Although industrial and organizational psychologists have labored for two decades to understand processes governing behavior at work, the literature reveals little empirical work on organization value orientation and its effects on individuals within an organization. From research on personal values and interpersonal relationships, one might speculate that organizational values influence an individual's orientation and work behavior. This study sought to determine whether school systems' organizational value orientation affects teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The study examined the degree of normative and utilitarian orientation demonstrated by a random sample of 133 Kansas teachers completing three standardized questionnaires. Findings showed that normative value-orientation was associated with diminished job satisfaction. While causes cannot be determined from the current data, the regression equation indicates that experience and organizational tenure are predictors of job satisfaction for both groups. Gender and experience may be the factors influencing organizational commitment. Findings suggest that school systems may need to develop personnel strategies and policies to assist teachers experiencing less job satisfaction. Administrators need to examine overall value orientation and its effect on teachers' attitudes. Included are 3 tables and 28 references. (MLH)
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Over the past 20 years industrial and organizational psychologists have attempted to understand the processes governing behavior at work (see Dunnette, 1976). Some studies conducted during that period emphasized external characteristics as the primary factors explaining individual behavior (Covner, 1950; Georgopoulous and Mann, 1962; Hage and Aiken, 1967; Helmreich and Spence, 1978; and Oldham and Hackman, 1981). On the other hand, other studies identified internal characteristics such as motivation, leadership, commitment, and others as the basis for human behavior at work (Lawler, 1969; Poter and Steers, 1973; Staw, 1974; Locke, 1976; Dittrich and Carrell, 1979; Mowday and Steers, 1979; Tracy and Johnson, 1981; and Zeitz, 1983). Yet, little scholarly attention has been given to the value orientation an organization holds and its impact on other work-related factors.

The academic literature reveals little empirical work on organization value orientation or the frame of reference used to guide individuals within an organization. Earlier work on subordinate's personality and effectiveness utilized value-oriented statements to study such a relationship (Fiedler, 1958). However, the value orientation of an organization was not of primary concern. Other investigators examined the values of corporate executives (Friedlander, 1965; Guth and Tagiuri, 1965; and England, 1967). For the most part, however, those investigations were mostly descriptive and/or attempted to relate personal values to personal or business goals (Senger, 1971).
Elsewhere, researchers explored managerial success and personal values from a business perspective. It was indicated that more successful managers emphasized pragmatic, dynamic, achievement oriented values, while less successful managers preferred more static, and passive values (England and Lee, 1974). Moreover, it was articulated that a significant relationship exists between the values of general managers and the values of those highly rated employees. The upshot of this finding is that those employees who held similar value structures as those of the managers' may be perceived as more productive than otherwise.

On the other hand, other research seems to indicate that personal values influence interpersonal relationships, perceptions of individuals, organizational success, and determine what is and what is not ethical behavior (England and Lee, 1974). It seems reasonable, therefore, to speculate that organizational values influence the orientation of an individual as well as his/her administrative behavior at work.

The present study seeks to determine whether the organizational value orientation of school systems has any effect on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of school teachers.

Method

Subjects

Subjects in this study were school teachers employed in the State of Kansas. The data were gathered from 150 subjects who
were randomly selected from a list of school teachers provided by the State Department of Education. Survey instruments were administered to the subjects.

The focus of this study is on organizational value-orientation and its effect on school teachers of which 150 constituted the sample for this study. Missing data further reduced the sample number to 133. The subjects in this group had a mean age of 39.5 years and an average of 13.73 years of experience. Subjects averaged 9.6 years of organizational tenure. Sixty five percent of the subjects were female (male coded as 1; female coded as 2), and 45.9% of the subjects reported being the head of household.

Measures

Organizational value orientation was defined as guidance systems which act as the criteria for psychological behavior and assist in making choices relative to some evaluative aspect of life (Guth & Tagiuri, 1965; Walton, 1969; Wilson, 1975). Two measures of value orientation were used in this study: normative and utilitarian. Each measure was developed based on two theoretical constructs proposed earlier by other scholars (Etzioni, 1975). Each measure examines the degree of normative and utilitarian orientation present in an organization. Normative orientation was operationalized as a guidance system that emphasizes mostly symbolic references as means to motivate employees at work. On the other hand, utilitarian orientation refers to a system that utilizes mostly remunerative references
to motivate employees in an organization. These measures were factor analyzed using the principal component method with varimax rotation. A two factor-solution was obtained. The Organizational Value-Orientation Questionnaire (OVQ) was submitted to validity and reliability tests. The two measures were nearly uncorrelated (r = .19) and the coefficient alpha for the OVQ scales were .89. Each construct was examined using 5 items measured on a likert scale.

Organizational commitment was defined as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Poter, et al, 1975; Mowday and Steers, 1979). This variable has been widely studied and reviewed (e.g. Poter, Steers, Mowday & Borelian, 1974; Dubin, Champoux, and Poter, 1975). The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) has been shown to have reliability and validity (Mowday and Steers, 1979). The coefficient alpha for the OCQ ranged from .82 to .93 with a median of .90.

