mean of 3.575 for middle school, and a mean of 3.463 for high school. The mean got lower as the school level got higher. Professional development also reported a mean of 3.783 for nonunion members and 3.773 for union members. This represented the high mean score for each of the levels and both union affiliations.

The second highest score reported for all teachers was with the factor of organizational structure. The mean reported was 3.655. The mean reported for the elementary level with this factor was 3.884. This was the third highest mean reported for the elementary level for the seven organizational climate factors. The mean reported for middle school teachers with this factor was 3.563. The lowest mean was reported by high school teachers with a mean score of 3.409. This was the third highest mean reported for the high school level for the seven organizational climate factors. Union members reported a mean of 3.656, and nonunion members reported a mean of 3.655. These were the second highest means reported for union affiliation for the seven organizational climate factors.

The lowest mean score reported overall for all the teachers for any of the factors was 3.066. This represented the mean score of the factor political climate. High school teachers reported a mean score for political climate of 2.802. Middle school teachers reported a score of 2.886 with political climate. This was the lowest mean score reported for these two levels for the organizational climate factors. The elementary teachers reported a mean score of 3.351 with the organizational climate factor of political climate. This was the second lowest score reported for the elementary level for the seven organizational climate factors. Union members had a mean score of 3.104 with this factor. Nonunion
members had a mean score of 3.028. These were the lowest means reported for union affiliation for the seven organizational climate factors.

The second lowest score reported overall for all the teachers in the study for the organizational climate factors was 3.170 with the factor of promotion. High school teachers had a mean of 3.039 with this factor. The middle school level reported a mean of 3.144, and the elementary level had a mean of 3.281. This was the lowest score reported by the elementary level for any of the seven organizational climate factors. Union members reported a mean of 3.282. Nonunion members reported a mean of 3.034 with this factor. These means were the second lowest scores reported for union affiliation with the seven organizational climate factors.

The third highest mean reported overall for all the teachers in the study was with the factor of evaluation. The mean reported was 3.597. High school teachers reported a higher mean than the middle school teachers for this factor. The mean score for the high school level is 3.455, and the mean score for the middle school level is 3.443. The elementary level reported a mean score of 3.777. Union members had a mean score of 3.607. Nonunion members had a mean score of 3.593 with the factor of evaluation. These means were the third highest scores reported for union affiliation with the seven organizational climate factors.

Internal communication reported a mean score very close to the score of the factor of evaluation. This mean was 3.553. The means associated with this factor ranged from a low of 3.179 for high school teachers to a high of 3.896 for elementary teachers. This was the second highest mean reported for the elementary level for any of the seven organizational climate factors. Middle school teachers reported a mean score of 3.419. Union members and nonunion members again indicated that not much difference existed between them. The mean for union members was 3.578 and for nonunion members was 3.565.
Regard for personal concern reported a mean of 3.421 for all the teachers. This ranked this factor fifth among the seven organizational climate factors. The means ranged from a low of 3.152 for the high school level to a high of 3.626 for the elementary school level. Middle school reported a mean of 3.413. Union and nonunion members indicated not much difference existed between them. The mean score for union members was 3.419 and for nonunion members was 3.438.

The findings in this study concerning promotion can be looked at in two ways. If teachers view promotion as the result of the political structure of the school system and are dissatisfied with that political climate, then they will be dissatisfied with the promotion process. If teachers are secure and simply enjoy being teachers, then promotion would not be an issue. The teacher would see promotion as being rewarded with a good class schedule and movement on the salary schedule.

Elementary school teachers continuously exhibited higher mean scores for satisfaction with all seven factors. The means were higher for elementary school teachers on all seven organizational climate factors than they were for the levels of high school and middle school.

Middle school teachers had a higher mean score than high school teachers on six of the seven factors. The only factor middle school teachers reported a lower mean score was with the factor of evaluation. The mean score for middle school teachers was 3.443. The mean score for high school teachers was 3.455.

Middle school teachers had lower mean scores than elementary school teachers on all seven organizational climate factors. The closest the two school levels came to being equal was the factor of promotion. Middle school teachers had a mean score of 3.144. Elementary school teachers had a mean score of 3.201 for this factor.

