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Abstract

LEADING CULTURAL CHANGE TO IMPACT WORKPLACE SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS WITH A FOCUS ON TEACHER CAREER CYCLE

Scott H. Ingwerson Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 2015

Advisor: Dr. Kay Keiser

School culture has a profound effect on both students and staff. As schools face the challenge of continuous improvement and raising student achievement, positive school culture can be the leverage schools need to take the next step in a positive direction. Teacher job satisfaction is often not the focus when student achievement is discussed, schools may be overlooking a very important factor. In this study, the perception of teacher’s job satisfaction was measured in 2013 based on the 40 Developmental Assets Framework. Grounded on the data collected, intentional cultural developmental strategies and structures were implemented by the leadership team. Then the teacher’s perceptions were measured again in 2014 to determine any impact. Within the study the teacher’s career cycles, based on years of experience, were examined. In doing so, novice teachers and experienced teachers were compared in their responses. Overall findings indicate a growth in both groups of teachers in their school workplace satisfaction. The growth of the novice teachers was greater than the experienced teachers. This study may provide a process for other schools to follow with the hope of positively impacting teacher job satisfaction and school culture. Job satisfaction continues to need further study.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

If you don’t feed the teachers they will eat the students. This title of Neila A. Connors’ book is meant to be funny, but when examined, education has traditionally been “feeding” teachers without significantly impacting their job satisfaction and as a result student achievement to its highest potential. Programs, technology, and curriculums have fallen short. This study will examine the influence of strategic cultural development experiences and structures on teacher’s perceived workplace satisfaction.

Culture is a very large beast that education and business organizations have focused on for decades. Many approaches and theories have been used but the questions and issues still exist. The 40 Developmental Asset Framework is a new and different twist on the old topic and shows potential to have a positive impact. Just as the Developmental Assets decrease negative outcomes and promote positive behaviors in students, an asset framework applied to staff climate has the power to decrease the attitudes and practices that lead to educational burnout and low job satisfaction (Eklund, 2008). The teacher career cycle also plays a role with teacher’s perception of their personal job satisfaction levels (Fessler & Christensen, 1992; Steffy & Kappa Delta Pi, 2000). Gaining a deeper understanding of how the teacher career cycle, the 40 Developmental Assets, and teacher job satisfaction interplay might allow educators to make better-informed decisions impacting school culture and thus student achievement.

An intentional approach by school leaders and staff could increase levels of school workplace job satisfaction and positive culture. This increase could help create a more enjoyable work environment resulting in an enhanced learning environment for students.
Schools that are great places to work are also more likely to be great places to learn (Starkman, Scales, & Roberts, 2006).

In this study, a different approach focused on “feeding” teachers based on cultural development experiences and structures considering the teacher career cycle will be examined. The participant’s measured perceptions of their 40 Developmental Assets will be used to determine levels of teacher workplace job satisfaction and thus an impact on school culture.

Education is one of the more complex professions (Shoup & Studer, 2010). Leading a school requires a complex set of skills and talents from school administrators (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). These talents and skills influence the culture and success of a school. Culture is very impactful to student successes. Culture fosters school effectiveness and productivity; it develops collegiality, relationships, communication, and problem-solving practices. Culture stimulates innovations and school improvement, builds commitment and inspires motivation. Culture focuses attention on what is important and valued and increases the energy and passion of school staff, students, and community (Deal & Peterson, 2009). Considering this list, the impact of culture has a profound effect on teachers and students each day.

Do schools do enough to address the personal stressors within the culture that impact teachers? Education issues are often framed around students and not teachers. For example, class size is often expressed as a negative for students, the effects on teacher is given very little attention (Eklund, 2008). These types of stressors can cause negative effects that take energy from teachers while making teachers negative and discouraged. At the worst, these stressors can lead to burnout in teachers and as the teacher is in this
state and before they leave the profession, students are the ones not benefitting under the unfortunate circumstances (Eklund, 2008).

Teacher job satisfaction matters not only to teachers but also to students. Nate Eklund (2008) states “I became convinced that creating a positive school climate for teachers is not a side issue to or a distraction from student success, but actually a central solution to so many of the obstacles we work to overcome” (p. 18). Based on these comments, to truly have the highest student success, teacher job satisfaction and culture must be considered.

By impacting culture one is changing culture. School leaders have a tremendous amount of guidance found in professional publications and research focused on change strategies. Douglas Reeves, (2009) explains that profound and lasting cultural change found in many leadership contexts, including business, government, education, and nonprofit organizations are centered on four essentials. The leader must express what still holds value and will not change. Second, organizational culture will change with leadership actions. Third, leaders must use the right change tools for the system. Finally, change in culture requires persistent personal attention and work by the leader (Reeves, 2009). This theoretical framework is useful when considering the impact of culture development within a school.

Interplaying with culture is the teacher’s own unique life experiences. Teachers are human beings with personal and professional experiences that affect their attitudes and engagement while at work. They have different individual dispositions that allow them to approach situations in different ways. Teachers have a variety of avocational outlets and family experiences that influence their approach at work. They might face
crises in their lives that interfere with their disposition while at school. Teachers also have different amounts and types of positive critical incidents occurring within their lives. Finally, teachers can be in many different life stages (Fessler & Christensen, 1992). The stresses and celebrations occurring at various times and in different ways within each teacher’s life affect their perception of their job satisfaction, thus the school’s culture. With such a vast number of influences on job satisfaction and culture, school leaders must act with intention and strategy to have a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction and school culture. Thus, the purpose of this expostfacto quasi-experimental study involving a longitudinal survey is to explore the impact of cultural development with respect to career stages on teacher workplace job satisfaction.

**Theoretical Framework**

Solid researched leadership and cultural frameworks have guided school leaders in the past when approaching many topics. This study is no different. Stephen Covey is known as an expert in leadership and culture. Within his book Principled Centered Leadership (1992), he describes his four levels of principled centered leadership. This framework is a four-tiered internal to external model. It is represented graphically as an expanded set of circles. Principled centered leadership is practiced from inside to outside on four levels: 1) personal – trustworthiness; 2) interpersonal – trust; 3) managerial-empowerment; and organizational-alignment.

The first circle of principled centered leadership, personal-trustworthiness, is focused on the leader and their ability to be honest, loyal, and demonstrate a commitment to the organization. Are their actions trustworthy to others they lead? The second circle is interpersonal-trust. This level is also based on trust and relates to the leader’s
relationships and interactions with others. Interpersonal-trust considers the leader’s character and competence. With trust the leader can establish clear communication, synergy, productive interdependency, and empathy. The next outer circle in principled centered leadership is managerial-empowerment. Building on the trustworthiness and trust from the two inner circles leaders can empower those around them. The critical variable is the degree the leader empowers others. The outer circle is organizational-alignment. Within this circle, leaders help themselves and others align their personal and professional goals with the mission of the organization. Systems, strategies, structures, and daily decisions are aligned to the bedrock principles and mission of the organization (Covey, 1992).

Within this study leadership will be examined and connected to the first inner circle. The leader impacts the culture and job satisfaction of teachers within a school. Key components in culture are the relationships developed within the school among the staff and between the staff and leadership (Purkey & Smith, 1983). The second circle of Stephen Covey’s principled centered leadership will be examined as this study examines the relationships within the research school. This study will also attempt to measure the impact of empowering teachers and addressing the third circle, managerial. In addition, intentional efforts will be made to focus and align systems, strategies, and decisions with the school’s and district’s mission.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were used to analyze the overall perceptions of teacher’s school workplace job satisfaction and then the perceptions of teachers in different career cycle’s school workplace job satisfaction.
Research Question #1: What are the faculty’s perception levels of school workplace job satisfaction?

Research Question #2: Is there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey factors between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching?

Definition of Terms

Career Cycle of Teachers: The unique phase a teacher could be in based on their response to personal and organizational environmental conditions. For this study the career cycle of teachers will be described in bands of years from: 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25 and 25+.

Developmental Assets: The relationships, opportunities, values, and skills that are building blocks for young people’s successful growth in the physical, social, emotional, moral, spiritual, cognitive, and psychological arenas (Scales, Sesma, & Bolstrom, 2004).

Developmental Assets Profile (DAP): An instrument to measure perceptions of student’s 40 Assets. (Search Institute, 2005)

Experienced Teacher: For this study, experienced teachers are teachers who have greater than ten years of teaching experience.

Job Satisfaction: The extent to which a person’s hopes, desires, and expectations about the employment he is engaged in, are fulfilled. (Job satisfaction, 2014)

Middle School: Within this study middle school is defined as a sixth grade through eighth grade school that utilizes interdisciplinary teams, exploratory classes, and middle school best practices.

Novice Teacher: For this study, novice teachers are teachers who have zero to ten
years of teaching experience.

**Organizational Factors**: Factors of Support, Influence and Acknowledgement, Professional Parameters, and Time Management that have the potential to influence teacher’s school workplace satisfaction (Eklund Consulting, n.d.).

**Personal Factors**: Factors of Professional Growth, Professional Identity, Collegiality, and Professional Values that have the potential to influence teacher’s school workplace satisfaction (Eklund Consulting, n.d.).

**School Culture**: The result of the leadership, relationships, and teaching and learning that occurs within a school (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

**School Workplace Satisfaction Survey for Teachers**: A secure web-based application that offers a detailed portrait of the workplace culture of a school and the job satisfaction of teachers (Eklund Consulting, n.d.).

