

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL
CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG
CHILD CARE TEACHERS

by

Sandra Pope

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Child Development

APPROVED:



Andrew J. Stremmel, Chairman



Cosby Steele Rogers



Victoria R. Fu

August, 1990

Blacksburg, VA

0.2

LD
5655
V855
1990

P674

@.2

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL
CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG
CHILD CARE TEACHERS

by

Sandra Pope

Committee Chairman: Andrew J. Stremmel
Family and Child Development

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction was examined to determine if they are redundant constructs. Second, the validity of aggregate scores on the organizational climate scale was tested.

Paula Jorde-Bloom's Early Childhood Work Environment Survey (ECWES) was sent to child care workers in Virginia to assess their perceptions of the organizational climate of their centers. An aggregate center score was derived by taking a mean of all the respondents from a particular center. The Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey (ECJSS) was used to assess workers' feelings of satisfaction with their jobs.

Results of correlations and factor analysis indicated that the two scales do represent distinct constructs. Results of T-tests, analysis of variance, and correlations provided partial support for acceptance of the validity of

aggregate scores on the ECWES. Directions for future research included replicating the study with a larger sample size and more respondents per center, attempting to validate aggregate scores on the ECWES with existing objective rating scales, examining the relationships between center attributes and climate dimensions, and between these attributes and turnover. Implications for practice include ways child care center directors can enhance the climate of their centers. For example, directors should examine their supervisory behavior to see if they are being supportive of their staff and fostering group decision-making.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to my committee head, Dr. Andrew J. Stremmel. Without his support, knowledge and guidance, I would not have finished this degree. Thanks also to my other committee members, Dr. Cosby Steele Rogers and Dr. Victoria R. Fu, for their time and suggestions.

My parents, David and Geneva Pope have been very helpful and supportive through this process--thank you. I am especially grateful to my father for assisting in data coding, proof reading and mailing. Thanks to my mother for comforting me with a book instead of a cookie.

Thanks also to my Blacksburg parents, Dr. and Mrs. Clifford W. Randall for opening their home and their family to me. I will always treasure the friendships formed in your home. Both my parents and I thank you for your concern and caring.

The Prevatts--Bruce, Peggy, Julie, and Bobby--have provided comic relief and treasured friendship. They have truly brought some beauty to my life. Although she has not been living in Blacksburg during much of this ordeal, Julie has remained my most supportive and caring friend. Thank you to all the Prevatt's (even Nikki). Julie, I pray that we will continue our friendship for another 23 years--or more.

Kathy Kearney was very helpful during this project. Thank you for helping compile articles for the literature review, being treasurer of my grant and trying to understand what I was going through.

I am grateful to the child care teachers who completed and returned questionnaires and the Virginia Association for Early Childhood Education for their grant of \$353. All of you made this possible.

"I CAN DO ALL THINGS THROUGH CHRIST WHO STRENGTHENS ME."

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	vii
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
II. Literature Review	4
Organizational Climate	4
Job Satisfaction	15
Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate	23
III. Purpose and Hypotheses	31
IV. Method	34
Subject Selection	34
Sample Characteristics	35
Measures	35
Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey	35
Early Childhood Work Environment Survey	36
V. Results	43
VI. Discussion	53
References	63
Appendices	68
Appendix A Invitation to Participate	69
Appendix B Instrument	71
Cover Letter	72
Informed Consent Form	73
Background Information	74

ECWES	75
ECJSS	78
Center Information	80
Vita	81

List of Tables

Table 1	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	39
Table 2	Salary Level and Benefits Received	40
Table 3	Reliabilities and Intercorrelations of the ECJSS and its Subscales	41
Table 4	Reliabilities and Intercorrelations of the ECWES and its Subscales	42
Table 5	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges for the ECJSS, ECWES and their Subscales	44
Table 6	Correlations among Job Satisfaction facets and Aggregate Climate Dimensions	46
Table 7	Means, Standard Deviations and t-scores for For-profit and Not-for-profit Centers	50
Table 8	Means, Standard Deviations and t-scores for NAEYC Accredited and Not Accredited Centers	51
Table 9	Means, Standard Deviations and t-scores for Public and Private Centers	52

Chapter 1

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG CHILD CARE TEACHERS

Turnover among child care teachers threatens the quality of child care. Increasing from 15% in 1977 to 45% in 1988 (Whitebook, Howes, Phillips & Pemberton, 1989), turnover adversely affects both child care programs and the children attending them. When turnover is high, directors must spend valuable time recruiting and training new staff members (Seiderman, 1978; Counselman, 1987). According to the National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook et al.) children attending centers with a high rate of staff turnover were less competent in social and language development. Costs to the children may also include increased distress upon separation from parent (Cummings, 1980). Cummings stated that attempts to increase the quality of care should include steps to reduce turnover.

Fleischer (1985) reported a consistently significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover. Specifically, Fleischer found that the factors most frequently cited as reasons for leaving child care work were the nature of supervision, salary, job stress and limited chance for

promotion. Locke (1976) reported that the following job attributes are causal factors in job satisfaction and dissatisfaction: pay, promotion, recognition, working conditions, supervisor relations and coworkers. Since there is some overlap in factors affecting both satisfaction and turnover, it is logical to investigate these factors more fully.

Literature in other fields indicates that organizational climate, the unique personality of each work environment, influences the way workers feel about their organization (Locke, 1976). Since evidence of this relationship has been found in child care centers (see Jorde-Bloom, 1988a; Maslach & Pines, 1977; Seiderman, 1978; Whitebook, Howes, Darrah & Friedman, 1982), it is reasonable to assume that improving the organizational climate of child care centers can increase job satisfaction of teachers while reducing the likelihood of turnover and its negative consequences.

Given the relationships described above, it seems that by increasing the job satisfaction of child care teachers we can improve the quality of children's child care center experiences. This study is concerned with determining the relationship between child care center climate and job

satisfaction among child care teachers. If organizational climate can be assessed, researchers can determine which of its dimensions most affect job satisfaction. Steps can then be taken to increase job satisfaction by modifying aspects of centers' organizational climates.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Organizational Climate

Organizational climate has been described as the unique personality of each child care center (Jorde-Bloom, 1986a) or descriptions of the work environment (cf. Forehand & Gilmer, 1964; Litwin & Stringer, 1968). Enduring over time, organizational climate influences the behavior of organization members (Forehand & Gilmer). Climate may be specific to various subsystems within one organization, i.e. all the teachers in a child care center (Field & Abelson, 1982; Forehand & Gilmer; Jorde-Bloom, 1988b; Schneider & Reichers, 1983). Each organization will have its own climate (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler & Weick, 1970; Drexler, 1977; Forehand & Gilmer; Jorde-Bloom, 1986a).

How organizational climate is measured. Johannesson (1973) stated that the construct can be operationalized in two ways. One, which he terms objective, uses factors such as the number of levels of authority, the ratio of administrative personnel to production personnel and the number of formal rules. In this case, the respondent is the researcher, rather than a participant in the work environment. The more common

perceptual method of determining organizational climate uses participant perceptions of the work environment (Johannesson; Jones & James, 1979; Lafollette & Sims, 1975).

When measured perceptually, climate has been viewed as either an organizational attribute or as an attribute of individual workers (James & Jones, 1974). In either case, respondents are asked to rate their perception of the environment (Forehand & Gilmer, 1964; Jones & James, 1979; Joyce & Slocum, 1984; Lafollette & Sims, 1975; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Schneider & Snyder, 1975; Woodman & King, 1978). Perceptual measures of organizational climate should be multi-dimensional (James & Jones; Jones & James; Jorde-Bloom, 1986a, 1988b, 1989, 1990; Litwin & Stringer; Schneider & Reichers; Schneider & Snyder).

Researchers stress that when climate is measured perceptually, respondents should be asked to *describe* the conditions existing in the workplace, rather than to *evaluate* the environment (Drexler, 1977; Joyce & Slocum, 1984; Lafollette & Sims, 1975; Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). That is, respondents should be asked to state the conditions of the workplace without reporting their feelings about these conditions. It should be noted that

there may be some variation in the way climate is perceived by different workers.

Distinctions between organizational, psychological and aggregate climate. When perceptual measures of climate are used, the organizational climate for any organization is based on the subjective interpretations of the members of the organization (Jorde-Bloom, 1986a). One problem associated with measuring organizational climate perceptually is that since people's perceptions vary it is not easy to determine which person's climate perception most closely fits the actual climate. This is particularly problematic when trying to correlate climate with another construct. It is important, then, to clarify the distinction between psychological climate and organizational climate.

Psychological climate refers to an *individual's* perception of organizational practices and procedures, whereas organizational climate refers to an objective description of this environment (James & Jones, 1974; Jones & James, 1979; Joyce & Slocum, 1982). In the latter case, the psychological climates of all employees can be considered together to reflect the organizational climate.

When psychological climate scores are considered collectively, the result is termed aggregate climate. Thus, aggregate climate is one way to operationalize the concept of organizational climate. Jones and James (1979), in describing the rationale for using aggregate climate to reflect organizational climate, stated that while psychological climate scores reflect perceived situations, it is assumed that people exposed to the same environment will describe it in similar ways.

James and Jones (1974) advocated that researchers shift away from relying on perceptions and use more objective scales when possible. However, since such observational scales are not prevalent, given near 100% agreement between workers in an organization, scores on perceptual scales can be accepted as indicative of the organization's climate (Guion, 1973). Averaging psychological climate scores, the most prevalent method of aggregation (Jones & James, 1979; Jorde-Bloom, 1988b; Joyce & Slocum, 1982; Lafollette & Sims, 1975), emphasizes perceptual similarities while minimizing individual differences in scores, assumed to merely reflect differences in personality.

Conditions and criteria for using aggregate climate.

Jones and James (1979) considered the use of averaged scores legitimate as long as respondents report their perceptions of the situation, which should be objective, rather than of themselves or of their reactions to the situation, more likely to be subjective (a later section of this paper will discuss the potential problems involved in making this distinction). When a researcher is trying to justify using aggregate climate, it is helpful to demonstrate that the respondents have experienced similar exposure to the situational factors (Jones & James). For instance, in a child care center the teachers will generally experience the same environmental conditions. Jones and James reported that aggregation of scores is increasingly justifiable as perceptions are combined across groups of increasingly homogenous positions--as would be the case with child care teachers within a given center.