Union affiliation reported results in six of the seven factors that showed not much difference in the means of union and nonunion membership. The one factor that reported a
separation between these two was promotion. Union members reported a mean of 3.282. Nonunion members reported a mean of 3.034.

The analysis of the data indicates that elementary school teachers are the most satisfied of the three levels of teachers with the seven organizational climate factors. Middle school teachers reported higher mean scores than high school teachers measuring level of satisfaction with all the organizational climate factors, but not by substantial margins.

It is important to note the following. Each factor was scored on a 1 through 5 scale with 5 being satisfied. No mean score for the all teachers in the study reached the level of four. The only mean score of 4 reported was with elementary school teachers for the factor professional development.

A score of 2 indicated a feeling of being dissatisfied with a given organizational factor. The factor of political climate reported means of less than 2 for the high school level and the middle school level. The mean for the high school level was 2.802. The mean for the middle school level was 2.886. Similarly, nonunion membership reported a mean of 3.028 with political climate and reported a mean score of 3.034 with the factor of promotion. The high school level reported a mean level of 3.039 with the factor of promotion.

Overall, these results indicate a general feeling of indifference with these seven organizational climate factors. There are several areas where the study indicates teachers are dangerously close to being dissatisfied. Such a situation would indicate a need to address these concerns in order to maintain the level of productivity in the school district.

Discussion of Question 2

Research question 2 asked the following question: Are there significant differences in the measures of satisfaction with organizational climate factors when compared by school level and by union/nonunion membership?
All seven organizational factors reported a significant difference between school levels using an analysis of variance. A post hoc test was used to identify where these differences actually occurred between the levels of schools. The level of significance for both the analysis of variance and the post hoc test was at the .05 level. The only factor that reported a significant difference according to union affiliation using an analysis of variance was promotion.

The Scheffe's post hoc test reported a significant difference on five of the seven factors between the middle school level and elementary school level. The high school level reported a significant difference with the elementary school level on all seven factors. The high school level and middle school level reported no significant differences with any of the organizational climate factors.

The organizational climate factor of internal communication reported a significant difference existed between the high school and elementary school levels. A significant difference was found between elementary school teachers and middle school teachers. No significant difference was found between the middle school level and the high school level. No significant difference was found between union and nonunion members. The mean scores reported indicated that the elementary school teachers were more satisfied with this factor than either the middle school teachers or the high school teachers. The mean score for the elementary school teachers is 3.896. The mean score of 3.419 for middle school teachers is higher than the mean score for high school teachers of 3.096. This would indicate a higher level of satisfaction even if it not significant at the .05 level.

The factor of organizational structure reported that a significant difference existed between the high school level and elementary school level. A significant difference existed between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference existed between the middle school level and high school level. No significant difference existed between union members and nonunion members. The mean for high school
teachers with this factor was 3.409. The mean for middle school teachers for this factor was 3.563. The mean for elementary school teachers for this factor was 3.884. The means reported indicated that elementary school teachers were the most satisfied of the three levels of teachers with the factor of organizational structure.

The organizational climate factor of political climate reported that a significant difference existed between the high school level and the elementary school level. A significant difference existed between the middle school and the elementary school level. No significant difference existed between the middle school level and the high school level. No significant difference existed between union affiliation. The means reported indicated elementary school teachers were the most satisfied with the factor of political climate.

The mean for the high school level was 2.802. The mean for the middle school level was 2.886. The mean for the elementary school level was 3.351. The means reported indicated that elementary school teachers were the teacher level most satisfied with the factor of political climate.

The factor of professional development reported that a significant difference existed between the high school level and the elementary school level. A significant difference existed between the middle school level and the elementary school level. No significant difference existed between the high school level and the middle school level. No significant difference existed between union affiliation. The mean for the high school level was 3.463. The mean for the middle school level was 3.575. The mean for the elementary school level was 4.087. The means reported indicated elementary teachers were the most satisfied with the factor of professional development.

The factor of evaluation indicated a significant difference existed between the high school level and elementary school level. A significant difference existed between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference existed between
the middle school level and the high school level. No significant difference existed between union affiliation. The mean for the high school level was 3.455. The mean for the middle school level was 3.443. The mean for the elementary school level was 3.777. The means reported indicated that elementary school teachers were the most satisfied of any level of teaching with the factor evaluation.