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey (SWSS) (Appendix A) is an accurate measure of teacher’s job satisfaction and of teacher’s perceived level. As the SWSS (Appendix A) is a self-report instrument, it was also assumed that all participants were honest and candid when completing the survey.

The design of this study has some strong features. Participants experienced a consistent school climate from the pre survey to the post survey. Participants experienced the same building level staff development sessions and topics throughout the study year. The administrative team was consistent from the pre survey to the post survey. Within the study certified teachers were surveyed. They all held a current teaching certificate, were involved in teacher evaluation, and participated in district and building staff development
sessions helping each be informed about good educational practices.

**Delimitations**

This study is delimited to teachers in the Midwestern, suburban research school. Using the test results from one suburban school may skew the statistical results and reduce the utility and generalizability of the findings. The findings were delimited to the teachers who took the optional pre and post surveys given fifteen months apart in November of 2012 and February of 2014 respectfully.

**Limitations**

The total number of teachers taking the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey for Teachers varied from the pre-survey to the post survey. Fifty-four teachers took the pre-survey while 62 teachers took the post-survey. The difference was accounted by a higher percentage of teachers being present at the time of the post survey and that the school hired two more teachers based on increased enrollment during the school year the post survey was taken. The unique age, gender, and experience levels of the staff that took the surveys might have an impact on the results compared to staff demographics of other schools. The career cycle each teacher is currently in and their personal life experience also limit this study. The perceptions and mindset of a non-married teacher at the age of twenty-three opposed to a teacher at the age of thirty-three who is married with three children might be different.

Given the make up of the staff present during the study of the research school limitations were present. Not all of the career cycle band groups contained the same number of teachers. Some groups were smaller or larger than others.

**Significance**
This study will contribute to research, practice, and policy. The study is of significant interest to educators because there is a considerable focus on school culture, teacher job satisfaction, teacher career cycle, and their impact on student achievement. The connection between the three has implications for students, parents, school staff, and the success of a school or school system.

Contribution to research: A review of professional literature suggested that more research was needed on impacting culture through the perceptions of teacher workplace job satisfaction being measured using the 40 Developmental Assets through the lens of teacher experience or teacher career cycle phases. School leaders do not have research, a clear example, showing how cultural development impacts teacher workplace job satisfaction of teachers in different phases of the teacher career cycle. Teachers who are in the first five years of their careers may be impacted differently than those with more than 20 years of experience.

Contribution to practice: As a result of this research a suburban school district may decide whether or not to continue to support and measure staff’s 40 Developmental Assets and the effectiveness of staff development efforts focused on culture building strategies. A suburban school may decide whether staff development initiatives and planning focused on the staff’s 40 Developmental Assets should be continued.

Contribution to policy: The results of this study will offer insights into the most effective use of staff development time. This research may provide information about the usefulness of the data from the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey and in doing so help school leaders determine the impact that cultural development has on student successes. This increased understanding may allow them to create policies and adjust
funding to better support both teachers and students.

**Outline of Study**

The literature review applicable to this research study is offered in Chapter 2. This chapter reviews the professional literature related to school culture, teacher job satisfaction, career cycles, the 40 Developmental Assets, and change theory. Chapter 3 describes the methodology used within the study, research questions, subjects, and data collection method. Results of the study will be detailed in Chapter 4 and discussed in Chapter 5.
Chapter 2
Review of Literature

Peter Drucker is credited for saying “Culture eats strategy for breakfast.” In any organization understanding and then positively impacting culture is essential for long-term success. Peter Drucker’s quote reminds leaders strategies are not the most powerful influences on the success of a school, culture is. Schools are charged with the education and development of our nation’s most valuable resource, our students. Gaining a full understanding of culture, its’ components, and how to influence them is essential to maximize the success of each student we serve.

School Culture

There are several ways culture is described or defined. Rexford Brown (2004) said culture refers to a set of common values, attitudes, beliefs, and norms, some of which are explicit and some of which are not. Deal and Peterson (2009) describe school culture as the unwritten rules and traditions, norms, and expectations. The unofficial pattern seems to permeate everything: the way people act, how they dress, what they talk about or consider taboo, whether they seek out colleagues or isolate themselves, and how teachers feel about their work and their students. Simply said, culture is how we do things around here. For decades, research dealing with school cultures has discussed many factors involving leadership, relationships, and the teaching and learning. Purkey and Smith (1983) described these factors collectively as school culture or school climate.

Organizational culture is a unique, deep structure of assumptions and beliefs that defines an organization’s view of itself and its environment and shapes for its members the meaning of experience (Evans, 1996). Culture affects all aspects of a school. It
influences informal conversations in the faculty lunch room, the type of instruction valued, how professional development is viewed, and the shared commitment to ensuring all students learn. Culture amplifies the energy and vitality of school staff, students, and community. It has long been known that social climate and culture influence the emotional and psychological orientation of a school. Many say that the context is infectious. This is especially the case in schools that are optimistic, caring, supportive and energetic (Deal & Peterson, 2009).

Culture has a profound affect on the success of students. A school’s culture has shown to have effects on student perceived safety, student achievement, teacher job satisfaction, and a seemingly endless list of other areas concerning a school. Purkey and Smith (1983), in an oft-cited review of early school-effectiveness research identified school culture as the most important factor in a school’s ability to facilitate student achievement. Purkey and Smith said school culture is both a structure and a process. A growing body of evidence suggests school climate is one of the factors that differentiate schools that succeed from those that do not. There are significant differences in school climate between successful and unsuccessful schools, even when taking into account schools’ student characteristics and resources. A positive school climate is an asset for all schools, serving all types of students across demographic spectrums (Voight, Austin, & Hanson, 2013). Leaders know that success flourishes only when people are committed, believe in the organization, and take pride in their work. Such organizations become beloved institutions where people pour their heart and soul into everyday ritual and routine (Deal & Peterson, 2009). Researchers have compiled some impressive evidence on school culture. Healthy and sound school cultures correlate strongly with increased
student achievement and motivation, and with teacher productivity and satisfaction. School culture also correlates with teachers’ attitudes toward their work (Bogler, 2001; DeNobile & McCormick 2008; Deal & Peterson, 2009; Ololube, 2006).

Leaders are challenged with changing, reigniting, or keeping a school or district culture strong. Whether a leader is new, is facing a turnover in staffing, or bringing a new educational paradigm on board culture is often one of the first aspects analyzed and considered. While facing change, and addressing culture leaders set the example. The actions of a leader are viewed and interpreted by others as the example to follow (Stolp, 1994).

**Leadership**

The leadership styles used by building administrators have shown to have a positive or negative impact on the level of teacher job satisfaction. Ronit Bogler (2001) completed a study that revealed teachers report greater satisfaction when they see their principal as someone who shares information with others, delegate’s authority, and keeps open channels of communication with teachers and staff. At the same time, teachers with poor levels of job satisfaction express more negative attitudes toward teaching as a career and toward the school administration and toward structural and administrative factors (Bogler, 2001). A leader’s awareness of the aspects and undercurrents concerning the workings of the school and their use of this information to address current and potential problems that effect school culture is called situational awareness. Situational awareness is a key skill in the success of a school leader (Marzano, et al., 2005). Dr. James Sutfin (Personal communication. 2013) said “As a leader you must be aware of the ripple effect each decision makes.” Leaders are challenged with knowing and understanding what
impacts each of their decisions will have on all the areas of the school environment and culture (Marzano, et al., 2005).

**Relationships**

Relationships are another key factor in impacting teacher job satisfaction. Relationships can be formal or informal. Formal relationships are the interactions teachers have in a planned and organized way during the school day. These relationships may occur at staff and department meetings and other formalized structured times during the school day. These formal environments are often focused and related to school tasks. Informal relationships occur outside of formalized or organized time. These relationships may occur for teachers during times in the teacher’s lounge, while at lunch, when on duty standing in the cafeteria with other staff members, or off contract time. These tend to be the times teachers may not discuss work but rather their own personal lives or other events. Both informal and formal relationships are formed with students, teachers, and administrators in different ways and at different levels. Teachers have expressed that their relationships with students, staff, and the administration have a significant impact on their level of job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001; Collie, Shapka, & Perry, 2012; Ololube, 2006). School leaders should plan with intentionality for the formal relationship times held in schools. Many teachers spend a significant amount of time in meetings; this time can help create higher levels of teacher job satisfaction if used correctly or erode job satisfaction if wasted and unfocused.

