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It is anticipated that the results of this study will contribute to the existing body of research on the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction while adding to the knowledge base relative to the interaction between organization and individual. Additionally, it was hoped that a profile of the most satisfied workers would enhance the ability to successfully manage human service organizations.
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The findings in the study indicated the following:

1. The variables highly predictive of job satisfaction were perceptions of supervision (beta weight .456), and perceptions of the work itself (beta weight .365).

2. The variables highly predictive of organizational climate were perceptions of reward (beta weight .554), and perceptions of decision-making (beta weight .435).

3. While there was a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate (-.433**), not all of the work dimensions were found to have statistically significant relationships with the climate factors.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Although recent reports indicate that job satisfaction among workers appears to be increasing, human related problems such as low morale, high rates of absenteeism, and frequent and unpredictable staff turnover continue to plague the development and operation of organizations, stifling their productivity and vitality (Wanous, 1980). Such developments have particular consequences for the human service organization, whose internal structure, according to Weick (1976), usually depicts a "loosely coupled system" in which work units preserve considerable autonomy and identity, and respond to each other in a circumscribed, infrequent, slow, or unimportant manner.

The impetus for interest in this study stems from the author's direct observations over the past thirteen years as an administrator of a major human services organization characterized by high staff turnover, and frequent expressions of job dissatisfaction due to staff's perceptions of the "way things are around here." Further investigation found these perceptions frequently characterized intervening variables (personality, norms, values, attitudes, etc.) Argyris (1976), astutely described as contributing to the complexity of organizations.

Management's interest in human relations in the work setting commenced, for the most part, in the 1940's after World War II. Many factors were operative to effect this
development at that time. The rapid expansion of unionism in the late 1930's and early 1940's caused management everywhere to be more sensitive to the problems and needs of its work force. Management could no longer ignore festering human problems and employee complaints, because the unions would no longer allow these issues to go unnoticed (Bennis, 1966).

With the advent of increasing interest among researchers in the mid-1940's, a number of universities established centers or institutes to carry on research, teaching, publishing, and extensive activities in human relations, industrial relations, and organizational behavior. Important areas of study were motivation, job satisfaction, group dynamics, organizational climate, and values and attitudes (Bennis, 1966).

The formalized search for variables leading to increased job satisfaction (i.e., contentment of employees with a variety of work dimensions) and, presumably greater productivity is generally acknowledged to have commenced with the Hawthorne studies. These studies focused upon the manipulation of environmental factors, insofar as they were observed to be associated with improvements in the performance of tasks by industrial workers in a division of the Western Electric Company (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939).
One of the more important implications of these studies was that satisfaction was more a function of humane treatment by supervisors and the cohesive relations among workers rather than a function of any specific financial rewards or physical conditions (e.g. rest, pauses or temperatures of workrooms). Although numerous statements have been made for and against these studies, the fact remains that the findings, regardless of the degree of their validity, prompted a proliferation of studies on similar relations among variables in a variety of work settings (Hilgendorf and Irving, 1969).

In recent years, researchers have paid increasing attention to work related stress and strain among child welfare workers. Much of this research has been conducted under the rubric of "burnout" or "tedium," and the literature focuses on the effects of identified stressors, such as role conflict and role ambiguity, on the physical and mental health of workers (Barrett and McKelvay, 1980). In general, there is consensus that work related stress has deleterious effects on the individual worker and on job performance and job satisfaction (Jayaratne, Chess and Kunkel, 1986). Thus, interrelations between psychological factors and work roles remain an important area of investigation.

It is recognized that all work dimensions relative to job satisfaction are not confined to the internal
environment. Societal or external environmental changes generally do not affect employee connections to organizations, but can alter work environments, and in so doing, affect employee-organization linkages (Mowday et al, 1982). Nonetheless, questions do arise concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate in formal organizations: What work dimensions are included in the individual’s perception of job satisfaction? What climate factors are included in the individual’s perception of organizational climate? How does one’s perception of organizational climate impact his/her perception of job satisfaction?

**PURPOSE OF STUDY**

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the following: the climate factors and their impact on the perception of overall organizational climate; the work dimensions and their impact on the perception of overall job satisfaction; and the nature of the relationships among the work dimensions of job satisfaction and the factors of organizational climate. A secondary purpose of the study was to delineate composite characteristics of those respondents who demonstrated the highest degree of job satisfaction.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Formal organizations may be approached and examined at several different levels or "units" of analyses. Two units of analyses significant to this study were: (1) the individual, and (2) the formal organization.

The conceptual framework that undergirded this study was based upon two variables: job satisfaction (individual), and organizational climate (formal organization) which were considered consistent with the human relations perspective of organization (Champion, 1975). The human relations perspective examines the integration of people into an organization and includes those factors which motivate them to work together cooperatively and productively. It is action-oriented, relating to people at work in organizations and their economic, psychological, and social satisfactions. It examines variables which contribute toward building a more productive and satisfying worker inter-relationship (Keith Davis, 1962).

Seven central ideas characterize the human relations perspective of organization (Haas and Drabek, 1973). First, workers are viewed as complex social creatures with feelings, desires, and fears. Behavior on the job is a consequence of many factors apart from economics. "Each of us wants appreciation, recognition, influence, a feeling of accomplishment, and a feeling that people who are important
to us believe in us and respect us," (Likert, 1961, p. 98). Hence, motivational forces are reconceptualized to include: (1) ego motives, i.e., the desire to achieve and maintain a sense of personal worth and importance; (2) security motives; (3) curiosity, creativity, and the desire for new experience; and (4) economic motives. This is not to propose that workers are unconcerned about wages, but rather that there are additional bases for incentives.

Second, persons derive their primary satisfactions through group interactions. Failure to participate in satisfying group relationships will result in higher turnover, lower morale, more rapid fatigue, and reduced performance levels. Work settings should be designed to facilitate group emergence.

Third, group formation and process can be manipulated; various techniques can be used to encourage group formation. Most importantly, however, is the style of the supervisor. Human relations researchers argue that their findings show "that those supervisors and managers whose pattern of leadership yields consistently favorable attitudes more often think of employees as "human beings rather than just persons to get the work done" (Likert, 1967, p. 91). Consequently, in study after study, the data show that treating people as "human beings" rather than "cogs in a machine" is a variable highly related to the attitudes and motivation of the subordinate at every level in the organization (Likert,
Thus, supervisors should be skilled in building peer group loyalty through a leadership style that emphasizes the "principle of supportive relationships" (Likert, 1967, p. 105). This principle states: "The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organization each member will, in light of his background, values and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance" (Likert, 1961, p. 59).

Fourth, group norms serve as major regulatory devices for member behavior. The observation that production levels were being informally controlled by group norms was a major contribution of the Hawthorne studies. Social control was maintained through positive and negative sanctions. Hence, social approval is given or withheld depending on the degree to which individual behavior conforms to group standards (Haas and Drabek, 1973).

Fifth, effective organizations are viewed as sets of interlocked functioning groups. Pelz's (1966) research indicated that "subordinates expect their supervisors to be able to exercise an influence upward in dealing with problems on the job and in handling problems which affect them and their well being. To be successful, supervisors,
must be able to exert such influence. The most effective way to accomplish this and to maintain necessary group coordination is to use the "linking pin" principle. This principle suggests that groups can be linked together to form a total functioning organizational unit.

Sixth, the linking pin structure further increases an individual's motivation by maximizing a sense of participation in the entire organization. One's ideas and desires can become expressed and felt beyond the single work group. The individual is aware of the organization's objectives and how he or she has helped, in part, to create and implement them. "Each member recognizes that the more adequately the organization's objectives are met, the greater is the extent to which one's own goals and desires are fulfilled" (Pelz, 1966, p. 154).

Seventh, the participative group system is most effective. The major emphasis is on the general quality of the group and organizational "atmosphere" as reflected in day-to-day interactions. Thus, participative organizations provide a supportive, ego-building atmosphere, one in which people feel valued and respected and in which confidence and trust grow. The atmosphere is permeated by ego-enhancing rather than ego-deflating and threatening points of view toward people (Haas and Drabek, 1973, p. 70).

The formalization of the "human-relations school" in the late 1940's contributed significantly to the development
of the organizational climate construct. Davis (1962) states that:

"climate for an organization is somewhat like personality for a person. The perceptions which people have of that climate produce its image in their minds. Some organizations are bustling and efficient, others are easy going. Some are quite human, others are hard and cold. They change slowly, being influenced by their leaders and their environment". (p. 49).

This variable is difficult to conceptualize from the standpoint of examining it scientifically with the research tools of the social investigator (Champion, 1975, p. 93). Frequently, it conveys the impressions people have of the organizational environment within which they work (Pelz and Andrews, 1966).

Acknowledgement that organizational climate has common properties does not mean, however, that there cannot be subclimates within any given climate. Most larger organizations have dominant climate and numerous sets of subclimates (Smircich, 1985). A dominant climate expresses the core values that are shared by a majority of the organization's members.

There are some methodological problems with this term as well. Since climate often is inferred from the subjective impressions workers have of the organizational environment, it is logical to expect that not all individuals will have the same view of that environment. Some will see it as authoritarian, and others will view it as democratic. The location of the defining individual in
the organizational hierarchy is an important consideration in understanding the nature of the concept. The job satisfaction variable also presents methodological problems.

In a detailed analysis of literature dealing with job satisfaction in the early 1960's Robinson and Conners (1963) indicated that variable relationships with job satisfaction are far from being clearly conceptualized. One reason for this is the fact that so many competing definitions and measures of job satisfaction exist. One measure may emphasize a person's satisfaction with the working hours, and another measure will focus upon his satisfaction with work associates.

Job satisfaction is used as a dependent variable to measure the effect of other variables such as the type of supervision or quality of job content. It is also used as an independent variable which affects individual productivity or rates of labor turnover. Early thinking about the importance of job satisfaction to organizational members espoused the philosophy that "a happy employee is a more productive one" (Champion, 1975, p. 37). Therefore, much attention was devoted to examining this variable under a variety of conditions. For example, in their study of job satisfaction of Prudential Insurance Company employees, More and Reimer (1956) found that increased involvement in the decision-making process of the organization contributed to greater job satisfaction among employees.
MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In carrying out the objectives of this study the following research questions were designed to guide the investigation. The 0.5 level of confidence was the criterion for determining the significance of relationships.

1. Which of five work dimensions (work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and coworkers) has the greatest impact on perceptions of overall job satisfaction?

2. Which of six climate factors (decision making, warmth, risk-taking, openness, reward, and structure) has the greatest impact on perception of overall organizational climate?

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the five work dimensions of job satisfaction and the six climate factors of organizational climate?

4. What are the composite characteristics of those respondents determined to be the most satisfied?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It was anticipated that the results of this study would contribute to the existing body of research on the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction, while adding to the knowledge base relative to the interaction between organization and individual. Additionally, it was hoped that a composite profile of satisfied workers would enhance the ability to successfully manage human service organizations that are viable and effective.
ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The following basic assumptions were made in carrying out this study.

1. There are identifiable work dimensions that are frequently associated with one's perception of job satisfaction.

2. There are identifiable climate factors that are frequently associated with one's perception of organizational climate.

3. A variety of complex work dimensions and interconnected organizational climate factors impact human service workers' perceptions of job satisfaction.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Any generalizations from the findings of this study should take into account the following limitations:

1. Since there is a general consensus among organizational researchers that no two organizations are the same, the ability to generalize should be limited to the perceptions of workers within the organization under investigation.

2. Data were self-reported, and the validity and reliability of the information were dependent upon the respondents' abilities to accurately and honestly recall and report events and perceptions.

3. Time and cost constraints posed limitative conditions under which the study was conducted.

DEFINITION AND OPERATIONLIZATION OF KEY STUDY TERMS

The following definitions were utilized in this study:

**Organizational Climate** - a set of factors which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems, and that may be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment. The concept was operationally defined by the worker's responses on the Climate Questionnaire (Litwin and Stringer, 1968). Six factors were measured: decision...
making, warmth, risk-taking, openness, rewards, and structure.