The factor of promotion reported a significant difference existed between the high school level and the elementary school level. A significant difference was found between the union members and nonunion members. No significant difference was found between middle school teachers and elementary school teachers. No significant difference was found between middle school teachers and high school teachers. The mean for the high school level was 3.039. The mean for the middle school level was 3.144. The mean for the elementary school level was 3.281. The mean for union members was 3.282. The mean for nonunion members was 3.034. The means reported indicate that union members were more satisfied with promotion than nonunion members. The means reported indicated that elementary school teachers were more satisfied with promotion than high school teachers.

The factor of regard for personal concern reported a significant difference existed between the high school level and the elementary level. No other significant difference existed between levels of school or with union affiliation. The mean for the high school level was 3.152. The mean for the elementary level was 3.626. The mean for the middle school level was 3.413. The means reported indicate elementary school teachers are more satisfied with this factor than high school teachers. The mean of the middle school teachers indicates the middle school teachers are more satisfied with this factor than high school teachers even if it not significant at the .05 level.

The levels of satisfaction were not high with the seven organizational climate factors on any level in question 1. These results in question 2 indicate a much higher dissatisfaction with the organizational climate factors among secondary school teachers.
The results also indicate high school teachers are the most dissatisfied with their jobs than any of the other levels of school.

**Discussion of Question 3**

Research question 3 asked the following question: What are the mean levels of satisfaction on each of the seven characteristics of teachers position? These are reported by school level and by union affiliation.

The means reported for the seven teacher position characteristics ranged from a high of 4.199 reported for the characteristic relationship with peers to a low of 1.823 for the variable of salary. The high school level ranged from a high of 3.930 for the variable relationship with peers to a low of 1.735 for the variable of salary. The middle school level ranged from a high of 4.162 for the variable of relationship with peers to a low of 1.725 for the variable of salary. The elementary school level ranged from a high of 4.417 for the variable of relationship with peers to a low of 1.936 for the variable of salary. Union members ranged from a high of 4.180 for the variable of relationship with peers to a low of 1.723 with the variable of salary. Nonunion members ranged from a high of 4.282 for the variable of relationship with peers to a low of 1.947 for the variable of salary.

Relationship with peers reported the highest mean of any position characteristic or any climate factor. The overall mean for all teachers in the study for this variable is 4.199. The high school level reports a mean of 3.930. The middle school level reports a mean of 4.162. These are the highest mean scores reported for any one of the seven position characteristics by these two levels. The elementary level reports a mean of 4.417. This is the highest mean reported for any category in the study. Union members had a mean of 4.180. This is the highest mean reported for union members with the seven position characteristics. Nonunion members reported a mean of 4.282. This is the highest mean score reported for nonunion members for the seven position characteristics.
The second highest mean score reported overall for all teachers was with the characteristic of relationship with supervisors. The mean scores of each of the three levels of schools were also the second highest reported for the seven teacher position characteristics. The mean scores for the union and nonunion members were also the second highest recorded among the position characteristics for these categories. The high school level reported a mean of 3.739. The middle school level recorded a mean of 3.731. The elementary school level recorded a mean of 4.174. Union members reported a mean of 3.889, and nonunion members had a mean of 3.997.

The third highest mean reported overall for teachers was with the position characteristic of professional effectiveness. This mean was 3.736. All three levels of schools reported this as their third highest mean score. Union and nonunion members reported this as their third highest means. The mean reported for the high school level was 3.576. The mean reported for the middle school level was 3.617. The mean reported for the elementary school level was 3.913. Union members reported a mean of 3.735, and nonunion members had a mean of 3.739.

Decision making reported an overall mean for all teachers of 3.445. High school teachers reported a mean of 3.195. Middle school teachers reported a mean of 3.168. This is one of three variables on which the middle school level had lower means than the high school level. The other two are (a) power, autonomy, and control and (b) salary. Elementary school teachers had a reported mean of 3.735. Union members had a mean of 3.410. Nonunion members reported a mean of 3.512.

