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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers and specific educator groups has long been an area of intense interest to researchers in education. In one review of industry and education job satisfaction research, it was found that over 40% of previous studies focused on teacher satisfaction or morale (Robinson, Conners, & Robinson, 1964). In 1982 a task force was established by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to study effective school climate (Halderson et al., 1987). One of the primary components of school environment described by the task force was staff satisfaction. The results of small group research indicate that group size directly affects member satisfaction and attitude (Abramowits, 1976), whereas organizational behavior suggests that group size may affect these outcomes indirectly. Indik (1965) concluded that organizational size affects member participation and satisfaction by setting limits on communication, control, role specialization, and coordination processes.

The problem, then, is that there is a need to
investigate the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and school size. This research will attempt to answer the following question: Does school size effect teacher job satisfaction?

The leadership style of a supervisor is an important determinant of an employee's job satisfaction. The reaction of employees to their supervisor is usually dependent on both their characteristics and that of the supervisor. Consideration, "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff" (Halpin, 1959, p. 4), has a predictable effect on subordinate satisfaction. Employees tend to be more satisfied with leaders who demonstrate behaviors that are considerate and supportive rather than indifferent and hostile (Yukl, 1971). Although research findings support this premise by Yukl, other studies have provided indices that some employees have been more satisfied when leaders demonstrate high task-orientation (Halpin, 1957; Yukl, 1969).

Administrator behavior is found to be a direct factor of job satisfaction for teachers (Medved, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1967). Leadership styles that provide teachers with opportunities to experience personal and professional success, to organize and plan work, to implement goal achievement, and to exercise more autonomy in making decisions were found to enhance job satisfaction for
teachers (Sergiovanni, 1967).

The body of literature on both noneducational and educational organizations indicates inconsistencies in the findings on member job satisfaction with relationship to leadership styles. These inconsistencies have provided the impetus to further study the effects of leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction. The questions to be investigated in this research will coincide with both school size and the nine scales of job satisfaction found in the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey (Schmitt & Loher, 1986). They are as follows:

1. Is there a relationship between leadership styles and school size?

2. Do leadership styles effect teacher job satisfaction?

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is generally defined as one's affective response to various facets of the work environment (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). These feelings are associated with the difference perceived between what is expected and what is experienced in relation to the alternatives in a given job situation. Individuals will act in accordance with the behaviors they have chosen to help them achieve the goals they have accepted. The dimensional structure of job satisfaction chosen for this study
are those identified by the NASSP (Halderson et al., 1987) in their Teacher Satisfaction Survey which includes the following nine areas: (1) administration; (2) compensation; (3) opportunities for advancement; (4) student responsibility and discipline; (5) curriculum and job tasks; (6) satisfaction with co-workers; (7) parents and community; (8) school buildings, supplies and maintenance; and (9) communications.

School Size

School size was defined a posteriori on the basis of school enrollment figures reported by the participating schools. Both the teachers and the principals were asked to use the appropriate blanks on the answer sheet designated for the number of students in their buildings. These figures allowed for a numerical ordering of the enrollments which facilitated a division of the list into approximately thirds. The three categories used were small, medium size and large high schools. For this study schools will be classified small if they have enrollments within the interval of $98 \leq n \leq 406$. Medium size schools will fall within the enrollment interval $410 \leq n \leq 900$ while large high schools will have enrollments $n \geq 910$. One reform suggested for the improvement of education is the creation of smaller schools for the purpose of decreasing student alienation and increasing the
diversification of programs (Brown, 1973; Coleman, 1974; Martin, 1974). Experimental research literature on small groups indicates more frequent and more equal interaction and participation in groups that are smaller (Bales & Borgotta, 1955; Kelly & Thebaut, 1954). Small groups are subjected to more intense peer pressure and are found to exhibit greater intragroup homogeneity of attitudes and behavior (Betz, 1972). Greater group cohesiveness and amicability are found among individuals of the group (Katz, 1949; Larson, 1949).

One example of program diversity is the Alum Rock Voucher Demonstration (Abramowits, 1976) which was to create new smaller decision-making units called "mini-schools." Teachers and principals in the participating schools determined how many and what type of programs their school would offer. The results provided parents with 43 mini-schools in six schools the first year and 51 mini-schools in 13 schools during the second and third year of the experiment from which to choose an educational program their children would attend. With the creation of the mini-schools, decision making became decentralized and the teaching staffs had additional responsibilities of budget preparation, and making curriculum and general policy decisions (Abramowits, 1976). Little research has been undertaken to determine if smaller sized schools do, in fact, provide the positive educational benefits.
ascribed to them.