**Teaching and Learning**

Teaching and learning are other key factors impacting school culture and teacher job satisfaction. Two layers within these key factors are the teacher’s perception of the
actual teaching profession and the importance of their work to society. Do they see purpose and value in the teaching profession? Teachers identify their student’s achievement as a critical source of their own job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001). This would support the idea that teaching and learning are key components to teacher job satisfaction. A teacher’s day is mainly consumed with creating an engaging learning environment so their students can thrive. Teachers are also responsible for selecting the best instructional strategies to reach each of their students. When students are successful and achieve at high levels, they have probably been exposed to quality teaching and engaging learning environments. If teaching and learning are seen as so impactful one can make the connection to student successes and teacher job satisfaction. Teaching and learning is also affected by the structure of the school, class sizes, community support, and perceived level of support or lack of support provided to teachers. These influences are impacted by a number of controllable and uncontrollable factors and often blend with leadership dynamics and relationships. Factors dealing with the community often relate the type of relationship the individual teachers may have with parents and students. It could also be influenced by the relationship the school or school district has with the community. Class sizes vary from year to year and are often related to the financial status of the school and/or district. The structure of the school and level of support felt or not felt by teachers is often a reflection of the leadership style in place. Each leader or leadership team brings its own style and approach to leadership. The interaction between the teachers and the leadership results in an impact on teacher job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001). Each school is unique and made up of a variety of teachers with different personalities. The collection of teachers found in each school and their collective personalities would interact with
leadership styles in different ways. One leadership style may work better in certain environments and fail in another. Leaders are challenged with finding their own personal leadership style while searching for a school or district that matches their style with hopes of creating the best working and learning environment for all (Reeves, 2009).

**Job Satisfaction**

Chinese philosopher Lao-tzu said, “A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step” (Laozi, 1905). In a similar mindset, to make a change in culture, you would need to start with a small step or start to make smaller changes that have lasting impacts. Focusing on teacher job satisfaction is one approach to impacting smaller changes that could result in a larger impact on culture. Job satisfaction is the extent to which a person’s hopes, desires, and expectations about the employment he is engaged in are fulfilled (Job satisfaction, 2014) Job satisfaction is a day to day feeling that has shown the ability to be measured and influenced. The review of literature shows that education is not alone in struggling to retain the best. Those in business, medicine, and the military face similar challenges. Social conditions like lack of loyalty to employers and a culture of speed and movement exacerbate the transitory workplace. At the same time, the educational environment creates additional challenges. The school day and year are highly regimented, as are ways to professionally advance. Decisions and rewards are often made based on bureaucratic rules for all rather than the individual skills (Margolis, 2008). If school leaders can influence and measure teacher job satisfaction they will have the potential of changing culture. Boger’s study in 2001 supports Purkey and Smith’s (1983) perception that leadership, relationships and teaching, and learning are key factors in impacting teacher job satisfaction and as a result school culture.
Within the research over the years, a large variety of the components that make up culture have been explored. Different authors and experts have developed different themes or frameworks over the years. These themes connect to leadership, relationships and teaching, and learning. In 1959, Herzberg proposed that workplace satisfaction comes from achievement and growth within the job. He also labeled two factors as motivators and hygienes. Motivators are listed as: achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement. Hygiene factors include administration, technical supervision, salary, interpersonal relationships with supervisors, and work conditions. Maslow (1970) outlined five fundamental needs that affect job satisfaction and culture: physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and the need for self-actualization. Ronit Bogler (2001) reports that teacher satisfaction is tied to the leadership in place, the relationship the teacher feels with the leader. It is also related to the relationship with students, parents, and colleagues. Student achievement is also identified as an important factor in teacher workplace job satisfaction.

When examined each of these three domains blend and mix with each other in so many ways. They are influenced and affected by each other. The environment of each school or district is very different. Even schools with very similar characteristics within the same district can have very different cultures based on how leadership, relationships and teaching, and learning interact within each school. To appreciate culture, one needs to gain a deeper understanding of each domain and reflect on how they interplay within each environment.

When digging deeper into these domains one should be cognizant of the organizational and personal factors influencing teacher job satisfaction. Leaders also have
a direct connection to the organizational factors that impact teachers. The amount of and
type of supports present for teachers affects their perceptions of their job satisfaction. The
expectations and professional parameters communicate and set by leadership also
influences teachers and their perception of the culture at a school. The influence staff
feels they have on their job, the amount and type of acknowledgement they receive, all
play a role in the level of job satisfaction they perceive. Another organizational factor
that influences teacher job satisfaction is time management. How leaders schedule the use
of time during the workday and encourage the use of it outside of the workday also
impacts teacher job satisfaction (Eklund Consulting, n.d.).

Personal factors play a role in teacher’s perception of their job satisfaction levels.
Teacher’s professional growth, identity, and values all play a role. The type of
collegiality present in the school environment also plays a role. Together these personal
and organizational factors should be understood and addressed to have the great impact
on teacher job satisfaction, school culture, and as a result student achievement.

School leaders can influence many aspects of the culture within a school
environment but some factors are outside of their control. Teachers are human beings and
often very different from each other. They can be anywhere from in their early twenties
to over sixty-five years old. Teachers can have extremely different life experiences, views
of the world, and opinions about education. On any given staff, teachers will represent
different life stages or represent a variety of the phases of the career cycle of a teacher.

**Career Cycles and Job Satisfaction**

What do we know in particular about the careers of teachers? Huberman (1988)
would say very little until the late 1970’s, apart from Becker’s (1970) seminal study and a
perceptive chapter by Peterson (1963) on secondary-school teachers. Despite this view, Frances Fuller (1969) completed studies in planning meaningful pre-service programs for education students at the University of Texas. Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973) expanded on Fuller’s work by developing instruments to diagnose teacher needs and provide relevant staff development activities. During the 1970’s Unruh and Turner (1970) were among the first to propose the notion of career stages. Gregorc (1973) and Katz (1972) added to the building understanding of a teacher career cycle by exploring the stages of teacher development. The views presented by Unruh and Turner, Gregorc and Katz provided valuable insight into the notion of differentiated stages of teacher development (Fessler & Christensen, 1992).

In the 1980’s Burden’s (1982) work helped synthesize the labeling and characteristics of teacher careers. His model helped sharpen the view of career stages through a synthesis of interview data. Up to this point in research teacher career stages lumped all experienced teachers into one homogenous group. It did not take in account the more detailed and differentiated stages teachers experienced based on a number of factors (Fessler & Christensen, 1992).

Fessler and Christensen (1992) expand on previous work by offering a comprehensive and wider picture of the career cycle and by placing the career cycle concept into the context of influences from personal and organizational factors. Their model describes the dynamics of the teacher career cycle. The model provides a view of the career progression process that reflects influences from environmental factors that are both environmental and organizational in nature. As teachers respond to personal and organizational factors they progress through the career cycle in a dynamic manner. The
cycle is not a linear model rather a dynamic model that is responsive to the personal environment and organizational environment individual teachers would experience differently (Fessler & Christensen, 1992).

Among the variables from the **personal environment** that affect the career cycle are family support structures, positive critical incidents, life crises, individual dispositions, and avocational outlets. The **organizational environment** of schools and school systems compose a second major category of influence on the career cycle; among the influential variables are school regulations, management style of administrators and supervisors, atmosphere of public trust in the community, expectations of the community for its educational system, activities of professional organizations and associations, and union atmosphere (Lynn, 2002).

The literature suggests that the characteristics of teachers that appear to change are their concerns, instructional behaviors, understanding of children, awareness and understanding of the school and teaching environment, and perceptions of themselves, their work, and their professions. The literature describes the variability that occurs in the areas of personal awareness, cognitive development, interpersonal development, and theoretical knowledge. Implied is the idea that as teachers’ characteristics change, their needs with regard to professional activities, relationships, and interests will change accordingly (Lynn, 2002).

The teacher career cycle model incorporates both the literature on career stages and the literature on adult growth and development (Fessler & Christensen, 1992). The model is an attempt to describe the teacher career cycle within the context of a dynamic and flexible social system. The career cycle itself progresses through stages, not in a lock
step, linear fashion, but in a dynamic manner reflecting responses to personal and organizational environmental factors (Lynn, 2002).

The model proposes that a supportive, nurturing environment can assist a teacher in the pursuit of a positive career progression. Alternatively, an environmental atmosphere that includes negative pressures and conflicts can have an adverse effect on a teacher’s career path. Fessler’s (1992) career cycle model, based on self-reported characteristics of teachers on the variables of enthusiasm, interactive teaching skills, attitudes toward students and teaching, and attitudes toward the teaching profession, consists of eight stages: pre-service, induction, competency building, enthusiasm and growth, career frustration, career stability, career wind-down, and career exit. Movement in and between these eight stages is dynamic and flexible rather than static and linear (Lynn, 2002).

The significance of the teacher career cycle model lies in the implication that teachers move in and out of career stages in response to personal and organizational environmental conditions (Lynn, 2002). Teacher development theory is predicated on the assumption that the needs of the beginning or novice teacher in the induction phase differ from that of an experienced teacher who has reached the enthusiasm and growth stage or has entered the stable phase. As a result, teachers must be motivated to seek continual growth through professional development that advocates personalized and individualized support systems (Lynn, 2002).

Huberman (1988) developed another perspective. He supported that through research, the career cycle of teachers can be described in four phases: Launching from years 1-6, Experimentation from years 2-6, Stabilizing from years 4-8 and New
Challenges from the 6th year of experience onward. These phases, although tied to years of teaching experience, are not necessarily experienced in chronological order. The phases are not always found to be linear.

Still another perspective support by research states, through the review of literature and systematic observation of teachers over time, Steffy & Kappa Delta Pi (2000) identified six basic phases that committed classroom teachers experience during their careers: novice, apprentice, professional, expert, distinguished, and emeritus. They support that teachers take this path in developing and maintaining professional growth. The process of reflection and renewal to obtain growth is the central and critical aspect of their model. They also discuss the initial, persistent, and deep levels of withdraw teachers can experience resulting in negative teacher characteristics (Steffy, et al., 2000).