Power, autonomy, and control reported an overall mean for all teachers of 3.567. This ranked fourth out of seven teacher position characteristics. The high school level reported a mean score of 3.467. The middle school level reported a mean score of 3.299. The elementary school level reported a mean score of 3.771. These scores ranked fourth for each of the levels in relation to the other teacher position characteristics. Union
members had a mean of 3.517. Nonunion members had a mean of 3.658. These means for union affiliation ranked fourth in relation to the other teacher position characteristics.

The lowest mean reported overall for teachers was with the position characteristic of salary. The overall mean for all teachers for this variable was 1.823. All three levels reported this as their lowest mean among the seven position characteristics. Union and nonunion members reported this as their lowest mean score. The mean score reported for high school was 1.735. The mean score reported for middle school was 1.725. The mean score reported for elementary school was 1.936. Union members had a mean of 1.723, and nonunion members had a mean of 1.947.

The second lowest mean score was reported for the position characteristic of benefits. The overall mean for all teachers for this variable was 2.515. All three levels of schools reported this variable as their second lowest mean score among the seven teacher position characteristics. Union and nonunion members had this variable reported as their second lowest mean. The mean score for the high school level was 2.389. The mean score for the middle school level was 2.443. The mean score for the elementary level was reported as 2.643. Union members had a mean score of 2.410, and nonunion members had 2.652 as a mean score.

The teacher position characteristics were ranked in the same order from one through seven for the overall mean of teachers, the means for each level of schools, and the means reported by union affiliation. Elementary school teachers had the highest mean score for all variables. Nonmembers had the highest mean scores for all the variables when compared to union members. The variable of professional effectiveness was extremely close with the mean scores for union affiliation. Union members had a mean of 3.735, and nonunion members had a mean of 3.739.

Teacher position characteristics had a wider range for their mean scores than the organizational climate factors had for their mean scores. The teacher position characteristics
had a range of 2.376. This was from a high of 4.199 for relationship with peers to a low of 1.823 for salary. Organizational climate factors had a range of .701. This was from a high of 3.67 for professional development to a low of 3.066 for political climate.

Discussion of Question 4

All seven teacher position characteristics reported a significant difference between school levels using an analysis of variance. A post hoc test was used to identify where these differences actually occurred between the levels of schools. The level of significance for both the analysis of variance and the post hoc test was at the .05 level. Two factors reported a significant difference according to union affiliation using an analysis of variance. These factors were salary and benefits.

The Scheffe's post hoc test reported a significant difference on six of the seven variables between the high school level and elementary school level. The only variable where no significant difference was found was salary. The post hoc test found a significant difference on five out of seven variables between the middle school and elementary school levels. The two variables where no significant difference were found were salary and benefits. No significant differences were found between the high school level and middle school level.

The positional characteristic of decision making reported a significant difference existed between the high school level and elementary school level. A significant difference was found between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference existed between the high school level and middle school level. No significant difference was found between union members and nonunion members. The mean for the high school level was 3.195. The mean for the middle school level was 3.168. The mean for the elementary school level was 3.765. The mean scores reported indicated that elementary school teachers were the most satisfied with the variable of decision making.
The positional characteristic of power, autonomy, and control reported a significant difference existed between the high school level and elementary school level. A significant difference was found between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference was found between the high school level and middle school level. No significant difference was found between union and nonunion members. The mean reported for the high school level was 3.467. The mean reported for the middle school level was 3.299. The mean reported for the elementary school level was 3.771. The means reported indicate a higher satisfaction with this variable by elementary school teachers.

The positional characteristic of relationship with peers reported a significant difference exists between the high school level and elementary school level. A significant difference was found between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference was found between the high school level and middle school level. No significant difference was found between union and nonunion members. The mean reported for the high school level was 3.930. The mean reported by the middle school level was 4.162. The mean reported by the elementary school level was 4.417. The means reported indicate that elementary school teachers are the most satisfied with the variable relationship with peers.