The results of small-group research suggest that group size affects member satisfaction and attitudes (Abramowitz, 1976), while organizational behavior research indicates that group size may affect these outcomes only indirectly. Organizational size affects member participation and satisfaction by setting limits on communication, control, role specialization and coordination processes (Indik, 1965). If greater interaction among teachers, consensus on program policy and greater cohesiveness and satisfaction are desirable outcomes, and if these outcomes are found more often in smaller-sized units, then school size itself is a positive and important variable for research.

Demographic Variables

In addition to school size, the relationship with three demographic variables was investigated--age, sex, and ethnicity. Paralleling the views of the NASSP's task force on school climate: "The demographic variables we chose to collect are standard control variables. We wanted to know whether the sample showed any significant differences by sex, race, school role, socioeconomic status or grade level" (Keefe, 1987). Efforts were made to determine if the sample showed any differences in the level of job satisfaction for teachers in different age
groups, for male or female teachers, and for teachers of different ethnicity. The questions to be answered are:

1. Are there differences in levels of job satisfaction reported by teachers of various ages?

2. Are there differences in levels of job satisfaction reported by male teachers as compared to female teachers?

3. Are there differences in levels of job satisfaction for teachers of different ethnic groups?

These demographics have been chosen, not for the ramifications they may have on teacher job satisfaction, but for a recognition that they exist in schools. The purpose of this research is descriptive and will provide only explanatory qualities. Therefore, the data generated by the demographics should not be used for one to seek corrective measures, but only compensatory strategies for the work place.

Leadership Style

In 1945, the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University attempted to identify various leader behavior dimensions. They defined leadership as the behavior of an individual when directing the activities of a group toward goal attainment. The end result of their studies was leader behavior being described by two dimensions—Initiating Structure and Consideration. Initiating
Structure is "the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns, channels of communication, and methods of procedure" (Halpin, 1959, p. 4), while Consideration is the "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff" (Halpin, 1959, p. 4).

The Ohio State staff developed two instruments to gather data about the behaviors of leaders: the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) (Halpin & Winer, 1952). The former is used for observed leader behavior and contains an equal number of items pertaining to consideration and initiating structure, while the latter, to be used in this study, gathers data about the self-perceptions of leaders on their leadership styles. For the purpose of this study, the LOQ will be used to determine the scores on both dimensions. The behavior of the leader (principal) will be described in terms of any mixture of initiating structure and consideration.

Significance of the Study

Specific information about the size and nature of the work setting may bring about changes which will maximize the achievement of both organizational and individual
goals (Getzels & Guba, 1957). Job satisfaction, an input to effective school environment, can be measured and evaluated for the purpose of identifying areas that need to be improved to enhance school climate. One of the major independent variables in this study is school size. If a significant positive or negative relationship exists between school size and teacher job satisfaction, awareness of these findings can be beneficial to school districts when planning for future building usage.

Even though managers desire to have an ideal type of leader behavior, there is evidence in the literature to support the concept that a single normative good style of leader behavior that can be applied to all leadership situations is unrealistic (Halpin & Winer, 1952; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Likert, 1961). A normative leadership style does not take into consideration such variables as levels of education, customs, standard of living, and job experience. Leader behavior is, therefore, dependent on a specific situation or environment that has unique characteristics for each.

Efforts will be made in this study to determine if size is a unique characteristic of an organization and if a certain leadership style is found in large, medium, or small high schools that parallels high teacher job satisfaction. When certain leadership styles are found to have a positive impact on job satisfaction these behaviors
should be reinforced. If certain leadership styles have a negative impact on job satisfaction, perhaps strategies for changing certain behaviors should be provided.

Implications

If school size is found to influence teacher job satisfaction, school districts may be able to plan future building use strategies. One example is directly connected with the closing of buildings due to declining enrollment. If in fact teacher job satisfaction increases within smaller schools, boards of education may choose to keep smaller buildings open until it is no longer cost efficient. Another area of decision making that may be affected by the results of this research is consolidation. The benefits of smaller schools may supersede the advantages of consolidating with another school district. Schools with large enrollments may choose to satellite as an alternative strategy for decreasing the size. New buildings could be designed of an appropriate size that would enhance job satisfaction for the instructional staff. For these reasons school size may prove to be an important variable to investigate when studying job satisfaction.