**Job Satisfaction** - an employee's perception of his/her overall liking and acceptance of work dimensions available in a given situation. This concept was operationally defined by a worker's response on the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, Hulin, 1969). Work dimensions measured were satisfaction with: work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers.

**Decision Making** - an ongoing process of evaluating alternatives for meeting an objective, at which expectations about a particular course of action impel the individual to select that course of action most likely to result in attaining the objective.

**Warmth** - the sense of friendliness and trust prevalent in the organization as perceived by the employee.

**Employee** - one who works for wages or salary in the service of an employer. Employee and worker were used interchangeably.

**Openness** - the employee's perception of the ease or difficulty in getting acquainted with others in the organization.

**Impact** - power to produce changes, move the feelings, or influence perceptions.

**Rewards** - components of compensation which may include monetary as well as management encouragement and humanitarian approach.

**Co-Worker** - person/persons with whom one works, including one's supervisors and other supervisors, peers and subordinates.

**Perception** - the process by which an individual gives meaning to the environment. It involves organizing and interpreting various stimuli into a psychological experience.

**Structure** - the established patterns of coordinating the technology and human assets of an organization.

**Organizational Effectiveness** - the degree to which an organization is achieving its goals.

**Human Service organization** - an organization whose principal function is to protect, maintain, or enhance the personal
well-being of individuals by defining, shaping, or altering their personal attributes.

**Human Service Worker** - refers to an individual who is employed by a human service organization and engages in activities which directly contribute to the principal function of the organization. An individual is in one of the following occupational categories: professional, administrator, supervisor, paraprofessional, or clerical.

**Paraprofessional** - a human service worker without extensive formal credentials, often working at a lower ranking job in an agency. The individual is in one of the following occupational categories: activity therapist, caseworker (less than Master’s Degree), Caseworker principal (less than Master’s Degree), Caseworker Senior (less than Master’s Degree), Community Worker, Human Services Technician, Licensed Practical Nurse, Youth Development Worker, and Youth Development Worker I.

**Professional** - A human service worker with extensive formal credentials, often working at a higher ranking job in an agency. The individual is in one of the following occupational categories: accountant, caseworker (Master’s Degree), Caseworker Principal (Master’s Degree), Caseworker Senior (Master’s Degree), Legal Assistant, Staff Nurse, Training Specialist Senior, and Volunteer Resources Coordinator II.

**Clerical** - A human service worker whose major responsibilities involve the performance of some aspect of information processing. The individual is in one of the following occupational categories: Accounting clerk, Accounting Technician I, Accounting Technician II, Clerk, Clerk Transcriber I, Clerk Principal, Clerk Senior, Data Transcriber, Personnel Technician I, Procurement and Service Officer I, Secretary Typist, and Secretary Typist Senior.

**Supervisor** - A human service worker whose major occupational responsibilities entail the critical watching and directing of the activities of others occupying a particular unit or operation within the organization. The individual is classified in one of the following occupational categories: Casework Supervisor Senior, Casework Supervisor, Casework Supervisor Principal, Children’s Home Assistant Supervisor, Children’s Home Supervisor, Clerk Administrative, Data Transcription Supervisor, Fiscal Analyst Senior, Office Supervisor, Payroll Supervisor I, Personnel Technician II, Property and Supply Supervisor I, Secretary Administrative, and Secretary Principal.
Administrator - A human service worker whose major occupational responsibilities entail management of the execution or conduct of other personnel in major leadership roles within the organization. Such individuals generally functions at the higher echelon of the organization. The individual is classified in one of the following occupational categories: Accounting Principal, Administrative Assistant, County Administrator, County Program Director, Deputy County Administrator, and Personnel Manager II.

Human Problems - personnel related circumstances that often create conditions that adversely affect organizational effectiveness. Some major examples are: job dissatisfaction, low morale, high absenteeism, low productivity, and high turnover.

Work dimensions - refers to an individual's needs, abilities, and objectives, and the specific properties of his job available to fulfill their needs, abilities, and objectives. Properties of the job to be considered are: the work performed, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers.

Climate Factors - refer to specific attributes or characteristics that form the prevailing temper or environmental conditions of an organization. Climate factors for an organization, are like personality traits for a person. The climate factors consist of: decision-making, warmth, risk-taking, openness, rewards, and structure.

Pay - refers to the absolute amount of dollar earning a worker receives, in addition to his perception of whether the amount of dollar earning is fair or not fair.

Work - one's specific task, assignment, duty, or function, often a part or phase of some larger activity.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents information considered most relevant to the purpose of the study through a review of the empirical and theoretical literature on the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. In conducting this review, specific attention was given to prior studies and research findings relative to the work dimensions and climate factors under consideration in the study.

The literature review is divided into five sections: (1) theories on the behavior of people at work; (2) theories on organizations and management; (3) work dimensions of job satisfaction; (4) factors associated with organizational climate; and (5) personal characteristics and job satisfaction.

THEORIES ON THE BEHAVIOR OF PEOPLE AT WORK

Despite the "work-intoxicated" nature of the world in which we live today, the study of people at work has been regarded as an applied subject—a practical extension of the study of the psychology of perception, learning, and motivation (Bass and Barrett, 1981). Several scholars have made attempts at constructing theories to explain the behavior of people in the work place. Among some of the more noted contributors are: Maslow, Herzberg, Homans, and...
Maslow, in expounding his theory of self-actualization, postulated that all human needs can be arranged in ascending hierarchy, and that the lowest-level unsatisfied needs are the main motivators of any individual (Bass, 1981). The lowest-level needs are physiological needs for food, water, and bodily survival. If these are satisfied, the next high-level needs become the motivating factors of the individual. As long as low-level needs are unsatisfied, one is dominated by them and cannot be concerned with needs of a higher order. The level above physiological needs contains the safety needs. Safety needs include, for example, security in one's work and various forms of insurance against the risks of life. The satisfaction of these leads to the next higher need: for love and affection. For satisfaction of this love need, the individual seeks close relationships with his family and friends. If the love needs are met, esteem needs then demand attention. The top need identified in the hierarchy is the desire for self-actualization. This is the need of the individual to fulfill his or her potential (Bass, 1981).

As with most theories, Maslow's theory was tested and gave rise to modifications by other researchers. For example, Alderfer (1969) has shown with correlational analyses of workers' responses about their needs, that needs tend to cluster into three areas, rather than five:
existence (safety and security), relatedness (love and affiliation), and growth (esteem and self-actualization).

Building upon Maslow's work, Frederick Herzberg (1959) became the chief proponent of a specific theory of job motivation that has ideological similarities to Maslow's more general conceptualizations. The major support for this theory rests on a detailed study of 200 engineers and accountants. Responders were asked to recall incidents when they may have felt extremely good or bad about their work.

An analysis of the results showed that although work itself, sense of responsibility, and opportunity for advancement produced the longest-lasting and most frequent positive attitudes toward the job, they did not play a significant role in producing job attitudes. These intrinsic elements were "motivators" since they fulfilled the individual's need for self-actualization and growth and were related only to the job itself. In contrast, extrinsic factors, such as working conditions, salary, interpersonal relations, and security, brought about dissatisfaction only when they fell below a certain point. Since the satisfaction of these factors led to neutral rather than to positive job attitudes, they were not "motivators" but simply "hygiene factors" surrounding the job, the presence of which prevented dissatisfaction. As expected, most of those interviewed said they were more productive when they felt good about their jobs (Herzberg, 1959).
A variety of reasons led numerous investigators to reject the main tenet of Herzberg's theory, that the separate factors that lead to satisfaction are different from the factors that result in dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 1971). A major reason is that his methodology does not afford respondents an equal opportunity to respond positively and negatively to both job content factors (the work itself) and job context factors (the surroundings).

However, regardless of the criticisms, Herzberg's theory has been widely popularized and few managers are unfamiliar with his recommendations. For example, according to Robbins (1988), much of the enthusiasm in the late 1960's and early 1970's for vertically expanding jobs to allow workers greater responsibility in planning and controlling their work can probably be attributed largely to Herzberg's findings and recommendations. Additionally, and perhaps more important for our purposes here, the motivation-hygiene theory, and Herzberg's recognition of the role extrinsic factors play in shaping one's perception of job satisfaction, further support the possible relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate.

Homans (1961), in expounding his distributive justice and equality theories, has advanced the relatively simple and logical proposition that employees of an organization want an equitable return for the contributions they make. They want distributive justice. He expressed the belief
that when people are in an exchange relationship with one another, they expect that the rewards of each person will be proportional to his or her costs. Thus, the focus of the employees' concerns is not just how well their needs are being satisfied but how well off they are in comparison with others at work.

Finally, according to Vroom, people have two kinds of expectations. The first is that the more effort we exert, the better we will perform. Second, the better we perform, the more we are likely to attain a desired outcome. Thus, our effort can be predicted by adding up all the pros and cons in the work situation and outside it, each literally multiplied by its expected probability of occurrence. Our performance can be predicted by adding up all the pros and cons of its consequences, again, each literally multiplied by its expected probability of occurrence (Bass, 1981).

Elaborations of Vroom’s expectancy theory came quickly. Among these was Porter and Lawler’s (1968) formal model, which integrates the concepts of attitudes, motivation, effort, satisfaction, ability, performance, and the rewards of work. Job satisfaction or good job attitudes are considered not just as a cause of high performance but as a complex function of the rewards of work.

In summary, many psychologists have addressed the study of individual behavior in organizations, but often attempted to classify environmental factors in molecular terms.
Vroom's model, as an example, acknowledged the importance of situational variables, but does not provide a format by which such variables can be measured. Additional, he fails to relate the situational variables to sociological and organizational concepts of the situation. Such developments are necessary: (a) to allow a valid cross-situational comparison of behavior, and (b) to provide the basis for theories of organizational behavior which includes an appreciation of intrapersonal phenomena (Litwin and Swinger, 1968).

**ORGANIZATIONAL AND MANAGEMENT THEORIES**

Organizational theorists, interested in descriptive rather than normative explanations of human behavior in organizations, have dealt indirectly with notions of organizational environments. However, current theoretical models do not explicitly use concepts of subjective environment or climate (Litwin and Swinger, 1968).

Classical organization theories, as represented in the writings of Fayol (1949), Koontz and O'donnell (1955), and others, render such concepts unnecessary. These theories assume that man is an economic and logical being. Their main concerns are (a) the sub-division of activities into clearly differentiated functional units, (b) the formal structuring of the organization that differentiates positions in relation to status and function, and (c)
operations, defined in terms of time and motion study, work flow, and production charts. According to Litwin and Swinger (1968), this emphasis on a highly rationalized system prohibits the consideration of informal, subjective phenomena such as climate.

Managerial theorists have also shown some interest in the influence of organizational climate. Organizational psychologists interested in the management process have developed various terms to describe the indirect and subtle effects of management practices on the attitudes and behavior of subordinates. Several of these terms attempt to describe the phenomenon that is often referred to as organizational climate (Bass and Drenth, 1987).

In the Human Side of Enterprise, Douglas McGregor (1960) has developed what he calls the "managerial climate" defined in terms of the manifestations of the assumptions of management. He states:

"The day-by-day behavior of the supervisor and other significant people in the managerial organization communicates something about their assumptions concerning management which is of fundamental significance. Many behavioral manifestations of managerial attitude create what is often referred to as the psychological climate of the relationship" (P. 134).

McGregor used the concept of a psychological climate to complete his analysis of effective management, but the broader implications of the concept were not examined. Why do subordinates respond to management assumptions? How do
these "deeper assumptions" arouse behavioral responses? What dimensions of this psychological climate are most important? Such questions are not given satisfactory answers (Bass and Drenth, 1987).