Joyce and Slocum (1984) maintained that aggregation is justifiable when:

1. Internal consistency of the aggregate climate scores is demonstrated. That is, respondents at any given center describe the climate similarly. Guion (1973) agreed, adding

that only items on which there is close to 100 percent agreement on should be used. Howe (1977) looked for consensus among members of a work group.

2. It will be possible to discriminate between climates of different organizations. For example, it would be possible to distinguish differences in the climates of different centers or between the climates of different types of centers (e.g. proprietary versus non-profit).

3. Predictable relationships are found between the climate and related constructs. For example, Jorde-Bloom (1990) postulates a negative relationship between turnover and climate. One would also expect a positive correlation between a center's climate and the satisfaction of the teachers working in that center.

Joyce and Slocum (1984) advocate that all three criteria be met before utilizing aggregate score, but reported that neither the internal consistency of the climates nor testing for predictable relationships has consistently been used as a criteria for using aggregate climate to represent organizational climate. In fact, in many cases, discrimination between climates has been the only criterion utilized.

The dimensions of organizational climate. Since there are several aspects of the work environment, organizational climate should be measured multidimensionally (James & Jones, 1974; Jones & James, 1979; Jorde-Bloom, 1986a, 1988b, 1989; Joyce & Slocum, 1984; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Schneider & Reichers, 1983; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). Jorde-Bloom (1988e), studying child care centers, developed an instrument utilizing ten dimensions of climate: supervisor support, collegiality, goal consensus, decision-making, professional growth, physical setting, clarity, reward system, task orientation and innovativeness.

Supervisor support is described in terms of the helpfulness and quantity of feedback given to the teachers (Jorde-Bloom, 1988a; Kreuger, 1986). Respondents are asked to characterize the supervision given in terms of amount of praise and criticism, the standards set and the supervisor's knowledge base (Jorde-Bloom, 1989).

Jorde-Bloom (1986a) stated that collegiality derives from the universal need to receive emotional support. She described the dimension as "the extent to which staff are friendly, supportive and trust one another" (1989, p. 42) and proposes that it measures the cohesion among employees. The

concept includes shared planning and preparation as well as team spirit; another characteristic is the absence of cliques among the staff (Jorde-Bloom, 1989). Gruneberg (1979), Joyce and Slocum (1984) and Krueger (1986) all list collegiality as a component of the organizational setting.

Opportunities for professional growth include staff inservice training as well as opportunities to attend conferences (Jorde-Bloom, 1986a). Krueger (1986), studying residential youth care facilities, pointed out that staff not only need orientation training, but also continuing education. Both Krueger and Jorde-Bloom stated that such training enhanced job satisfaction as well as increased the quality of service provided to the organization.

Clarity versus confusion of roles was listed as a factor of the job context by both Gruneberg (1979) and Jorde-Bloom (1986a). Jorde-Bloom described the dimension as the degree to which order and explicitness characterize organizational functioning. Kontos and Stremmel (1988) found that in child care centers, caregivers, regardless of their position, performed many of the same tasks. This lack of hierarchical structure may lead to role conflict among staff, adding to job stress.

Lawler (1975) found that although many organizations say they use a merit based pay system, in practice, pay has little to do with past performance. Fair distribution of pay, policies about tenure, promotion and job security are characteristics of the dimension Jorde-Bloom (1986a) terms reward system. While it is important that salaries cover basic needs (Kreuger, 1986), the pay system is a symbol of recognition and status as well (Jorde-Bloom, 1989).

Decision-making refers to the relative influence staff have in making the decisions that affect them (Gruneberg, 1979; Jorde-Bloom, 1986a). Kreuger (1986) stated that staff involvement in decision-making is an important aspect of the organization and suggested that staff be encouraged to submit proposals for organizational change. This dimension includes not only the autonomy staff are given regarding their own classrooms, but also extent to which they participate in making center-wide decisions (Jorde-Bloom, 1989).

Goal consensus, the staff's ability to agree on organizational goals and objectives, is a key factor in their ability to carry out these goals and objectives (Jorde-Bloom, 1986a). This dimension includes staff agreement on and

commitment to organization goals as well as their ability to understand different points of view.

Task orientation is the amount of emphasis placed on planning and working toward goals (Moos, 1974). It includes paid planning time (Kreuger, 1986) as well as the efficiency with which meetings are run and tasks get completed (Jorde-Bloom, 1989). Jorde-Bloom (1986a) and Kreuger stated that while it is important to use time wisely, obsession with efficiency lowers the organizational climate.

The work environment or physical setting, includes such attributes as temperature, light, color, noise, ventilation and the spatial arrangement of the classroom (Jorde-Bloom, 1986a). She stated that these variables affect children's behavior, which then affects the teacher's ability to accomplish program goals.

Innovativeness, also described as flexibility (Joyce & Slocum, 1984), refers to the center's ability to adapt to change (Jorde-Bloom, 1986a). Jorde-Bloom characterized this factor as being a function of the director's leadership style. Gruneberg (1979) described the progressiveness of an organization as an aspect of its organizational climate.

As can be seen, there are many dimensions of organizational climate of child care centers. As discussed earlier, most measures of climate are perceptual; that is, workers are asked to describe their perceptions of their working conditions. The only scale available that measures organizational climate in child care centers (Jorde-Bloom, 1988e) uses this format. As will be discussed in a later section, there are some problems with this type of measure. For instance, the distinction between perceptions of and reactions to the environment may be difficult to operationalize. In addition, it may be difficult to determine whose perceptions most closely approximate reality. Jorde-Bloom (1988b) noted that in child care centers, the administrators rate organizational climate differently than the rest of the staff.

Acknowledging these potential problems, Jorde-Bloom's (1988e) scale was used. It is the only organizational climate scale developed for use in child care centers and has been shown to have acceptable reliability and validity (Jorde-Bloom, 1989). Additional research is needed to replicate previous psychometric findings. Further research is also necessary to test whether aggregate scores on Jorde-Bloom's

(1988e) Early Childhood Work Environment Survey meet Joyce and Slocum's (1984) guidelines for acceptance of aggregate scores.

JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is described as the positive emotional state which results from evaluating one's job experiences (Locke, 1976). Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) noted that satisfaction involves affective responses to various facets of the job and that workers may have different feelings about different facets. In 1935, Hoppock defined the dissatisfied worker as one who is discontented overall with his/her job, but stated that a person may be satisfied with one aspect of his job and dissatisfied with another.

Kreuger (1986) defined job satisfaction as reflecting the strength of the person's satisfaction with different aspects of his/her job. In other words, a worker who is very satisfied with most aspects of his/her job but moderately dissatisfied with one aspect of it will have a higher satisfaction rating than a worker who is moderately satisfied with some aspects of the job and moderately dissatisfied with others.

While job satisfaction can be measured using either global or facet specific measures, most researchers agree that

job satisfaction is a function of many factors (Davidson, 1979; Herzberg, 1966; Hoppock, 1935; Jorde-Bloom, 1986b, 1989; Locke, 1976; Smith et al., 1969). Therefore, satisfaction should be measured multidimensionally. Davidson stated that the most commonly measured factors presumed to contribute to the construct of job satisfaction are pay/benefits, nonfinancial rewards, nature of supervision, opportunities for advancement, status/recognition and communication. Smith et al., in their widely used Job Descriptive Index (JDI), assessed five facets of job satisfaction: coworkers, pay, promotion, supervision and work. The JDI and its development will be discussed in more detail in a later section of this paper.

The consequences of job satisfaction. The extent of a worker's satisfaction or dissatisfaction has repercussions in several areas. Satisfaction or dissatisfaction may affect absenteeism and turnover (Gruneberg, 1979; Locke, 1976; Mortimer, 1979; Portigal, 1976; Whitebook et al. 1982). Long term dissatisfaction may result in burnout (Seiderman, 1978; Whitebook et al.). Gruneberg stated that dissatisfaction with one's job can even lead to counter-productive behavior, for example, the improper treatment of children. As Maslach and

Pines (1977) pointed out, teachers suffering from burnout may begin to treat the children as inhuman. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction affect employees' physical as well as mental health (Locke; Mortimer), potentially resulting in increased absenteeism.

What affects job satisfaction. Locke (1976) suggested that the individual affects his or her own job satisfaction. That is, while working conditions were found to affect job satisfaction, individual workers will report varying levels of satisfaction with the same conditions. Similarly, Whitebook et al. (1982) stated that the workers personality affects job satisfaction, as did Jorde-Bloom (1988c). Although Gruneburg (1979) did not hypothesize a direction of causality, he found positive correlations between job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

In other fields, organizational climate has been found to be related to job satisfaction (Davidson, 1979; Downey, Hellriegel, Phelps & Slocum, 1974; Lafollette & Sims, 1975; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). Locke (1976) listed aspects of climate as being causal factors in job satisfaction. Using multiple regression, Friedlander and Margulies (1969) concluded that climate is a significant determinant of job

satisfaction, while Batlis (1980) found two factors of climate to predict job satisfaction. Researchers recently have begun investigating work environment effects on the satisfaction of child care teachers (Jorde-Bloom, 1988c; Kontos & Stremmel, 1988; Stremmel, 1989). Evidence suggests that a relationship between climate and satisfaction exists within the child care setting as well as the traditional business setting (Jorde-Bloom, 1988a, 1988b, 1989; Kreuger, 1986; Maslach & Pines, 1977; Whitebook et al., 1982). To date, however, there is insufficient data to suggest a causal relationship.

The measurement of job satisfaction. As discussed earlier, job satisfaction is derived from several factors (Davidson, 1979; Herzberg, 1966; Hoppock, 1935; Jorde-Bloom, 1986b, 1988c, 1989; Kreuger, 1986). Given the multidimensional quality of job satisfaction, an accurate measure of job satisfaction should be multidimensional as well. Gruneburg (1979) cautioned that job satisfaction is not static, although it is generally measured and interpreted as though it were (also Jorde-Bloom, 1988c). Instead, satisfaction with one's job changes slightly day to day and may change greatly over longer periods of time (Smith et al., 1969).

