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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Education is the aggregate of all the processes by which a person in the society in which he lives; and the social processes by which people are subjected to the influence of a selected and controlled environment so that they may obtain social competence and optimum individual development (Crow & Crow 1962).

Education has been recognized as the most important factor for human development, which contributes to national progress attuned to the globalization process. According to National Policy of Education (1986), “Education is the investment for national development which depends upon quality citizenship which is provided by quality education and quality of education is the result of quality of teachers.”

In the prevailing conditions the educationists all over the world are perturbed by falling standards in education and the huge wastage in the educational field that goes on as a result of many unidentified reasons. A students’ performance in the school is the outcome of many forces working on the students. The research literature is replete with the studies on the relationship of pupil performance with different demographic, organizational, and environmental variables. In the words of Kothari Commission (1966), “Of all the different factors which influence the quality of education and contribute to the national development, quality, competence and character of teacher are undoubtedly most significant.”
The National Policy of Education (1986) has emphasized the role of the teacher as social engineer, director of learning and architect of the nation rather than simply imparter of instructions to the students. He is a friend, philosopher and a guide. He is next only to the saint who moulds the character and behaviour of those who come under his influence. Teacher can work miracles that can shape material into a new finished product and he can make their future. The first and foremost responsibility of the teacher is thus, in relation to his students. The teacher by his good teaching can make the life of students. Any kind of improvement in education is contingent upon teaching effectiveness of the teacher.

People enter the teaching profession in search of the satisfaction of their varied needs. Behavioural scientists have categorized the needs of a human being as physiological needs, security/safety needs, social needs, esteem, and self-actualization, in ascending order. A teacher will only be satisfied with his or her job when s/he perceives that there is little or no difference between what s/he expects from the job and what s/he actually receives from it (Singh, 1987).

Before the serious studies on workers’ morale and job satisfaction were conducted, pay was assumed to be the only factor that employees could be satisfied or dissatisfied about. Mayo (1933) and his colleagues changed the picture from the one of “economic man” to that of the “social man”. A further analysis that was key in his study was that of Herzberg (1968) which described job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as two independent factors: job satisfaction is caused by “Motivators”
that relate directly to the job itself, like achievement, recognition for accomplishment, increased responsibility and growth and development, while job dissatisfaction emanates from concern about “hygiene” or environmental factors like supervision, school policies and administration, interpersonal relationships, money, status and security. This means that factors that influence job satisfaction or motivation are derived intrinsically from the job itself and have little influence on job dissatisfaction; those factors influencing job dissatisfaction are peripheral to the job and have little effect on satisfaction and motivation. In fact, there is a neutral point at which employees are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their jobs. In this case, employees simply perform at the minimum acceptable level in order to keep their jobs. One can see this in the indifference that some teachers exhibit as they go about their job.

The term “job is loosely used to refer to that occupation from which somebody earns a living, and more so, narrowed down to the eight-hour clock; however, a job is a whole way of life (Singh, 1986; Singh, 1987). It permeates a person’s physical, social, mental, emotional, psychological and spiritual part of life, and that is why studies that relate to job satisfaction have their roots in these fields.

The different aspects that constitute one’s personality do not operate in a vacuum. People behave the way they do as a result of interaction with external factors, both concrete and abstract. In the teaching profession, concrete factors are the superiors, colleagues, students, auxiliary workers, coupled with
the physical surroundings and the objects in them. The abstract factors include perceptions, culture, ideologies and relationships. Studies in management have analyzed these interrelationships, observing that the sum of all these interactions make a school what it is – distinct from all others.

Halpin (1966) has defined the social interaction between the teachers and their heads as ‘Organizational Climate’. Psycho-emotional environment in which the progress of education takes place speak for organizational climate. It is the climate, which can be conducive for the teachers to teach and for the students to learn. Organizational climate may work to develop an apathy in the minds of teachers and at the same time it can prove to be an instrument in creating a distaste for learning in the minds of the learners. Thus organizational climate projects the nature of teaching learning situation that is believed to prevail in a school.

Keeping good teachers in the teaching profession is one of the big challenges to educational planners at the moment. Providing congenial environment for the professional growth and facilitating the teachers to perform their work effectively and earnestly are the dire needs of the time. It is believed that the present study will go a long way in finding solutions to some of these problems.

CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATION

An organization is viewed as social arrangements for achieving controlled performance in pursuit of collective goals. It is the system of arrangements, the pattern or network of relations between the various positions and their holders.
According to Griffiths (1959), a formal organization is construed to mean an ensemble of individuals who perform distinct but inter-related and co-related functions in order that one or more tasks can be completed.

Roethisbeiger and Dickson (1939) observed that an organization might be seen as performing two major functions: production and that of creating and distributing satisfaction among the individual members of the organization.

Etzioni (1961) defined organization as a social unit or human group deliberately constructed and restructured to seek specific goals.

The Encyclopedic Dictionary (Biswa and Aggarwal, 1971) describes organization as the process or the outcome of arranging different elements into a functional whole for achieving a certain objective. It then defines school organization as the process of harmonizing the different elements of a school and ensuring effective relationship among students, staff and community for obtaining maximum educational results. Barnard (1938) defined a formal organization as a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons. Tosi et al. (1978) opined that an organization develops and maintains relatively stable and predictable behaviour pattern even though the individuals in the organization may change.

Thus, organization can now be defined as a highly complex social system composed of the most complex organizers i.e. the human beings interacting with each other and are interdependent ingredients of the interaction phenomena where the interaction
takes place between two dimensions, namely the social and the psychological dimensions of the social system.

**APPROACHES OF ORGANIZATION**

There are various views about organization and how the organization operates. The way in which managers conceptualize organization influences the way they manage it. Those who are familiar with the various models or schools of thought about organization are better able to select an appropriate one to deal with the particular situation they need to manage. There is no one ‘right’ model of so complex an entity as an organization; different models are different approximities to the truth.

**The Classical Approach**

Classical management theory was the outcome of the works of Federick Taylor, Henry Fayol, Mary Parker Follett, Luther Gulick and E.F.L. Brech. Their views have exerted a lasting impression right upto the present day.

This model emphasizes characteristics such as rationality, high job specialization, centralization, a command system, a tight hierarchy, strong vertical communication, tight control, rigid procedures and an autocratic approach. The needs of employees were viewed primarily in economic terms. There was no recognition of informal relations that are essential for meeting social needs. Only the managers were supposed to do the planning and decision-making while the workers performed the routine jobs.

Fayol (1916) analyzed the operations which occurred in business and govt. “To govern an undertaking is to conduct it
towards its objective by trying to make the possible use of the resources at its disposal. It is, in fact, to ensure the smooth working of the six essential functions.” Fayol’s list of managerial activities originally developed some 80 years ago, remained broadly intact with minor modifications to this day. Six activities given by him are:

1. Forecasting: predicting what will happen in the future.
2. Planning: devising a course of action to meet that expected demand.
3. Organizing: mobilizing materials and resources by allocating separate tasks to different departments, units and individuals.
4. Commanding: providing direction to employees, now more commonly referred to as directing or motivating.
5. Co-ordinating: making sure that activities and resources are working well together towards the common goal.
6. Controlling: monitoring progress to ensure that plans are being carried out properly.

The six managerial activities are interrelated.

Fayol (1916) distinguished management as a separate activity and identified fourteen principles of management which are as follows:

1. Division of Work: efficiency would be maximized if employees specialized in certain tasks.
2. Authority: authority is the right of managers to command and to be obeyed and should match responsibility.
3. Discipline: discipline is necessary to develop obedience, diligence, energy and respect within the limits fixed by an organization.