In past decades, researchers have tried to better understand and identify the career cycle of teachers. They divided teachers into two groups at first, those on appraisal and those who have earned tenure status. Then researchers broke up tenured status teachers into groups based on their years of experience or in groups or phases based on age or years of experience. The evolution of our understanding of teacher’s career cycle continued to grow was it was realized that many factors affect teachers outside of years of experience. Years of experience in education, is one factor affecting teachers within their career cycle but personal and organizational environmental factors also play an important role. These factors interplay with each other while teachers move, not solely bound by age or years of experience, in a dynamic fashion through the three phases of the teacher’s career cycles of: Launching, Stabilizing/Plateauing, and New Challenges (Huberman, 1988).
Launching

Launching describes the joys and frustrations with beginning new. It can include the joys of being a first year teacher along with good contacts with pupils, enthusiasm, and being at ease with teaching pedagogy. It can also include the frustrations of having a poor start to a teaching career and feeling overwhelmed, isolated, anxious, and working with difficult pupils. This phase can also relate to those experienced teachers who are starting new at a new school or new position within the same school. Launching can be experienced in several ways (Huberman, 1988).

Stabilizing/Plateauing

Plateauing is a unique form of career staff that can occur if one has been in a long period of work stability. Plateauing can reduce employees’ enthusiasm and satisfaction and can negatively affect the ability of organizations to achieve goals. If people’s jobs are filled with routine and repetitive tasks then they are likely to feel an intrinsic sense of loss and become skeptical about finding fulfillment in their careers. Research says it is difficult to have a sense of learning if your work remains essentially the same for more than three years (Milstein, 1990).

Milstein (1990) listed characteristics of plateaued employees as: Those in well-defined positions for more than 5 years. Older workers. Those who work in mature, low growth organizations. Workers who frequently change jobs early in their careers and less frequently later in their careers. Workers with lower formal education. Many teachers and administrators fit at least three categories of those with the potential for plateauing.

Education is often described as a “front loaded” career. Education has systems in place to support non-tenured teachers but these supports decrease or drop off entirely
after a teacher is tenured. Once tenured, there is usually no ladder to climb within teaching and the routine of the job can become repetitive. It is interesting to note the much lower perception of plateauing reported by teachers and administrators who attended workshops or learning experiences outside of their school system. By attending these seminars, these individuals made a choice to grow and stay alive professionally. These educators were seeking ways of avoiding plateauing, or at least of the blunting effects of it (Milstein, 1990).

Too often organizational and school leaders tend to look upon plateaued employees as lazy or turned off. When this type of perception prevails a more punitive approach or negative mindset is taken. This punitive approach rarely meets the needs of the affected employees or the organizations they serve (Milstein, 1990). Schools would be better served being aware of and staying focused on the need of teachers in different phases of the teacher’s career cycle. By doing so, schools should develop staff development plans to better meet teacher’s needs and help motivate them or move teachers to another phase of their career cycle.

Plateauing is not likely to occur if educators feel effective and satisfied in their work. Educators must believe that their jobs are of central importance to the organization and that they have sufficient opportunities to be creative and productive (Milstein, 1990).

New Challenges

Once a basic level of classroom mastery is achieved, there is a need for refinement and diversity. Teachers come to see that they can get better results by diversifying their materials and their modes of classroom management and instruction. This phase of teaching involves experimentation and the diversification of practices. It
also involves the increased awareness of the amount of responsibility taken by the
teacher. This phase also results after a teacher is exposed to classes and students who are
more difficult or if students would produce poor results. Teachers would reflect and
approach this new challenge with different techniques and strategies. This phase would
not include a new position but new factors that influence their current position and
responsibilities (Huberman, 1988).

40 Developmental Assets’ Relationship to Teacher Job Satisfaction

The three key components of school culture: leadership, relationships, and the
teaching and learning that is occurring in the school are influenced by many aspects
within a school. These component’s connections to teacher job satisfaction and school
culture are supported by numerous research studies occurring over the last few decades
(Bogler, 2001; Collie, et al., 2012; Moore 2012; Ololube, 2006; Purkey & Smith, 1983;
Xiaofu & Qiwen, 2007). How can we measure and impact the level of each and thus
culture in a school environment? How can we address this area in a way that will impact
both teachers and students resulting in positive change for both groups? New paradigms
provide innovative perspectives and solutions to old problems (Shoup & Studer, 2010).
The topic of teacher job satisfaction has been around for a long time. It is obvious that
people vary in the amount of satisfaction they get from work. All else being equal, we
expect higher engagement to be associated with higher satisfaction, as in the adage that
one gets out of life what one puts into it (Lortie, 1975). Recently, a new way to look at
the topic of teacher job satisfaction has been explored. The new paradigm or lens to look
at this topic is through the Developmental Asset Framework (Eklund, 2008).

The Search Institute is a nonprofit research organization focusing on positive
youth development, they have identified a framework called the 40 Developmental Assets; this framework describes the positive qualities, experiences, and opportunities that all young people need in their lives. Developmental assets are relationships, opportunities, values, and skills that are building blocks for young people’s successful growth in the physical, social, emotional, moral, spiritual, cognitive, and psychological arenas (Scales, et al., 2004).

The Search Institute, through research, has linked these healthy traits to positive behaviors and outcomes, and that absence of assets is likewise linked to unhealthy behaviors and negative outcomes for young people. In other words, research indicates that the more assets a student has, the more he or she will thrive (Scales, Benson, & Mannes, 2006). The Assets are sometimes described as building blocks needed for success. The structure of these assets comes through eight asset categories, or eight basic areas of positive human development. The first four categories comprise the external assets that youth need developed around them. Four additional categories spill out the internal assets that youth need to develop as they mature. (Benson, et al., 1998; Eklund, 2008; Scales, et al., 2004; Scales, 2005; Search Institute, 2005).

The 40 assets placed within their eight categories (Support, Empowerment, Boundaries and Expectations, Constructive Use of Time, Commitment to Learning, Positive Values, Social Competencies and Positive Identity) retain a remarkable stability of their own across developmental stages. The 40 assets are grounded in common sense and research (Benson, Galbraith, & Espeland, 1998). When in their first two decades of life is it important for young people to feel loved and cared for in their families? When is it unimportant for young people to spend a reasonable portion of their “free” time in
creative activities, organized programs, and spiritual pursuits? Is there any time throughout the first two decades of life when it is unimportant that children are engaged in and enjoy learning, are caring, honest, responsible people; are able to function well socially with all sorts of others; can say no to unhealthy behaviors; and have a solid belief in their own worth, capacities, and future? These questions focus us on some of the life experiences the 40 assets measure and also have shown to positively impact the lives of teenagers (Benson, et al., 1998). The developmental assets framework does not claim to be perfect or include everything a student would ever need, no framework does. But it does offer a compelling, useful, and consistently broad lens through which to understand development throughout at least the school age years, and perhaps both earlier and beyond (Scales, et al., 2004).

School districts have used the Developmental Asset Framework for decades in a productive way. In one example, a Midwest suburban school district of over 20,000 students, adopted the Developmental Asset Framework in 2009. This district spent time and energy educating the entire staff about the Developmental Asset Framework and how to incorporate it into the school experience for students. The Developmental Assets were infused into the language and approach each teacher, administrator, and counselor would use. The 40 assets are to be infused into each teacher’s classroom and when they interact with students.

Understanding the individual child, their needs and having the school’s and the community’s actions emerge from this understanding can contribute to reducing children’s risk behaviors, promoting their resilience, and enhancing their ability to thrive (Scales, et al., 2004). To help gain this understanding, Search Institute has developed an
instrument to measure perceptions of student’s 40 Assets. The Developmental Asset Profile (DAP) survey is used to gain the perception data of seventh and ninth grade students. The data from the DAP informs the school’s staff of the student’s perception of each asset category. DAP data tells a story of the assets present and absent in each student’s life. The data can be used in a variety of ways. Student problem solving meetings can include the DAP data to help gain a better understanding of the perception of the student and their life. Within these meetings staff is challenged with supporting the fundamental needs of students so they can be more successful in school. The number of assets present in each student’s life helps determine the perception of the student’s basic needs being met. Where there are lower asset areas a focus can be made to positively impact the assets involved. While at the same time effort is made to capitalize on the assets perceived to be present in student’s lives.

The research school district feels the Developmental Asset Framework has helped students be more successful. In my own experience, the Developmental Asset Framework has given schools a focus or strategy to meet the needs of struggling students. It defines and provides a framework to work with. Before the Developmental Asset Framework, schools were reaching for ideas and support systems that were not based on each particular student, rather support systems that may have helped students in the past. The Developmental Asset Framework provides a systematic research based on a way to strategically support each student.

The research school district has observed first-hand that students who perceive they have more assets tend to be more successful and make more positive choices both in and out of school. These student’s perceptions support the research behind the
Developmental Asset Framework. The goal of the research school and district is to help each student identify the assets they have in their lives while helping each student obtain more. The learning environment or culture of a school with asset rich students is one we are excited about.