Davidson (1979), in a manual for developing employee attitude surveys, stated that questions are generally asked using a Likert-type scale. The rationale given for this response format is that the more response categories given, the more detailed the results will be, showing more degrees of affect (Davidson; Kerlinger, 1973). This format also assists the respondent in precisely reporting his/her level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction (Davidson).

When using such a rating scale, Smith et al. (1969) advise "anchoring" the ratings (e.g. never to always or strongly agree to strongly disagree). This is advantageous both because it is easier for the worker to respond to and because it tends to result in greater reliability within individual respondents. When designing questionnaires, one must decide whether to utilize a factual (descriptive) or a feelings oriented (evaluative) measure. Smith et al. advocated using factual measures because they are more specific and objective, reducing the effect of organization based standards and conditions. A drawback of factual measures is that they may reduce the variability between individuals in the same organization.

Smith et al. (1969) developed a scale, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) designed for use by a variety of workers. The most widely used of job satisfaction scales, it displays a list of words relating to satisfaction/dissatisfaction on five facets: coworkers, pay, promotion, supervision and work. The respondent is asked to mark a Y (for yes), N (for No) or a ? (for unsure) by each word.

Jorde-Bloom's (1988d) Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey uses similar facets and a similar format for measuring satisfaction. It is the only job satisfaction scale designed and normed on child care teachers; thus it is important to use this scale when assessing the relationship between climate and satisfaction of child care teachers. Jorde-Bloom's scale measured teacher satisfaction with co-worker relations, supervisor relations, the work itself, pay/promotion and working conditions.

Robinson (1979) found that 12% of men and 11% of women reported the nature of supervision as the reason they left their child care jobs. This factor focuses on the supervisory behavior of the director, such as giving assistance when help is needed (Counselman, 1987; Jorde-Bloom, 1989). Jorde-Bloom

operationalized this construct largely in terms of the quantity and quality of feedback given by the administrator. Supervisors who are viewed by the staff as being competent and acting as a resource/support person (Counselman; Jorde-Bloom) are more likely to retain staff than those who are not as supportive of their staff.

Staff relations is the most frequently listed source of satisfaction among child care teachers (Whitebook et al., 1982). Jorde-Bloom (1989) describes this factor as reflecting the degree of support and encouragement staff members receive from one another (also Counselman, 1987). Robinson (1979) found that 21% of teachers who had left their child care positions would have stayed in their original positions if staff relationships had been better.

Working conditions is another factor related to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Jorde-Bloom, 1989; Whitebook et al., 1982). Robinson (1979) reported that as many as 15% of former teachers left because they were dissatisfied with their working conditions. These working conditions include environmental characteristics of the center as well as aspects of the organization and its administrative policies.

Pay, another factor of job satisfaction, deals not only with whether the teacher is paid enough to live on, but also whether his/her pay is commensurate with his/her abilities (Jorde-Bloom, 1989). Being overworked and underpaid are the two most frequent responses given when teachers are asked about sources of dissatisfaction (Whitebook et al., 1982). In fact, 39% of former teachers would have stayed in their original positions had they received more pay (Robinson, 1979). Jorde-Bloom included opportunity for promotion with the pay facet of satisfaction, stating that both pay and promotion convey a statement about the worker's worth.

The nature of the work itself is frequently cited as a source of satisfaction (Jorde-Bloom, 1989; Robinson, 1979; Whitebook et al., 1982). This facet is composed of the degree of challenge, autonomy and variety (Jorde-Bloom; Whitebook et al.) as well as the enjoyment the workers may derive from working with children (Jorde-Bloom). This facet can also be described in terms of the job structure (Maslach & Pines, 1977), i.e. the inherent characteristics of the job. While there may be other facets of job satisfaction (Locke, 1976), Jorde-Bloom (1989) has found co-worker relations, supervisor relations, work itself, pay/promotions and the working

conditions to be the most salient in the study of child care teacher satisfaction. Additionally, it is the only job satisfaction survey developed for use specifically with child care teachers. For these reasons, it was used in this study.

Convergent validity was reported for the ECJSS with the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Smith et al., 1969). Correlations between the measures on various facets ranged from .29 on working conditions to .90 for supervisor relations. Jorde-Bloom (1989) explained the low correlations on working conditions by stating that the JDI does not measure working conditions per se.

IS CLIMATE REDUNDANT WITH SATISFACTION?

While most researchers agree that job satisfaction and organizational climate are conceptually different (Field & Abelson, 1982; Lafollette & Sims, 1975; Payne, Fineman & Wall, 1976; Schneider & Reichers, 1983), a few have raised the concern that the two constructs may be redundant (Guion, 1973; Johannesson, 1973). If this is the case, attempts to determine the relationship between the two concepts will be misleading. Johannesson (1973), in particular, stated that when participant perceptions of climate are used, there is a

danger that these perceptions will be indistinguishable from the participants' affective evaluations of their satisfaction.

Johannesson's (1973) basis for this statement is a study in which he administered one climate scale and two satisfaction scales. He concluded that the three scales measured the same thing because of what he considered to be very high correlations between all three measures. Closer examination of his results reveals that of the 96 correlations between climate and satisfaction factors, in only two cases did the climate-satisfaction correlation account for more than 36 percent of the variance between the two constructs. In no cases did the amount of variance accounted for by the climate-satisfaction correlation exceed 44 percent.

Johannesson (1973) noted that all three scales used were based on respondent's perceptions. He stated that even when workers are asked to describe (rather than evaluate) the environment, their feelings influence their descriptions. This may result in climate scales being redundant with satisfaction scales, since job satisfaction scales are designed to measure feelings. Johannesson believed that this confusion could be a possible cause of his redundancy finding.

According to Johannesson (1973), a potential cause of

climate-satisfaction redundancy is that organizational climate researchers utilize items from satisfaction scales in their climate scales. Relatedly, many of the factors that comprise climate are also factors of satisfaction. Guion (1973) stated that the confusion is one of semantics: if the construct is organizational climate, then the unit of analysis should be the organization. However, frequently the unit of analysis is the individual.

Schnake (1983) reported that an individual's perceptions of organizational climate are influenced by his/her affective response to the climate. Schnake and Dumler (1985) proposed that, when asked to complete both satisfaction and climate scales, respondents strive to display cognitive consistency in their answers. That is, satisfied workers will describe the organization in more positive terms, whereas if dissatisfied workers will attempt to justify their feelings by describing the organization in more negative terms.

The Schnake and Dumler (1985) study used the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) as a climate scale, although it was designed to measure job characteristics (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). That is, the JDS yields information about particular jobs, while the climate scales yield information about the

organization as a whole. Thus, while the results are thought-provoking, they do not represent clear evidence on the redundancy issue. It is evident from this study that even climate researchers may misapply measurement scales.

Payne and Mansfield (1978) stated that an individual's perceptions of climate are affected by four categories of factors: (a) the contextual, technological and structural parameters of the organization; b) the views of others in the organization with whom the respondent works; (c) the position in the organization the respondent holds; and (d) the personality of the respondent. Of these, only one deals specifically with the organization (the contextual, technological and structural parameters of the organization), and it was found to have only a limited influence on individual's perceptions. In contrast, the views of others in the organization had a considerable influence on the worker's responses. The influence of the position in the organization the person holds on his/her perceived climate was "stronger than expected."

Schneider and Snyder (1975) attempted to replicate Johannesson's (1973) conclusion that climate and satisfaction are the same construct. In addition to finding that the two

satisfaction scales correlated more highly with each other than either did with the climate scale, Schneider and Snyder found that the respondents agreed more on the climate of their organization than they did on their satisfaction and that those who described climate in what was considered to be more positive terms were not always more satisfied. Finally, they found that satisfaction was more related to turnover than climate was.

Lafollette and Sims (1975) also investigated the hypothesis that climate and satisfaction are redundant constructs. Finding only low correlations between climate and satisfaction, they rejected the hypothesis. Lafollette and Sims correlated these constructs with two others: job performance and organizational practices. Since they found the correlations between satisfaction and each of these constructs to differ significantly from the correlations between climate and the two constructs, Lafollette and Sims concluded that organizational climate is not redundant with job satisfaction.

Lafollette and Sims (1975) offered four possible explanations of the findings that led Johannesson (1973) to conclude that organizational climate and job satisfaction are

redundant terms. The first possible reason is that the two terms do, in fact, refer to the same construct, as Johannesson claimed. However, the high correlations Johannesson found could also have resulted from either of the constructs causing the other. Or, the two may be caused by a third construct. Finally, Lafollette and Sims stated that it is possible that Johannesson's findings resulted from happenstance. They caution that one should not be too quick to accept any of these as being the true cause of the high correlations.

Payne et al. (1976) pointed out that while organizational climate and job satisfaction do have similar factors, they are not the same construct, nor is climate merely a variant of job satisfaction. While job satisfaction is derived from a worker's affective responses to his/her job, climate is derived from descriptions of organizations (also Schneider & Snyder, 1975). However, as Payne et al., pointed out, it is not always possible to tell simply by looking at a particular item if it measures climate or satisfaction.

It seems that, as Payne et al. (1976) stated, "the concepts of organizational climate and job satisfaction are different and no amount of empirical similarity makes them the same" (p. 46). The problem, then, becomes one of

measurement. In order to keep the constructs operationally distinct, the unit of analysis for organizational climate must be the organization, rather than the individual (Downey et al., 1974; Guion, 1973; Howe, 1977; Lafollette & Sims, 1975; Payne et al.; Schneider & Snyder, 1975).

The instructions on perceptual scales should stress to respondents the importance of describing rather than evaluating the environment (Guion, 1973; Lafollette & Sims, 1975; Payne et al., 1976; Schnake, 1983; Schneider & Snyder, 1975). Johannesson (1973) suggested that a solution to the problem of operational redundancy would be to use alternative methods of measuring climate. He suggested that having a nonparticipant observer rate the climate would alleviate the problem of feelings influencing descriptions.