4. Unity of Command: each subordinate should report to one boss.

5. Scalar principle: the line of authority (scalar chain) in an organization runs from the top of the hierarchy to the bottom, because the unity of command. Communications usually go up and down this path, but employees at the same level should be able to communicate laterally.

6. Unity of direction: each group of organized activities that have the same objective should have one manager using one plan to ensure consistency and responsibility.

7. Interest Subordination: organizational goals and interests should take precedence over individual ones.

8. Remuneration: pay should be fair, sufficient to motivate to perform well, but not unreasonably high.

9. Centralization: refers to the degree that workers are involved in decision-making. The over-centralization of authority and responsibility should be avoided. Delegation of decision-making to encourage subordinates to work well is recommended, but with sufficient centralization to ensure accountability within the organization.

10. Order: people and materials should be in the right place at the right time.

11. Equity of Treatment: managers should be fair and kind to their subordinates.
12. Stability of employment: as employee turnover is inefficient, management should provide orderly personnel employment planning and ensure that replacements are available to fill vacancies.

13. Opportunity for initiative: employees should be given the opportunity and freedom to use and execute a plan, even if it sometimes fails.

14. Esprit de corps: promoting team spirit will build harmony and unity within the organization.

One of the main advocates of the classical management theory, Urwick (1947) summarized it as, “that these are principles which can be arrived at inductively from the study of human experiences of organization, which should govern arrangements for human association of any kind. These principles can be studied as a technical question, irrespective of the purpose of the enterprise and the personnel composing it. They are concerned with the method of subdividing and allocating to individuals all the various activities, duties, responsibilities essential to the purpose contemplated and continuous control of the work of individual, so as to secure the most economical and most effective realization of the purpose.

Classical management theory is characterized by a plethora of principles, rules, hints, hunches and tips. These are descriptive, prescriptive or exhortative.

**The Humanistic Approach**

The first real insight into human behaviour in organization has been attributed to Mary Parker Follett (1924) who viewed
organization as a dynamic system of human relationships in which integration, both between the individual and the organization, and among the various parts of an organization is a prime requisite for a successful enterprise. Metcalf and Urwick (1940) quote her: “The chief function, the real service, of business is to give an opportunity for individual development through the better organization of human relationships. Several times lately I have seen business defined as production, the production of useful articles...But the greatest usefulness of these articles consists in the fact that their manufacture makes possible those manifold, interweaving activities of men by which spiritual values are created...The PROCESS of production is as important to the welfare of society as the PRODUCT of production”.

In 1933, Mayo and his colleagues (and separately, Barnard, 1938) gave empirical support to Follet’s observations and changed the picture from what former theory made out to be an “economic man” to that of a “social man.” The Hawthorne Experiments indicated that employees were not only economic beings, but social and psychological beings as well, and they demonstrated that the man at work is motivated by more than the satisfaction of economic needs. By treating organizations as social systems, they vehemently argued for democratic participation, creativity and commitment (Rao & Rao, 1996). The emphasis was on creating a workforce with high morale, where each individual was recognized as unique, with work being a social experience where workers find satisfaction in membership in small groups. They concluded that a supervisor could contribute significantly in
increasing productivity by providing a free, happy and pleasant work environment. Indeed, the thesis of the study concurs with such observations.

Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939) said that the two major functions of an industrial organization are that of producing a product and that of creating and distributing satisfactions among the individual members of the organization. At that time, they lamented that a great deal of attention had been given to the external function of the organization and nothing comparable had been done in regard to getting individuals and groups of individuals working together effectively and with satisfaction to themselves.

The Systems Approach

The focus on the interplay or interaction among the component parts of organizations is that is called the System Theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978), and it is geared towards the discovery of all kinds of meaningful relationships (Rapoport, 1958; Newell, 1978). Barnard (1939) defined a formal organization as a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons. He went on to say that if organizations are systems, it follows that the general characteristics of systems are also those of organizations. It is therefore becoming increasingly clear that a knowledge of System Theory is helpful in understanding human behaviour in any organization (Newell, 1978; Luthans, 1998; Rollinson et al., 1998).
Griffiths (1964) defined a system as a “complex of elements in mutual interaction.” This means that a system is any set of interrelated elements, and interrelationship implies that a change in one element has a direct effect on one or more of the other elements. If one part changes, the other parts either change or force the deviant to conform to the existing system (Newell, 1978; Mitchell & Larson, 1987). In Barnard’s (1938) and Roethlisberger & Dickson’s (1939) words, “By system’ is meant something which must be considered as a whole because each part bears a relation of interdependence to every other part.”

There are two general types of systems: the Open system and the Closed System. The degree to which a system relates to and makes exchanges with the environment determines whether it is an open system or a closed system. An open system interacts with its environment, but a closed system does not do this (Miller & Rice, 1967; Churchman, 1968; Guba, 1968; Emery, 1969; Baker, 1973). Human beings are open systems: we affect the environment in which we live, and it, in turn, affects us.

Organizations are also open systems. They interact with their environment. The factors in the environment that influence the organization are called inputs (Mitchell & Larson, 1987; Koontz & Weihrich, 1990; Rollinson et al., 1998). In a school, inputs may be the amount of money paid to run the school, the number and type of students who attend the school, the rules and regulations set by government which the school has to adhere to, and these make that particular school what it is. The organization as an open system takes inputs, transforms them and produces
outputs (Mitchell & Larson, 1987; Koontz & Weihrich, 1990; Rollinson et al., 1998). In the case of a school, it takes in new students, money, teachers, books and other facilities and transforms these into certificate holders with new knowledge and skills. However, it should be emphasized that the inputs into an organizational system include many more things than we normally think of. These may be time, legal requirements, or minimum basic amenities. Similarly, the outputs of an organizational system also go well beyond what we think of as an organization’s products. A school not only produces educated people, but also noise in the vicinity, more work for the local traffic-control authorities, happy parents and varying levels of teacher satisfaction. Koontz & Weihrich (1990) make a particular elaboration on the satisfaction output as “the organization must indeed provide many “satisfactions” if it hopes to retain and elicit contributions from its members. It must contribute to the satisfaction not only of basic material needs (for example, employee’s need to earn money for food and shelter or have job security) but also of needs for affiliation, acceptance esteem, and perhaps even self-actualization so that one can use his or her potential at the workplace”.

Therefore, if a school discovers that its teachers are deflecting in big numbers to schools in the vicinity, it will try to address the problem. This means that as open systems, organizations also receive feedback regarding that acceptability of their output and this feedback allows them to correct errors and
Nadler & Tushman (1980) elaborated on the basic open systems concept put forward by their predecessors and they came up with what they called the Congruence Model. The major focus of the Congruence Model is that the outputs from an organization are the direct result of the way in which the following four elements of an organization relate to each other: (i) the formal structures of an organization, (ii) the characteristics of the tasks being performed, (iii) the informal social relationships that exist among work-group members and (iv) the personal characteristics of the people performing the tasks in question. When these elements fit together, there is a state of congruence, and desirable outputs can be expected. However, when they do not fit together, a state of incongruence exists and undesirable outputs can be expected. The implications for practice are that in order to be effective, an organization should maintain the proper fit among organizational elements, and also maintain the fit between the organization and its own larger environment (Van de Ven & Drazin, 1985; Mitchell & Larson, 1987).

The elements of the organization operate as a social system. Parsons (1958; also cf. Parsons & Shils 1962) developed a model based on analytical abstractions in which there were four generic types of subsystems: the organism, the social system, the cultural system, and personality. Apart from distinguishing these four generic types, Parsons (1958) found that they function in relation to the organic-physical environment, the cultural environment and
they psychological environment. Schools function along the same lines (cf. Newell, 1978).