Blake and Mouton (1964), in the Managerial Grid, see the need for a general concept of organizational climate. They use the term "organizational culture" and propose that when a manager sees his responsibility as that of managing a culture rather than just managing people to get work out of them, the basic unit of development is no longer the individual considered separately and alone. While their arguments for total organizational development are appealing, they stop short of explaining what happens to the members of the organization when the climate or culture is changed. In summary, management theories have dealt with the organizational process as a continuing phenomenon. As a result, they have been concerned with changes in organizational behavior and have recognized, therefore, the need for a dynamic conceptual framework that links the person with his environment. None of the theories they have thus far developed, however, has provided such a systematic or generally useful linkage (Litwin and Swinger, 1968).

**JOB SATISFACTION/WORK DIMENSIONS**

Workers' perceptions of job satisfaction appear to be universal. In a national comparison of job satisfaction by
occupations, agreement was found between the United States and five other countries as to the percentage of satisfied employees (Inkles, 1960). It was concluded that approximately 80 percent of employees were satisfied with their jobs, while 20 percent were not. This conclusion was corroborated in a study of 2,159 female employees in electronic firms (Wild, 1970). He found that 21 percent of the workers then employed and only 36 percent of the former employees expressed overall dissatisfaction with their jobs, which were a highly routinized typed. An analysis of reasons for leaving their former jobs by the former employees indicated that voluntary turnover resulted from dissatisfaction.

According to Megginson (1972), job satisfaction does not result merely from the job, the individual, or the environment; a combination of all these factors is necessary. He hypothesizes that job satisfaction varies directly and proportionately with the extent to which the needs of the individual worker can be satisfied in a job situation. This hypothesis maintains that workers whose personal needs are satisfied on the job are more likely to remain on the job as productive employees than those whose needs are not satisfied in the work situation.

Killian (1976) ascribes to a similar philosophy in advocating for managing human resources with a return on investment (ROI) approach. He states:
"Maximizing return on investment in people does not mean exploiting, manipulating, or taking advantage of employees. Rather, it means providing the highest form of benefit a company can offer its employees—a systematic, organized, approach to guaranteed opportunities for the full use of talent and potential. Such an approach offers the individual an opportunity to achieve an appropriate return on his or her own investment of time and effort through greater economic and personal rewards. The company in return benefits as its production, sales, and profit goals are achieved." (p. 89)

Smith et. al (1969), in developing a measurement of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, identified several work dimensions to operationalize the job satisfaction construct: perception of work itself, perception of pay, perception of opportunities for promotion, perception of supervision, and perception of co-workers.

Job satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the work itself focuses on the job scope or duties (tasks) of a position as a source of good or bad feelings about the job being performed. Available research yields a fairly consistent, but modest, relationship between variations in job scope and absenteeism. In particular, absenteeism has been found to be inversely related to perceived measures of task identity (Hachman and Lawler, 1971).

The subject of pay is extremely complex, and its exact influence is hard to determine. Some critics argue that it is the most important source of job satisfaction. However, the pay individuals receive is only part of what motivates them to work, although additional pay may increase
production. It determines one's possible standard of living. For some, pay is a symbol of success. For some it may mean a new car or boat, a college education for their children, or a source of power and standing in their community (Bass, 1981).

According to Bass (1981), when workers are asked directly the importance of pay to their overall job satisfaction, pay ranks relatively high compared with other factors. However, if workers are questioned more indirectly about the importance of pay, its significance drops substantially. Further, the absolute amount of dollar earnings is of great importance to some workers, but there is also evidence that workers' perception of whether their pay is fair or not, is often more important to their morale than their actual absolute dollar earnings.

In a more sophisticated approach to determining the importance of money, workers were asked to express their preferences for either increased pay or different type of fringe benefits. All alternatives had equal monetary value. Over a thousand electrical workers indicated, on the average, that direct pay increases were not as important as fringe benefits, such as increased sick leave and extra vacation time (Nealey and Goodale, 1967). In another study, nearly 200 industrial workers ranked a pay raise fifth in order of preference (Opsahl and Dunnette, 1966). For the relatively affluent worker in America, simply earning more
money often is less important than the opportunity to have more time for leisure activities.

Additionally, by 1980, sizable salary increments for middle-income workers could often result in relatively little increase in real disposable income because it moved them into higher income-tax brackets and because of the rise of continuing inflation. Thus, in the late 1970's many U.S. deep coal miners were refusing to work more than three days a week.

Researchers have also studied actual wage rates or incentive systems and the rate of absenteeism. Beatty and Beatty (1975), Bernardin (1977), Fried et al (1972), and Lundquist (1958), all found a direct inverse relationship between wage rate and absenteeism. Finally, where income is low and psychological safety and securing needs are unmet, pay is still considered to be of prime importance to the average worker (Mowday et al., 1982).

Many employees quit during the first year of working at a new job. The job fails to meet the expectations of the new recruit. These unmet expectations may be dealt with by making changes in the job situation or by changing the expectations at the time of hiring (Porter and Steers, 1973). Thus, turnover was reduced 18 percent by changing promotion and pay policies for over 300 clerical workers in a manufacturing concern (Hulin and Blood, 1968).

A study conducted at Sears (Smith, Roberts, and Hulin,
1976) gathered job satisfaction data from over 98,000 blue and white-collar employees at 132 branches located throughout the United States. Data were collapsed into three time periods extending over a ten year span of time (1963-69; 1967-70; 1971-72). A total of seven areas were measured: supervision, financial rewards, career future, kind of work, co-worker, physical surroundings, and amount of work done. The data showed a downward trend for five of the seven areas of job satisfaction. One area did not change (amount of work done), and one area dropped and then rose (financial rewards). To try to isolate trends for the newly entered employees, those with less than one year's tenure in the 1967-70 group were compared with those with one to five years of service in the 1971-1972 group. There was a decline for five of the seven areas: supervision, amount of work done, co-workers, physical surroundings, and career future. Kind of work done and financial rewards both increased.

Finally, research supports the contention that the rate of promotion influences employees' affective response to the general job situation (Hackman and Lawler, 1971). Hence it is apparent that opportunities for promotion impact job satisfaction.

The relationship between employees and their supervisors is very important and tends to influence the way employees feel about their jobs. Generally, job
satisfaction often results from the subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors. Thus, good working relationships between the subordinates and the superiors tend to produce the greater levels of job satisfaction.

Research on leader behavior reviewed by Stodill (1974) confirms that a more considerate leadership style facilitates job satisfaction, whereas a more task-oriented or structured leadership style often inhibits satisfaction. Additionally, four studies found a significant inverse relationship between satisfaction with supervisory style and absenteeism (John, 1968; Metzner and Man, 1953; Schriesheim and Von Gilnow, 1980; F.J. Smith, 1977).

Teamwork is not a modern invention. Loyalty to Kith and Kin predates civilization. The buddy system was practiced in the Greek phalanx by older soldiers befriending new recruits. The Arab sweeping out of Arabia to spread Islam spoke of the spirit of the clan (Bass and Barrett, 1981).

Thus, it is not surprising to see how powerful the influence of the work group, or attitudes about co-workers can be on the motivation of the individual worker to perform and experience job satisfaction. Homans (1951) points out that during World War II, absenteeism and high turnover were prevalent in Plant X but not in Plant Y, a similar one. In Plant X, with low absenteeism and turnover, the Supervisor introduced new workers to each of their co-workers and made
them feel they were part of the team. Workers' tasks and their relationship to the production of the total plant were carefully explained. On the other hand, Plant Y with high absenteeism and turnover, did not attempt to integrate new workers into the groups.

Only two out of nine studies reviewed by Mowday et al (1982) found a significant relationship between co-worker relations and absenteeism (Metzner and Mann, 1953; Nicholson, Wall, and Lischeron, 1977). However, co-workers relations have generally been found to be quite strongly related to general job satisfaction, which in turn, has been found to be related to attendance (Rhodes and Steers, 1978; Vroom, 1964).

Although there are several possible dimensions to be considered relative to job satisfaction, a review of the existing literature revealed a substantial group of studies to support workers' perceptions of the work dimensions (work itself; pay; opportunities for promotion; supervision; and co-workers), adopted for study, as predictors of job satisfaction.

**FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

The first explicit studies of psychological climate were initiated by Kurt Lewin (1951) in the 1930's. In seeking to describe the essential dynamics that linked human behavior to generalized environmental stimuli, he states:
"To characterize properly the psychological field, one has to take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, needs, social relations, as well as more general characteristics of the field as the "atmosphere: (for instance, the friendly, tense, or hostile atmosphere) or the amount of freedom. These characteristics of the field as a whole are as important in psychology as, for instance, the field of gravity for the explanation of events in classical physics. Psychological atmospheres are empirical realities and are scientifically describable" (p. 241).

Lewin, Lippit, and White (1958) attempted to study climate as an "empirical reality" in an experiment involving the behavioral effects of three different leader-induced atmospheres. The three leadership roles were authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. In a restatement of their classic paper, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates" (1939), the authors reported that the adult-leader role was found to be a very strong determiner of the pattern of social interaction and emotional development of the group. Four clear-cut types of social atmosphere emerged, in spite of great member differences in social expectations and reaction tendency due to previous adult-leader (parent, teacher) relationships.

In other words, the climate itself proved more powerful than previously "acquired" behavior tendencies, and it was able to change the observed behavior patterns of the group members.

Another notable attempt at theory building was the interpersonal organization theory proposed by Kahn and his
associates (1964). This so called "role-set theory" is more explicitly psychosocial in both formulation and emphasis than any of the other theories discussed. The organization is pictured as a vast set of overlapping and interlocking role-sets (some of which transcend the boundaries of the organization). Kahn and his associates state:

"It is the key assumption of this approach that the behavior of any organizational performer is the product of motivational forces that derive in large part from the behavior of members of his role-set because they constantly bring influence to bear upon him which serves to regulate his behavior in accordance with the role expectations they hold for him" (p. 35).

Finally, Litwin and Swinger (1968) have proposed a climate model that in many ways represents an alternative to Kahn. It proposes a more molar concept of situational variables, and thus, can be thought of as representing some cumulative sum of expectations and incentives across motivations. It is an expression of the situational motivational influences described cumulatively for a group of individuals and a group of motivations.

According to Litwin and Stringer (1968) the climate model can be distinguished from the Kahn theory in at least five significant ways:

1. The role-set theory implies that organizational influences are largely limited to the specific subgroup with whom the member has contact. On the other hand, the climate model suggests that organizational/environmental influences are more general and diffuse. Further, the climate model suggests that certain factors such as history and tradition, leadership style, spatial arrangements, etc., do influence, through climate, the
motivation and behavior of individuals.

2. The role-set theory is somewhat more rational in emphasis and in method of measurement. Members of the role-set have expectations which they can verbalize more or less directly. The individuals involved may and probably do have at least some of these data already. Climate, on the other hand, may have many nonrational components. For example, no person in the organization may consciously hold a certain view, yet that view might have become part of the climate. Individuals may be completely unconscious of the effect climate is having on them and others.

3. The expectations of the role-set are assumed by Kahn and his associates to have some reasonable stability, at least as long as the role-set itself is stable. Expectations may shift over time, but the total impact of the role-set is assumed to be reasonably constant. Climate conditions, on the other hand, are assumed to show properties of cyclical change, time decay, and fairly rapid temporary shifts (with return to base levels and basic cyclical patterns).

4. The role-set theory rests on molecular analysis. It would be tedious and difficult (if not impossible) to assess the total sum of role-set expectations in a large complex organization. Such a sum would represent an extremely detailed body of data on individuals and groups. The climate model utilizes a molar level of analysis. It would be somewhat easier to describe climate in a large organization, though the same amount of precise data about individual role behavior would not be available.