Although no physical changes can be made to alter the demographic variables in this study, the implications may be that intervention strategies can be employed in the
work place to increase job satisfaction among specific groups of dissatisfied individuals, such as the older teachers.

The findings of the *Status of the American Public School Teacher* survey conducted by the National Education Association (NEA) (1982) in 1980-1981 indicated that less than 22% of all teachers surveyed were certain they would choose teaching again if they were just entering college, whereas 25% indicated that they probably would. Almost 18% responded that the chances were even that they would make this choice, and others stated that they probably (24%) or certainly (12%) would seek another profession.

These results were supported by the *New York Times* survey completed in 1982 in which teachers in New York state indicated that they enjoyed their work, thought they were doing a good job, and were proud of their occupation ("Survey of Teachers," 1982). In spite of their positive attitudes toward their jobs, about half said they would choose another line of work if they had to start over. These findings parallel the findings of the National Center for Educational Statistics, which indicate a decline in the number of college students planning to major in education (Lester, 1984).

The implication is that the decrease in the number of potential teachers, coupled with the low morale of practicing educators will lead to a shortage of teachers in
the near future which may affect school climates of existing institutions.

School administrators may audit the findings or results of this study to determine which aspects in the work place contribute to teacher job satisfaction. They can obtain valuable information about how their teachers evaluate their present teaching positions in order to determine teachers' expectations about the job and the work environment. Principals may also find that certain leadership styles enhance teacher job satisfaction. If these behaviors are different or in opposition to their current practices, they may wish to develop a new style that is conducive to employee satisfaction.

Scope and Delimitations

High school size, one of the two independent variables used in this research restricts the findings. Middle schools, junior highs and elementary schools could be targeted for further investigation. When survey research is conducted, which is the nature of this study, there are built in limitations. Since surveys depend on responses from individuals, who have varying characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes, they are reactive. Reactive methods may generate misleading information. One of the greatest restrictions of this study is the accessible population. Due to the enormous instructional population,
this study will be limited to a distinct geographic region.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes the problems to be researched and the significance of pursuing such an endeavor. Brief definitions of job satisfaction, school size, and leadership style can be found in this chapter along with the significance and limitations of this study. The delimitations and scope are also listed for the reader's benefit.

Chapter II reviews selected literature on the nine scales of job satisfaction identified by the NASSP Task Force (Halderson et al., 1987) for effective school climate. A relationship between these nine dimensions to the body of literature on job satisfaction will be the context of this chapter.

Chapter III will be the research methodology used for this study. Chapter IV is the data analysis and the testing of the research hypotheses. Chapter V includes the findings and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE SELECTED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this research is to determine the effects of school size and leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. This chapter will be composed of a literature review of the theoretical conceptualization of job satisfaction with emphasis on its relationship with teacher job satisfaction. The nine dimensions of job satisfaction identified by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (Halderson et al., 1987) will be the parameters of this review. The nine dimensions are: (1) administration compensation; (2) opportunities for advancement; (3) student responsibility and discipline; (4) curriculum and job tasks; (5) satisfaction with co-workers; (6) parents and community; (7) schools buildings, supplies and maintenance; and (9) communications.

Job Satisfaction and School Size

Definitions

The definition of job satisfaction for this research
will be one's affective response to various facets of the work environment and more specifically teacher satisfaction with the nine dimensions found in the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey. These nine scales measure the following (Schmitt & Loher, 1986):

**Administration:** Teacher relations to administrator behaviors of concern, support, feedback, supervision, and praise for teachers' efforts.

**Compensation:** Teacher satisfaction with salary, fringe benefits, and job financial security.

**Opportunities for advancement:** Teacher satisfaction with opportunities for career advancement through promotion or professional development for new career roles.

**Student responsibility and discipline:** Teacher satisfaction with student conduct and disciplinary practices in the school.

**Curriculum and job tasks:** Teacher satisfaction with the school program and teacher workload.

**Co-workers:** Teacher satisfaction with the personal and professional characteristics and behavior of colleagues.

**Parents and community:** Teacher satisfaction with the levels of involvement and support provided by parents and community members.

**School buildings, supplies, and maintenance:** Teacher satisfaction with the quality and availability of supplies
and the adequacy and maintenance of the buildings and grounds.

**Communication:** Teacher satisfaction with the accuracy and availability of information about important school and district events.

School size was defined a posteriori on the basis of school enrollment figures.