Guion (1973) stated that perceptual measures can be used, but that an appropriate methodology would be to utilize dichotomous responses to climate items. Items on which respondents from the same organization did not approach 100 percent agreement would not be used in any analysis.

Regarding the validity of the construct of organizational climate, Howe (1977) suggested that if a climate measure is valid, it will yield distinctions between different

organizations. Most researchers have only studied one organization, so more research is necessary to determine if his assumption is correct. The criteria for aggregating climate scores discussed previously (Joyce & Slocum, 1984) stem from confusion over how to validly measure organizational climate.

As can be seen from this section, researchers must carefully consider the nature and format of both climate and satisfaction scales. While it is clear that organizational climate and job satisfaction are conceptually different, those investigating these constructs have not fully solved the problems surrounding the redundancy issue. For instance, this researcher found no studies in which the items from both climate and satisfaction were factor analyzed together to see if the factors generated were separate. Most studies did not heed Guion's (1973) advice to utilize dichotomous scoring of climate items.

Chapter 3

Purpose and Hypotheses

Knowledge of how job satisfaction and organizational climate are related to each other may help child care administrators attract and retain qualified staff and reduce the likelihood of turnover. Further, an understanding of the climate-satisfaction relationship may enable center directors to manipulate organizational factors in order to increase job satisfaction of all staff.

Studies reviewed in the previous section suggest that the constructs of climate and satisfaction are conceptually different. However, as shown, even when surveys are designed to measure each construct, the problem of keeping them operationally distinct is evident. This study attempted to determine the relationship between climate and satisfaction in child care centers, using Jorde-Bloom's (1988e) Early Childhood Work Environment Survey (ECWES) and her Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey (ECJSS; 1988d).

While Jorde-Bloom developed the ECWES and ECJSS, little empirical evidence exists that they do not both measure satisfaction. Since Jorde-Bloom maintains that the two measure different constructs, this evidence should be

gathered. Accordingly, this study seeks to determine if the ECWES and the ECJSS are operationally different. Additionally, this study will attempt to justify the use of aggregate scores of climate, which further ensures the constructs will not be operationally redundant.

Specific Hypotheses

1. While climate and satisfaction are assumed to be significantly and positively related, it is expected that, as measured with Jorde-Bloom's instruments, they will be operationally distinct constructs. Therefore, correlations between the two should be modest but positive.

2. It is expected that aggregate scores on the ECWES will be a valid measure of the construct climate, as defined by Joyce and Slocum (1984). Validity will be demonstrated by the following criteria:

a) The respondents at any given center will describe the climate similarly, as shown by group consensus of scores within centers.

b) There will be differences in climate between different types of centers. This study will assess contrasts in the climates of for-profit and not-for-profit centers, those accredited by NAEYC and those not accredited, and public

centers (those sponsored by a government agency or those which accept public money) versus private centers (those which are not sponsored by, nor accept money from government agencies).

c) It is expected that there will be a positive correlation between climate and satisfaction and a negative one between climate and turnover.

Chapter 4

METHOD

Subject Selection

One-half of the child care centers in Virginia licensed for 100 or more children ($n = 108$) were invited to participate in this study. Directors from 35 centers returned a postcard indicating interest in the study and stating the number of questionnaires needed ($n = 495$). Follow-up phone calls were made asking directors to encourage their staff to complete and return the questionnaires. One hundred forty questionnaires from 27 centers were completed and returned, yielding a response rate of 28%.

Of the 140 questionnaires returned, 18 were unusable because the respondents did not work 30 or more hours per week, as had been requested. Twenty-five were discarded because the respondents were administrative staff, rather than teachers or assistant teachers. Three were discarded because the respondents did not work primarily with children, and three were discarded because of excessive deletions. Therefore, the data analysis was performed on 94 questionnaires.

The questionnaire included questions about demographic characteristics, turnover rates, number of children enrolled, type and auspice of center as well as information on job satisfaction and organizational climate. The demographic information gathered included the teacher's sex, age, tenure, salary level, benefits and educational level. Questionnaires were numbered so that centers could be aggregated and to maintain respondents' confidentiality.

Sample Characteristics. All of the respondents who reported their sex were female; six did not report their sex. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics about the sample. Table 2 displays information about the respondents' salaries and benefits.

Measures

Jorde-Bloom's (1988d) Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey (ECJSS) was used to measure five facets of job satisfaction: co-worker relations, supervisor relations, the work itself, pay/promotion and working conditions. Although Jorde-Bloom suggested using a yes/no format with this survey, the format was changed to a six point Likert scale because it allows respondents to show more degrees of affect (Davidson, 1979;

Kerlinger, 1973). The National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook et al., 1989) utilized this format for the ECJSS, as did Stremmel (1989). Respondents were asked to rate each statement according to the strength of their agreement or disagreement with it. Mean scores for each facet (reported in Table 5) were used in the analyses. The possible range of scores for each facet was 1 (indicating strong disagreement or dissatisfaction) to 6 (indicating strong agreement or satisfaction).

Internal consistency reliabilities obtained for this sample ranged from .74 (satisfaction with *The Work Itself* and satisfaction with *Working Conditions*) to .86 (satisfaction with *Co-workers*), somewhat higher than those Jorde-Bloom (1989) reported. Intercorrelations among the facets ranged from .10 to .63. Reliability scores and intercorrelations for the ECJSS are reported in Table 3.

Organizational climate was measured using Jorde-Bloom's (1989) Early Childhood Work Environments Survey (ECWES), which assesses climate along ten dimensions: collegiality, professional growth, supervisor support,

clarity, reward system, decision-making, goal consensus, task orientation, physical setting and innovativeness.

As with the ECJSS, the ECWES presents ten statements for each of the ten dimensions. Respondents are asked to check all the statements that describe that aspect of their work environment. While variation in job satisfaction is desired, an objective picture of the organizational climate is preferred. Therefore, the suggested dichotomous format was used, resulting in a possible range of 0-10. Low scores (0-5) represent negative perceptions of climate, while high scores (6-10) represent positive perceptions of climate

Reliability scores for this sample on the ECWES ranged from .65 (*Reward System*) to .79. (*Goal Consensus*). Intercorrelations ranged from .05 to .80, somewhat lower than those Jorde-Bloom (1989) found. Table 4 shows the reliability scores and intercorrelations for the ECWES and its facets.

Turnover was assessed by asking directors to report the number of teachers and assistant teachers who had left the center in the past year and to specify whether the teacher had been dismissed, laid off or had left

voluntarily. This measure was used in the National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook et al., 1989).

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Position (%)	
Teacher	67
Assistant Teacher	33
Formal Coursework in ECE/CD (%)	
High School level	60
Child Development Associate Credential	7
Associate Degree	10
B.S./B.A.	16
M.S./M.A.	3
Other	4
Length of time in child care work (%)	
Less than one year	9
One to three years	24
Four to six years	31
Seven to ten years	17
Eleven or more years	19
Mean length of time in present job (months)	41.3
Mean age (years)	33.8
Auspice of Center (%)	
Public	17
Private	83
Legal status (%)	
For profit	40
Not-for-profit	60
NAEYC accreditation status (%)	
Accredited	26
Not accredited	74

Table 2 Salary Level and Benefits Received (%)

Salary level	
under \$5,000	9
\$5,000-\$7,999	34
\$8,000 10,999	32
\$11,000-\$13,999	11
\$14,000-\$16,999	2
\$17,000-\$19,999	4
\$20,000-\$22,999	5
\$23,000-25,999	3
\$26,000 or more	0
Benefits	
Paid Sick Days	86
Paid Holidays	85
Paid Vacation	81
Breakfast or Lunch	58
Partial or Fully Paid Health Insurance	50
Reduced Tuition for your Child	43
Life Insurance	37
Partial or Fully Paid Dental Insurance	36
Retirement or Pension Plan	27
Paid Maternity or Paternity Leave	10

Table 3 Reliabilities and Intercorrelations of the ECJSS and its Subscales

	ECJSS ()	Co-workers	Pay	Super- visor	The Work Itself	Working Conditions
ECJSS	.91	.48***	.37***	.58***	.69***	.70***
Co-workers	.87		.49***	.63***	.48***	.28**
Pay/Promotion	.79			.41***	.32**	.10
Supervisor	.86				.58***	.29**
The Work Itself	.74					.32**
Working Conditions	.74					

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

*** = $p < .001$

Note: The first column displays the reliability of the ECJSS and its facets.

Table 4 Reliabilities and Intercorrelations of the ECWES and its Subscales

	()	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ECWES	.95	.79***	.61***	.75***	.84***	.80***	.54***	.80***	.67***	.59***	.72***	.80***
1. Collegiality	.71	.19*	.80***	.65***	.56***	.68***	.54***	.52***	.54***	.52***	.66***	.63***
2. Professional Growth	.78	.09	.58***	.05	.37***	.22*	.15	.29**	.66***			
3. Supervisor Support	.70	.51***	.64***	.60***	.64***	.65***	.49***	.52***				
4. Reward System	.65	.37***	.74***	.60***	.50***	.60***	.60***	.75***				
5. Decision-making	.74	.44***	.29**	.31***	.43***	.35***						
6. Goal Consensus	.79	.72***	.46***	.62***	.59***							
7. Task Orientation	.76	.38***	.36***	.30**								
8. Physical Setting	.73	.54***	.57***									
9. Clarity	.69	.53***										
10. Innovativeness	.74											

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

Note: The first column displays the reliability of the ECWES and its dimensions.

Chapter 5

Results

Table 5 reports the means, standard deviations and range of scores for the job facet satisfaction and organizational climate dimensions. Overall, the respondents in this sample were slightly to moderately satisfied with their jobs. As can be seen in Table 5, the only facet in which respondents reported they were slightly dissatisfied was the facet Pay/Promotion. The highest source of satisfaction was The Work Itself.