Apart from Parsons and his associates who study the organization as a social system using abstract analyses (and earlier on Barnard, 1938), there were those who saw the organization as a social system comprising actual interacting persons. Three personalities who specifically contributed to the study of the school as a social system in this way were Getzels, Guba and Thelen. Each of these people made contribution to the development of what is commonly known as the Getzels-Guba-Thelen model (Getzels, 1952; Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, 1958; Getzels, 1960; Guba, 1960; Getzels & Thelen, 1960). In this model, the school as a social system includes the following three major dimensions: (1) the individual, with Personality and Needs, and closely related to these are the Organism, the Constitution and Potentialities respectively; (2) the Group with its Climate and Intentions; and (3) the Institution, with its Roles and Expectations, and closely related to these are the Ethos, Mores and Values respectively.

Newell (1978) concluded that the thrust of the Systems Theory is that human behaviour can be understood only when viewed within the context of the situation in which it occurs, and particularly within the context of its human system. This means that the behaviour of an individual is not an isolated phenomenon, but rather occurs as part of a system and is intertwined with the behaviour of others. While people sometimes behave as separate individuals, individual behaviour is often, at least in part,
symptomatic of what is happening in a group or an organization. When behaviour is considered as an individual phenomenon, symptomatic behaviours are often mistakenly identified as being causal. However, when behaviour is viewed as a system phenomenon, individual behaviour can be perceived as being symptomatic of the whole system, and causal elements can more readily be identified. Therefore, if a single individual in a school expresses strong feelings such as satisfaction, dissatisfaction, resentment, or appreciation, it is probable that others in the school feel much the same way. If a staff member does not want to do a fair share of the work, this resistance may be symptomatic of the interpersonal relationships that the individual is experiencing in the staff. If there is lack of creativity, individual members may well be conforming to group norms. Even as we seek to understand the nature of the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and organizational climate, we draw prescriptive implications from conclusions such as these ones.

Griffiths (1964) described the environment in which the organizational system exists as a “Supra system” and the administrative apparatus within the system itself as “sub-systems” (also, cf. Barnard 1938). This means that the school itself is a subsystem within larger systems (“supra systems”) and it is itself a system composed of subsystems. However, according to Katz & Kahn (1978), the actual subsystems that are referred to are those such as the Managerial Subsystems, the Maintenance Subsystems, the Production Subsystems, etc. These would then be the ones that comprise the different departments, as we know them.
The observations on Systems Theory have far-reaching implications for school administrators in as far as creating a favourable organizational climate is concerned. Head teachers should realize that their actions have rippling effects: they cannot act in isolation per se, but they link up with the actions of the rest of the school members and set what Newell (1978) describes as “the tone of an organization”. Through his/her relationships with individuals or groups in a school, a Head teacher may either set a good example to follow or s/he may provoke negative reactions. Head teachers should direct their efforts towards the integration of the school system both internally and with its super ordinate system.

To sum up, the Open Systems approach to organizations (and, therefore, to schools) has been found to be beneficial to the understanding of organizations, not only in abstract or theoretical terms, but also in terms of human social behaviour. As far as job satisfaction is concerned, organizations must “organize” themselves and work towards the satisfaction of the various needs of its members. Since Systems Theory is based on interrelationships, it can be used to develop or enhance a favourable school organizational climate if the Head teachers and the teachers begin to understand and interpret their mutual responses as a function of the entire system and not just as independent phenomena. All these factors contribute to maintaining a proper fit among the different “elements” of the school, and also a fit between the school and its larger environment.
The Contingency Approach

The contingency approach in organizational behaviour refers to the view that the appropriate solution in any specific case depends, is contingent upon, the circumstance prevailing at the time. Some writers consider it as a way of thinking rather a theory and refer it as an approach. Contingency approach seeks to analyze a problem and then develop the best managerial or organizational solution to it. Mary Parker Follet stands out as the earliest of the contingent thinkers. She writes “If any situation is looked at by those concerned, carefully and clear sightedly, it is found that it has a logic of its own and its own laws. It is the situation itself, which is dictating the orders of what needs to be done, and both managers and managed, in essence, have to take order from it. (Graham 1987 p.17).

Critics of this theory are of the view that it is theoretically complex. It is difficult to determine all relevant contingency factors and show their relationships, and in the end even a simple problem involves a number of organizational components, each of which has innumerable dimension (Koontz & Werhrich 1990, Rao & Rao 1996).

A recent approach to organization is the Information processing system. It deals with system of communication. This approach is the outcome of rapid progress in the field of information technology devising electronic mail, the Internet, the intranet, the world wide web and other sophisticated methods of information transfer. As work related uncertainty increases so does the need for an increased amount of information processing
capacity (Tushwan & Nadler 1978, Luthans 1998). This implies that school should create better mechanism so that it can use to diagnose and cope with environmental and task uncertainty (Luthans 1998).

Proper communication of information is very significant and it requires extreme care and caution on the part of heads of the institution, especially in terms of organizational climate and job satisfaction. Information gaps lead to slackening the interest and initiative of the teachers.

Luthans (1998) concept of learning organization is another very recent development in organization theory. It advocated that the theoretical foundation for the learning organization emphasizes the importance, not only of adaptive learning but also generative learning leading to creativity, innovation and staying ahead of change (cf Senge 1990, 1991). Many organization are reluctant to adopt the new ways of doing things but learning organization break this and teach their people to look at things differently from a systematic point of view whereby issues and events are seen as interconnected rather than isolated phenomenon. Argyris (1978), and Senge(1990,1991) opined that the new work of leaders is to create learning organization. The teachers should be encouraged to learn to gain new experiences from what appears to be a repetitive job and to share new ideas, which help the achievement of both organizational and personal goals. Luthans (1998) says that learning organization approach ensures that organizations compete and are successful in the fast changing challenging environment.
Besides these formal organizations, there exist informal organizations prevalent within the formal organization. Tosi et al. (1998) observe that informal organization arise out of individual needs and attraction of people to one another. An informal organization in school may take the form of a group that meets during lunch, that of female teachers, people of same age group etc. Informal organizations are just as important enduring and rewarding as the relationship that employee have with the formal organization (Bernard, 1938 Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939, Katz 1965).

Informal organization & relationship are more intimate and cohesive. They help very vitally in the achievement of organizational goals, as it is much easier to interact and seek help from those whom you know personally, it is easier and faster to pass information at the informal level than through the formal channels. The skillful administrator can channel the power of informal groups in constructive pursuits. Head of the institution should encourage rather than stifle informal organization as these will help the administrator find answers to problems like teacher’s disengagement and their lack of team spirit. The informal organization is an important tool in the enhancement of teacher’s job satisfaction and favourable organizational climate.

Mitchell and Larson (1987) say that organizations exist to facilities the attainment of many goals, and that some of these are the broad, formal, publicly stated or official goals, which the organization seeks to achieve. According to Barnard (1939), an organization is concerned with effectiveness and efficiency.
Effectiveness stands for the achievement of institutional goals and efficiency means their achievement for the people in the organization. Human beings join organizations and continue to participate in them for a variety of reasons, which usually go well beyond wanting to achieve the formal goals of the organization (Simon, 1964; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Rao & Rao, 1996). These goals include meeting certain financial goals, the satisfaction of social needs, or the opportunity to exercise skills that individuals could not exercise when they are alone. Mitchell & Larson (1987) say that from a behavioural standpoint, these personal goals are likely to be at least as important as the formal goals of the organization, and that if an organization was suddenly unable to meet the personal goals of its members, it would quickly lose those members; if it were unable to replace them, it would ultimately go out of existence. Rao & Rao (1996) see this as some kind of exchange relationship between the individual and the organization: organizations provide opportunities to people to exhibit their skills, knowledge and talent to reach their goals and individuals, in turn contribute their talent, effort and time to the organization.