**Conceptual Perspective for Job Satisfaction**

Since the 1930s, the research on the topic of job attitudes has increased rapidly. The understanding of the causes of job satisfaction has not advanced at a pace commensurate with research efforts. There seems to be some confusion over whether the determinants of job satisfaction be solely in the job itself, whether they reside wholly in the worker's mind, or whether it is the consequence of an interaction between the worker and his work environment (Locke, 1969).

Need fulfillment (Schaffer, 1953), discrepancy theory (Locke, 1969), equity theory (Adams, 1963), and Herzberg's Two Factor Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) have been several theoretical approaches that provided ground work for the numerous perspectives on job satisfaction. Conceptually, job satisfaction has been treated as unidimensional and multidimensional with the most widely accepted conceptualization being the latter (Baehr,
1954; Dubas, 1958; Halderson et al., 1987; Kahn, 1951; Smith et al., 1969). The dimensional structure used for the research will be the nine factors identified by the NASSP. Another dimension structure used frequently is that of Smith et al. (1969) with the dimensions of satisfaction with supervisor, pay, work, co-workers, and promotions supporting five of the nine facets used in this study. Satisfaction with supervisor is the dimension most closely examined while the establishment of relationships with associates within the organization has been identified as the second most important contributor to effective management (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970).

Satisfaction With Supervisor

The behavior of the supervisor is an important determinant of an employee's job satisfaction; however, the reaction of the employees to their supervisor is usually dependent on both the characteristics of the employees and the supervisor. The relationship between leader characteristics and subordinate satisfaction has been found to be complex and inconsistent. Consideration is one leader behavior that has a predictable effect on subordinate satisfaction. Employees tend to be more satisfied with leaders who demonstrate behaviors that are considerate and supportive rather than indifferent and hostile (Yukl, 1971). Although research findings indicate greater
employee job satisfaction when leaders are considerate and supportive, individuals differ in their preference for leader consideration. These two characteristics are more important for employees with low self-esteem or very unpleasant and frustrating jobs (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974). In seven studies of the relation between consideration and subordinate satisfaction with their leader, findings from five indicated a strong positive relation between the two. Findings from the remaining two showed a significant curvilinear relation between consideration and two objective measures of job satisfaction—turnover and grievances (Fleishman & Harris, 1962; Skinner, 1969).

Less predictive is the effects of a supervisor's task-oriented behavior on subordinate satisfaction. Employees have been more satisfied with leaders who demonstrate high task-orientation in some studies while other studies are indicating greater employee satisfaction with leaders who are low in task-oriented behavior (Kerr, Schrieshiem, Murphy, & Stogdill, 1974; Yukl, 1971). Within sets of studies using comparable measures, a consistent linear relation between task-oriented behavior of the supervisor and subordinate satisfaction was not found (Baumgartel, 1956; Halpin & Winer, 1952; Likert, 1961). Positive correlates were found by both Halpin (1957) and Yukl (1969) while a negative correlation between
task-oriented leaders and subordinate satisfaction for second-level supervisors and a positive correlation for first-level supervisors was found by Nealey and Blood (1968).

These inconsistent results reflect various job situations in which work roles are defined in different degrees. If subordinate work roles are ambiguous, they will prefer a leader who is task-oriented and will clarify their role requirements. They will expect and prefer adequate guidance and instruction. On the other hand, when subordinates are competent to perform a given task which has been clearly defined, they do not require frequent guidance and instruction and prefer a leader who does not supervise closely (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974). Unmotivated subordinates, who find their work unpleasant prefer leaders who do not pressure them to maintain a high level of performance.

Care must be taken when interpreting task-oriented behavior due to the lack of specificity on what the task is and who is making the decisions pertaining to the tasks. The task orientation of leaders does not appear to be closely related to the amount of influence they will allow subordinates in the making of task or maintenance decisions. Autocratic leaders can even differ considerably with respect to their task orientation and concern about group performance.
The amount of employee participation also affects their satisfaction with the supervisor. Numerous variables make this a complex relationship, some of which include the subordinates' desire and ability, the type of decisions, the personality and needs of the subordinates and the trust they have in their leader (Heller, 1971; Kavanagh, 1975; Yukl, 1971). Workers were most satisfied when the amount of participation was equal to the amount of participation desired (Morse, 1953).