Aggregate climate scores reflected a variety of perceptions about the workplace. Although the theoretical range for the overall score was 0-100, the lowest aggregate score was 40. Similarly, actual range for dimension scores was narrower than the theoretical range. Supervisor Support was the dimension rated the highest ($\underline{M} = 7.8$, $\underline{SD} = 1.1$), while Professional Growth was rated the lowest ($\underline{M} = 5.9$, $\underline{SD} = 2.0$) among child care teachers in this sample.

This research had a two-fold purpose, (a) to determine whether organizational climate and job satisfaction, as measured by the ECWES and the ECJSS respectively, are distinct yet related constructs; and (b) to evaluate the validity of using aggregate scores on the ECWES to measure organizational climate. To test the first hypothesis Pearson Product-Moment correlational

Table 5 Ranges, Means and Standard Deviations for the ECJSS, ECWES and their subscales.

Scale/Subscale (average mean scores)	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	Possible Range	Actual Range
Job Satisfaction (sum score) *	21.3	3.6	5-30	5-29
Coworkers	4.34	1.4	1-6	1-6
Pay/Promotion	3.20	1.30	1-6	1-6
Supervisor Support	4.47	1.25	1-6	1-6
The Work Itself	4.51	1.05	1-6	1-6
Working Conditions	4.22	0.96	1-6	1-6
Aggregate Climate (sum score)	65.0	10.7	0-100	40-84
Staff Relations	6.8	1.3	0-10	3-10
Professional Growth	5.9	2.0	0-10	3-10
Supervisor Support	7.7	1.1	0-10	3-10
Reward System	6.2	1.2	0-10	3-8
Decision-making	6.3	1.6	0-10	3-9
Goal Consensus	6.3	1.4	0-10	3-9
Task Orientation	6.8	1.5	0-10	2-9
Physical Setting	7.5	1.1	0-10	3-10
Clarity	6.1	1.4	0-10	4-9
Innovativeness	6.7	1.3	0-10	4-10

* Note: Means derived from a 6 point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = moderately agree, 6 = strongly agree).

n = 94

analyses were performed; the correlation between the aggregate center climate and overall satisfaction scores was .47 ($p < .001$).

Table 6 shows the correlations between satisfaction scores and aggregate climate scores. The dimensions Goal Consensus and Physical Setting each correlated with overall satisfaction the highest ($r = .44$, $p < .001$). Professional Growth had the lowest ($r = .18$) and only nonsignificant relationship with overall job satisfaction. Based on this evidence, it seems that the two scales measure different but related constructs. A principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation generating two factors was performed to further test the discriminant validity of the two measures. The first factor was largely composed of items from the ECWES, while the second factor was primarily composed of items from the ECJSS, supporting the conclusion that the scales measure different constructs. However, as can be seen from Table 4, intercorrelations between the dimensions (a) *Collegiality and Supervisor Support*; (b) *Reward System and Goal Consensus*; (c) *Reward System and Innovativeness*; and (d) *Goal Consensus and Task Orientation*.

The second hypothesis dealt with the validity of aggregate scores on the ECWES. Validity was evaluated according to the three guidelines discussed earlier (Joyce & Slocum, 1984). First, Joyce and Slocum stated that internal consistency of the

Table 6 Correlations among Job Satisfaction facets and Aggregate Climate Dimensions

Climate Dimension	ECJSS	Co-worker Relations	Pay	Supervisor Relations	The Work Itself	Working Conditions
ECWES	.47 ***	.15	.10	.16	.24 *	.31 **
Collegiality	.41 ***	.15	-0.02	.21 *	.28 **	.28 **
Professional Growth	.18	.06	.12	-.03	.01	.03
Supervisor Support	.40 ***	.19	.04	.18	.24 *	.29 **
Reward System	.37 ***	.11	.19	.10	.19	.30 **
Decision-making	.26 **	.05	-0.02	.16	.24 *	.18
Goal Consensus	.44 ***	.10	.04	.15	.25 *	.29 **
Task Orientation	.32 *	.06	.06	.01	.13	.25 **
Physical Setting	.44 ***	.14	.17	.17	.23 *	.34 ***
Clarity	.39 ***	.16	.10	.17	.23 *	.30 **
Innovativeness	.40 ***	.19	.16	.23 *	.19	.20

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

aggregate climate scores within a given center should be demonstrated. Following Howe (1977), this criterion was tested with a one-way analysis of the variance within and between centers. Howe inferred group consensus when there was greater variance between than within centers. For this analysis, only centers which had four or more respondents (nine centers) were used. The independent variable for this procedure was the center; the dependent variable was individual climate scores. Because analysis of the variance revealed no significant difference in the amount of variance attributable to differences between centers, as opposed to differences within centers, it was determined that this criterion was not met.

Joyce and Slocum (1984) next stated that discrimination between aggregate climates should be possible. For example, it would be possible to distinguish differences in the climates of different centers or between the climates of different types of centers (e.g. proprietary versus non-profit). To test this assumption, independent t-tests were employed to examine differences in the aggregate climates of: (a) for-profit and not-for-profit child care centers, (b) NAEYC accredited centers and those not accredited and (c) public and private child care centers. No significant differences were found with respect to the overall aggregate climate scores of any of these groups.

There were, however, differences between centers of various types on several of the dimensions.

Table 7 shows the means, standard deviations and t scores for both for-profit and not-for-profit centers. Teachers at not-for-profit centers rated their centers significantly higher on the following dimensions of climate: professional growth ($t = -2.05$, $df = 45.8$, $p < .05$), reward system ($t = -3.24$, $df = 71$, $p < .01$) and task orientation ($t = -4.92$, $df = 37.1$, $p < .001$). Teachers in for-profit centers rated their centers significantly higher for supervisor support ($t = 2.27$, $df = 69$, $p < .05$) and decision-making ($t = 2.68$, $df = 71$, $p < .01$)

The means, standard deviations and t scores for centers accredited by NAEYC and those not accredited are reported in Table 8. NAEYC accredited centers were found to have more positive climates for supervisor support ($t = 2.10$, $df = 66$, $p < .05$), decision-making ($t = 4.90$, $df = 68$, $p < .001$), goal consensus ($t = 3.66$, $df = 68$, $p < .001$), task orientation ($t = 2.17$, $df = 68$, $p < .05$) and clarity ($t = 2.61$, $df = 68$, $p < .05$).

Table 9 reports the means, standard deviations and t scores for public and private centers. Private centers were rated significantly than public centers for the following dimensions of climate: supervisor support ($t = -2.13$, $df = 65$, $p < .05$), goal consensus ($t = -3.87$, $df = 46.9$, $p < .001$) and physical setting

($t = -3.40$, $df = 67$, $p < .01$), while public centers were rated higher on decision-making ($t = 2.27$, $df = 67$, $p < .05$).

Finally, Joyce and Slocum (1984) stated that if aggregate scores are to be considered valid, predictable relationships should be found between aggregate climate and related constructs. As reported earlier, there was a significant moderate correlation between aggregate climate and satisfaction. This criterion was also tested with the assumption that there would be a negative relationship between turnover and climate (Jorde-Bloom, 1990). However, no significant correlation between climate, as assessed by the ECWES, and turnover was found. Therefore, it was determined that evidence regarding this criterion was not sufficient to determine whether it was met.

Exploratory Analyses

Examination of the data suggested the need for further analysis, since there was a significant difference in the turnover rates of different types of centers. Independent t-tests were used to compare the relationship between turnover rates in two categories of center types. For-profit centers had a significantly higher turnover rate than not-for-profit centers ($t = 4.25$, $df = 33.7$, $p < .001$). Privately operated centers had a higher turnover rate than publicly operated centers ($t = 4.11$, $df = 67$, $p < .001$).

Table 7 Means, Standard Deviations and t-scores for For-profit and Not-for-profit Centers

	For Profit		Not-for-Profit		<u>t</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
ECWES	65.3	9.8	67.6	9.2	-0.99
Collegiality	7.1	0.7	7.0	1.4	0.50
Professional Growth	5.4	2.2	6.3	1.5	-2.05 *
Supervisor Support	8.2	0.9	7.8	0.7	2.27 *
Reward System	5.9	1.1	6.7	0.8	3.24 **
Decision-making	6.7	1.1	5.9	1.4	2.68 **
Goal Consensus	6.4	1.2	6.7	1.2	-1.09
Task Orientation	6.5	1.1	7.7	0.6	-4.92 ***
Physical Setting	7.9	1.0	7.5	1.0	1.48
Clarity	6.1	1.7	6.2	1.3	-0.39
Innovativeness	6.8	1.3	6.8	1.2	0.00

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

Table 8 Means, Standard Deviations and t-scores for NAEYC Accredited and Not Accredited Centers

	Accredited		Not Accredited		<u>t</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
ECWES	70.9	13	64.7	7.3	1.93
Collegiality	7.4	1.7	6.8	0.9	1.43
Professional Growth	6.7	1.5	5.8	2.0	1.81
Supervisor Support	8.3	1.0	7.8	0.7	2.10 *
Reward System	6.7	1.2	6.2	0.9	1.82
Decision-making	7.3	1.0	5.7	1.2	4.91 ***
Goal Consensus	7.3	1.3	6.2	0.9	3.66 ***
Task Orientation	7.5	0.7	7.0	1.0	2.17 *
Physical Setting	7.4	1.2	7.7	0.9	-1.13
Clarity	6.7	1.5	5.8	1.2	2.61 *
Innovativeness	7.2	1.6	6.7	1.2	1.36

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

*** = $p < .001$

Table 9 Means, Standard Deviations and t-scores for Public and Private Centers

	Public		Private		<u>t</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
ECWES	64.9	8.9	66.3	9.5	-0.48
Collegiality	6.8	1.2	7.1	1.2	-0.71
Professional Growth	6.3	2.3	5.8	1.8	0.97
Supervisor Support	7.4	1.0	8.0	0.7	-2137 *
Reward System	5.8	0.9	6.4	1.0	-1.92
Decision-making	6.8	0.9	5.9	1.3	2.27 *
Goal Consensus	5.9	0.5	6.7	1.3	-3.87 ***
Task Orientation	6.8	0.6	7.4	1.1	-1.81
Physical Setting	6.8	1.1	7.8	0.8	-3.40 **
Clarity	5.9	1.2	6.2	1.6	-0.76
Innovativeness	6.4	1.7	6.8	1.2	-1.03

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

Chapter 6

Discussion

Teachers in this sample were most highly satisfied with child care work, while they were the least satisfied with pay and promotion opportunities, paralleling the findings of other researchers (Kontos & Stremmel, 1988; Robinson, 1979; Whitebook et al., 1982; Whitebook et al., 1989). Interestingly, no correlation was found between salary and satisfaction with pay, possibly indicating that regardless of how well paid some teachers are in relation to others in the child care profession, no one is paid adequately.