School should be able to facilitate achievement for the individuals who work there. Roethlisberger & Dickson (1939) observed that no two individuals make exactly the same demands of their job. The demands a particular employee makes depend not only upon his physical needs but upon his social needs as well. These social needs and the sentiments associated with them vary with his early personal history and social conditioning as
well as with the needs and sentiments of the people closely associated with him both inside and outside of work. The values of any particular group in an organization are related to the logical purposes of the total organization, and they are also related to personal values of individuals within that group. The individuals within any particular group are concerned with handling these various values in ways that bring maximum job satisfaction to themselves. In this connection, three aspects of job satisfaction have been singled out, which are conflicts, organizational climate and motivation.

Argyris (1960) came to the conclusion that the needs of even healthy individuals are in conflict with the demands of formal organizations. People often have to work in situations that coerce them to be dependent, subordinate, submissive, and to use merely their skin-surface abilities. At times their needs are not congruent with the traditional requirements of formal organizations.

Conflict ranges from the micro level to the macro level: intra individual, interpersonal, inter group and organizational conflict (Luthans, 1998). Intra individual conflict comprises frustration (When a motivated drive is blocked before a person reaches a desired goal); goal conflict (Where two or more motives block one another); role conflict and ambiguity when the expectations attached to a given role are not in agreement with the pattern of need and personality dispositions characteristic of the incumbent of the role; or there are contradictory expectations about how a given role should be played; or conflicts arise from
differing requirement of two or more roles that must be played at the same time. In the investigator’s opinion whereas Head teachers may be able to deal with some of the situations that cause frustration, goal and role conflicts may have to be solved by the teacher himself/herself.

There are four sources of interpersonal conflict. Personal differences, information deficiency, role incompatibility (this time between two or more people who have interdependent roles, like the Registrar and the Institute Secretary), and environmental stress (Whetten & Cameron, 1991). Whereas interpersonal conflict normally occurs within groups, inter group conflict occurs between groups. Inter group conflicts are brought on by competition for resources, task interdependence and status struggles (Yukl, 1990). Organizational conflict involves aspects like hierarchical conflict where the management may be in conflict with the workers; there may also be functional conflict between different departments, as well as formal-information conflict.

Kelley (1975) says that whereas previously conflict was by definition avoidable, and was caused by troublemakers, boat rockers and prima donnas, where legalistic forms were emphasized and scapegoats accepted as inevitable, the new assumption about organizational conflict are that conflict is inevitable, it is determined by various structural factors, it is integral to the nature of change, and a minimal level of conflict is optimal. Gatzels (1952) says that it should be appreciated that disagreements and conflicts are often important in themselves.
They highlight the need for re-evaluation and modification of the current relationships; something must be done differently if satisfactions are to be enhanced (also, cf. Jewell & Reitz, 1981 and Baron, 1983).

Much has been written about positive ways of dealing with the various types of conflicts, ranging from Lee’s (1993) suggestions (modeling attitudes and behaviours one wants their subordinates to emulate, identifying the source of conflict, focusing on the task and not on personalities, addressing conflict in a timely way and learning from conflict) to King’s (1993) process (allow time to cool off; analyze the situation; state the problem to the other person; leave the person an “out”) to Fisher & Ury’s (1983) famous negotiation skills (separate the people from the problem focus on interests not positions, generate a variety of possibilities before deciding what to do; insist that the result be based on some objective standard) and the Win-Win strategy. Bringing this down to schools, it calls for Head teachers to learn how to deal with conflict because this is a very sensitive area as far as organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction are concerned (cf. Back et al., 1991).

To sum up, organization theories have been around for a long time, and they have found relevance in the operation of schools, which are themselves organizations. Strict adherence to certain aspects of organizational theory is unfavourable to the running of schools, and the challenge for Head teachers and a teacher is to discover which aspects best suit schools in general and which ones suit one’s school in particular. This is because it
is very difficult to have a unified theory in the study of organizations. New theories of organization are coming up but it is observed, apart from the Learning Organization which appears to be a completely new direction in organization theory, many of these “new” theories have been found to be embedded in older theories; therefore, they principally serve to enrich what we know about organizations rather than open up a completely new chapter which can find new applications to the understanding and running of schools. By organizational definition, schools are not only concrete structures, but equally so, they are interactions of various stakeholders. Apart from looking at how best to achieve the goals of the school, each stakeholder looks to the school to fulfill his/her own goals. Schools, as organizations, should therefore create favourable conditions in which both organizational and personal goals can be fulfilled.

CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

New Webster’s Dictionary of the English Language (1981) describes climate as the tendency suggestive of the mood and temper of a social or political group, while the Oxford English Dictionary (1989) says it is the mental, moral, etc., environment or attitude of a body of people in respect to some aspect of life, policy etc. The Dictionary of Education (Good, 1959) defines organizational climate as the pattern of social interaction that characterizes an organization.

According to Cornell (1955) organizational climate is “a delicate blending of interpretations by persons in the organization of their jobs and roles in relationship to others and their
interpretations of the roles of others in the organization." He concluded that no two schools have the same climate, and the organizational climate has important effects on the performance of the school.

Argyris (1958) defined organizational climate as a "homeostatic state of an organization composed of elements representing many different levels of analysis."

Halpin and Croft (1963) use the metaphor of personality in their study of the organizational climate of schools. Their metaphorical definition guided their construction of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The impetus for their study was the observation that schools differ in their "feel". Halpin's explanation of his metaphorical definition of organizational climate is as follows:

"Anyone who visits more than a few schools notes quickly how schools differ from each other in their "feel". In one school the teachers and principal are zestful and exude confidence in what they are doing. They find pleasure in working with each other; this pleasure is transmitted to the students, who thus are given at least a fighting chance to discover that school can be a happy experience. In a second school the brooding discontent of the teacher is palpable; the principal tries to hide his incompetence and his lack of a sense of direction behind a cloak of authority, and yet he wears this cloak poorly because the attitude he displays to others vacillates randomly between the obsequious and the officious. And the psychological sickness of such a faculty spills over on the students who, in their own..."
frustration, feed back to the teachers a mood of despair. A third school is marked by neither joy nor despair, but by hollow ritual. Here one gets the feeling of watching an elaborate charade in which teachers, principal, and students alike are acting out parts. The acting is smooth, even glib, but it appears to have little meaning for the participants; in a strange way the show just doesn’t seem to be for real.” And so, too, as one moves to other schools, one finds that each appears to have a “personality” of its own. It is this “personality” that we describe here as the “Organizational Climate” of the school. Analogously, personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization (Halpin, 1966).

Forehand and Gulmer (1964) for instance, defined the organizational climate as a set of characteristics that describe an organization and that

- distinguish the organization from other organizations
- are relatively enduring overtime and
- influence the behaviour of the people in the organization.

Forehand and Gulmer included size, structure, systems complexity, leadership styles and goal directions as the dimensions of organizational variation in terms of climate.

Lonsdale’s (1964) definition of organizational climate was a “global index of the task achievement and the need satisfaction integration.” He was of the view that in general usage, the term has a psycho-social flavour and reflects more concern with the task achievement dimension.
Margulies (1965) defined organizational climate as the degree to which the organization is capable of adapting to its dynamic environment.

Litwin and Streinger (1968) have included six major factors in organizational climate such as:

- Organizational structure; rules, regulations and red-tapism.
- Individual’s responsibility – Autonomy.
- Rewards.
- Risk and risk taking; perception of degree of challenge and risk in work situation.
- Warmth and support; feeling of general good, fellowship and helpfulness in work setting.
- Tolerance and conflicts; degree of confidence that the climate can tolerate differing opinions.