While helping teachers increase their understanding and infuse the 40 Developmental Asset Framework into their daily interactions with students, it was discovered that the assets supported adults as well. This discovery challenged schools to reflect on how they are supporting the adults working with students. The research school district began to ask the question: How do the 40 Developmental Assets relate or impact teacher job satisfaction or school culture? This type of approach conflicts with the direction education seems to be moving. The major emphasis in education at this current time in the United States is high stakes testing and a piece of legislation called No Child Left Behind. In England it is Every Child Matters and in New York City it is Children First. New York’s plan is to focus everything on the only outcome that matters: student success (New York City Department of Education, 2009). These types of approaches are misleading and incomplete. If we only support students and never support the teachers interacting and leading students how will we truly have the greatest impact on students (Fullan, 2008)?

Nate Eklund (2008) a leading researcher and author of workplace satisfaction details the Search Institute’s 40 Developmental Asset categories in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Descriptions of Each Developmental Asset Category

External Assets (the external structures, relationship, and activities that create a positive environment):

- **Support:** Young people need to be surrounded by people who love, care for, appreciate and accept them. They need to know that they belong and that they are not alone.
- **Empowerment:** Young people need to feel valued and valuable. They need to feel safe, to believe that they are liked and respected, and to have opportunities to make meaningful contributions within the hierarchies that surround them.
- **Boundaries and Expectations:** Young people need the positive influence of peers and adults who encourage them to be and do their best. They need clear rules about appropriate behavior, and consistent, reasonable consequences for inappropriate behaviors.
- **Constructive Use of Time:** Young People need opportunities—outside of school—to learn and develop new skills and interests, and to spend enjoyable time interacting with other youth and adults.

Internal Assets (the values, skills, and beliefs necessary to fully engage with other people and function well in the world):

- **Commitment to Learning:** Young people need a variety of learning experiences, including the desire for academic success, a sense of the lasting importance of learning, and a belief in their own abilities.
- **Positive Values:** Young people need to develop strong guiding values or principles, including caring for others, having high standards for personal character, and believing in protecting their own well-being.
- **Social Competencies:** Young people need to develop the skills to interact effectively with others, to make difficult decisions and choices, and to cope with new situations.
- **Positive Identity:** Young people need to believe in their own self-worth, to feel that they have control over the things that happen to them, and to have a sense of purpose in life as well as a positive view of the future.

Figure 1. Brief summary of the asset categories broken down into external and internal assets by Eklund, N. (2008). How was your day at school? Improving dialogue about teacher job

These simple but powerful concepts are focused on young people or students.

Eklund suggests that we read through each category again. Only this time, replace “young people,” with “educators.” The feeling of the statements with teacher’s educational experiences and past job experiences is striking. Although Search Institute’s
research has focused on children and teenagers, we can see that these internal and external opportunities are things that all people, regardless of age, need in order to be healthy and happy (Eklund, 2008).

The central focus of this thought process is the notion that if Developmental Assets can support and make healthy and happy teenagers, it could and should be applied to adults as well. In fact, teachers who have been working with this framework in schools do indeed report that they enjoy their jobs more and feel better about their teaching (Eklund, 2008). Eklund (2008) said the obvious progression of their notion has led these teachers to ask the question, “How can we build this notion for our students if we don’t experience them ourselves” (p. 23)?

How teachers experience the 40 Developmental Assets within their work environment can be measured by the SWSS (Appendix A). Exploring this data can provide insight into the culture present within the school and level of teacher job satisfaction. School leaders can use the 40 Developmental Asset data provided by the SWSS to help develop intentional cultural development strategies impacting teacher job satisfaction and thus the overall school culture. As part of the leadership team, at the research school within this study, we attempted to make the connection between the SWSS data and intentional cultural development strategies that had a positive impact within the school environment. In doing so focused on four main themes from the data.

**Consistency Through Change**

Douglas Reeves (2009) said leaders must express what still holds value and will not change. While examining the pre-survey data, our leadership team intentionally revisited our administrative and building goals with the staff and continued to throughout
the school year and next. An excellent leader establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school’s attention and while doing so the leader fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation (Marzano, et al., 2005).

**Empowering Teachers and Building Leaders**

Marzano, et al., (2005) research reveals quality school leadership involves teachers in the development and implementation of important decisions and procedures. Our survey data showed that our teachers perceived the administration was not considering the interests of teachers when making decisions and that teachers did not have a forum where they could discuss issues with administration. As a result we created a forum for teachers to provide input in helping make building level decisions.

Department heads and other teachers were selected based on a number of parameters to be part of the committee we called Administrators’ Council. It was created as an input giving opportunity for teachers. Any staff member could add items to the agenda to be discussed but they also had to add possible solutions at the same time. The council empowered teachers, provided them with a voice and at the same time helped build them into better leaders as we had excellent discussions and then each person was responsible for communicating our solutions or results with the staff in smaller groups.

**Building Systems**

With a new administration team and quite a bit of staff turnover in the last five years we wanted to develop systems people knew and could easily follow. Quality leaders establish a set of standard operating procedures and routines (Marzano, et al., 2005). Helping define a system of standard operating procedures and routines was important for several reasons. Teachers need to know what is expected of them and how
to easily accomplish tasks while at work while following the set expectations. We also considered our meeting structure within this theme. Data from the survey expressed teachers showed a negative perception when asked about the amount of time spent in meetings and the value of the meetings they attended. To help address this area we took an intentional look at the meetings we have in place, their purpose, their length, and the overall number of meetings. I helped develop a form that outlined the specific purpose of each meeting, how agenda items are added and how or why certain people were part of the meeting. After review we discovered we could not reduce our meeting so we made them better and more focused. We revisited the clear focus of each meeting and promised that we would not have a meeting if the agenda items would not support the time needed.

This theme carried over into another question that was an area of concern based on the data. Teachers expressed adults in our school did not get to know each other as people as much as they would like to. We focused on this area but intentionally creating times at the beginning and end of each staff meeting where staff interact with each other in an exit ticket and entrance activity. The activities were based on educational topics, general sharing or just plain silly fun. Our goal was to create structures that would randomly mix the staff and provide several opportunities for them to get to know each other at deeper levels.

**Clear Communication**

Effective leaders establish strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students (Marzano, et al., 2005). As an administrator, I have always followed the mantra that communication goes both ways. We tried to clearly communicate our expectations for staff using several methods and consistently
communicating throughout the school year. We also created a forum called Administrator’s’ Council where teachers could discuss issues, concerns, and suggestions with the administrative team with the aim of improvement. In addition, as an administrative team we have made intentional efforts to focus on establishing and enhancing the positive relationships we have with the staff helping open up the lines of one on one communication.

Culture Change

Change theory has been very popular in the education and business world for quite some time. There are a number of examples and experts who have shown to provide sound advice when approaching change. Michael Fullan, Claudia Cuttress, and Ann Kilcher (2005) expressed the need for eight key features to be present during change to result in successful lasting change. Their research work support the absence of these features often ends with failure. The features of changes they deemed so important are: 1. Engaging people’s moral purposes 2. Building capacity 3. Understanding the change process 4. Developing cultures for learning 5. Developing cultures of evaluation 6. Focusing on leadership 7. Fostering coherence making and 8. Cultivating trilevel development. Leaders need to know by doing, reflecting, and re-doing to help move education and businesses forward. These keys to change are ongoing and encompass a large spectrum of the organization. Leaders who have greater change knowledge and who can, in turn, develop leadership in others while honoring the importance of change knowledge will be set up to be more successful (Fullan, Cuttress, & Kilcher, 2005).

A professor at Harvard Business School and world-renowned change expert, Kotter (1996) introduced his eight-step change process as follows:
1. Establishing a sense of urgency,
2. Creating the guiding coalition,
3. Developing a vision and strategy,
4. Communicating the change vision,
5. Empowering employees for broad based action,
6. Generating short term wins
7. Consolidating gains and producing more change, and
8. Anchoring new approaches in the culture.

Each of these steps plays an important part of the change process. When strategically approached implementing change can be much more successful. Leaders must show patience and stay focused on the process of change to help produce the best results.

Douglas Reeves (2009) outlined four imperatives of culture changes. These change essentials are consistent across leadership contexts in a variety of organizations. Leaders must define what will not change. They must share what values, beliefs, and practices will not change helping provide stability through the change. Second, organizational culture will change with leadership actions. Leaders must be the example in their words and most importantly their actions. Culture change without acquiring new attitudes, values, and behaviors will not be as lasting or impactful. Third, use the right change tools for your system. Leaders must use their situational awareness and knowledge of the current culture to strategically select the best change tools needed at the time for the particular change desired. Fourth, change in culture requires relentless personal attention and ground-work by the leader. Leaders must take on the approach that
no job or task is too small or messy for them. Impacting the change from the ground up will have a profound effect on the success of the culture change.

Reeves gave the research school a model to follow during its’ cultural development efforts. After reflecting on and examining the cultural data, the leadership team discussed what essential core values and beliefs will not change. The team discussed what aspects of the school and culture they would honor and hold steady. These non-changeable elements were shared with the staff in words and actions. One example was the alignment to the school and District mission statement of guaranteeing students will be successful. The commitment within the mission statements, guaranteeing students success, would not change and remain a key focus and decision point for the school. The school honored and kept the high expectations it had developed over time.