Consistent with previous research (Jorde-Bloom, 1989), scores on the ECWES and scores on the ECJSS were found to represent distinct yet related constructs. It is also consistent with research concerning the possible redundancy of climate and satisfaction. As Guion (1973) pointed out, by definition organizational climate refers to an attribute of the organization. Satisfaction, though, is an attribute of the individual. When properly measured the two should not be redundant. Appropriate measurement, then, is essential. When studying organizational climate, the unit of analysis must be the organization (Downey et al., 1974; Guion, 1973; Howe, 1977; Lafollette & Sims, 1975; Payne et al., 1976; Schneider & Snyder, 1975).

Jorde-Bloom (1988b, 1990) contends that while organizational climate is an organizational attribute, individual perceptions of climate are inherently valid for the individual. While this may be true, it is of no help to those who may want to modify the climate. That is, directors cannot change the worker's *perceptions* of the climate. On the other hand, if the director can determine what the objective organizational climate is, he or she can change it. A change in the climate should produce a corresponding change in the way teachers perceive the climate.

Psychological climate is reflective of one person's perceptions, but aggregate climate reflects the descriptions of all the staff members. Thus, while psychological climate is highly related to individual job satisfaction, organizational climate is more useful to the child care center director. Since directors will find aggregate climate scores more useful in planning organizational change, it is necessary to develop a scale which adequately quantifies the aggregate climate of child care centers. Jorde-Bloom (1989) has reported adequate reliability and validity scores for the ECWES. But in order for directors to effect policy changes, they need to have access to valid information on the aggregate climate of their center.

This research found significant differences in several dimensions of aggregate climate between various center types, but did not find significant differences between the overall

aggregate climate across these center types. It may be that, as Schneider and Reichers (1983) theorized, work settings have multiple climates, each for a different aspect of the environment. For example, there might be a climate for supervisor relations, and a separate one for professional growth. Schneider and Reichers stated that "to speak of organizational climate per se, without attaching a referent, is meaningless" (p. 21).

Whether climate is one multidimensional construct, or several constructs, the current findings have implications for organizational change. Evidence from this study indicates areas of climate on which administrators of various types of centers can focus when attempting to enhance the organizational climate or climates of their centers. Differences in the aggregate dimension scores for supervisor support and decision-making were found between for-profit and not-for-profit centers, NAEYC accredited and non-accredited centers, and public and private centers. To foster a more positive climate in these areas, directors should examine their supervisory behavior to see if they are being supportive of their staff and fostering group decision-making. Attention should also be given to the emphasis placed on task orientation, as both not-for-profit centers and those accredited by NAEYC were rated higher on this dimension than for-profit centers and those not accredited. Directors

should examine the extent to which they foster goal consensus among staff, since accredited centers and private centers rated higher for this dimension than non accredited and public centers.

Directors of for-profit centers should examine the value placed on staff development, or professional growth, and the reward system. In both of these areas not-for-profit centers were rated as having a significantly higher climate than for-profit centers. Directors may feel discouraged about their ability to improve teacher satisfaction with the existing reward system. This research does confirm previous findings on the effect of low salaries on job satisfaction. Even with low salaries, however, pay should be distributed fairly, as should promotions. Directors can also recognize teachers for a job well done.

In addition to the differences between NAEYC accredited and non-accredited centers described above, NAEYC accredited centers were rated higher for the dimension clarity. Care should be taken that roles and expectations for staff are explicitly defined and that all written communication is clear. Public centers were found to have higher climates for the dimension *physical setting*. Directors should make an effort to enhance the setting and make efficient use of space.

The results of this study suggest that job satisfaction and organizational climate, as measured by the ECJSS and the ECWES

respectively, are distinct constructs. Jorde-Bloom (1990) suggested the need for future research to replicate the reliability findings for the ECWES, a relatively new measure. This study found somewhat higher reliabilities than did Jorde-Bloom (1989).

If the results of this study are externally as well as internally valid, its evidence provides partial support for acceptance of the validity of aggregate scores on the ECWES. However, it is important that future researchers attempt to replicate these findings, as there are some limitations (discussed below) to this study. In particular, as Jorde-Bloom (1990) pointed out, attempts should be made to examine the congruence between participant perceptions and objective scales, or expert perceptions, of organizational climate.

Following the current research, future attempts should focus on aggregate, rather than individual perceptions of climate. Johannesson (1973) suggested that using objective rating scales completed by the researcher would be more effective in obtaining an objective view of organizational climate. Most research seems to rely on perceptual measures for practical reasons; future researchers may attempt to validate perceptual climate scales using objective scales. In order for this to be feasible, however, such objective scales must be developed. Existing environmental rating scales, e.g. the Early Childhood Classroom

Observation Scale (NAEYC, 1984) and the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale (Harms & Clifford, 1980), focus on program quality, a construct related to, but distinct from climate. Jorde-Bloom (1990) has explored the link between climate and program quality, but the relationship should be explored further.

Limitations of the study. There are several methodological limitations to this study that warrant caution in interpreting the results. First, there were only 94 useable responses to the questionnaire. The overall response rate was 28%, slightly less than the average 30% response rate anticipated. In many cases, there were less than four respondents in a given center. It is not known whether a center's climate score would have changed significantly with more respondents.

Another limitation of the current study lies in the fact that it is self report survey research. It is difficult to determine the characteristics that motivated some child care teachers to return the survey, while others did not. It is also difficult to ascertain why some directors responded to the invitation to participate in the study, while others did not. Given the self report nature of the study, it is probable that some bias is inherent--although it is not known what direction this bias might have taken.

Although slightly more than one-half the items on the ECWES are positively worded, the scale can seem very negative. The director of one center invited to participate in the study informed her that he and a few "key staff" decided not to participate in the study because they felt that the ECWES was too negative.

The researcher is also concerned that the length of the scale (100 items) may have inhibited some teachers from responding and noted that many of the items were very similar (e.g. "meetings are productive" and "meetings are a waste of time"). While inclusion of both items enhances the reliability of the scale, it may be beneficial to delete these items in order to reduce the scale to a more manageable length.

The results of this study suggest that some of the dimensions of climate may not be distinct from one another. That is, the intercorrelations between several of the dimensions exceeded .70 (e.g. collegiality and supervisor support; reward system and goal consensus; reward system and innovativeness; and goal consensus and task orientation). If these dimensions are not distinct, combining them would serve to reduce the length of the survey.

Directions for future research. The primary area for future research would be replicating this study with a larger sample size, including a greater percentage of responses within centers.

While the findings of this study are noteworthy, they do not constitute clear evidence regarding the validity of aggregate scores on the ECWES. Eliminating the limitations discussed would clarify future findings. Jorde-Bloom (1989) obtained an 87% response rate in part by promising to send to each center director a profile of the center's climate. This technique should be considered in future research. In particular, attempts should be made to evaluate the climates of centers which do not respond to the initial invitation to participate.

Jorde-Bloom (1990) found a relationship between climate and turnover. Although no relationship between overall aggregate climate and legal status or auspice was found in this study, there was a correlation between turnover and both of these center characteristics. These relationships should be investigated further; researchers should also continue to investigate any relationship between climate and turnover.

The possibility of negativity of the ECWES should be investigated. Certainly the effect on response rates of so many negative items should be examined. If revisions of the ECWES are attempted, this possibility should be addressed. Finally, further investigation regarding the distinctness of the dimensions is warranted.

This study adds to emerging research on organizational climate of child care employees by focusing on aggregate climates

of child care centers, applying Joyce and Slocum's (1984) criteria for determining the validity of aggregate scores on the ECWES. To date, no other studies on the ECWES have attempted to satisfy all three of Joyce and Slocum's (1984) criteria, although literature in the business field has shown the need for valid measures which utilize the organization as the unit of analysis. In focusing on Joyce and Slocum's guidelines, the ECWES was interpreted differently than Jorde-Bloom typically interprets it. That is, Jorde-Bloom (1998b) aggregated scores of all teachers in the sample, whereas this study aggregated scores of teachers and assistant teachers in the same center.

Further, this study made extensive use of research done in the business and industry fields. While considerable research has been done in these fields, it has not been explored adequately by previous child care center climate researchers. This study represents an attempt to apply this previous climate research (done in other fields) to child care center climate research. It is hoped that the results of this study will foster research which further integrates research in other fields with child care climate research. In particular, it is hoped that the results of this study will foster further attempts to validate aggregate scores on the ECWES or another early childhood climate scale. In examining the relationship between climate and satisfaction, this study employed a technique not seen in any of

the literature reviewed, i.e. factor analyzing items from both scales together to test for divergent validity.

In addition, this study gathered information on the psychometric properties of the ECWES and the ECJSS. As Jorde-Bloom (1990) pointed out, since the scales are so new, replication of the psychometric properties is important. Jorde-Bloom examined the relationship between climate and center legal (profit) status. In addition to examining the climate-legal status relationship, this study investigated the relationship between a center's climate and its NAEYC accreditation status, and between center climate and the center's auspice (public or private).