5. Finally, a manager would go about influencing climate and role-set expectations quite differently. He could change the influence of the role-set by changing members or by directly influencing expectations throughout training. He would want to take a multitude of factors into account in trying to influence climate. He might have to look at the physical plant, the geographic location, the procedures and practices, and his own leadership style and that of others.

A manager has, furthermore, only a limited number of ways of affecting role set expectations, but he or she has a much
wider range of alternative approaches to changing the climate.

Just as individuals have personalities, so do organizations (Halpin and Croft, 1963). Thus, organizations, like people, can be characterized in such terms as rigid, friendly, warm, innovative, or conservative. These traits in turn, can then be used to predict attitudes and behaviors of the people within these organizations (Robbins, 1988). Furthermore, there is a systems variable in organizations that while hard to define or describe precisely, nevertheless exists and which employees generally describe in common terms. Organizational behaviorists call this variable "organizational climate".

Concern for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate is not new. However, during the past ten years organizational researchers have demonstrated an increasing interest in the potent utility of the organizational climate construct and its relationship to job satisfaction. In one of the broadest conceptualizations, organizational climate is discussed as: "the set of characteristics that (a) distinguish the organization from other organizations, (b) are relatively ending overtime, and (c) influence the behavior of the people in the organization" (Frederickson, 1966).

According to Robbins (1981), organizational climate is a descriptive term. It is concerned with how employees
perceive a set of lay characteristics, not whether they like them or not. This is important because it differentiates climate from job satisfaction. Research on organizational climate has sought to measure how employees see their organization: Is it highly structured? Does it reward innovation? Does it stifle conflicts? Job satisfaction, on the other hand, seeks to measure effective responses to the work environment. That is, the former describes, while the latter evaluates. Organizational climate represents a common perception held by the organization’s members. We should expect, therefore, that individuals with different backgrounds or at different levels in the organization will tend to describe the organization’s climate in similar terms (Robbins, 1981).

As was indicated earlier, there have been intensive and diverse efforts to conceptualize, measure, and utilize the organizational climate construct (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974). For reviewing and evaluating the research literature, the studies reported are classified into broad categories by the use of organizational climate as an independent, intervening, or dependent variable.

**Climate as an Independent Variable**

Research on climate and dependent measure of organizational effectiveness, such as performance and job satisfaction, indicate that there is some commonality upon
which to build some tentative integrative conclusions (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974). Job satisfaction often varies according to the subject’s perception of his organization’s climate. Several studies by Friedlander and Margulies (1969), Kaczka and Kirk (1968), Schneider (1972), and Hall (1972), have all reported data indicating that climate and performance are related. However, the relationship between performance and climate is not as easily understood, or as persuasive, as the relationship between job satisfaction and climate. Frederickson (1966) for example, when studying the effects of organizational climates on administrative performance, found that individuals who consistently perceived the climate as either rules oriented and closely supervised or innovative and loosely supervised had more predictable performance records than those individuals working in inconsistent climates. In consistent climates perceptions were associated with lower organizational performance. Thus, one important aspect of the Frederickson study was the consistency of climate perceptions and their relation to performance.

It was also found that the amount of administrative work in the simulated job (in-basket exercises) is more predictable in a climate that encourages innovation than in one that encourages standard procedures; and that in an innovative climate, greater productivity can be expected of people with skills and attitudes that are associated with
independence of thought and action and the ability to be productive in free, unstructured situations (Frederickson, 1966).

Additionally, a further analysis of his data found that subjects employed different work methods under different climate conditions. For example, under climate conditions permitting more freedom, administrators tended to work more directly with peers, while in the restrictive climates the administrators tended to work through the formal organizational channels more.

Other researchers have also found that a particular type of climate was associated with high performance. Friedlander and Greenberg's (1971) study of the hard core unemployed indicated that workers who perceived the climate as supportive had higher performance than those who perceived the climate as less supportive. Hall and Lawler (1969) found that higher performing research and development laboratories were more likely to be described as low on emotional control and high on dominance.

Significant differences in subjects perceptions of climate, however, do not always result in varying levels of performance. Kaczka and Kirk's (1968) computer simulation indicated that an employee-centered climate does not always lead to higher performance levels. Low emphasis on costs had a marked effect on profits and on unit costs. Employee-oriented cost emphasis led to lower organizational
performance and had little effect upon grievances. Pritchard and Karasick (1973) in their study of the effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance, found only two of their eleven climate terms (performance-reward, dependency and achievement) correlated significantly with managerial performance.

**Climate as an Intervening Variable**

Organizational climate was used principally as an intervening variable when the independent variables were human relations training programs, leadership styles, or manager’s personality needs. The dependent variable in these studies was job performance or satisfaction.

The three studies—Costly, Downey, and Blumberg (1973); Hand, Richards, Slocum (1973); and Watson (1973)—which used climate as an intervening variable yielded inconsistent results. In the Hand et al. study, the organization had a long-linked technological process, faced a simple and static environment, and had members from the same level. On the other hand, Watson used managers who were members of the institutional level. No data are given to permit a classification of the general technology represented or the type of external environment confronting the firms. Thus, differences between the Watson research and the Hand et al. research may be attributed to differences in organizational level or to the external environments facing the firms. Litwin and Stringer (1968) created three firms that competed
in a realistic simulated business game. Three different climates were created: (a) an authoritarian-oriented business; (b) a democratic-friendly business; and (c) an achieving business. The independent variable was the leadership style of the president. By instructing the president of the business how to act, the three climates were created. The significant feature of the study was the marked effect of the different leadership styles in creating different organizational climates, and consequently, different performance levels. Subjects in the achieving climate produced the most, but the democratic--friendly climate resulted in the highest level of worker satisfaction.

**Climate as a Dependent Variable**

A number of researchers have suggested that climate is dependent upon the organization’s structure and can be changed through human relations training programs. Researchers studying the impact of internal properties (e.g. locus of decision-making, rules, position in the hierarchy, and the like) and how these influence climate include George and Bishop (1971), Cawsey (1973), Dieterly and Schneider (1974), Litwin and Stringer (1968), Hall and Lawler (1969), Payne and Phesey (1971), Schneider and Bartlett (1970), Schneider and Hall (1972), and Stimson and LaBelle (1971).

The findings of these studies indicate that perceptions of climate vary among employees at different levels in the
managerial hierarchy. For example, Schneider and Hall (1972) found position level in the priesthood moderates the priest's perception of his climate; Schneider and Bartlett (1970) found perceptions of climate vary between managers and assistant managers; and Hall and Lawler (1969) found varying climate perceptions between technicians and managers.

However, Porter and Lawler (1965) reported significant differences in job satisfaction among managers depending upon their level within the organization. Thus, organization level has been found related to both how the individual describes his organization (climate) and his evaluation of it (job satisfaction).

Employee participation in decision making is believed to be a strategy to increase the motivation to work and job satisfaction. Research on whether, when, why, and how participation works have been accumulated. Schuler (1980) found support for his prediction that participation is associated with employee satisfaction when it reduces and clarifies the expectancy from performance to reward.

Studies have demonstrated that social support reduces the stressfulness of conditions and that individuals experiencing support suffer less from strains, and thus enjoy job satisfaction. The support of one's superior and colleagues is particularly important in organizations. Leadership studies have given much attention to support and
consideration. Many of the findings can be applied by organizations, for example, in the structuring of management training programs. Examples are the behavior modeling programs developed by AT&T and General Electric (Bumaska, 1976; Goldstein and Sorcher, 1974; and Moses and Ritchie, 1976).

Abbey and Dickson (1983) studied the R & D departments of eight companies in the electronics industry in the United States. They compared the climate in these departments, measured as the average of descriptions provided by researchers active there, with an independent valuation of the company's innovativeness. Strong and significant rank correlations were obtained between the two, climate variables and innovativeness, namely, risk taking/flexibility and the emphasis on performance in the system of rewards. Other climate dimensions showing positive but somewhat weaker correlations were freedom, psychological support, and performance ambition.

The experienced reality of structure in organizations resides its impact, in the pattern and regularities that it imparts to the behavior of the organization and its members (Stein & Kanter, 1990). Additionally, according to Shaw (1984), the relations among organizational structure and the behaviors and attitudes of their members is a core question in organizational theory.

One's status in an organization is often based upon the
position he or she holds within the organizational structure. Job satisfaction tends to be greater with higher status level. This means that when supervisors have higher job satisfaction, also, when managers are compared, research indicates that the higher the level of a manager, the greater his or her job satisfaction (Bass and Barrett, 1981). This finding of increased satisfaction with each succeeding level in the organization is not surprising, since a number of other, satisfaction-related job factors are implied by higher positions, including responsibility, money, prestige, fate control, and more intrinsically rewarding work.

More than a thousand managers were questioned about how well five of their needs were being satisfied. Satisfaction was found to increase with each level of management or the esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. But security and social-need satisfaction was high and relatively constant across all levels of management samples (Roach and Davis, 1973). Moreover, at different levels in the organization, different needs are important to employees. At higher occupational levels, more intrinsic job factors (such as the work itself, and the opportunity for self expression were more valued than at lower job levels, where extrinsic job characteristics (such as pay and security) assumed more importance for the employee (Centers and Bugental, 1966).
Porter and Lawler (1965), Berger and Cummings (1979), and James and Jones (1976) have reviewed the large number of empirical and conceptual studies on the impact of organizational structure on the attitudes and behaviors of the organization and its members. These reviews were based on an underlying concept of structure that included several dimensions: (1) organizational level, (2) line and staff hierarchies, (3) span of control, (4) subunit size, (5) total organizational size, (6) tall or flat shape, and (7) centralized or decentralized shape. In general, the reviewed studies attempted to determine the effects of these structural dimensions on one or more attitudes (mainly satisfaction) and behaviors (performance, turnover, absenteeism, and employee-grievance rates) of their members.

An important element within organizational climate is the quality and freedom of social interaction among employees (Costley and Todd, 1978). Social needs are satisfied in organizations through both formal and informal group interactions which can contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction due to related as well as unrelated job factors. Thus, the extent to which the organizational climate is perceived to facilitate social interaction very often impacts perceptions of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Wanous (1980), in discussing the importance of human resources as a critical element in organizational effectiveness, points out the importance for
the successful socialization of newcomers during organizational entry, and its impact on worker attitude and performance.

**Personal Characteristics and Job Satisfaction**

Several personal characteristics have been found to affect job satisfaction. For example, people high in self-esteem tend to report higher levels of satisfaction with their jobs than persons low in self-esteem (Locke, 1988). Similarly, persons who are high in the ability to withstand stress tend to report higher levels of satisfaction than persons low in this ability (Scheier et al., 1986). Also, individuals who believe they can influence or control their own outcomes tend to report higher job satisfaction than those who feel that such outcomes are outside their personal influence (Andrisani, et al., 1976). Persons who are high in status and seniority often report higher levels of satisfaction than those who are low in status or seniority (Near et al., 1984). Such findings probably stem, at least in part, from the fact that persons in the former group actually enjoy better working conditions than those in the latter. However, they may also reflect the fact that persons happy in a given job or organization tend to remain in it, and thus are higher in status and seniority as a result of their positive attitudes.

Some attention has also been given to the interaction between individual needs and climate as an influence on job
satisfaction. Pritchard and Karasick (1973) considered five personality needs (needs for achievement, affiliation, autonomy, order, and dominance) and their relationship to climate and job satisfaction and performance. A highly supportive climate was found to be closely linked with high job satisfaction of managers regardless of the individual manager’s personality needs. However, managers with a high need for order tended to perform better in a highly structured climate. Similarly, managers with a high need for autonomy were more satisfied in a climate characterized as low in decision centralization than were managers who were in need of autonomy. Thus, these researchers conclude there is some limited evidenced that individual needs and climate can interact to influence job performance and satisfaction.

Although there are several possible climate factors to be considered relative to the organizational climate construct, a review of the existing literature revealed a substantial group of studies to support the impact of the worker’s perception of the climate factors (decision-making, support, risk-taking, reward, structure, and openness) adopted for study, and their relationship to job satisfaction.