The leadership team committed to actions that would result in a positive impact on school culture. One example included a teacher leadership committee that was created to gain the input from the staff as a whole. The results of this committee’s discussions resulted in changes in structures, practices, and actions the staff could see and feel. Changing the teacher duty structure from covering a duty location every five weeks for five days straight, to one day a week every week, is an example of an idea that the teacher leadership committee provided input to the administration team about. The input given in the committee meeting resulted in the actions of the administrator revamping the duty schedule mid-year. The leadership team also reflected on the change tools needed for the unique environment with their school. Based on this reflection two forms of staff recognition were developed. The administrative team started handwriting notes of gratitude to teachers weekly. The second method developed was taking a thank you snack
cart around the building one a month to show each staff member how much their efforts are noticed and appreciated.

Finally, the building administrators made an effort to help staff at their level. No job or task was too small or insignificant to help with. This was done in a variety of ways from covering classes for teachers, taking on supervision duties and personal one on one coaching with teachers helping improve instruction and other classroom skills. The leadership team also spent hours behind the scenes developing and discovering numerous other strategies focused on impacting the cultural development.

While the administration team took these action steps, they kept in mind the results of the SWSS (Appendix A) and the teacher’s career cycle. This helped the leadership team increase the positive impact on workplace satisfaction and school culture.

**Summary**

Over time our understanding of the interplay between culture, teacher job satisfaction, and the teacher career cycle has evolved. We understand that age or years of experience are important and make an impact but age and years of experience are one of many factors influencing teacher job satisfaction. We also know that the 40 Developmental Assets can be used to help support teachers resulting in higher job satisfaction having the potential to impact student achievement in a positive way. School leaders and teachers have come to realize the teacher career cycle is a fluid model not bound by one factor, rather influenced by a large number of personal and environmental factors. Gaining a full understanding of culture, what impacts teacher job satisfaction, the 40 Developmental Assets, and respecting the fluidity of the teacher career cycle a school leader can make informed and intentional decisions to help improve school culture.
resulting in an increase on student achievement.

Quality school leadership teams are charged with knowing and understanding their staff and the career cycle they are currently experiencing. With this understanding they will be better able to impact each teacher and the school’s culture in a positive way. Despite age or years of experience not solely relating to a teacher's career cycle or job satisfaction, it can be measured and considered with other known factors to make informed decisions to impact culture and teacher job satisfaction. This study is an attempt to explore the effects of teacher experience on the perceptions of teacher job satisfaction after participating in school culture building strategies.

The research school within the study has used the 40 Developmental Asset framework with its student body and staff. This study provided the staff the opportunity to measure and impact the culture of their school and workplace job satisfaction levels through the lens of the 40 Developmental Assets. The leadership team within the research school wanted to take an intentional approach to developing a supportive and positive culture for the benefit of the students and staff alike. Knowing each staff member has his or her unique experience and context, the data from the survey was broken down by years of experience. This was done with the aim of impacting all teachers at all levels within their career cycle. The leadership team wanted their efforts and cultural development strategies to have an equally positive impact on the staff within the research school.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative ex post facto quasi-experimental study is to explore the effect of teacher experience on perceptions of job satisfaction after participating in and experiencing cultural development strategies. In the time between the pretest and posttest, intentional effort will be made to support the teacher’s developmental assets and thus job satisfaction.

School leaders will be informed of how intentional cultural development strategies impact the levels of job satisfaction for teachers as a whole and then by years of experience band. Being armed with this knowledge, school leaders will be able to better plan cultural development strategies that will have a positive impact of teachers at all bands of teaching experience.

Design

This retrospective study uses an ex post facto quasi-experimental study design in order to determine the impact intentional cultural development strategies have on school culture and teacher job satisfaction. This study will examine archived data that was used by the research school to make intentional impacts on job satisfaction and school culture. Teachers at the research school were given the SWSS (Appendix A) as a pre and post survey about a year apart. The SWSS (Appendix A) collected data about their perceptions related to organizational and personal factors at work and their levels of workplace job satisfaction. The questions developed in the survey are founded on the principles supported within the research gathered on the 40 Developmental Assets.
Data was collected during the pre and post survey through the use of an online version of the SWSS (Appendix A) developed by Eklund Consulting. After completing the pre-survey, all teachers, counselors, and administrators completed a data dig into data. The staff developed a plan to maintain and enhance the areas of strength and action steps to address areas of need. Between the pre-survey and post-survey all the teaching staff experienced the same cultural development strategies, structures, and interactions. A little over a year later the post-survey was given to measure the impact of the cultural development strategies and experiences. Within this study the impact on the overall data will be analyzed and then the data broken down by years of teaching experience bands. The impact of the cultural development strategies and experiences on each group or band will be explored.

**Research Questions and Data Analysis**

**Research Question #1:** What are the faculty’s perception levels of school workplace satisfaction?

The first question will use descriptive statistical measures for the overall teacher perception of school workplace satisfaction, examining each asset related variable. Then the perceived levels of satisfaction based on years of teaching experience will be identified. Each of the asset related variables found within the Organizational and Personal Factors will be tabled (mean and standard deviation) by pretest and posttest for each of the teacher experience level groups.

**Research Question #2:** Is there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey factors between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?
The second research question will be analyzed using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with factors of test (pretest to posttest) and group (years of teaching experience. The ANOVA was selected, as it is efficient and minimizes error (Creswell, 2005; Gay, Mills, & Airaisian, 2006). If significance is found at the .05 alpha level, post hoc tests will be completed.

Subjects

The number of teacher subjects surveyed on the pretest was $N=53$, 100% of the teachers completed the survey but not all answered each question provided. This number represents a naturally formed group found at the Midwest suburban research middle school with grades sixth through eighth. The teachers within the research school fell within the following bands of years of teaching experience. Thirteen teachers had 1-5 years of teaching experience. Twelve teachers had 6-10 years of teaching experience. These two groups were combined to create the Novice teaching group to be studied. Ten teachers had 11-15 years of teaching experience. Seven teachers had 16-20 years of teaching experience. Four teachers had 21-25 years of teaching experience. Twelve teachers had +26 years of teaching experience. These five groups of teachers, with greater than ten years of teaching experience, were combined into the Experienced teacher group for study. The average years of teaching experience, for the research school’s teaching staff, was 13.14 years. The average teacher salary was $49,080. The demographics of the pretest group are comprised of 19 males and 35 females. Fifty-two are white, 0 are African American, 2 Hispanic, and 0 American Indian. Forty total teachers or 71% hold their Masters, 28 Team Teachers, 21 Special Area Teachers, and 5 Resource Teachers.
The research school was an International Baccalaureate School that housed the Middle Years Program. The student population was 760 students of which 22% of the students qualified for free and reduced priced lunch. The school had a Principal and two Assistant Principals along with two counselors and a full time social worker.

**Data Collection**

The researcher collected data with help from Eklund Consulting. The School Workplace Satisfaction Survey was shared using the teacher’s email and taken during an organized staff development time allowing uninterrupted time to take the survey. The data was collected electronically and in a way to not identify individuals. This same process was replicated for the posttest.

**Instrument**

The School Workplace Satisfaction Survey (SWSS) (Appendix A) is a secure web-based survey that produces detailed data of the school culture and job satisfaction levels of teachers. The SWSS (Appendix A) measures Organizational Factors, Personal Factors, and Job Satisfaction. Organizational Factors are broken down into the following asset related variables:

- Support, described as the support teachers feel from their colleagues, administrators, and the larger school community.
- Influence and Acknowledgement, described as feeling valued by the community and seen as competent in their fields and as problem solvers.
- Professional Parameters, described as setting boundaries between work and home life while sharing high and reasonable expectation with coworkers. This asset also
includes having well defined expectations and roles within the school environment.

- Time Management, described as having the support and time needed to be creative and content at work while viewing personal health at a high level to job satisfaction.

Personal Factors are broken down into the following asset related variables:

- Professional Growth, described as being engaged in the teaching profession, growth opportunities, and teachers who are motivated by personal and professional goals.

- Professional Identity, described as having a high self esteem, a positive view of the future and a purpose in teaching.

- Collegiality, described as staff working together through conflict resolution while being flexible, communicative and resilient.

- Professional Values, described as having a high commitment to teaching while exhibiting a tie to personal values and professional practice.

Job Satisfaction through the survey is described as being committed and energized about teaching, education, and the present work conditions.

Each asset variable had 5-11 items used to compute the scale score. Teachers involved in the survey-received directions explaining that the survey items are things they and their colleagues might do, have, or feel at school. The directions continue to inform the teachers to read each item and reflect on their experiences in the last three months, marking their response indicating how much they agree or disagree with the statement.

The SWSS (Appendix A) uses a 7-point Likert scale. The possible responses were:
Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Disagree nor Agree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, and Strongly Agree. This scale produces a numerical value that allows the researcher to compute statistical analysis of the scores (Eklund, 2008).
Chapter 4

Results

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this expostfacto quasi-experimental study involving a longitudinal survey was to explore the impact of cultural development with respect to career stages on teacher workplace job satisfaction.

Research Questions

Research Question #1: What are the faculty’s perception levels of school workplace satisfaction?

The first question used descriptive statistical measures for the overall teacher perception of school workplace satisfaction, examining each asset related variable. Then the perceived levels of satisfaction based on years of teaching experience were identified. Each of the asset related variables or factors found within the Organizational and Personal Factors are tabled (mean and standard deviation) by pretest and posttest for each of the teacher experience level groups.