Campbell and Beaty (1971) defined organizational climate as a summary variable intended to represent perceptual filtering, structuring and description of numerous stimuli impinging on him from the domain we so casually refer to as the situation. Organizational climate was considered a perceptual measure describing the organization and differing from attitudinal, evaluative and need satisfaction variables. An organizational climate study of salaried personnel in a manufacturing plan showed that (1) subjects perceptions for their job climate was more finely differentiated than that of the total organization’s climate; (2) a significant portion of climate variance was attributed to submit difference; and (3) significantly, climate
perceptions were related to measures of work-group performance. Further seven dimension of organizational climate that emerged as common to both the organization and work-group were task structure, reward performance relationship, decision centralization, achievement emphasis, training and development emphasis, security versus risk and openness versus defensiveness.

In a review and synthesis of four studies by Litwin and Stringer (1968); Schneider and Bartlett (1968); and Campbell, et al. (1970), following are the dimensions of organizational climate and the variables on which they were identified:

1. Individual autonomy based on individual responsibility, agent independence, rules orientation, and opportunities for exercising individual initiative.
2. The degree of structure imposed upon the position based on structure, managerial structure and closeness of supervision.
3. Reward orientation based on reward, general satisfaction, promotion achievement orientation, sales and profit oriented.
4. Consideration, warmth and support based on managerial support, nurturance of subordinates and worth and support.

Evan (1976) stated that organizational climate is a multidimensional perception by members as well as nonmembers of the essential attributes or character of an organizational system. He deliberately limits the concept to “multidimensional perceptions” rather than posit some inherent properties such as might be implied in the concept of “organizational culture” or
organizational structure. The term “multidimensional” is necessary because the “essential attributes” are not likely to be perceived along one dimension only.

Klatt et al. (1978) gave a comprehensive description of organizational climate as: just as we live in a climate of weather, we work in a “climate” of other people’s behaviour and organizational forces. A climate may provide stimulation and motivation, which encourages the performance of human resources. It may also contain constraints, blockages and frustrations, which inhibit this performance. The organizational climate is intangible like the wind in our weather climate. It is felt but cannot be seen. It affects every member’s performance. The organizational climate is a composite of many factors, some of which are the managerial style of the organization; the values held by individual managers and reflected in the organization as a whole; the formal organization (rules, policies, organization structure, the reward system); the informal organization (norms of behaviour, beliefs, values and attitudes of the emergent behavioural system), the communication system, and all other managerial systems. The organizational climate is best thought of in terms of as a set of forces within the organization that greatly affect the way people work. These forces influence the motivation and commitment of individuals and groups through their impact on interpersonal and inter group relationship.

Nwankwo (1979) referred to climate as “the general we-feeling, group subculture or interactive effect felt in the school”.
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According to Armstrong (1984), the working atmosphere of an enterprise can be described as “organizational climate”. He says that this comprises the ways in which the following aspects of organizational behaviour manifest themselves: teamwork and co-operation; commitment; communications; creativity; conflict resolution; participation; confidence and trust between individuals and groups and between managers and their subordinates. The school climate definitions and a model for a large setting were framed by Keefe, et al. (1985). They defined climate as the relatively enduring pattern of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members.

O’Neal, et al. (1987) defined school climate as the combination of eight variables: (1) clear school mission; (2) safe and well-ordered learning environment; (3) expectations for success; (4) high morale; (5) effective instructional leadership; (6) quality classroom instruction; (7) monitoring of student progress; and (8) positive home school relations.

Sweeney, et al. (1988) reported that climate was generally defined as the prevailing conditions affecting life and activities. For effective schools, a humane healthy school climate affecting the “Life and activities” of students and staff was a necessity. Because school climate influences the affective domain, it is difficult to isolate climate from the skills, knowledge, and attitudes that students gain through their academic studies.

Lindelow (1989) suggested that school climate was defined as the feeling an individual got from experience within a school system. More specially, climate was the composite of norms,
expectations, and beliefs characterizing the school social system as perceived by its members.

Azari (1991) purports that climate is attitudinal, and it is defined as the qualitative aspect of the interpersonal relationships within an organization; it depends upon the perception by an individual of his own work and his status, of other members, and of the organization: these perceptions are determined largely by individuals’ participation in the organization – the cumulative behaviour that defines the working relationships of individuals.

The Dictionary of Business and Management (Rosenberg, 1993) defined organizational climate as a set of properties of the work environment perceived by employees and assumed to be a major factor in influencing their behaviour.

Considering the definitions of organizational climate, reliance on perceptual measurement may be interpreted to mean that organizational climate includes description in perception and attitudes. If it is employed as an organizational attribute it would be confusing since the use of perceptual measurement introduces variances, which is a function of differences among individuals and is not necessarily descriptive of organizations or situation. “Therefore, the accuracy and/or consensus of perceptual organizations climate measures are used to describe organizational attributes” (Guion, 1973).

At the same time, there are others (e.g. Hall, Hass and Johnson, 1967, Pugh, Hickson, Hinings and Turner, 1969) who considered these as situational and structural variables. There are still other investigations that view the climate with a multiple
measurement approach (e.g. Litwin and Stringer, 1968) and encompass organizational model and taxonomies (e.g. Hall et al., 1967, Indik, 1968, Sells, 1963, Katz and Kahn, 1966), organizational context (e.g. Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Pugh et al., 1969), systems and value norms (Katz and Kahn, 1966).

**TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE**

Halpin identified six (6) types of organizational climates, and he described them as follows:-

**The Open Climate**

The Open Climate depicts a situation in which the members enjoy extremely High esprit, with a strong feeling of confidence in the principal. Teachers work well together without bickering and complaining (Low Disengagement). Teachers are not burdened by over work and routine duties; the principal’s policies facilitate the teacher’s accomplishment of their task (Low Hindrance). On the whole, the group members enjoy friendly relations with each other, and can use their initiative. However, they apparently feel no need for an extremely high degree of intimacy (Average Intimacy). The teachers obtain considerable job satisfaction, they are proud of their school, and are sufficiently motivated to overcome difficulties and frustrations.

The behaviour of the principal plays a big role in portraying the organizational climate of a school; in the Open Climate the principal sets an example by working hard himself (High Thrust), but depending on the situation, he can either criticize the teachers or go out of his way to help a teacher (High Consideration). Thus his behaviour is an integration of his personality and the role he is
required to play as a leader. He is not aloof; nor are the rules and procedures, which he sets up, inflexible or impersonal (Low Aloofness). He has personal flexibility, whether he is required to control and direct the activities of others, or to show compassion in satisfying the social needs of individual teachers. He does not have to emphasize production, nor does he need to monitor the teachers’ activities closely because the teachers do, indeed, produce easily and freely in the favourable climate that he himself has created (Low production Emphasis). Because the principal does not do all the work himself but shares it with his teachers, appropriate leadership qualities emerge from the teachers.