This chapter contained a review of the literature related to the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate. Literature specific to the climate
factors and work dimensions associated with job satisfaction were presented.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methods and procedures that were used in conducting this study. The following are described: (1) research design, (2) the setting, (3) sample, (4) selection procedure, (5) instrumentation, (6) procedure for implementation, and (7) analysis of data.

Research Design

The research design sets up the framework for "adequate" tests of the relations among variables. The design tells us, in a sense, what observations to make, how to make them, and how to analyze the quantitative representations of the observations. Further, a design tells us what type of statistical analysis to use, and the possible conclusions to be drawn from the statistical analysis (Kerlinger, 1976).

The research design employed in conducting this study was correlational, a form of descriptive research methodology. The process of descriptive research includes the following: (1) statement of the problem; (2) identification of information needed to solve the problem; (3) selection or development of instrument for gathering the data; (4) identification of the target population and determination of any necessary sampling procedure; (5) design of the procedure for data collection; (6) collection
of data; (7) analysis of data; and (8) preparation of the report (Ary, Jacobs and Razavich, 1972).

A correlational design involves the collection of sets of scores on a sample of subjects and the determination of the relationship, if any, among these sets of scores (Ary, Jacobs and Razavich, 1972). In this study, the research design was exploratory and concerned with determining the bivariate and multi-variate correlations between sets of scores that were derived from the assessment of five work dimensions, and six climate factors.

Descriptive statistics, which included percentages, averages and frequency distributions, were used to organize the data. Inferential research techniques were used to determine the degree of relationship (correlation) between the criterion variables and the selected predictors.

Setting

The study was conducted at the Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services. The Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS) is a human service organization whose mission is:

"to enable families and individuals in economic need to attain successful independent living, to protect vulnerable adults, and to enhance and strengthen families; abilities to provide the care, protection and experiences essential for healthy child development" (DFACS brochure).
Programmatic responsibilities include the delivery of direct services to the client through major programs authorized under Title IV A & B of the Social Security Act. Although administratively supervised by the state (Georgia), the services are delivered through county departments at the local level.

The Agency's organizational structure is complicated by the fact that it operates as a single county district with the same county administrative staff functioning as district staff. The services are decentralized through satellite offices that carry out the functions of this county agency.

The organization is seen as a single county operation in spite of its size, complexity, and identification as a district. The agency administrator is identified as a District Director and assumes the same roles and responsibilities as his counterparts across the state who have multi-county districts.

Sample

A total sample of 350 subjects were used in this investigation. The pool from which this sample was drawn consisted of all current employees (925) of the Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS). These employees occupied a variety of positions within the organizational structure,... e.g. administrator, supervisor, professional, paraprofessional, and clerical.
Selection Procedure

The Personnel Manager, provided a list of all current DFACS budgeted positions, as well as a list of employee position status. These lists indicated the classifications, number of positions, race, sex, names and employment numbers. Through stratified sampling, 350 subjects were selected for inclusion in the total sample. A questionnaire, cover letter, participation consent form, and form to request a copy of the results were sent to all persons in this pool. Follow-up postcards were sent to persons who failed to respond within one week of the deadline established for the return of questionnaire.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study consisted of the Job Descriptive Index and the Organizational Climate Questionnaire (Form B). The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was developed by Patricia Smith, Lorne M. Kendall, and Charles L. Hulin, all of Cornell University, while engaged in research commonly referred to as the Cornell Studies of Satisfaction (Smith et al., 1969).

The JDI is designed to measure satisfaction with five areas of a job: the type of work, the pay, the opportunities for promotion, the supervision, and the co-workers on the job. For each area there is a list of adjectives or short phrases, and the respondent is
instructed to indicate what each word or phrase applies with respect to the particular facet of his job in question (e.g., his pay). If a word applies to his pay, he is asked to write "Y" (for yes) beside the word. If the word does not apply to his pay, he is asked to write "N" (for No) beside the word. If he cannot decide, he is asked to enter a question mark (?). The format employed in this instrument is so designed as to reduce the amount of response sets phenomena. Scoring involves assigning a value of 3 to a "Yes" if it is a positive item and 3 to a "No" if it is a negative item. A '?' on any item is scored as 1. Any other response is given zero weight. The higher the score, the greater the reported satisfaction.

The JDI has several advantages as a measure of job satisfaction. First, it is directed toward specific areas of satisfaction rather than global or general satisfaction. Several different areas of job satisfaction must be measured separately if any substantial understanding is to be achieved. This is not intended to imply that satisfactions in several areas are necessarily statistically independent, but it does provide for those important situations where there are discriminable differences which the respondent can report with some assurance.

Secondly, the verbal ability level required to respond to the items on the JDI is quite low. In one setting in which it was administered, the modal educational level was
fourth grade, yet all the respondents who could read English at all were able to complete the JDI. The JDI does not require that the respondents be able to make abstractions or understand long, vague sentences with several qualifications, but only that they understand the general meaning of single words or short phrases.

Thirdly, the JDI does not ask the respondent directly how satisfied they are with their work, but rather it asks them to describe their work. Thus, the responses have a job-referent rather than a self-referent. In describing their jobs, the respondents do, however, provide information which may be used to infer their satisfaction. Some of the description involves the use of words which are evaluative (e.g., satisfying, good) as well as those which are objective (e.g. on my feet). The JDI is not a projective measure of job satisfaction which tries to trick the respondent by "sneaking by his/her defenses". The JDI is designed to help the respondent, not to fool them.

**Validation of JDI**

Increasingly, social scientists have used attitude measures as predictors or criteria, rather than as static assessment devices. Such popularity has also necessitated an assessment of these measures' reliability and validity (Schneider and Dachler, 1978). The 16-month reliability of the JDI was assessed by two administrations of the measure to a diverse sample of 847 Atlantic coast utility employees.
Data analyzed within a Campbell and Fiske (1959) multitrait (JDI dimensions) - multimethod (Time 1 - Time 2 administration) matrix revealed good reliability coefficient (.57) and also indicated that the five JDI satisfaction scales retain their relative independence over time.

Additionally, considerable research data on the validity of the JDI are now available (C. F. Locke, 1976) in addition to the external, convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell and Fiske, 1959) data presented in the original publication of the measure (Smith et al., 1969).

**Climate Questionnaire**

The Organizational Climate Questionnaire (Form B) was developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968) and consists of eight scales: structure, responsibility, reward, risk, warmth, support, standards, and conflict. Each scale consists of several items and subjects can respond Definitely Agree, Inclined to Agree, Inclined to Disagree, or Definitely Disagree. According to these researchers, the concept of climate describes a set or cluster of expectancies and incentives and represents a property of environments that is perceived directly or indirectly by the individuals in the environment.

It is a molar (vs. a molecular) construct which (1) permits analysis of the determinants of motivated behavior in actual, complex social situations; (2) simplifies the problems of measurement of situational determinants by
allowing the individuals in the situation to think in terms of bigger, more integrated chunks of their experience, and (3) makes possible the characterization of the total situational influence of various environments, so that they may be mapped and categorized, and so that cross-environmental comparisons can be made.

**Validation of Climate Questionnaire**

Litwin and Stringer (1968) report the results of eight field studies of organizational climate conducted in several operating business organizations. The climate data are presented in terms of standard scores based on norms for approximately 460 managers, professionals, technicians, and clerical personnel. These studies demonstrated relationships of the climate measure to organizational conditions, on the one hand, and to conditions of individual motivation on the other hand. These data support quite strongly the initial theoretical assumption that the organizational climate concept would serve as a link between organization and individual motivation variables.

Additionally, Campbell et. al. (1970) found in a review of existing climate measures that at least four factors were common in all climate instruments: (1) individual autonomy, (2) the degree of structure imposed upon the position, (3) reward orientation, and (4) consideration, warmth, and support.

Data from the Climate Questionnaire were submitted to
factor analysis. The primary reason for the factor analysis routine was to ascertain whether or not the factors conceptually derived by Litwin and Stringer represented separate dimensions or whether they were really measuring only one factor. Factor analysis is one method for establishing the construct validity of an instrument. The subprogram FACTOR from the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (University of Chicago, 1970) was used to identify the factor structure most representative of the data drawn from the questionnaire. The researchers calculated zero-order correlations between the six factors derived from the Organizational Climate Questionnaire and the five satisfaction scales derived from the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The correlations were calculated using the subprogram PPMCR from Statistical Package (STPAC).

Of the 42 possible relationships, 18 are significant at the p < .01 level while 7 are significant with p < .05. Strong relationships exist for the warmth and rewards scales with the job satisfaction scales. Highly significant relationships also are evident between most of the satisfaction scales and climates for Decision Making, Openness, and Structure. The relationship between the Risk scale and the satisfaction dimensions was insignificant.

**PROCEDURE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

The following procedures were followed in implementing this research study:
1. Approval of the research topic was secured from the faculty of the Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work.

2. A preliminary proposal was submitted to and approved by the Faculty of Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work.

3. Authorization was secured from the Administrator, Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS) to conduct the study.

4. Literature relevant to the study was reviewed, summarized and incorporated into the synthesis of the dissertation.

5. The research sample was selected.

6. Informed consent was secured from the research participants.

7. The questionnaire was mailed and completed by the target population and returned in self-addressed envelopes to the researcher.

8. The data were organized, analyzed, interpreted and reported.

9. Research findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations were incorporated into the final dissertation.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA**

Descriptive statistics, which included percentages, averages and frequency distributions, were used to organize and present the data. Bivariate and multivariate procedures were used to determine the degree of relationship between the criterion variables and the selected predictor variables. Specifically:

1. Multivariate as well as bivariate (inter-correlation) procedures were employed in examining research question one (1).
2. Multivariate as well as bivariate (inter-correlation) procedures were employed in examining research question two (2).

3. Bivariate correlational procedures were employed in examining research question three (3). The .05 level of significance was employed as the decision rule in determining the results of the analyses for research questions 1, 2, and 3.

4. Descriptive analysis techniques were employed to describe the composite characteristics of those respondents determined to exhibit the highest degree of job satisfaction.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the characteristics of the sample; the statistical analysis performed on the data obtained from the mailed questionnaire; and a discussion of the findings of this study as they relate to the research questions and the literature reviewed. The results are further divided into five sections which include: a demographic analysis of the data; work dimensions and perceptions of overall job satisfaction; climate factors and perceptions of overall organizational climate; relationships between the work dimensions and climate factors; and composite characteristics of the most satisfied respondents.

Demographic Analysis of Data

Three hundred and fifty (350) subjects employed at the Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services (DFACS) were in the initial sample. A total of one hundred and ninety-seven (197) questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 56%. Of the questionnaires returned, one hundred and fifty-three (153) were usable (78%). Forty-four questionnaires were discarded because the respondents were: unwilling to participate (7); on extended health leave (2); on military leave (2); no longer employed due to separation (2); and no longer employed due to resignation (31).

The demographic information included in this section
was developed from a descriptive analysis of the data. Data were categorized and tabulated according to frequency distributions, central tendencies and summarized to provide descriptions of the personal characteristics of distribution. The results of the description of the sample are shown in Table 1.

The characteristics of the workers in the sample present the general traits of the group through the use of selected demographic factors that included: age, sex, marital status, race, job title, years in current job, formal education, and salary. As noted in Table 1, the ages ranged from twenty-five (25) to sixty-six (66) years. The majority of the respondents (98%) were at least twenty-five (25) years old but under sixty-one (61), with the largest proportion (25%) in the 31-35 age range. There were more female respondents (77.8%) than males (22.2%), and more respondents were married (51.6%) than single (28.1%) or divorced (17.6%).