The faculty’s reported perception levels of school workplace satisfaction were high on the 7-point Likert scale pre-survey (n = 53), with a mean of 6.38 and standard deviation of .56. The post survey (n = 51), also on a one to seven point scale, reported increased results with a mean of 6.53 and a standard deviation of .45. This data is represented on Table 1. Table 2 breaks down the data into more detail. It shows further supporting data of a general trend of high scores that improved between the 2013 administration of the survey and the 2014 administration of the survey. The result’s means ranged from the lowest of 5.01 to the highest of 6.71. Job satisfaction was the
lowest (5.01) reported factor while positive values was the highest (6.71).

**Research Question #2:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey factors between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience? Teachers were divided into two groups based on years of teaching experience. The first group labeled novice teachers, had zero to ten years of teaching experience. The second group labeled experienced teachers, had greater than ten years of teaching experience. Analysis will include overall scores and for each factor.

The second research question was analyzed using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with factors of test (pretest to posttest) and group (years of teaching experience). The ANOVA was selected, as it is efficient and minimizes error (Creswell, 2005; Gay, et al., 2006). If significance is found at the .05 alpha level, post hoc tests were completed.

**Research Question #2:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey factors between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

**Question 2A:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey overall between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 3, there was no main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), F(1,100) = 0.93, p = .34, η² = 0.01. There was also no main effect for group (novice and experienced) F (1,100) = 0.01, p = .93, η² < 0.01. There was also no interaction between test and group, F(1,100) = 3.80, p = .05, η² = 0.04. Means and Standard Deviations are listed in Table 2.
**Question 2B:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Support factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 4, there was a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), \( F(1,100) = 7.05, \ p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.07 \). There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) \( F(1,100) = 6.35, \ p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.06 \). There was no significant interaction between test and group \( F(1,100) = 0.34, \ p = .56, \eta^2 < 0.01 \).

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for novice and experienced teachers \( (p = .02) \). There was no significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test \( (p = .21) \).

**Question 2C:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Empowerment factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 5, there was not a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), \( F(1,97) = 0.97, \ p = .33, \eta^2 = 0.01 \). There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) \( F(1,97) = 6.93, \ p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.07 \). There was no significant interaction between test and group \( F(1,97) = 0.91, \ p = .66, \eta^2 < 0.01 \).

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for novice and experienced teachers \( (p = .02) \). There was no significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test \( (p = .15) \).

**Question 2D:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Boundaries and Expectations factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?
As seen in Table 6, there was a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,98) = 4.73, p = .03, \eta^2 = 0.05$. There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,98) = 14.17, p < .01, \eta^2 = 0.13$. There was no significant interaction between test and group $F(1,98) = 0.18, p = .67, \eta^2 < 0.01$.

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for Novice and Experienced teachers ($p < .01$). There was a significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test ($p = .03$).

**Question 2E:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Constructive use of Time factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 7, there was a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,100) = 4.52, p = .04, \eta^2 = 0.04$. There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,100) = 9.47, p < .01, \eta^2 = 0.09$. There was no significant interaction between test and group $F(1,100) = 0.31, p = .86, \eta^2 < 0.01$.

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for novice and experienced teachers ($p = .03$). There was significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test ($p = .04$).

**Question 2F:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Commitment to Teaching and Learning factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 8, there was a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,100) = 7.89, p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.07$. There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,100) = 6.50, p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.06$. There was no significant
interaction between test and group $F(1,100) = 1.01, p = .32, \eta^2 = 0.01$. 

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for novice and experienced teachers ($p = .01$). There was no significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test ($p = .32$).

**Question 2G:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Professional Identity factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 9, there was a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,97) = 12.92, p < .01, \eta^2 = 0.12$. There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,97) = 9.37, p < .01, \eta^2 = 0.09$. There was no significant interaction between test and group $F(1,97) = 0.71, p = .40, \eta^2 < 0.01$.

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for novice and experienced teachers ($p < .01$). There was no significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test ($p = .15$).

**Question 2H:** Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Positive Values factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 10, there was a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,99) = 4.95, p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.05$. There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,99) = 5.43, p = .02, \eta^2 = 0.05$. There was no significant interaction between test and group $F(1,99) = 0.55, p = .46, \eta^2 < 0.01$.

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for novice and experienced teachers ($p = .02$). There was no
significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test (p = .30).

**Question 2I**: Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Social Competencies factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 11, there was a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,99) = 4.77, p < .03, \eta^2 = 0.05$. There was a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,99) = 7.82, p < .01, \eta^2 = 0.07$. There was no significant interaction between test and group $F(1,99) < 0.01, p = .95, \eta^2 < 0.01$.

Pairwise comparisons indicate for 2013 test there was a significant difference between the scores for novice and experienced teachers (p = .03). There was no significant difference between the groups on the 2014 test (p = .08).

**Question 2J**: Was there a significant difference on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey Job Satisfaction factor between 2013 and 2014 based on years of teaching experience?

As seen in Table 11, there was no significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,99) = 2.26, p = .14, \eta^2 = 0.02$. There was also no significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,99) = 0.12, p = .73, \eta^2 < 0.01$. There was also no significant interaction between test and group, $F(1,99) < 0.01, p = .96, \eta^2 < 0.01$. Means and Standard Deviations are listed in Table 2.
Table 1

Total average SWSS responses for the faculty’s perception levels of school workplace satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013 Cohort ($n = 53$)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Cohort ($n = 51$)</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

SWSS responses for the faculty’s perception levels of school workplace satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice ($n = 25$)</td>
<td>Experienced ($n = 28$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries and Expectations</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Use of Time</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Identity</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Competencies</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Values</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

ANOVA Results for Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

ANOVA Results for Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

ANOVA Results for Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

ANOVA Results for Boundaries and Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>&lt; .00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

ANOVA Results for Constructive Use of Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

**ANOVA Results for Commitment to Teaching and Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

ANOVA Results for Professional Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

ANOVA Results for Positive Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Variation</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>$\eta^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

ANOVA Results for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 and 2014 Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test*Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Conclusion

The power of school culture and its effect on teachers, and student success is evident. Without a positive culture how do we get the best student results? Can you improve school culture by improving teacher workplace job satisfaction? Schools are faced with the challenge of developing the absolute best culture and learning environment so each student will achieve at their highest level. Teachers found in all school cultures come with a wide variety of personal and professional life experiences. Each teacher is in a different spot in his or her own personal career cycle. School leaders are challenged with influencing teachers found throughout their career cycle. School leaders will need to accurately measure the culture helping them make informed decisions. While there is a large amount of research on school culture, more research is needed in determining the impact of cultural development within schools. This study is a step in adding to the body of research of impacting school culture.

The purpose of this expostfacto quasi-experimental study involving a longitudinal survey was to explore the impact of cultural development with respect to career stages on teacher workplace job satisfaction. Within this study, a leadership team made an intentional effort to impact school culture in a positive way by measuring the perceptions of teachers on the School Workplace Satisfaction Survey, examining the results, implementing culture development strategies and structures and finally measuring the teacher’s perceptions again.

Overall Results

The School Workplace Satisfaction Survey (SWSS) was used to measure
the initial perceptions of the teachers on staff and then again a year later after intentional cultural development strategies and structures were implemented. The SWSS is broken down into Organization Factors, Personal Factors, and job satisfaction. Then each of these factors is broken down into four sub factors (Support, Boundaries and Expectations, Constructive use of Time, Commitment to Learning and Teaching, Professional Identity, Social Competencies, Positive Values, and Empowerment).

The faculty’s reported perception levels of school workplace satisfaction were initially high on the 7-point Likert scale pre-survey ($n = 53$), with a mean of 6.38 and standard deviation of .56. The post survey ($n = 51$), also on a 7-point Likert scale, reported increased results with a mean of 6.53 and a standard deviation of .45. This data is represented on Table 1. Table 2 breaks down the data into more detail. It shows further supporting data of a general trend of high scores that improved between the 2013 administration of the survey and the 2014 administration of the survey. The result’s means ranged from the lowest of 5.01 to the highest of 6.71. Job satisfaction was the lowest (5.01) reported factor while positive values was the highest (6.71).

The results of the surveys were very positive and encouraging, although the total average between the tests, within the groups, and their interaction was not significant. As seen in Table 3, there was no main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,100) = 0.93, p = .34, \eta^2 = 0.01$. There was also no main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,100) = 0.01, p = .93, \eta^2 < 0.01$. There was also no interaction between test and group, $F(1,100) = 3.80, p = .05, \eta^2 = 0.04$. Means and Standard Deviations are listed in Table 2. Globally, there was an upward trend in all areas and generally positive movement but at the total average level no significance.
Within each sub-factor of the SWSS you discover there was a significant change that occurred. The initial scores started off high within the 2013 survey ($M = 6.38$, $SD = .56$). All factors (Support, Boundaries and Expectations, Constructive Use of Time, Commitment to Learning and Teaching, Professional Identity, Social Competencies and Positive Values) except Empowerment showed a significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test). All sub-factors showed a significant main effect for group (novice and experienced). The data showed that the experienced teachers scored themselves higher on each sub-factor on the 2013 and 2014 test, and although they showed growth not quite as much growth as the novice teachers. There was a significant difference in the 2013 test results for all sub-factors between the experienced teacher’s mean and the novice teacher’s mean. On the 2014 test only Boundaries and Expectations and Constructive use of Time maintained the significant difference. All the other sub-factors showed the novice teachers increasing at a higher rate than experienced teachers thus closing the gap that existed during the pre-survey. The study results indicate an overall gain for all teachers despite years of teaching experience. The results also show the novice teacher’s perceptions increased at a greater rate. The cultural development strategies and structures that were intentionally used showed growth for both groups, and had a greater positive impact on novice teachers than experienced teachers.