The Autonomous Climate

The distinguishing feature of this climate is the almost complete freedom that the principal gives to teachers to provide their own structure-for-interaction so that they can find ways within the group for satisfying their own social needs (High Intimacy). Here teachers achieve their goals easily and quickly (Low Disengagement). The essential point is that the teachers do work well together and accomplish the tasks of the organization. They are not hindered by administrative paperwork. The principal has set up procedures and regulations to facilitate the teachers’ task (Low Hindrance). The morale of the teachers is high, but not as high as in the Open Climate. The high morale probably stems largely from the social-needs satisfaction, which the teachers receive (High Esprit); esprit would probably be higher if greater task accomplishment also occurred within the school.
The principal remains aloof from the teachers. He runs the schools in a business-like and rather impersonal manner (High Aloofness). His leadership style favours the establishment of procedures and regulations, which provides guidelines that the teachers can follow. He does not force teachers to produce, nor does he say, “We should be working harder”, instead, he is satisfied to let the teachers work at their own speed, and there is very little monitoring of their activities (Low Production Emphasis). He is considerate, and he attempts to satisfy the social needs of the teachers as well as most principals do (Average Consideration). The principal provides thrust for the organization by setting an example and working hard himself (High Thrust). He looks out for the personal welfare of the teachers and is genuine and flexible, but his range of administrative behaviour as compared to that of the principal in the Open Climate is somewhat restricted.

**The Controlled Climate**

The Controlled Climate is marked by a pressure for achievement at the expense of social needs satisfaction. Nonetheless, since morale is high (High Esprit), this climate can be classified as more open than closed. Teachers do not bicker, find fault or differ with the principal’s directions: they are there to get the job done, and they expect to be told personally exactly how to do it (Low Disengagement). There is an excessive amount of paperwork, routine reports, busy work and general hindrance (High Hindrance). Accordingly, teachers have little time to establish very friendly social interaction with each other; there is
very little feeling of comradeship (Low Intimacy). The job satisfaction found in this climate results primarily from task-accomplishment, and not from the social need satisfaction.

The principal allows little flexibility within the organization, and insists that everything be done his way (High Production Emphasis). Essentially, the principal says, “My way of doing things is best, and to hell with the way people feel.” He is somewhat aloof (Average Aloofness), and prefers to publish directives to indicate how each procedure is to be followed. He becomes dogmatic when members of the group do not conform to his views. He cares little about how people feel; accordingly he does not seek to satisfy the group’s social needs (Low Consideration). Nevertheless, he tries to move the organization by working hard (Average Thrust) and he personally sees to it that everything runs properly. He delegates few responsibilities and initiates leadership acts rather than allowing them to come from the group.

The Familiar Climate

The main feature of this climate is the conspicuously friendly manner of both the principal and the teacher (High Intimacy). Social needs satisfaction is extremely high. The teachers are disengaged, and accomplish little in a task-oriented situation, primarily because the principal exerts little control in directing their activities (High Disengagement). The principal does not burden the teachers with routine reports; he makes it as easy as possible for them to work (Low Hindrance.) The teachers have established personal friendship among themselves (High
Intimacy). Morale or job satisfaction is average, but it is one-sided, stemming primarily from the social needs satisfaction (Average Esprit).

The behavioural theme advanced by the principal is essentially that of a big happy family (High Consideration). He wants everybody to know and feel part of the group; nevertheless, his abdication of social control is ironically accompanied by high disengagement on the part of the group. He is not aloof, nor is he impersonal and official in his manner (Low Aloofness). He does not emphasize production, nor does he do much personally to ensure that the teachers are performing their tasks correctly (Low Production Emphasis). In short, little is done either directly or indirectly to evaluate or direct the activities of the teachers. The principal suggests things instead of issuing instructions, and he is very reluctant to criticize. However, the teachers do attribute thrust to the principal (Average Thrust), though in this context they like him as a person who is interested in their welfare; nevertheless, they are inclined to discount him as a leader.

**The Paternal Climate**

The Paternal Climate is characterized by the principal’s ineffectiveness. He is neither capable of controlling the teacher nor satisfying their social needs. He tries to be both friendly to the teachers and to control them, but they are not prepared to accept him or his efforts.

The principal’s behaviour is not genuine, and is perceived by the teachers as non-motivating (Low Esprit). This climate is, of course, a partly closed one.
The teachers do not work well together. They are split into factions, and group maintenance has not been established because of the principal’s inability to control them (High Disengagement). He does a great deal of routine reports and administrative duties (Low Hindrance). The teachers do not enjoy friendly relationships with each other (Low Intimacy), therefore they obtain inadequate satisfaction with respect to both task-accomplishment and social needs.

The principal is the very opposite of aloof (Low Aloofness): he is everywhere trying to do everything. If not, he checks, monitors and tells people how to do things. In fact, he is so involved that he becomes intrusive. Although he is always emphasizing all the things that should be done (High Production Emphasis), somehow nothing gets done. He himself sets up such items as schedules and class changers, and does not let the teachers perform any of these activities.

The principal is considerate (High Consideration), but his consideration appears to be a form of seductive over-solicitude rather than a genuine concern for the social needs of others. In a sense, the principal uses this considerate behaviour to satisfy his own social needs. Although he preserves an average degree of thrust (Average Thrust) evidenced by his attempts to move the organization – since his main interest in life is the school and his duties within it – he nonetheless fails to motivate the teachers, primarily because he as a human being does not provide an example or an ideal which the teachers care to emulate.
The Closed Climate

The climate is pretty well the opposite of the Open Climate. It marks a situation where the teachers obtain little satisfaction either in task-achievement or in social needs. The principal is ineffective in directing the activities of the teachers and at the same time, he is not inclined to look out for their personal welfare.

The teachers are disgruntled, disengaged (High Disengagement), and do not work well together. Consequently, group achievement is minimal. The principal does not facilitate the task-accomplishment of the teachers (High Hindrance). Esprit is at a nadir, reflecting low job satisfaction (Low Esprit). However, friendly relations do exist among the teachers (Average Intimacy), and this seems to be the only satisfaction that the teachers get from the school. The turnover rate for teachers in this climate would be very high unless, of course, the teachers are too old to move readily to another job or have been locked into the system by attractiveness of a retirement arrangement.

The principal is highly aloof, and impersonal in controlling and directing the activities of the teachers (High Aloofness). He emphasizes production, and frequently says, “We should work harder” (High Aloofness). His words are hollow because he himself possesses little thrust and he does not activate the teachers by setting a good personal example (Low Thrust). He is not concerned with the social needs of the teachers; in fact, he can be depicted as inconsiderate (Low Consideration). He expects everyone else to take the initiative, but in practice he resents this
because he does not give them the freedom required to perform whatever leadership acts are necessary; moreover he himself does not provide adequate leadership for the group. In Halpin's (1966) words, “This climate characterizes an organization for which the best prescription is radical surgery.”

A Model Of Organizational Climate (Evan, 1976)

To relate the systems model of organizations to organizational climate, Evan (1976) considered the following assumptions about the latter:

- Members as well as nonmembers have perceptions of the climate of the focal organization, i.e. the organization or class of organizations, which is the object of analysis.
- Organizational members tend to perceive the climate differently from nonmembers because of the prevalence of different frames of reference and different criteria for evaluating an organization.
- Perceptions of organizational climate, whether real or unreal, have behavioral consequences for the focal organization as well as for elements of the organization-set, i.e. the complement of organizations with which the focal organization interacts.
- Organizational members performing different roles tend to have different perceptions of the climate, if only because of (1) a lack of role consensus, (2) a lack of uniformity in role
socialization, and (3) a diversity in patterns of role-set interactions.

- Members of different organizational subunits tend to have different perceptions of the climate because of different role-set configurations, different sub goals, and a differential commitment to the goals of subunits compared to the goals of the organization as a whole.

With the aid of these concepts and assumptions a systems model of organizational climate will now be developed for analyzing organizational climate. In other words, a systems approach by itself does not dictate the constituents of the model used in analyzing a particular phenomenon. It merely identified the basic element of analysis, namely, input, process, output, and feedback. Nor does it define which input, process, and output elements to select and which feedback effects to study.
FIGURE

Figure 1. Processes within the focal organization generating an organizational climate.
The level and quality of the inputs at any particular time activate the complex of intra organizational processes within the focal organization (Figure).