Only two respondents (1.3%) had less than a high school education, while one (.6%) had taken some doctoral courses. Although twenty-six (26) respondents reported having had some graduate training (17.0%), a slightly smaller proportion (14.1%) had actually earned a graduate degree. Additionally, twenty (20) respondents reported having had some college training, compared to sixty (60) who reported having earned a college degree (39.0%).
### TABLE 1: Profile of the Workers in the Research Sample by Selected Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Adjusted Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Measures of Central Tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>Mean = 37.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>67.30</td>
<td>Median = 36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>Mode = 34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>97.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>99.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>77.80</td>
<td>77.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51.60</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>97.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Courses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Doctoral Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>37.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>63.40</td>
<td>Mean = 10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>Median = 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>86.90</td>
<td>Mode = 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>94.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaProfessionals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clericals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>Mean = 25,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-29,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Median = 24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>Mode = 25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-49,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professionals = Administrators, Supervisors, Professionals

Non-professionals = Para professionals, clericals

Source: Summary of Information Taken From Demographic Section of Questionnaires Completed by the Sample
When examining the amount of time respondents had worked for DFACS, the largest number of responses fell between 0-3 years (21.0%). However, an equal distribution of respondents had been employed between 4-6 years (16.1%), and 13-15 years (16.0%) respectively. The median period of employment with DFACS for the sample was 10.0 years.

Seventy-eight (78) of the respondents were classified as paraprofessionals, and represented the largest proportion of the sample (51%). There was a fairly equal distribution of respondents classified as supervisors (14%) and professionals (16%), but slightly fewer than those classified as clerical (18%).

A majority of the respondents were African American (68%), while the next largest proportion of respondents were white (29%). Hispanics, Asians, and respondents classified as "other" represented, cumulatively, three percent of the sample.

An examination of the salaries revealed that a majority of the respondents (54%) earned between $20,000-$29,000 annually. The median annual income for respondents in the sample was $24,000.

**SUMMARY**

Demographically, the median age of the respondents in the study was thirty-six (36) years. The majority were married African American females with a college degree. On
an average, the majority of the respondents had been employed with Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services for ten years, and were classified as paraprofessionals earning, at the time of the study, $24,500 annually.

**WORK DIMENSIONS AND JOB SATISFACTION**

One of the aims of this study was to determine the work dimensions (predictor variables) and their impact on the perception of overall job satisfaction (criterion).

**Correlation of Work Dimensions and Overall Job Satisfaction**

*Research Question One:* Which of five work dimensions (work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers) has the greatest impact on perceptions of overall job satisfaction?

In the study, five work dimensions of job satisfaction (work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers) were identified to determine which among them accounted for the greatest variation in predicting perceptions of overall job satisfaction. To accomplish this, two statistical procedures were computed: correlation matrix and step wise multiple regression of the five predictor variables. In each case, job satisfaction was held as a criterion variable. Table 2 and Table 3 represent, respectively, the summary of stepwise multiple regression analysis of job satisfaction by the five predictor variable, and the results of the correlation
As indicated in Table 2, supervision, nature of work, promotion, co-workers, and pay were entered on steps one, two, three, four, and five respectively. The variable highly predictive of job satisfaction was the perception of supervision. The strength of this association is indicated by the fact that after all other variables had been controlled for, the variable with the highest beta weight (.456) was supervision. Additionally, the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .783$) indicated that, according to this study, 78% of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained or predicted by perceptions of supervision.

**TABLE 2: Summary of Stepwise Multivariate Analysis Among Five Work Dimensions and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Beta Weight</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>192.067**</td>
<td>.36523</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>241.432**</td>
<td>.45577</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>488.874**</td>
<td>.26484</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>944.598**</td>
<td>.25483</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12501.33**</td>
<td>.20412</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

It can also be inferred from the results that work, as one of the predictors, appeared to have the second strongest association with job satisfaction. The coefficient of
determination \( R^2 = .559 \) indicated that 56% of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained or predicted by perceptions of work. The strength of this association was further indicated by the second highest beta weight (.365).

The results of the correlation matrix reported in Table 3 indicated that all five predictor variables were shown to be positively associated with job satisfaction (criterion). That means that after all the possible combinations of correlations among the five predictor variables and between each predictor variable and the criterion had been considered, the results suggested that the strongest associations were between the predictor variables and job satisfaction (criterion).

**TABLE 3: Intercorrelations Among Work Dimensions and Each Dimension With Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation with Predictor Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.748**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01
Climate Factors and Organizational Climate

A second aim of this study was to determine the climate factors (predictor variables) and their impact on the perceptions of overall organizational climate.

Correlation of Climate Factors and Overall Organizational Climate

**Research Question Two.** Which of six climate factors (decision-making, warmth, risk taking, openness, reward, and structure) has the greatest impact on perceptions of overall organizational climate?

In this study six climate factors (reward, decision-making, risk, warmth, structure, and openness) were identified to determine which among them accounted for the greatest variation in predicting perceptions of overall organizational climate. To accomplish this, two statistical procedures were carried out: correlation matrix and step-wise multiple regression analysis of the six climate factors (predictor variables). In each case, organizational climate was held as the criterion variable. Table 4 and Table 5 represent, respectively, the summary of stepwise multiple regression analysis of organizational climate by six predictor variables, and the results of the correlation matrix.

As indicated in Table 4, the variable highly predictive of organizational climate was reward, entered on step one. The strength of this association is indicated by the fact
that after all other variables had been controlled for, the variable with the highest beta weight (.554) was reward.]
Additionally, the coefficient of determination \( (R^2 = .349) \) indicated that, according to this study, 35% of the variation in organizational climate can be explained or predicted by perceptions of reward.

**TABLE 4: Summary of Step-wise Multivariate Analysis Among Six Climate Factors and Organizational Climate (Criterion)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Percent Variation Accounted for</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Beta Weight</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001

It can also be inferred from the results that decision making, as one of the predictors, appeared to have made the second greatest contribution to organizational climate. The coefficient of determination \( (R^2 = .568) \) indicated that 57% of the variation in organizational climate can be explained
or predicted by perceptions of decision making. The beta
weight (.435) further indicated the strength of the as-
sociation.

The results of the correlation matrix reported in Table
5 indicated that all six climate factors were positively
associated with organizational climate (criterion). The
climate factors making the greatest contribution to the
criterion include reward and warmth with Pearson r’s of .591
and .590 respectively.

TABLE 5: Intercorrelations Among Climate Factors and Each
Factor With Organizational Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Correlation With Predictor Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reward Decision Making Risk Warmth Structure Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion: Organizational Climate</td>
<td>.591 .412 .161 .590 .227 .409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors: Reward</td>
<td>.091 -.353 .470 -.025 .092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>.047 .032 -.011 .151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>-.205 .005 .208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>-.063 .036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<p < .05
**<p < .01
SUMMARY

In summary, multiple step-wise regression was performed utilizing five predictors which appear in the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) as independent variables in the regression model. It was determined that the predictor variables most predictive of job satisfaction appeared to be perceptions of supervision and perceptions of work. Additionally, the results of the correlation matrix of the five predictors indicated all predictors, although in varying degrees of strength, to be positively associated with job satisfaction (criterion).

Likewise, multiple stepwise regression was performed utilizing six predictors which appear in the Organizational Climate Questionnaire as independent variables in the regression model. It was determined that the variables most predictive of organizational climate appeared to be perceptions of reward and perceptions of decision making. Additionally, the results of the correlation matrix of the six predictors indicated all predictors, although in varying degrees of strength, to be positively associated with organizational climate (criterion variable).

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK DIMENSIONS AND CLIMATE FACTORS

Another aim of this study was to determine the strength of the relationship between the work dimensions of job satisfaction and the climate factors of organizational
Correlation of Work Dimensions and Climate Factors

Research Question Three. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the five work dimensions of job satisfaction and the six climate factors of organizational climate?

To address this question in the study, a series of bivariate analysis were performed. Bivariate analysis was carried out among each of the work dimensions and each of the climate factors. The results of these analyses can be seen in Table 6.

**TABLE 6: Correlation Among the Work Dimensions of Job Satisfaction and the Climate Factors of Organizational Climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Organizational Climate</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>.1534</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.328**</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.463**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-.219*</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.282**</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for</td>
<td>-.305**</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.215*</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.301**</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.281**</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.314**</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.331**</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01

Various interactions of the predictors of the two criterion variables, ... i.e. ... job satisfaction and
organizational climate were considered for the purpose of determining the extent to which these two variables had impact on job satisfaction. While there is a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and overall organizational climate ($r = -0.433^{**}$), not all of the work dimensions showed a statistically significant relationship with the climate factors.

One might assume from the outset that the quality of organizational climate would have a positive relationship with the workers' perceptions of job satisfaction. However, samples of the relationships between the two variables, as indicated in Table 6, were examined to determine the extent to which this assumption held true.

When examining the bivariate analyses carried out with reward (climate factor) by selected work dimensions of job satisfaction: work ($-0.463$), pay ($-0.282^{**}$), opportunities for promotion ($-0.301^{**}$), and supervision ($-0.331^{**}$), it was indicated that in each instance there was a negative, but significant relationship between the variables. Likewise, similar results were indicated when examining the bivariate analysis carried out with warmth (climate factor) and selected work dimensions of job satisfaction: opportunities for promotion ($-0.215^{**}$), supervision ($-0.314^{**}$), and work ($-0.328^{**}$).

Interactions between the two variables ranged between ($-0.215$) and ($-0.463$). The inverse relationship across these
factors suggested that as one increased the other decreased. More specifically, as perceptions of organizational climate decreased, perceptions of job satisfaction tended to increase. While all of the selected interactions tended to be significant, the predictive power was questionable, as evidenced by the coefficients of determination.

**COMPOSITE CHARACTERISTICS OF MOST SATISFIED**

This section contains a composite profile of the most satisfied respondents. The profile is based on a descriptive analysis of the demographic data provided by the 24 respondents in the sample whose scores on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) found that they were the most satisfied. Data were categorized and tabulated according to frequency distributions, central tendencies and medians, and summarized to provide descriptions of the personal characteristics of respondents. The results of the descriptions of the sample are shown in Table 7.

The characteristics of the respondents in the sample present the general traits of the group through the use of selected demographic factors that include: age, sex, marital status, race, job title, years in current job, formal education, and salary. As noted in Table 7, the ages of the respondents ranged from less than twenty-five (25) to fifty (50) years. Almost all of the respondents (92%) were at least twenty-five (25) years old, but under fifty (50), with the largest proportion (29%) in the 41-45 age range.
The median age for respondents in the sample was thirty-eight (38) years old. There were more female respondents (85.3% than males (16.7%), and more respondents were married (54% than single (21%) or divorced (21%).

The largest proportion of the respondents (42%) had earned the college degree, while one respondent (4.2%) had some doctoral courses. There was an equal distribution of respondents who had taken technical courses (13%), had some college training (13%), or had some graduate training (13%).

When examining the amount of time respondents had worked for DFACS, the largest number of respondents fell between 0-3 years (50%). The median period of employment with DFACS for the sample was 4.0 years. Nine (9) of the respondents were classified as para professional, and represented the largest proportion of the sample (38%). However, there was an equal distribution of respondents who were classified as supervisor (21%) or clerical (21%).

A majority of the respondents (79.2%) were African American, while white workers represented 21% of the most satisfied respondents. None of the remaining groups was represented in the sample.

An examination of the salaries revealed that a majority of the respondents (46%) earned between $20,000-$29,000 annually. The median annual salary for respondents in the sample was $25,250.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Adjusted Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Measures of Central Tendencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>245.8</td>
<td>Mean = 37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>Median = 37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>Mode = 44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Data</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Courses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Doctoral Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>70.80</td>
<td>Mean = 6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>91.70</td>
<td>Median = 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91.70</td>
<td>Mode = 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Data</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>Mean = 27,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-29,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>58.30</td>
<td>Median = 25,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>Mode = 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-49,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Professionals = Administrators, supervisors, professionals
Non Professionals = Para professionals, clericals, service

Source: Summary of Information Taken From Demographic section of Questionnaires
completed by the sample, based upon scores on the JDI.
SUMMARY

Demographically, the median age of the respondents found to be the most satisfied was thirty-eight (38) years old. This was two years older than the median age (36 yrs.) for respondents in the study sample. The majority were married, African American females, with a college degree. On an average, the respondents had been employed with DFACS for four (4) years, and classified as para-professional, earning, at the time of the study, $25,200 annually. This compared with the majority of respondents in the study sample, who had been employed an average of ten (10) years, and earning, at the time of the study, $24,500 annually. (A complete comparison of the characteristics of the study sample and the most satisfied respondents can be found in Appendix F.)