The positional characteristic of relationship with supervisors reported that a significant difference exists between the high school level and elementary school level. A significant difference exists between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference exists between the high school level and middle school level. No significant difference was found between union members and nonunion members. The mean reported for the high school level was 3.739. The mean reported for the middle school level was 3.731. The mean reported for the elementary school level was 4.174. The means reported indicated that elementary school teachers were the most satisfied with the variable relationship with supervisors.
The positional characteristic of salary reported no significant difference existed between any level of school. No significant difference was found between union members and nonunion members. The mean score reported for the high school level was 1.735. The mean score reported for the middle school level was 1.725. The mean score reported for the elementary school level was 1.936.

The positional characteristic of benefits reported a significant difference exists between the high school level and elementary school level. No significant difference exists between the middle school level and elementary school level. No significant difference exists between the high school level and middle school level. No significant difference was found between union members and nonunion members. The mean reported for the high school level was 2.389. The mean reported for the middle school level was 2.443. The mean reported for the elementary school level was 2.643. The means reported indicated elementary teachers were more satisfied than high school teachers with the variable of benefits.

The positional characteristic of professional effectiveness found a significant difference exists between the high school level and the elementary school level. A significant difference was found between the middle school level and the elementary school level. No significant difference was found between the middle school level and the high school level. No significant difference was found between union members and nonunion members. The mean reported for the high school level was 3.576. The mean reported for the middle school level was 3.617. The mean reported for the elementary school level was 3.913. The means reported indicate that the elementary school level is the most satisfied with professional effectiveness.

The means reported for teacher position characteristics had a much wider range than the organizational climate factors. The two top means reported for the variables of interpersonal relationships were noticeably higher than the highest mean reported for the
organizational climate factor of professional development. The mean for professional development was 3.767. The two lowest means for teacher position characteristics were very noticeably lower than the mean reported for the organizational climate factor of political climate. The mean for salary was 1.823. The mean for benefits was 2.515. The mean for political climate was 3.066.

Elementary school teachers consistently scored higher than secondary level teachers with the seven teacher position characteristics. High school teachers reported higher means than middle school teachers on four of the variables. The middle school teachers had higher means on three of the variables.

Conclusions

This study was concerned with the levels of teacher job satisfaction with seven organizational climate factors and seven teacher position variables. The study was also concerned if there was a significant difference at the .05 level using an analysis of variance with these seven organizational climate factors and seven position characteristics between level of school and union affiliation. If a difference did occur between the level of school, then the study used a post hoc test to find out just where the differences did occur.

The following conclusions were drawn from the research in this study:

1. Salary is by far the biggest cause of dissatisfaction in the school district. This is reported in Table 70 as what teachers disliked most about teachers. Salary also reported a mean of 1.823 for all teachers in Table 52.

2. Teachers in the district are not satisfied with their benefits package. Benefits reported the second lowest mean for all factors and variables. A mean of 2.515 was reported in Table 53.

3. A significant difference exists between the level of satisfaction between high school teachers and elementary school teachers in the study.
4. A significant difference exists between the level of satisfaction of middle school teachers and elementary school teachers in the study. This difference is not as great as it is between the high school level and the elementary school level.

5. There is not much difference between the levels of satisfaction between high school and middle school teachers in the study.

6. Teachers either feel neutral or unsatisfied on all the variables or factors studied except for relationship with peers and supervisors.

7. Teachers are unsatisfied with the political climate in the district. There is a feeling of distrust from the teachers in regard to the administration and school board.

8. This study found results very similar to Zeazek (1994). Teachers can be satisfied with the job overall. Zeazek and this study both found dissatisfaction with the level of support from parents and community, salary, fringe benefits, and opportunities for professional advancement. This study also found dissatisfaction with support from the district office and the school board.

**Recommendations**

The implications of this study suggest that the following should be done in the area of teacher job satisfaction:

1. Do a follow-up study in the district now that a new salary schedule has been instituted. This schedule has compressed the steps from 29 to 26.

2. A replication study should be conducted with a major effort to involve the younger teachers in the district. A strong effort should also be made to involve the minorities.

3. The district should realize the importance of salary to their workers. Equity theory stated that motivation is triggered by an employee's need for fair treatment (Katzell & Thompson, 1990). Workers become dissatisfied if they perceive a discrepancy with the
compensation received and the effort they put forth. Salary may affect productivity in the district. Underpayment in relation to others in similar jobs could lead to dissatisfaction and lower productivity.