References

- Batlis, N.C. (1980). The effect of organizational climate, anxiety and propensity to leave. Th Journal of Psychology, 104, 233-240.
- Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lawler, E.E., & Weick, K.E., Jr. (1970). Managerial behavior, performance and effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Counselman, K. (1987). Supervising longterm employees. Child Care Information Exchange, 56, 11-13.
- Cummings, E.M. (1980). Caregiver stability in daycare. Developmental Psychology, 16, 31-37.
- Davidson, W.L. (1979). How to develop and conduct successful employee attitude surveys. Chicago: Dartnell Corporation.
- Downey, H.K., Hellriegel, D., Phelps, M. & Slocum, J.W. (1974). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A comparative analysis. Journal of Business Research, 2, 233-248.
- Drexler, J.A. (1977). Organizational climate: Its homogeneity within organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 38-42.
- Field, R.H.G., & Abelson, M.A. (1982). Climate: A reconceptualization and proposed model. Human Relations, 35, 181-201.
- Fleischer, B. (1985). Identification of strategies to reduce turnover among child care workers. Child Care Quarterly, 14, 130-139.
- Forehand, G.A. & Gilmer, B.H. (1964). Environmental variation in studies of organizational behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 62, 361-382.
- Friedlander, F. & Margulies, N. (1969). Multiple impacts of organizational climate and individual value systems upon job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 22, 171-183.
- Gruneberg, M.M. (1979). Understanding job satisfaction. London: Macmillan Press.

- Guion, R.M. (1973). A note on organizational climate. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9, 120-125.
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.
- Harms, T. & Clifford, R. (1980). The early childhood environmental rating scale. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Publishing Corporation.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Arno Press.
- Howe, J.G. (1977). Group climate: An exploratory analysis of construct validity. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19, 106-120.
- James, L.R. & Jones, A.P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1096-1112.
- Johannesson, R.E. (1973). Some problems in the measurement of organizational climate. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 10, 118-144.
- Jones, A.P. & James, L.R. (1979). Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individual and aggregated work environment perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 201-250.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1986a). Improving the quality of work life: A guide for enhancing organizational climate in the early childhood setting. Evanston, IL: Early Childhood Professional Development Project.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1986b). Teacher job satisfaction: A framework for analysis. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 1, 167-183.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988a). A great place to work: Improving conditions for staff in young children's programs. Washington, D.C.: NAEYC.

- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988b). Closing the gap: An analysis of teacher and administrator perceptions of organizational climate in the early childhood setting. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4, 111-120.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988c). Factors influencing overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment in early childhood work environments. Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education, 3(2), 107-122.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988d). Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey. Evanston, IL: Early Childhood Professional Development Project.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988e). Early Childhood Work Environment Survey. Evanston, IL: Early Childhood Professional Development Project.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1989). Measuring work attitudes in the early childhood setting: Technical manual for the Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey and Early Childhood Work Environment Survey. Evanston, IL: Early Childhood Professional Development Project.
- Jorde-Bloom, P. (1990). Organizational climate in child care settings. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston, April, 1990.
- Joyce, W.F. & Slocum, J.W. (1982). Climate discrepancy: Refining the concepts of psychological and organizational climate. Human Relations, 35, 951-972.
- Joyce, W.F. & Slocum, J.W. (1984). Collective climate: Agreement as a basis for defining aggregate climates in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 27, 721-742.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.
- Kontos, S. & Stremmel, A.J. (1988). Caregivers' perceptions of working conditions in a child care environment. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 3(1), 77-91.
- Kreuger, M. A. (1986). Job satisfaction for child and youth care workers. Washington: Child Welfare League of America.

- Lafollette, W.R. & Sims, H.P. (1975). Is satisfaction redundant with organizational climate? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 257-278.
- Lawler, E.E., III (1975). Using pay to motivate job performance. In K.N. Wexley & G.A. Yukl (Eds.), Organizational behavior and industrial satisfaction. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Litwin, G.H. & Stringer, R.A. (1968). Motivation and organizational climate. Boston: Harvard College.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Maslach, C. & Pines, A. (1977). The burnout syndrome in the daycare settings. Child Care Quarterly, 6, 100-113.
- Miles, R.E. & Snow, C.C. (1984). Fit, failure and the hall of fame. California Management Review, 26(3), 10-28.
- Moos, R.H. (1974). Systems for the assessment and classification of human environments: An overview. In R.H. Moos & P.M. Insel (Eds.), Issues in Social Ecology: Human Milieus. Palo Alto: National Press Books.
- Mortimer, J.T. (1979). Changing attitudes toward work. Scarsdale: Work in America Institute.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1984). Accreditation criteria and procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Payne, R.L., Fineman, S. & Wall, T.D. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: A conceptual synthesis. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 45-62.
- Payne, R.L. & Mansfield, R. (1978). Correlates of individual perceptions of organizational climate. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 51, 209-218.
- Portugal, A.A. (1976). Towards the measurement of work satisfaction. Paris: OECD.

- Robinson, B.E. (1979). A two year followup study of male and female caregivers. Child Care Quarterly, 8, 279-294.
- Schnake, M.E. (1983). An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organizational climate. Personnel Psychology, 36, 791-807.
- Schnake, M.E. & Dumler, M.P. (1985). Affective response bias in the measurement of perceived task characteristics. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 58, 159-166.
- Schneider, B. & Reichers, A.E. (1983). On the etiology of climates. Personnel Psychology, 36, 19-39.
- Schneider, B. & Snyder, R.A. (1975). Some relationships between job satisfaction and organizational climate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 318-328.
- Seiderman, S. (1978). Combatting staff burnout. Day Care and Early Education, 5(4), 6-9.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M. & Hulin, C.L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Stremmel, A.J. (1989). A multi-variate analysis of the predictors of intention to leave child care work. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University.
- Whitebook, M., Howes, C., Darrach, R. & Friedman, J. (1982). Caring for the caregiver: Staff burnout in child care. In L.G. Katz (Ed.), Current Topics in Early Childhood Education. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Whitebook, M., Howes, C., Phillips, D. & Pemberton, C. (1989). Who cares?: Child care teachers and the quality of care in America. Young Children, 45(1), 41-45.
- Woodman, R.W. & King, D.C. (1978). Organizational Climate: Science or Folklore? Academy of Management Review, 3, 816-826.

Appendices

Appendix A
Letter to Directors

600 1/2 Airport Road
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Date

^F1^
Director
^F2^
^F3^

Dear ^F4^:

Are you concerned about high rates of turnover in child care centers? You can probably guess that satisfied employees tend to stay longer than dissatisfied ones, but may not be sure how to raise the levels of satisfaction of your employees. As a graduate student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am interested in factors affecting satisfaction and believe that a major contributor to teacher satisfaction is the work environment. I am trying to determine which aspects of the environment affect satisfaction the most and need your help.

I have a questionnaire that I would like you, your teachers and assistant teachers (please not cooks and busdrivers) to fill out. If you and your staff would like to participate in this study, please return the enclosed card telling me how many questionnaires you need.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the above address, or at (703) 231-6548 (mornings) or (703) 951-9167. I hope that you will help me out with this.

Sincerely,

Sandra Pope

Appendix B

Survey

Dear Child Care Teacher:

Are you concerned about the job satisfaction of child care teachers? As a graduate student at Virginia Tech, I am interested in factors affecting satisfaction and believe that a major contributor to teacher satisfaction is the work environment. I am trying to determine which aspects of the environment affect satisfaction the most and need your help. Although I know your time is valuable, I would appreciate it if you would help me by filling out this questionnaire and sending it back to me. I have enclosed a tea bag, so sit back, relax, and fill out the questionnaire while you enjoy a cup of tea. **PLEASE DO NOT IDENTIFY YOURSELF ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.**

After you finish the questionnaire, send it directly back to me in the envelope provided. **DO NOT GIVE IT TO YOUR DIRECTOR.** In this way, you can be sure that your confidentiality is maintained.

Please be sure to read and sign the informed consent form. **THIS WILL BE DETACHED FROM THE SURVEY BEFORE THE RESULTS ARE TABULATED.** If you have any questions, you can contact me at (703) 951-9167.

Thank you for taking the time to help me.

Sincerely,

Sandra Pope

P.S. If possible, return the questionnaire by _____.
Thank you.

CHILD CARE SATISFACTION PROJECT Informed Consent Form

Purpose and Procedure of this Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between work environment and job satisfaction of child care teachers. Participation involves completing the attached questionnaire and returning it directly to Virginia Tech in the envelope provided. You may refuse to answer any question you wish.

Protection of your privacy

If you decide to participate, all information you provide will be treated as highly confidential. Information obtained in this study will not be given to your supervisor or your co-workers. The results will be presented in reports about groups of child care teachers. Information about individuals will not be released.

Informing You of the Results of the Study

After I have had a reasonable amount of time to tabulate the results, I will prepare and distribute a preliminary report to all child care workers who request this information.

For Further Information about this Study

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Sandra Pope, Master's candidate, Family and Child Development, VPI & SU, Blacksburg, VA 24061. Phone: (703) 231-4794 or (703) 951-9167.

Statement of Consent

Please place an X in the appropriate space below.

I voluntarily agree to complete the questionnaire on child care centers and teachers work attitudes. The study and requirements for my participation have been explained to me and I understand them. I understand that this form will be removed from my questionnaire before the results are tabulated.

I do not wish to participate in this study.

Date: _____ Signed: _____

I would like to receive a copy of the preliminary report for this study.

My address is _____

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND AND YOUR JOB:

Sex: Male Female Age:

Check your highest level of training in Early Childhood Education or Child Development:

<input type="checkbox"/> High school diploma/G.E.D.	<input type="checkbox"/> C.D.A. Credential
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate Degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's Degree
<input type="checkbox"/> Master's Degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)

How long have you worked in child care

 years months

In this job?

 years monthsCircle your job title: Director Assistant Director
Teacher Assistant Teacher Other (specify): _____How many hours a week do you work? Months a year?

Check each of the following content areas you have covered in a course.