The goals of an organization (Figure) whether explicitly or implicitly defined, condition the decision-making process of top executives (Figure). The decision making of top executives is functionally equivalent to the action of legislators in a governmental context in that it may have system-wide structural ramifications.

The decisions of top executives results in (1) the choice of technology with which to produce the organization’s goods or services, (2) the formation of formal subunits and (3) the development of norms designed to regulate the behaviour of members (Figure C,D,E). As a consequence of these three processes, a structure of statuses emerges, typically of a hierarchical nature (Figure F), which affects the socialization of new member (FIGURE G). As new members are recruited, they are socialized by formal and/or informal means into a particular role that involves the recruit in a network of interactions with various role partner-peers, superiors, and possibly also subordinates (Figure H). These role-set relations directly or indirectly influence the member’s role-performance (FIGURE I). In turn role performance tends to affect the distribution of rewards (Figure J) particularly in organizations governed by norms of rationality and universalize.

The processes of role socialization, role-set interactions, and role performance collectively influence the type of
interdepartmental relations that develop (Figure K). The rewards received by members for their role performance and their intradepartmental experiences lead them to evaluate the character of the organization (Figure L). This evaluation process influenced in part by the commitment of members to their role, their subunits, and the total organization, results in the formation of a perceived organizational climate (Figure M). The collective perceptions by members about the organizational climate, possibly because of their feedback effects on role performance (Figure M-I), influence the organizational performance (Figure N).

CONCEPT OF JOB SATISFACTION

The term job satisfaction may be defined as a psychological satisfaction, which the employee derives by performing a job. Performance of the job, by the employees also requires that his expectations and aspirations in term of rewards, consideration and fulfillment of his needs, etc. have been met. If these are fulfilled properly, he will be satisfied with the outcome of the job performance and greater job satisfaction would generally motivate the employees for performing their jobs more efficiently. Stability of tenure is also ensured by job satisfaction since it is in view or recognition, achievement and advancement being provided to the employee he decides to stay and continue in the organization for a longer period of time (Moshal, 1998).

Hoppoch (1935) referred to it as “the result from the interaction between job incumbents and their job environment”.
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Bullock (1952) indicated that “the job satisfaction is an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with job”.

Smith (1955) suggested that job satisfaction is “the employee’s judgment” of how well his job on the whole is satisfying to his various needs.

Vroom (1964) refers to it as “affective orientation on the part of individuals towards work role which they are presently occupying. Positive attitudes toward the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction”.

Gilmer (1966) suggested that job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes the person holds towards his job, towards related factors and towards life in general.

Schultz (1973) too refers to job satisfaction as “a set of attitudes that employees have about their jobs’ and describes it as the psychological disposition of people towards their jobs-how they fell about the work”. This involves a collection of numerous attitudes or feelings.

Katzell (1980) conceptualized job satisfaction as “an employee’s own evaluation of his or her job in terms of supervision, co-workers, pay, promotions and the work itself. This evaluation is actually a comparison between the employee’s expectations about these job-related factors and his or her actual experience on the job”.

According to Robbins (1996), job satisfaction is a primarily dependent variable of organizational behaviour, and it is one of the critical determinants of an organization’s human resources
effectiveness. He says that it is a general attitude towards one’s job; it represents an attitude rather than behaviour. Therefore, although job satisfaction represents an attitude rather than behaviour, organizational behaviour researchers typically consider it an important dependent variable.

Tosl et al. (1998) define satisfaction, as a function of the extent to which the task provides a persons’ desired level of both intrinsic and extrinsic outcomes.

Porter & Lawler (1968) say that satisfaction is derived from the extent to which actual rewards fall short, meet or exceed the individual’s perceived level of equitable rewards. If actual rewards meet or exceed perceived equitable rewards, the individual will feel satisfied; if these are less than equitable rewards, he will be dissatisfied.

Robbing (1996) defines satisfaction as the difference between the amount of rewards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive attitudes towards the job; a person who is dissatisfied with his/her job holds negative attitudes about the job. When people speak of employee attitudes, more often than not they mean job satisfaction.

The Dictionary of Business Management (Rosenber, 1993) simply defines job satisfaction as the positive or negative aspects of an employee’s attitude toward his/her job or some part of it.

Armstrong (1996) says that the term “job satisfaction” refers to the attitudes and feelings people have about their work. Positive and favourable attitudes towards the job indicate job
satisfaction and negative and unfavourable attitude towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction.

Newstrom & Davis (1998) describe attitudes as the feelings and beliefs that largely determine how employees will perceive their environment, commit themselves to intended actions, and ultimately behave. Attitudes are a mental set that affects how a person will view something else. He illustrates this using an analogy with a window: just as window provides a framework for our view out of a building (but the size and shape of the frame of the window allows us to see some things and prevents us from observing others), and the colour of the glass may affect the accuracy of our perception, the “size”, “shape” and “colour” of our attitudes have an impact on how we view the surroundings at work. The authors define job satisfaction as a set of favourable or unfavourable feelings and emotions with which employees view their work: job satisfaction is an affected attitude – a feeling of relative likes or dislikes. They say that employee attitudes consist of two more elements: objective thought (belief) is an intellectual response (“My work is quite complex”), and behavioural intentions are reflected in terms like “I plan to quit this job in three months”. Attitudes thus consist of feelings, thoughts and intentions to act.

Job satisfaction typically refers to the attitude of a single employee; the general term used to describe overall group satisfaction is morale (Newstrom & Davis, 1998). Furthermore, job satisfaction can be viewed as an overall attitude or it can apply to the various parts of an individual’s job. Newstrom &
Davis (1998) maintain that if it is viewed only as an overall attitude, managers may miss seeing some key hidden exceptions as they assess employees overall satisfaction.

Theories Of Job Satisfaction

Three major theories of job satisfaction have served as either implicit or explicit reference points for much of the research in this area.

Need-fulfillment Theory (Korman, 1978) in some respects the most rational of the theories of job satisfaction and the one which is probably the clearest analogue to the incentive theory of performance is the notion that (1) a person is satisfied if he gets what he wants and (2) the more he wants something, or the more important it is to him, the more satisfied he is when he gets it and the more dissatisfied he is when he does not get it. There are two major theories that utilize this kind of framework, one a subtractive model and the other multiplicative (Vroom, 1964). Both conceptualize job satisfaction as a direct function of the extent to which an environment corresponds to one’s need structures.

The subtractive model proposes that job satisfaction is a direct negative function of the discrepancy between a person’s needs and the extent to which the environment provides satisfaction of those needs. The greater the total discrepancy counting all needs, the less the satisfaction; and the less the discrepancy, the greater the satisfaction.

In any case, Vroom (1964) prefers a multiplicative model in which we multiply a person’s needs by the degree to which the
job fulfills the need and then add up the products for all needs. This total would then be the level of job satisfaction. There are several studies that support these models. For the multiplicative theory, one of the best known is the one reported by Vroom himself (1959). In this investigation Vroom was concerned with the extent to which the relationship between supervisory participative practices and job satisfaction was dependent on the extent to which the individuals involved wanted to engage in decision-making. The rationale here was that if they did not, it would not matter if the supervisor were participative or not. Vroom classified his sample on two scales, one of which measured authoritarianism.

Reference-group Theory (Korman, 1978) Reference-group theory is similar to need-fulfillment theory except that it takes as its point of departure not the desires, needs, and interests of the individual but, rather, the point of view and the opinions of the group to whom the individual looks for guidance. Such groups are defined as the reference group for the individual in that they define the way in which he should look at the world and evaluate various phenomena in the environment. It would be predicted, according to this theory, that if a job meets the interest, desires, and requirements of a person’s reference group, he will like it, and if it does not, he will not like it.