This study indicates that salary is both a satisfier and dissatisfier. It is an ambient or a factor or variable that can do both.

4. A concerted effort needs to be made to the teachers in the district to explain their benefit package. Many feel this is not as good as other districts. The district claims that the package is one of the best, but the message is not getting out to the teachers.

5. A study needs to be done to find out why the teachers in the district are dissatisfied with the political climate. Herzberg stated the most prominent dissatisfier is related to problems with organizational policies.

6. A study should be undertaken to see if there is a relationship between satisfaction with pay, promotion opportunities, and interpersonal relationships with absenteeism.

7. Conduct a study that measures the relationship of professional services contract to the satisfaction of teachers in the district.

8. This study cannot be generalized past this school district, but replication of the study is encouraged in other school districts.
APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHERS JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: the items in the following questionnaire relate to teachers, organizational climate factors, and variables which relate to job satisfaction. The questionnaire focuses on the satisfaction of teachers in the school district. Please circle each item according to your opinion and perception.

A. Listed below are seven organizational climate factors. How would you rate the importance of each to the job satisfaction of teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Internal communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political climate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional development opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Regard for personal concern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B. How would you rate your satisfaction with each of the following at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Internal communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political climate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional development opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Regard for personal concern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Listed are seven characteristics of a teacher's position. How important is each to the job satisfactory of a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in decision making</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Autonomy, power, control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship with peers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship with supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional effectiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*D. How would you rate your satisfaction with each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in decision making</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Autonomy, power, control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship with peers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationship with supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional effectiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with your position?

F. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with your school?
G. In comparing organizational climate factors which contribute to job satisfaction, please rank order the following seven characteristics in terms of importance. (1-most important, 6-least important).

1. Internal communication
2. Organizational structure
3. Political climate
4. Professional development opportunities
5. Evaluation
6. Promotion
7. Regard for personal concern

H. In evaluating your position, please rank order the following seven characteristics in terms of which most needs improvement at your school. (1-most needs improvement, 6-least needs improvement).

1. Internal communication
2. Organizational structure
3. Political climate
4. Professional development opportunities
5. Evaluation
6. Promotion
7. Regard for personal concerns
I. In comparing characteristics of teachers, please rank order the following eight characteristics in terms of importance to job satisfaction. (1= most important, 8= least important).

1. Participation in decision making
2. Autonomy, power and control
3. Relationship with peers
4. Relationship with supervisor
5. Salary
6. Benefits
7. Professional effectiveness

J. In evaluating your position, please rank order the following five characteristics in terms of which most needs improvement. (1= most needs improvement, 8= least needs improvement).

1. Participation in decision making
2. Autonomy, power and control
3. Relationship with peers
4. Relationship with supervisor
5. Salary
6. Benefits
7. Professional effectiveness
Directions: Please provide the following demographic information.

1. Your Sex: Male______ Female_______

2. Your Age 20-29______ 30-39______ 40-49______ 50-59______ Over 60______


4. Your annual salary: 20,000-24,999_____ 35,000-39,999_____ 25,000-29,999_____ Over 40,000_____ 30,000-34,999_____  

5. Your educational background (highest degree): Bachelor's degree_____ Specialist degree_____ Master's degree_____ Doctoral degree_____  

6. Your current teaching position: __________________________________________________________  

7. Your union status (member or nonmember): ________________________________________________  

8. Length of time in your current position: Less than 1 year_____ 8-11 years_____ 1-3 years_____ 12-16 years_____ 4-7 years_____ Over 17 years_____  

9. Your total length time teaching:__________________________________________________________  

10. The person to whom you report:_______________________________________________________ (Title)  

11. Your present assignment: Elementary______ Middle______ High School_______  

12. Optional: Your name:_________________________________________ Phone number_________________ School______________________________  

13. What do you like most about teaching?___________________________________________________  

14. What do you dislike most about teaching?_________________________________________________  

*Sections B, D, and the last page of the questionnaire were used to analyze the data.
APPENDIX B
LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

To: Principals
From: Gunnar Paulson
Re: Questionnaire: Doctoral Dissertation
Date: April 17, 1996

My name is Gunnar Paulson and I am a teacher and athletic director at a high school in the school district. I am also working on my doctoral degree in educational leadership at the University of Florida. The research involves the job satisfaction of teachers in the school district. Enclosed is a questionnaire that I would like to use the following procedure to insure a high percentage of return on these questionnaires.