DISCUSSION

Research Question One

The results of the statistical analysis indicated that the variable highly predictive of job satisfaction was the perception of supervision. This finding was consistent with previous studies on leader behavior reported by Stodill (1974), John (1968), Metzner and Mann (1953), and others, which generally indicated that job satisfaction often results from the subordinates' perceptions of their supervisor. Thus, relationships between subordinates and
superiors that are characterized by positive interactions, tend to produce the greater levels of job satisfaction.

The second best predictor was the perception of the nature of the work itself. Job satisfaction with work focuses on the job scope or duties (tasks) of a position as a source of good feelings about the job being performed. Available research, such as Hackman and Lawler (1971) yield a fairly consistent, but modest, relationship between variations in job scope and job satisfaction.

Of the five work dimensions studied, perceptions of pay ranked fifth as a predictor of job satisfaction. This finding was somewhat surprising, given the commonly accepted belief that human service workers, particularly those employed by public agencies, are meagerly paid. However, the finding appears to be consistent with the literature reviewed for this study. This might have resulted from the way the question is phrased within the JDI, or reflective of the complexity of the concept itself. The subject of pay is extremely complex, and its exact influence is hard to determine. According to Bass (1981), when workers are asked directly the importance of pay to their overall job satisfaction, pay ranks relatively high compared with other factors. However, if workers are questioned more indirectly about the importance of pay, its significance drops substantially.
Research Question Two

The results of multiple stepwise regression performed utilizing six predictors of organizational climate, indicated that the predictor variables most predictive of organizational climate appeared to be perceptions of reward, and perceptions of decision-making. These findings are consistent with literature reviewed for this study. Litwin and Stringer (1968), and Davis (1962) all indicate a strong relationship between decision making discretion and employee's perception of climate.

Employee participation in decision making is believed to be a strategy to increase the motivation to work and job satisfaction. Research on whether, when, why, and how participation works have been accumulated. Schuler (1980) found support for his prediction that participation is associated with employee satisfaction when it reduces and clarifies the expectancy from performance to reward.

Secondly, the finding that reward, as a predictor, is highly predictive of organizational climate is also consistent with the literature reviewed. People join organizations anticipating rewards. They probably expect to contribute something, but they certainly expect to gain satisfaction from membership. Persons who have been selected for membership (hired) typically experience a psychologically gratifying boost in self-esteem.
Research Question Three

The results of bivariate analysis with each of the work dimensions by each of the climate factors revealed a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate. However, not all of the work dimensions demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with the climate factors.

This finding was supported in the literature reviewed relative to the ongoing debate regarding the similarities and differences between measures of climate and measures of satisfaction. Johannesson (1971) sees the problem of assessing the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction as one of redundant measures. He attributes this redundancy to two main causes. The first lies in scales used in the construction of climate instruments— they are generally formed using items from already existing satisfaction measures. Secondly, he emphasizes that the method of measurement employed may be faulty. Specifically, measures of perceived climate are administered in such a way as to elicit affective responses (p.234).

Schneider and Snyder (1975) hypothesized that there should be no necessary correlation between climate and satisfaction measures; that is, those persons who describe an organization as having more of something (e.g., more considerate supervision, more training, less conflict)
should not necessarily be those who are more satisfied (p.319).

To test this hypothesis, relationships among two measures of job satisfaction, one measure of organizational climate, and seven production and turnover indexes of organizational effectiveness were investigated in 50 life insurance agencies (N=522). Their hypothesis received support. For some positions, climate and satisfaction were correlated; for others they were not.

In the present study, when examining the bivariate analysis carried out with selected work dimensions (job satisfaction) by selected climate factors (organizational climate), it was indicated that in each instance, there was a negative, but significant relationship between the two variables. The inverse relationship across these factors suggests that as perceptions of organizational climate decreased, perceptions of job satisfaction tended to increase. These occurrences provided a possible refutation of the assumption that the quality of organizational climate would have a positive relationship with the workers' perceptions of job satisfaction.

**Composite Characteristics of Most Satisfied**

The results of a descriptive analysis of the demographic data provided by the twenty-four (24) respondents in the sample whose scores on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) found them to be the most satisfied
indicated that the median age was thirty-eight (38) years, two years older than the median age for respondents in the study sample. Additionally, the respondents had been employed with DFACS on an average of 4 years, approximately six years less than the average length of employment for respondents in the study sample.

These findings were somewhat inconsistent with the literature review. Weaver (1980), in studying job satisfaction in the United States, found that although job satisfaction varied greatly across different groups of employees, older workers and those who held their jobs for longer periods of time reported greater satisfaction than younger ones of those lacking the benefits of seniority.

In the present study, factors other than the benefits of seniority could have contributed to the respondents' perceptions of job satisfaction. Thus, these perceptions might be attributed to differences in the stages of organizational socialization for the two groups of respondents. One way organizations can match new comers with the work environment is through socialization, i.e. changing the person's role expectations, skills, or motivation (Wanous, 1988).

Organizational psychologists view this process of socialization as proceeding through several stages. Buchanan (1974) in expounding his three-stage early career model, studied new managers from five governmental agencies
and three large manufacturing concerns. His objective in this research was to study the level of one's commitment to a new organization as influenced by early socialization experiences. This research is particularly applicable to the findings in the present study because the model is concerned with postentry events, and because it covers a much larger span of one's early work career. The three stages of the early career model consists of:

Stage 1: First Year: Basic Training and Initiation

This first year on the job is characterized by a focus on the security and experience needs of the newcomer. The first event is the establishment and existence needs of the newcomer. The second is the establishment of cohesion within one's peer group. The third is the relationship of one's immediate peer group to the rest of the organization. Fourth, the degree to which expectations are realized and the possibility of reality shock when they are not. The final event relates to loyalty conflicts, both within the organization and outside interests.

Stage 2: Performance: Years Two, Three, and Four at Work

Buchanan's second career stage concerns the achievement or growth needs of newcomers. There are five events that define this particular stage. First, the degree to which one feels personally important is crucial for long-run commitment to the new organization. Closely related to this is a second factor—the extent to which the new organization reinforces one's self-image. Third, the newcomer must come to terms with the internal conflict between needs for achievement and the fear of failure. Finally, at this stage newcomers will be sensitive to organizational norms regarding commitment and loyalty. The issue of the newcomer's future internal mobility may rest on the degree to which the newcomer can adopt the desired degree of loyalty.
Stage 3: Organizational Dependability: The Fifth Year and Beyond

Buchanan chose to lump all succeeding years into this stage since he believes that later events are much harder to predict than earlier ones. In essence, Stages 1 and 2 contain events that are common for most newcomers. By Stage 3, however, quite a lot of diversity occurs that makes it much harder to identify any particular set of experiences as typical for this group of insiders (Wanous, p. 176).

Finally, the distribution of satisfied respondents across occupational categories was consistent with the literature reviewed. Weaver (1980), as well as others, found job satisfaction varied greatly across different groups of employees.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a recapitulation of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations. The chapter has four sections. Section one summarizes the study's purpose and methodology employed. Section two presents major findings. In the third section, implications of the findings are discussed. Section four presents recommendations for future research.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the following: the climate factors and their impact on the perception of over-all organizational climate; the work dimensions and their impact on the perception of over-all job satisfaction; and the strength of the relationships between the work dimensions of job satisfaction and the climate factors of organizational climate. A secondary purpose of the study was to delineate a composite profile of those respondents who demonstrated the highest degree of job satisfaction. The study answered the following questions:

1. Which of five work dimensions (work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers) has the greatest impact on perceptions of overall job satisfaction?

2. Which of six climate factors (decision making, warmth, risk-taking, openness, reward, and structure) has the greatest impact on perceptions of overall organizational climate?

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship
between the five dimensions of job satisfaction and the six climate factors of organizational climate:

4. What are the composite characteristics of those respondents determined to be the most satisfied?

The study was anticipated to be significant because it added to the existing body of research on the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction, while adding to the knowledge base relative to the interaction between the organizations and the individuals. In addition, the delineation of a composite profile of the most satisfied workers provides information for enhancing the ability to successfully manage human service organizations that are viable and effective.

In addressing the study's purpose and research questions, the following assumptions were made:

1. There are identifiable work dimensions that are frequently associated with one's perception of job satisfaction.

2. There are identifiable climate factors that are frequently associated with one's perception of organizational climate.

3. A variety of complex work dimensions and interconnected organizational climate factors impact human service workers' perceptions of job satisfaction.

A review of the empirical and theoretical literature, as indicated in Chapter II, was conducted to identify study variables appropriate for this investigation. The literature reviewed revealed a substantial group of studies to support the impact of workers' perceptions of the work
dimensions and climate factors adopted for this study, on their perceptions of job satisfaction and organizational climate.

The theoretical framework that undergirded the study included two variables that complimented the human relations perspective of organizations: job satisfaction and organizational climate. These variables and perspectives served as the basis for examining the interactive influence of perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Key terms identified in the study were operationally defined as follows:

**Organizational Climate** - a set of factors which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems, and that may be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment. In this study, the concept was operationally defined by the worker's responses on the Climate Questionnaire (Litwin and Stringer, 1968). Six factors were measured: decision making, warmth, risk-taking, openness, rewards, and structure.

**Job Satisfaction** - an employee's perception of his/her overall liking and acceptance of work dimensions available in a given situation. In this study this concept was operationally defined by a worker's response on the Job Descriptive Index (Smith, Kendall, Hulin, 1969). Work dimensions measured were satisfaction with: work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers.

**Decision Making** - an ongoing process of evaluating alternatives for meeting an objective, at which expectations about a particular course of action impel the individual to select that course of action most likely to result in attaining the objective.

**Warmth** - the sense of friendliness and trust prevalent in the organization as perceived by the employee.

**Employee** - one who works for wages or salary in the service
of an employer. In this study, employee and worker were used interchangeably.

**Openness** - the employee’s perception of the ease or difficulty in getting acquainted with others in the organization.

**Rewards** - components of compensation which may include monetary as well as management encouragement and humanitarian approach

**Co-Worker** - person/persons with whom one works. Defined in this study as one’s supervisors and other supervisors, peers and subordinates.

**Human Service Worker** - refers to an individual who is employed by a human service organization and engages in activities which directly contribute to the principal function of the organization. In this study such an individual is in one of the following occupational categories: professional, administrator, supervisor, paraprofessional, or clerical.

**Paraprofessional** - a human service worker without extensive formal credentials, often working at a lower ranking job in an agency. In this study such an individual is in one of the following occupational categories: activity therapist, caseworker (less than Master’s Degree), Caseworker principal (less than Master’s Degree), Caseworker Senior (less than Master’s Degree), Community Worker, Human Services Technician, Licensed Practical Nurse, Youth Development Worker, and Youth Development Worker I.

**Professional** - A human service worker with extensive formal credentials, often working at a higher ranking job in an agency. In this study such an individual is in one of the following occupational categories: accountant, caseworker (Master’s Degree), Caseworker Principal (Master’s Degree), Caseworker Senior (Master’s Degree), Legal Assistant, Staff Nurse, Training Specialist Senior, and Volunteer Resources Coordinator II.