- Child Growth and Development
- Staff relations
- Early childhood education history
- Family/community relations
- Early childhood education philosophy
- Social foundations
- Psychological foundations
- Learning environments
- Developmentally diverse children
- Child health/safety/nutrition
- Creating/evaluating/selecting materials
- Planning for developmentally diverse children
- Planning, implementing, evaluating curriculum content

Check the supervised practicum/field work experiences you have had:

- Classroom observation
- Field work or practicum experience as a classroom assistant
- Student teaching or structured field work-assuming the major responsibility for the full range of teaching duties

Circle the continuing education or training you have completed:

- Classroom management/discipline
- Child growth and development
- Play
- Curriculum areas
- Assessment/evaluation of children Other (specify)

Indicate the salary range for your job this year:

<input type="checkbox"/> under \$5,000	<input type="checkbox"/> 11, 000-13,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 20,000-22,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 5,000-7,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 14,000-16,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 23,000-25,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 8,000-10,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 17,000-19,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 26,000 or more

Circle the fringe benefits you receive:

partial or fully paid health insurance
 paid sick days
 paid vacation
 partial or fully paid dental insurance
 paid holidays
 life insurance
 paid maternity or paternity leave
 retirement or pension plan
 reduced tuition for your child
 breakfast or lunch

PLEASE DESCRIBE WORKING CONDITIONS IN YOUR CENTER

Check all that describe the overall staff relations in your center most of the time

cooperative and friendly
 competitive
 people are reluctant to express their feelings
 teachers are very helpful to new staff
 good team spirit
 staff are generally frank and candid
 morale is low
 people socialize outside of work
 people feel isolated
 people complain a lot

Check all that apply. Does your center . . .

provide on-site staff development workshops?
 encourage staff to share resources?
 provide released time to attend conferences?
 provide released time to visit other schools?
 provide tuition reimbursements to take college courses?
 provide guidance for professional advancement?
 have a library of professional books for staff to use?
 subscribe to several educational journals and magazines?
 implement a career ladder for professional advancement?
 encourage staff to learn new skills and competencies?

Check all that characterize the supervision given in your center most of the time:

- provides support and helpful feedback regularly
- hard to please
- incompetent
- conducts fair evaluations of staff
- too critical
- sets high but realistic standards
- delegates too much
- compliments and praises staff
- talks down to staff
- very knowledgeable

Check all that apply. Does your center . . .

- distribute a parents' handbook detailing policies and procedures?
- have a staff manual outlining staff policies?
- provide written contracts for employees?
- have written job descriptions for each position?
- distribute a monthly newsletter to parents?

Check all that characterize your center most of the time:

- written communication is clear
- there are seldom conflicting demands made on staff
- policies and procedures are well-defined
- rules are consistent
- staff are well-informed

Check all that describe the pay and promotion system at your center:

- promotions are not handled fairly
- salaries are fair considering the center's income
- fringe benefits are equitably distributed
- some people are paid more than they are worth
- raises are based on favoritism
- pay is distributed fairly
- pay is fair compared to what other centers pay
- this place is a revolving door, no job security
- people are taken advantage of
- chances for promotion are good

Check all that describe how decisions are made at your center most of the time:

- people are encouraged to be self-sufficient in making decisions
- the director likes to make most of the decisions
- people don't feel free to express their opinions
- everyone provides input on the content of the staff meeting
- conformity is the name of the game here
- there are scheduled staff meetings at least twice a month
- people provide input but decisions have already been made
- teachers make decisions about things which directly affect them
- teachers are seldom asked their opinion on issues
- the director values everyone's input in major decisions

Check all that apply with respect to the goals of your program:

- goals are left vague
- everyone agrees on program goals
- people know how to compromise
- center does not have a written philosophy
- staff share a common vision about what the center should be like
- the staff seldom talk about educational objectives
- staff are committed to program goals
- staff are not unified in their philosophy
- people disagree on what should be taught to children
- program has well-defined educational objectives

Check all that describe the way things get done at your center:

- meetings are a waste of time
- this place is run very efficiently
- people get the job done
- time is wasted
- deadlines are missed regularly
- things rarely get put off
- employees work hard
- people come to work late
- people procrastinate often
- meetings are productive

Check all that apply to the physical environment of your center:

- well-arranged use of space
- cramped and crowded conditions
- seems either too hot or too cold
- neat, tidy, and safe
- decorations are drab
- teachers have a place to store personal belongings
- classroom noise disrupts office business
- there are sufficient supplies and materials
- the building needs major repairs
- storage space is well-organized

Check all that describe your organization as a whole:

- emphasizes creativity
- not very innovative
- quite traditional
- implements needed changes
- encourages diverse opinions
- regularly looks at new educational approaches
- things stay pretty much the same
- new ideas are tried out
- people avoid taking risks at all costs
- problems go unsolved

PLEASE EVALUATE YOUR OWN POSITION. USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1 = Strongly Disagree | 4 = Slightly Agree |
| 2 = Moderately Disagree | 5 = Moderately Agree |
| 3 = Slightly Disagree | 6 = Strongly Agree |

Describe how you feel about your relationship with your co-workers:

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied		
My co-workers care about me	1	2	3	4	5	6
I enjoy their company	1	2	3	4	5	6
They share personal concerns with me	1	2	3	4	5	6
My co-workers are hard to get to know	1	2	3	4	5	6
They are critical of my performance	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel I can't trust them	1	2	3	4	5	6
They are not very helpful	1	2	3	4	5	6
They share ideas and resources	1	2	3	4	5	6
They are competitive	1	2	3	4	5	6
They encourage and support me	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = Very Dissatisfied 4 = Slightly Satisfied
 2 = Moderately Dissatisfied 5 = Moderately Satisfied
 3 = Slightly Dissatisfied 6 = Very Satisfied

Describe how you feel about your relationship with your supervisor(s)--
 the person or people to whom you are directly accountable. Please list
 the name and title of your direct supervisor:

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied		
Respects my work	1	2	3	4	5	6
Is too busy to know how I'm doing	1	2	3	4	5	6
Supervises me too closely	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gives me helpful feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6
Asks for my opinion	1	2	3	4	5	6
Is tactful	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not very dependable	1	2	3	4	5	6
Encourages me to try new ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6
Makes me feel inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6
Is unpredictable	1	2	3	4	5	6

Describe how you feel about your particular job:

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied		
I have control over most things that directly affect my satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5	6
The work I do is stimulating and challenging	1	2	3	4	5	6
Is respected by the parents of my students	1	2	3	4	5	6
Too much paperwork and record-keeping	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not enough variety	1	2	3	4	5	6
Not very creative	1	2	3	4	5	6
Too little time to do all there is to do	1	2	3	4	5	6
Makes an important difference in my students' lives	1	2	3	4	5	6
Does not match my training and skills	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gives a sense of accomplishment	1	2	3	4	5	6

Describe how you feel about your working conditions:

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied		
My work schedule is flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6
The teacher/child ratio is adequate	1	2	3	4	5	6
I always know where to find the things I need	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel too cramped	1	2	3	4	5	6
I need some new equipment and materials to do my job well	1	2	3	4	5	6
The decor is drab	1	2	3	4	5	6
Meets my standards of cleanliness	1	2	3	4	5	6
I can't find a place to carry on a private conversation	1	2	3	4	5	6
Too noisy	1	2	3	4	5	6
School policies and procedures are clear	1	2	3	4	5	6

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 = Very Dissatisfied | 4 = Slightly Satisfied |
| 2 = Moderately Dissatisfied | 5 = Moderately Satisfied |
| 3 = Slightly Dissatisfied | 6 = Very Satisfied |

Describe how you feel about your pay and promotion opportunities:

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied		
	1	2	3	4	5	6
My pay is adequate	1	2	3	4	5	6
My pay is fair considering my background and skills	1	2	3	4	5	6
My pay is fair considering what my co-workers make	1	2	3	4	5	6
I'm in a deadend job	1	2	3	4	5	6
My fringe benefits are inadequate	1	2	3	4	5	6
I could be replaced tomorrow	1	2	3	4	5	6
I have enough time off for holidays and vacations	1	2	3	4	5	6
I'm being paid less than I deserve	1	2	3	4	5	6
Opportunities for me to advance are limited	1	2	3	4	5	6
I expect to receive a raise during the next year	1	2	3	4	5	6

DIRECTORS PLEASE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR CENTER
(If you are not a director, please skip this section)

- Is your center . . . public? private?
- Is it . . . for-profit? not-for-profit?
- Is it . . . corporate sponsored? non corporate sponsored?
- Is it . . . NAEYC accredited? not NAEYC accredited?

How many children are you licensed for? _____
How many children are currently enrolled in your program? _____

How many teachers, if any, have left your program in the last 12 months?
 Teachers Assistant Teachers

Of those who have left in the last 12 months, how many fall into each of the following categories?

- fired or dismissed for poor performance
- laid off because of low enrollment
- laid off for reason other than enrollment
- voluntary (employee left of own accord)
- other (please specify)

VITA

PERSONAL: Name: Sandra Pope
Date of Birth: 6/25/65

EDUCATION: M.S. Child Development, VPI & SU, August, 1990.
B.S., Daycare Administration, VPI & SU, June, 1987.

RELATED EXPERIENCE: HEAD TEACHER, VPI & SU Child Development Labs, 1988-89
Planned, implemented, supervised infant class schedule
Supervised, evaluated, guided student assistants
Assessed infant development, held parent conferences

TEACHER/TEACHER'S AIDE, 1983-1987
Rainbow Riders Child Care Center, 1987-1988
Tiny Tots Daycare Center, Christiansburg, VA
Blacksburg Christian Church Child Care, Blacksburg, VA
NOVA Child Development Centers, Inc., Annandale, VA

ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE: COORDINATOR OF RECRUITING, College of Human Resources,
VPI & SU, 1989-90
Marketed the College via career fair, letters, tours
Assisted in producing brochures, showcases, video

SEMINARS PRESENTED: How Center Environment Affects Teacher Satisfaction in
Child Care Centers, Virginia Association for Early
Childhood Education Conference, April, 1990

GRANTS: Virginia Association for Early Childhood Education, 1989
Omicron Nu Honor Society, chapter scholarship, 1988

ACTIVITIES: Habitat for Humanity
Omicron Nu Home Economics Honor Society
President, 1989-90, 1988-89; Vice President, 1987-88
Phi Upsilon Omicron Home Economics Honor Society
Virginia Tech Association for Early Childhood Education
Public Policy Committee, 1987-89, Chairman, 1988-89
Virginia Association for Early Childhood Education
Southern Association for Children Under Six
National Association for the Education of Young Children

Sandra Pope