1. I will ask a teacher in each school to hand out the questionnaire to every teacher in the school. These teachers would be chosen from among teachers that I know. The administration would be informed of which person this is.

2. I would like to put some follow-up letters in teachers mail boxes to encourage teachers that have misplaced or haven't participated with this study.

These questionnaires should not take more than five minutes to fill out. Your help is greatly appreciated.
APPENDIX C
LETTER TO TEACHERS

To: District Teachers
From: Gunnar Paulson
Re: Job Satisfaction Questionnaire
Date: April 2, 1996

My name is Gunnar Paulson. I am presently an athletic director and math teacher at a high school in Gainesville, Florida. I am also working on my doctoral degree in educational leadership at the University of Florida. The topic of my research for my dissertation is "A Study of Selected Organizational Climate Factors and Job Satisfaction Variables Among Teachers in a Large Suburban School District."

I am asking each teacher's consent to fill out a questionnaire regarding this topic. It is optional whether you sign your name. The data is being collected in an anonymous manner. You do not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer. You also have the right to withdraw at any time from the research. The amount of time it will take to participate is no more than 15 minutes. Also, no compensation will be offered regarding this research.

Your help in completing this research is greatly appreciated. I have been a teacher for 26 years and realize that your time is valuable.
APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Teachers:

Hello: My name is Gunnar Paulson and this note is a reminder asking you to please fill out the job satisfaction questionnaire recently handed out to you. I realize this is a busy time of year for all teachers and apologize for the timing. I also feel that it is important to find out how teachers view their job priorities. I have served on the negotiating team for the past ten years and feel this research can give me an idea of what is important to teachers in this district.

If for some reason you have misplaced your questionnaire, please see the following person for another one. Thanks again!
REFERENCES


Herman, J., & Hulin, C. (1972). Studying organizational attitudes from individual
and organizational frames of reference. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 8, 84-108.

Hersey, P., & Angelini, A. L. (1982). The impact of situational leadership and
classroom structure on learning effectiveness. Group and Organizational Studies, 7, 216-224.


of Pittsburgh.

New York: Wiley.

Administration, 34, 21-27.

Administration Quarterly, 14, 30-47.


Rowman & Allanheld.


climate improvement projects. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Hoy, W. K., & Appleberry, J. B. (1970). Teacher-principal relationships in
"humanistic" and "custodial" elementary schools. Journal of Experimental Education, 39,
27-31.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). Educational administration: Theory,


Pace, C. R. (1968). The measurement of college environment. In R. Taguiri & G.H. Litwin (Eds.). Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept (pp. 129-150). Boston: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business.


Tagiuri, R. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), Organizational climate: Exploration of a concept (pp. 101-131). Boston: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.


BIOPGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Gunnar F. Paulson graduated from the University of Florida in 1969 with a Bachelor of Science in Physical Education degree. Mr. Paulson received his master's degree in physical education in 1971 from the University of Florida. He received his Specialist in Education degree in educational leadership in 1986 from the University of Florida. Mr. Paulson has been a coach, mathematics teacher, and physical education teacher for 27 years. He is currently serving as athletic director and is a mathematics teacher at Buchholz High School in Gainesville, Florida. Mr. Paulson has taught Algebra 1 and Algebra 2 for 11 years. He has been married to Cynthia L. Paulson for 30 years, and they have two married daughters and three granddaughters. He has been involved in athletics all his life and recently was inducted into the Florida Sports Hall of Fame in Lake City.
I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

David S. Horneyman, Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

R. Craig Wood
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Eugene A. Todd
Professor of Instruction and Curriculum

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Robert M. Beland
Associate Professor Recreation, Parks, and Tourism

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James L. Doud
Professor of Educational Leadership
This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

May 1997

[Signature]
Dean, College of Education

[Signature]
Dean, Graduate School