**Clerical** - A human service worker whose major responsibilities involve the performance of some aspect of information processing. In this study such an individual is in one of the following occupational categories: Accounting clerk, Accounting Technician I, Accounting Technician II, Clerk, Clerk Transcriber I, Clerk Principal, Clerk Senior, Data Transcriber, Personnel Technician I, Procurement and Service Officer I, Secretary Typist, and Secretary Typist Senior.
Supervisor - A human service worker whose major occupational responsibilities entail the critical watching and directing of the activities of others occupying a particular unit or operation within the organization. In this study, such an individual is classified in one of the following occupational categories: Casework Supervisor Senior, Casework Supervisor, Casework Supervisor Principal, Children’s Home Assistant Supervisor, Children’s Home Supervisor, Clerk Administrative, Data Transcription Supervisor, Fiscal Analyst Senior, Office Supervisor, Payroll Supervisor I, Personnel Technician II, Property and Supply Supervisor I, Secretary Administrative, and Secretary Principal.

Administrator - A human service worker whose major occupational responsibilities entail management of the execution or conduct of other personnel in major leadership roles within the organization. Such individuals generally functions at the higher echelon of the organization. In this study such an individual is classified in one of the following occupational categories: Accounting Principal, Administrative Assistant, County Administrator, County Program Director, Deputy County Administrator, and Personnel Manager II.

Work dimensions - refers to an individual’s needs, abilities, and objectives, and the specific properties of his job available to fulfill their needs, abilities, and objectives. In this study properties of the job to be considered are: the work performed, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers.

Climate Factors - refer to specific attributes or characteristics that form the prevailing temper or environmental conditions of an organization. Climate factors for an organization, are like personality traits for a person. In this study the climate factors consist of: decision-making, warmth, risk-taking, openness, rewards, and structure.

Pay - refers to the absolute amount of dollar earning a worker receives, in addition to his perception of whether the amount of dollar earning is fair or not fair.

Work - one’s specific task, assignment, duty, or function, often a part or phase of some larger activity.

The limitations identified below restrict the generalizations that can be made from the study’s findings:
1. Since there is a general consensus among organizational researchers that no two organizations are the same, the ability to generalize will be limited to the perceptions within the organization under investigation.

2. Data were self-reported, and the validity and reliability of the information was dependent upon the respondents' abilities to accurately and honestly recall and report events and perceptions.

In this study, a descriptive-correlational research design was used. The methodology involved administering a questionnaire consisting of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), and the Organizational Climate Instrument (Form B), to randomly selected employees of the Fulton County Department of Family and Children Services. A total of 350 questionnaires were mailed, and 197 were returned, representing a response rate of 56%. Of the questionnaires returned, one hundred and fifty-three (153) were usable (78%).

Descriptive analysis of the demographic data was conducted to develop composite characteristics of a group of twenty-four (24) respondents that appeared to be the most satisfied based upon scores on the Job Descriptive Index. Research findings indicated that these respondents were slightly older but had shorter lengths of employment than respondents in the study sample.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study appear to justify drawing the following conclusions:
1. The workers' perceptions of supervision, followed closely by perceptions of the work itself, were identified as the most predictive of job satisfaction.

2. The workers' perceptions of reward followed closely by perceptions of decision-making were identified as the most predictive of organizational climate.

3. Not all of the work dimensions were found to have a statistically significant relationship with the climate factors. However, organizational climate was found to have a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction.

4. Composite characteristics of the most satisfied workers were comparable to the characteristics of workers in the study sample. However, the most satisfied workers tended to be slightly older, and had been employed with the Agency for a shorter period of time.

**IMPLICATIONS**

The similarities and differences between measures of climate and measures of satisfaction indicate a need for social work researchers to carefully develop climate and satisfaction measures that provide a greater assessment of the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Additionally, findings, which appear to suggest some inconsistency with earlier research, supported a positive relationship between greater job satisfaction and older workers with shorter periods of seniority. Such findings indicate a need to investigate factors other than seniority as a predictor of job satisfaction. Research in this area may provide additional insight into the present epistemology relative to organizational entry, and more importantly, the
extent to which managers can more successfully recruit, select, and socialize (integrate) new employees into their respective organizational settings.

The benefits of additional investigation in these areas to social work practice as well as social policy development appear to be obvious. The cost of low morale, excessive absenteeism, and "premature turnover" is quite high. It takes a while for almost all organizations to realize an appreciable return on the investment made in the recruitment and training of new employees. However, given the depiction of the internal structure of human service organizations as a "loosely coupled system" (Weick, 1976), human service managers probably experience considerably more "down-time" in replacing lost and/or unproductive personnel, thus, delaying organizational recovery and productivity for longer periods of time.

Finally, the positive relationship between greater job satisfaction and older workers with shorter periods of seniority suggests additional support for the efficacy of social policy designed to systematically maintain, as well as facilitate the entry of the older worker into the work force. Such groups as dislocated homemakers, as well as individuals forced into early retirement due to cut backs, mergers, or down-sizing could be major beneficiaries of such efforts.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the implications of this study, it is recommended that:

1. Future research should build on the present study's attempt to determine the factors which impact perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction, respectively.

2. Studies should be conducted to carefully develop climate and satisfaction measures that provide a greater assessment of the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction.

3. Studies should be conducted to determine the impact of organizational socialization on perceptions of job satisfaction.

4. Policy planners should aggressively advocate for the establishment of public policy designed to systematically maintain, as well as facilitate the entry of the older worker into the work force.
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APPENDIX A
December 10, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Survey Staff

FROM: Mr. Ralph Mitchell, Administrator
       Fulton County DFACS

SUBJECT: Job Description Index and Organizational Climate Questionnaire

In support of the educational enhancement of doctoral student, Clinton E. Dye, and the improvement of job satisfaction for our staff, I am encouraging you to participate in filling out the attached questionnaires. Your name was pulled through random selection.

After reviewing the attached material, I concur with Mr. Dye that the questionnaire should not require over 20 minutes to complete. Moreover, I assure you that anonymity will be maintained as it is vital that your true sentiments be registered in this regard.

Please seal and return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and addressed to Mr. Lafayette Lynch by December 21, 1990.

RM/bd/009

Attachments
APPENDIX B
Dear __________________________:

I am writing to ask for your participation in a study that I am conducting on the relationship between the perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction. This study will be submitted as my doctoral dissertation at the Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work.

In recent years, researchers have paid increasing attention to perceptions of job satisfaction in human service organizations, particularly focusing on work stress and strain among human service workers. These studies continue to raise questions concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational climate in such organizations. Because you are employed by a major human service organization, I feel you are uniquely qualified to contribute to our knowledge in this area. Thus, your participation in this study is extremely important.

Please agree to take part in the study by completing the enclosed consent form. Then fill out the Job Descriptive Index and Organizational Climate Questionnaire. The survey has been designed for easy and quick response. Other individuals who have filled out the questionnaire indicate that it takes about 20 minutes to complete. I would appreciate your returning both the consent form and questionnaire in the envelope provided by ________________, ________________.

Your response will be treated in the strictest confidence. The questionnaire is coded only to keep track of returned questionnaires. Information will be anonymously compiled and handled as grouped data to protect individual identities.

It is anticipated that the results of this study will contribute to the existing body of research on the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction. Thanks for taking time from your busy schedule to make a contribution. In appreciation, a summary report of findings will be sent to you upon request; simply complete the request section of the enclosed form.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Clinton E. Dye, Jr., LCSW, IMFT
Doctoral Candidate

ENCLOSURES: Consent/Request Form
The Job Descriptive Index and Organizational Climate Questionnaire
Return Envelope
APPENDIX C
NOTE: Please be assured that your responses will remain confidential. This page will not be processed with your questionnaire.

PARTICIPATION CONSENT FORM

My signature below indicates that I agree to participate in this study with the understanding that:

1. The information in the study will be used to investigate the relationship between perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

2. My participation is voluntary, and I may refuse to answer any item(s) on the questionnaire or withdraw my consent to participate in the study at any time.

3. My responses on the questionnaire will be kept completely confidential. My name will not be used in analyzing or reporting the results.

_________________________  ____________________________
Date                        Signature of Participant

I do not wish to participate in the study for the following reason(s):

REQUEST FOR SUMMARY OF RESULTS

If you would like a copy of the summary report on the study, please write your mailing address in the space provided below. To maintain confidentiality, your copy will be sent to "Occupant" at the address indicated.

_________________________
OCCUPANT

_________________________          _________________
(Street Address)                       (Apt. No.)

_________________________          _________________
(City)                              (State)              (Zip)
THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

INSTRUCTIONS

FOR EACH STATEMENT BELOW INDICATE THE ANSWER WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR CURRENT STATUS AS AN EMPLOYEE OF DFACS

1. My current age is: ________ years.

2. I am □ Male □ Female

3. My marital status is: □ Single □ Married □ Divorced □ Other: _________________

4. My racial identity is (check one):
   □ Asian □ Hispanic □ Other: _________________
   □ Black □ White

5. My current job title is: __________________________

6. I have ________ years of experience in the field of social welfare.

7. I have been employed at my current job for about ________ year(s).

8. The highest level of education I have completed is (check one)
   □ Less Than High School □ College Degree
   □ High School Graduate □ Some Graduate School
   □ Technical Courses □ Graduate School
   □ Some College □ Some Doctoral Courses

9. My current salary is about ________ annually.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Decision making in this organization is too cautious for maximum effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Excessive rules, administrative details, and red-tape make it difficult for new and original ideas to receive consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In this organization we set very high standards for performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A friendly atmosphere prevails among people in this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is a lot of warmth in the relationships between management and workers in this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People in this organization don't really trust each other enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Around here there is a feeling of pressure to continually improve our personal and group performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. We have to take some pretty big risks occasionally to effectively serve clients in view of the political pressures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It's very difficult to get to know people in this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In this organization the rewards and encouragements you get usually outweigh the threats and the criticisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The philosophy of our management emphasizes the human factor, how people feel, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. You don't get much sympathy from higher-ups in this organization if you make a mistake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III

INSTRUCTIONS

This section is designed to get your opinion on five areas of your job: the work you perform; the pay; opportunities for promotion; supervision; and your co-workers. For each area there is a list of adjectives or short phrases, and you are asked to indicate whether each word applies to a particular characteristic of your job by writing a "Y" (For Yes) beside the word if it applies. If the word does not apply, you are to write "N" (For No). If you cannot decide, enter a question mark (?) beside the word.

(24) WORK

- Fascinating
- Routine
- Satisfying
- Boring
- Good
- Creative
- Respected
- Pleasant
- Useful
- Tiresome
- Challenging
- Frustrating
- Endless
- Gives a sense of accomplishment

(25) PAY

- Income adequate for normal expenses
- Barely live on income
- Bad
- Income provides luxuries
- Insecure
- Less than I deserve
- Highly paid
- Underpaid
PROMOTION

- Good opportunity for Advancement
- Opportunity somewhat limited
- Promotion based upon ability
- Dead-end job
- Good chance for promotion
- Unfair promotion policy
- Infrequent promotions
- Regular promotions
- Fairly good chance for promotion

CO-WORKERS

- Stimulating
- Boring
- Slow
- Ambitious
- Stupid
- Responsible
- Fast
- Intelligent
- Easy to make enemies

SUPERVISION

- Asks my advice
- Hard to please
- Impolite
- Praises good work
- Tactful
- Influential
- Up-to-date
- Doesn't supervise enough
- Quick tempered
- Tells me where I stand
- Annoying
- Stubborn
- Knows job well
- Bad
- Intelligent
- Leaves me on my own
- Lazy
- Around when needed
APPENDIX E
COMPARISON OF COMPOSITE CHARACTERISTICS OF MOST SATISFIED RESPONDENTS AND RESPONDENTS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Most Satisfied Respondents</th>
<th>Study Sample Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>37.5 years</td>
<td>36 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
<td>10.0 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-Professional</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Salary</td>
<td>$25,250</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>