This study supports the use of similar approaches or strategies with other schools to result in a positive impact on school workplace job satisfaction for teachers. Even though the results were not all significant in all areas, they were positive in all areas and showed significance in most all areas. It is important to point out the impact the cultural develop strategies and structures especially had on the novice teachers. This study might
be an example of other schools to follow and positivity impact the smaller components of school culture and job satisfaction of teachers and especially in novice teachers.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction did not show a significant positive change within this study. As seen in Table 11, there was no significant main effect for test (2013 and 2014 test), $F(1,99) = 2.26, p = .14, \eta^2 = 0.02$. There was also no significant main effect for group (novice and experienced) $F(1,99) = 0.12, p = .73, \eta^2 < 0.01$. There was also no significant interaction between test and group, $F(1,99) < 0.01, p = .96, \eta^2 < 0.01$. Means and Standard Deviations are listed in Table 2.

Both personal and organizational environmental factors can influence teachers perceived levels of job satisfaction. Among the variables from the personal environment that affect the career cycle are family support structures, positive critical incidents, life crises, individual dispositions, and avocational outlets (Lynn, 2002). The organizational environment of schools and school systems compose a second major category of influence on the career cycle; among the influential variables are school regulations, management style of administrators and supervisors, atmosphere of public trust in the community, expectations of the community for its educational system, activities of professional organizations and associations, and union atmosphere (Lynn, 2002).

Considering the almost endless list of different variables found in a staff made of 63 teachers personal environments and perceived professional environments, one could see how gaining a significant main effect might be difficult. Leaders are charged with knowing each staff member as a person outside of work and as an employee at work to have the greatest impact and true read of the culture and job satisfaction levels.
It is interesting to note, the sub-factors all showed significant main effect but the overall average (including job satisfaction) and job satisfaction did not show any significant main effect for test, group, and between test and group. This study took steps to impact job satisfaction but only showed slight improvement. Further focus or different approaches are worthy of future attention.

Chinese philosopher Lao-tzu said, “A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step” (Laozi, 1905). In a similar mindset, to make a change in culture, you would need to start with a small step or start to make smaller changes that have lasting impacts. Focusing on teacher job satisfaction was the approach this study initially focused on to impact culture. The data supports one layer deeper might be the correct area deserving the leader’s and school’s focus. The SWSS results showed no main effect or significant positive impact at the overall or job satisfaction levels but a clear positive impact at the sub-factor’s level. Impacting the SWSS sub-factors over time may have potential leading to a positive impact on job satisfaction and eventually culture.

If culture can be compared to the climate, then job satisfaction would be the daily weather. In this analogy, the sub-factors in the SWSS would be the temperature or weather you feel right now. As current the temperature or sub-factors change and trend in a certain direction so could the daily weather or job satisfaction and if that trend in daily weather or job satisfaction continues to move in a certain direction the climate or culture could then change. Change can be a slow process and this change may not have been able to be significantly impacted and measured considering the year length of this study. The time between the two surveys may have played a factor in the lack of significance in the job satisfaction and overall average results.
Leadership

The leadership styles used by building administrators have shown to have a positive or negative impact on the level of teacher job satisfaction. Ronit Bogler (2001) completed a study that revealed teachers report greater satisfaction when they see their principal as someone who shares information with others, delegate’s authority, and keeps open channels of communication with teachers and staff. At the same time, teachers with poor levels of job satisfaction express more negative attitudes toward teaching as a career and toward the school administration and toward structural and administrative factors (Bogler, 2001). A leader’s awareness of the aspects and undercurrents concerning the workings of the school and their use of this information to address current and potential problems that effect school culture is called situational awareness. Situational awareness is a key skill in the success of a school leader (Marzano, et al., 2005).

The leadership, within this study, used their situational awareness skills to strategically and intentionally impact a positive change in school culture, job satisfaction and in other SWSS sub-factors. While doing so they kept in mind Douglas Reeves’ work on change theory and other experts in educational research combined with the unique knowledge of the teaching staff as professionals and human beings.

Douglas Reeves (2009) outlined four imperatives of culture changes. Leaders must define what will not change, providing stability through the change. Second, leaders must be the example in their words and most importantly their actions. Third, the right change tools must be used for your system. Fourth, change in culture requires relentless personal attention and ground-work by the leader.

Douglas Reeves (2009) said leaders must express what still holds value and will
not change. After examining the pre-survey data, our leadership team intentionally revisited our administrative and building goals with the staff and continued to throughout the school year and next. An excellent leader establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school’s attention and while doing so the leader fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation (Marzano, et al., 2005). We accomplished this by revisiting our school’s mission, vision, beliefs and goals throughout the school year in a variety of ways.

Marzano, et al., (2005) research reveals quality school leadership involves teachers in the development and implementation of important decisions and procedures. We created a forum for teachers to provide input in helping make building level decisions. Department heads and other teachers were selected based on a number of parameters to be part of the committee we called Administrators’ Council. It was created as an input giving opportunity for teachers. Any staff member could add items to the agenda to be discussed but they also had to add possible solutions at the same time. Administrators’ Council led to many changes and future plans based on staff input and proposed solutions.

Quality leaders establish a set of standard operating procedures and routines (Marzano, et al., 2005). Helping define a system of standard operating procedures and routines was important for several reasons. Teachers need to know what is expected of them and how to easily accomplish tasks while at work while following the set expectations. We also considered our meeting structure within this theme. We revisited the clear focus and purpose of each meeting and promised that we would not have a meeting if the agenda items would not support the time needed.
This theme carried over into another question that was an area of concern based on the data. Teachers expressed adults in our school did not get to know each other as people as much as they would like to. We focused on this area by intentionally creating times at the beginning and end of each staff meeting where staff interacts with each other in an exit ticket and entrance activity.

Effective leaders establish strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students (Marzano, et al., 2005). As an administrator, I have always followed the mantra that communication goes both ways. We tried to clearly communicate our expectations for staff using several methods and consistently communicating throughout the school year. Communication was enhanced by the creation of Administrators’ Council. This structure allowed for an additional avenue of communication with teachers and a platform for the administration to share the context and background of administrative decisions. In addition, as an administrative team we have made intentional efforts to focus on establishing and enhancing the positive relationships we have with the staff helping open up the lines of one on one communication.

The concepts of having stability through change, empowering teachers and building leaders, creating or enhancing quality systems and establishing clear communication were the strategies the leadership team successfully used to impact change at the study school. These strategies and supporting structures were chosen based on expressed concerns from within the 2013 pre-survey data, educational research, and the leadership team selecting what they determined to be the right change tools based on the characteristics of the present teaching staff at the school. The leadership team worked
with intentionality and consistency in their words and actions after the data analysis and planning day resulting from the 2013 pre-survey. These same strategies and structures may not fit all schools. The process the leadership went through might be the real key or thing to mirror in different schools. Each school based on the unique characteristics of the teaching staff in combination with their own survey data will be charged with honoring change components, reflecting on leadership styles and carefully selecting of the correct change tools for the present culture. Culture change answers cannot be given to anyone; they must be discovered or determined by the local leadership and staff together. There is not a magic key to change culture at schools, rather each school is challenged to develop their own key to unlock the positive change potential already present.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Research often answers one question and creates several more new questions at the same time. This study included only one school and one culture. It would be worth studying different types of schools with various cultures and staffs. This study was performed in a middle school, repeating the study in an elementary or high school may provide more evidence to help support culture change. This study involved teachers who perceived high SWSS levels to start with; it would be worth studying a school with teachers who do not share this same perceived high SWSS levels or a school with a toxic culture.

It would also be worth studying the same school in the future allowing more time to pass and its’ impact on culture change. One might be able to determine or support other research on the length of time it takes to impact culture.

The one question that may deserve the most attention concerns the teachers who
reported high levels of job satisfaction. Why do some teacher perceive higher levels of job satisfaction? What factors both professionally and personally play into their perceived high level of job satisfaction? How can school leaders use what they learn from these people to have a greater impact on the school and not negatively impact these teachers.

Summary

Today most educators will tell you school is all about the students and their achievement. As educators, we focus on our students so much we might be losing sight of other important factors that have a direct effect on the achievement and experiences students have at school. Education is so focused on test scores and achievement we might be losing sight of the human beings asked to help support and educate these students everyday. Teachers are difference makers, role models, mentors and counselors for students, everyday. They deserve the support and attention needed to come to work each day at the highest level to support each student they have. I always remind my teachers “Your students will only have one chance in their entire life to be in your class and learn the material and lessons you are providing, make each day count.”

School leaders must examine the culture they are creating, the strategies and structures they are using and determine if they are doing the best for their teachers, so in return teachers can do the best for their students. This study was an example of a leadership team taking action in this direction. This study provided a process to follow or learn from with the hopes of impacting other schools across the country in similar ways. School culture and teacher job satisfaction are worth the time to study and improve for the sake of each student that comes to school.
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School Workplace Satisfaction Survey