Job satisfaction was operationalized as the degree to which employees have positive affective orientation toward employment and the organization (Vroom, 1964; Locke, 1976). This variable has been also examined and researched (Bayfield and Rathe, 1951; Quinn and Staines, 1979; and Weiss et al, 1967). The instrument used in this study was the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The MSQ has been proven to be reliable and valid (Lofquist and Davis, 1969). The internal reliability coefficient for the index of general satisfaction is reported to be .90.
Organizational tenure, family status, gender, years of experience, and years at present job were obtained by using a series of single-item objectively worded questions.

Analysis

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to assess the effects of organizational value orientation on organizational commitment and job satisfaction of school teachers. Tenure, age, gender, and job experience were also analyzed because differences in these variables are likely across subgroups. The Pearson product-moment correlations of the variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tenure</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Head of Household</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Results

Table 2, on the other hand, examines the means, standard deviations, and pooled within-cells variance-covariance matrix for the two groups: utilitarian = 1 and normative = 2.

The null hypothesis for this investigation was that group value-orientation (normative or utilitarian) did not have any impact on the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of teachers. In other words, the omnibus test is $H_0: X_A = X_b$ where each group is measured on two dependent variables.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
<th>Group 1 $N^1=63$</th>
<th>Group 2 $N^2=70$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pooled Within-Cells Variance-Covariance Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>196.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Org Commitment</td>
<td>35.988</td>
<td>73.648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall omnibus test was statistically significant; however, the differences seemed not very pronounced as indicated by the
eigenvalue presented below (.057). Table 3 presents the eigenvalues and omnibus manova test.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root No.</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cannonical Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hyp. df.</th>
<th>Err df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.04172</td>
<td>3.12977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's</td>
<td>.04353</td>
<td>3.12977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.95828</td>
<td>3.12977</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.04172</td>
<td>3.12977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the omnibus test was significant, it was decided to investigate the specific differences between groups. Univariate F tests were conducted on each dependent variable.

The univariate F for job satisfaction was statistically significant, indicating that those teachers who held a normative value orientation experienced more job satisfaction than those who held utilitarian values $F (1,131) = 5.68, p < .019$. On the other hand, the variable organizational commitment was not statistically significant $F (1,131) = .722, p < .397$ for both normative or utilitarian groups. Likewise, when sex and head of household were introduced as covariates, none contributed to the variability of the two groups.

Tenure, gender, age, and experience were analyzed to test for significant contributions of each variable to explain job satisfaction and organizational commitment for both groups. The
categorical variables (e.g. gender of respondent) were used in the regression analyses through dummy coding (Pedhazur, 1969). Experience contributed more to the equation and was statistically significant (beta = 0.37, t = 2.104, p < .03) in exploring the variable of job satisfaction. Organizational tenure also contributed to the equation in explaining job satisfaction; however, it was not statistically significant.

In explaining organizational commitment, however, the variables gender and experience contributed the most to the equation. For gender the beta weight was .167, 5 = 2.101, p < .037; experience, on the other hand, was also statistically significant (beta = .369, t = 2.06, p < .041).

Discussion

Group value-orientation was associated with diminished job satisfaction among the subjects of this study. Those associated with utilitarian value orientation apparently experienced less job satisfaction than those holding a normative value orientation. The cause of this diminished job satisfaction cannot be specifically determined from the current data. However, the regression equation provided some evidence that experience and organizational tenure (to some extent) are predictors of job satisfaction for both groups. The more years of experience and years at present job, the more teachers are satisfied with their jobs.

Alternatively, organizational commitment was not a significant factor in analyzing the effect of group membership on that variable. The regression equation, nonetheless, showed that
gender and experience contributed more to the equation in predicting organizational commitment. On the other hand, women held more normative value-orientation than men did.

It appears, then, from the foregoing discussion that group orientation has an effect on the job satisfaction of teachers. This is consistent with the theoretical model used for this study in that organizational value orientation affects certain factors related to behavior at work. Organizational commitment, however, has been viewed largely from a job factors perspective (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977). The present study suggests that sex and experience may be other factors that influence organizational commitment along with value orientation. Furthermore, this study also suggests that job satisfaction and organizational commitment should be carefully analyzed from other angles than group value orientations.

This study has some characteristics that may limit its generalizability. First, subjects were from one region of the United States, and had an average tenure of 9.6 years. School teachers with less tenure and from other regions may very well exhibit less or more job satisfaction and commitment to the school or some combination of them.

Secondly, female subjects outnumbered the male subjects. The former group was fairly homogeneous. Perhaps an equal number of subjects per cell and a more heterogeneous group composition might contribute more variability to the two organizational value-orientation groups. This area merits further investigation.
These current findings, in spite of some limitations, suggest that school systems may need to develop personnel strategies and policies to deal with the needs of the teachers who experience less job satisfaction. In particular, administrators need to examine the overall organizational value orientation and assess its impact on teacher satisfaction and organizational commitment. Schools need to accommodate those needs and develop strategies for maintaining high levels of commitment to the organization and to the job itself.
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