Herzberg’s Motivator-Hygiene Theory (Moshal, 1998) Herzberg, a US behavioural scientist, has proposed a theory of employee’s motivation based on satisfaction. His theory advocated that satisfied employee is motivated from within to
work harder and dissatisfied employee is not self-motivated. Since Herzberg, research has discovered two sets of factors associated with satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the employee; therefore it is known as ‘Herzberg’s two factor theory’. The first set of factors known as satisfiers or motivators is responsible for self-motivation of employees. These factors include job, its importance, opportunities it provides for advancement, achievement, recognition and sense of responsibility, etc. These factors are known as job content factors and are real motivators because they are capable of providing satisfaction to employees. These are known as intrinsic factors.

The second set of factors called hygiene factors or maintenance factors or dissatisfiers which include working conditions, job security, salary, quality of supervision, organizational policies, interpersonal relationships and other factors in the immediate work environment. They are job context and extrinsic to the job. Any deficiency or absence of these factors would simply create dissatisfaction, demotivation and low performance but their presence does not motivate the employees. They have been considered as hygiene factor or maintenance factors because their role is supportive just to maintain healthy and congenial atmosphere in working setting.

By identifying and differentiating various factors as dissatisfiers and motivators, Herzberg has encouraged managers to think carefully about what actually motivates the employees. According to Herzberg the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction but rather no job satisfaction and similarly the
opposite of job dissatisfaction is not satisfaction but no dissatisfaction. Like Maslow's theory, two-factor theory of motivation has also been criticized on account of lack of empirical validation. In spite of criticism Herzberg's contribution to motivation theory remains very useful. Because he has made it quite clear that money is a weak motivation tool, because at best, it can only eliminate or reduce dissatisfaction. Moreover this theory has placed emphasis on motivating potentials, which can be profitably used for making job enrichment.

It would seem, then, that considering the negative outcomes of Herzberg's theory, there is good reason to suggest a gradual convergence on two major explanations or theories of the determinants of job satisfaction. These two explanations can be summarized as follows:

1. Need-fulfillment theory: Job satisfaction is a function of, or is positively related to, the degree to which one's personal needs are fulfilled in the job situation.

2. Reference-group theory: Job satisfaction is a function of, or is positively related to, the degree to which the characteristics of the job meet with the approval and the desires of the groups to which the individual looks for guidance in evaluating the world and defining social reality.
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND ITS EFFECT ON JOB SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The most important resource in a school is the teacher. The teacher’s conditions need to be appropriate to achieve the outcomes we desire. Under negative material conditions, the teachers cannot be motivated to give their best at work. Whitemore (1994) says, “in order to develop programmes which attract, motivate and retain teachers, it is necessary to identify the factors perceived by teachers as causing job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

The organizational climate is often the determining factor of the success or failure of the organization. It has a major influence on human performance through its impact on individual motivation and job satisfaction. It does this by creating certain kinds of expectancies about what consequences will follow from different actions. Individuals in the organization have certain expectations and fulfillment of these expectations depends upon their perception as to how the organizational climate suits to the satisfaction of their needs. Thus organizational climate provides a type of work environment in which individual feels satisfied or otherwise. Since satisfaction of individual goes a long way in determining his efficiency, organizational climate can be said to
be directly related with his performance in the organization. As education aims at changing behaviour pattern, organizational climate is a powerful variable that must be fully understood and considered while planning for the education of children.

When one moves from one school to another, one finds that each school has its unique climate, which ultimately determines the overall performance of the school. Organizational climate can be understood as the organizational personality of a school and is the result of interaction between the group and the leader and within the group itself. Organizational climate is the sum total of elements and constituents which have been designed and planned by its management so as to seek better performance from its members for a longer period of time. These elements can be measured, controlled, and changed as per the need of situation. It differs from organization to organization. Every individual needs different climate to contribute and develop most depending on organizational behaviour, the basic philosophy of organization and external environment.

Job satisfaction is a notion that has interested researchers in all fields. Organizational climate affects job performance, job satisfaction and attitude of individual working therein. Organizational climate also makes adequate provisions for various types of stimuli to be given to its members and seek desirable and positive behaviour in job performance. On the basis of interaction with organizational climate members of organization experience and perceive it which in a direct way affect their attitude, morale, and motivation. Various research
studies also confirm the positive relationship between organizational climate, employee performance and satisfaction. But so far as the elementary schools of Mumbai are concerned, little work has been done there in both organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Elementary education is the foundation of edifice of educational structure a strong super structure can be erected on a strong footing only. We have to make elementary education strong and effective so that higher education and ultimately citizenry of the nation becomes efficient and effective. This study would be helpful in providing and determining the type of organizational climate of elementary schools most suitable for the job satisfaction of teacher.

In elementary education, of all the factors, the teachers are the most instrumental in making and shaping the child’s personality. A lively, dynamic and efficient teacher will be the biggest boon for the society. Thus it becomes imperative to study every aspect related with education, which contributes to the development of teachers and child. Hence elementary education teachers become all the more important.

In the fifth survey of research in education it has been mentioned that organizational climate and job satisfaction in relation to elementary education has been neglected by the researchers. So the researcher has selected this study. This study would be helpful in providing and determining the type of organizational climate of elementary schools most suitable for the job satisfaction of teacher.
The study of organizational climate and its effect on job satisfaction of teachers provides a great interest in educational philosophy. The organizational climate of the school is an indicator of how well the organization copes with the continuing need to change, adopts and at the same time maintains itself internally.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The objectives of the present investigation were:

1. To study the Organizational Climate of different elementary schools.

2. To Study and compare the organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in Government and Private Elementary schools.

3. To study and compare the Gender differences in perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

4. To study and compare the perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers between graduate and post-graduate teachers.

5. To study and compare various dimensions of organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in Open Climate and Closed Climate schools.

6. To study and compare the perceptions of organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers of various age groups.
7. To study and compare the perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers according to their experience.

8. To study the relationship between the organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary school teachers.

9. To study the relationship and organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in open climate schools.

10. To study the relationship and organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in closed climate schools.

11. To study the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in government elementary schools.

12. To study the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in private elementary schools.

HYPOTHESES:

1. The organizational climate of different elementary schools will differ.

2. There will exist significant difference in organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers between government and private elementary schools.

3. There will exist significant difference between male and female teachers in their perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction.
4. There will exist no significant difference in the perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers between graduate and post-graduate teachers.

5. There will exist significant difference in various dimensions of organizational climate and job satisfaction of teachers in open and closed climate schools.

6. There will exist no significant difference between the teachers of various age-groups in their perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

7. There will exist no significant difference between the teachers with different years of experience in their perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

8. There will exist significant positive relationship between the organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary school teachers.

9. There will exist significant positive relationship between the organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary school teachers in open climate schools.

10. There will exist significant relationship between the organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary school teachers in closed climate schools.

11. There will exist significant relationship between the organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary school teachers in government elementary schools.

12. There will exist significant relationship between the organizational climate and job satisfaction of elementary school teachers in private elementary schools.
The study suggests that performance was more predictable for subjects who worked in a consistent climate than those who had to work in an inconsistent environmental climate. Inconsistent climate was having negative impact on productivity. Another study shows that significant differences were found in performance and satisfaction of people in varying organizational climates. It was found that people in democratic-friendly climate expressed maximum satisfaction with their jobs. However, people in authoritarian-structured organization produced goods of highest quality because of rigid specifications put by govt. orders. Various other studies also support the positive relationship between type of organizational climate and individual satisfaction.