Studies directly concerned with job satisfaction have produced conflicting results. Early research findings indicated only partial support for a positive relationship between participation and job satisfaction (Coch & French, 1948; French, Isreal, & As, 1960; Lawler & Hackman, 1969; Morse & Reimer, 1956). Later research findings show a significant relationship (Falcione, 1974; Harrison, 1981; Hurt & Teigen, 1977; Vroom, 1964).

In educational research, administrator behavior was found to be a direct factor of job satisfaction for teachers (Medved, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1967). Such behavior would include increasing the opportunities for teachers to experience personal and professional success by permitting them to organize and plan work, and to implement goal achievement (task-oriented behavior). Administrators would permit and encourage teachers to exercise more autonomy in making decisions, increase individual
responsibility in developing and implementing teaching programs, and develop professional skills as a means to job satisfaction. Supervisory behavior, is one of the factors relating to the conditions of work that is a necessary component in promoting an environment which will enhance job satisfaction for teachers (Sergiovanni, 1967). Demographic variables such as age, length of service, sex, and location of school were found to vary the satisfaction level with the supervisor. Women teachers need to have strong, positive leadership as well as teachers who have lengthy tenure in the profession (Medved, 1982). Teachers working in suburban school districts, and more specifically in highly motivated, upward bound upper middle-income communities were found to be least satisfied with supervision than were teachers employed in other types of districts such as urban. Low middle class community teachers were the most satisfied with supervision (Lester, 1984).

Inconsistencies in research findings exist in education also. From the National Association Nationwide Teacher Opinion Poll completed in 1980 (National Education Association, 1982), it was found that while 35% of all public school teachers were dissatisfied with their current jobs as teachers, supervision was not listed as a negative effect on their job satisfaction.
Satisfaction With Compensation

Pay is the job characteristic most likely to be a source of employee dissatisfaction (Lawler, 1971). One example of the phenomenon was found in a study done by Porter (1961), when 80% of a sample of managers were dissatisfied with their pay. One major cause of this pay dissatisfaction was perceived inequity. According to equity theory employees judge their pay by making social comparisons. They also appraise it in terms of the perceived discrepancy between it and the minimum pay required to fulfill their present wants. Their pay satisfaction results from comparing their actual pay in terms of adequacy (minimums) and the amount that would fulfill all of their current economic wants (Locke, 1969).

Certain categories of nonsupervisory employees, such as sales personnel, prefer their pay to reflect their job performance (Lawler, 1971). High performing employees will be dissatisfied if they are earning the same or less than low performers when pay is not based on performance. One alternative used to remedy this situation is an incentive program, but was found to have the inherent weakness of performance overestimation (Meyer, 1975).

Pay satisfaction is affected by the needs and values of the employee. Pay that provides for existence needs will satisfy the employee if it insures an adequate standard of living (Goodman, 1974). Pay is not only a means to
acquire goods, but also an indicator of achievement, recognition and potential enhancement of self-esteem. These needs are often unfulfilled and highly valued in most work settings (Lawler, 1971). In order to assess the value of these psychological rewards, an individual must use an evaluation process. A person can accomplish this task by comparing input-outcome ratios (Adams, 1963). Age, education, effort and skill represents the inputs a person brings to the job while output refers to the reward that is being evaluated. If there is a balance between the input/pay ratio of the individual as compared to some other input/pay ratio, the individual is likely to evaluate his or her pay as fair and feel satisfied with the outcome (Goodman, 1974).

The underlying values of individuals as they pertain to money and materialism, are indicative of an employee's attitude toward their pay. Pay becomes a more important predictor of job satisfaction for people who value money and material possessions than for people who do not (Wallace & Fay, 1983).

In a study, which synthesized employee attitude data over a 25-year period, Cooper, Morgan, Foley, and Kaplan (1979) found that employee values are changing and that dissatisfaction is increasing and manifesting itself in ways that have major implications for management. Discontent among hourly and clerical employees seem to be
growing while managers were found to be more satisfied. Both the hourly and clerical groups value and expect to get intrinsic satisfactions from work, which were formerly reserved for management. Employees satisfaction with pay has substantially increased in recent years; however, it is only managers who indicated high satisfaction with their jobs along with high satisfaction with their pay (Cooper et al., 1979). Hourly and clerical employees rate their pay more favorably now than in previous years but, as a group, indicate decreasing satisfaction with their jobs. Part of the reason for high satisfaction with pay is undoubtedly failure on the part of employees to differentiate between what they are paid and their purchasing power (Cooper et al., 1979).

Teachers, both as individuals and as groups, continually compare their earnings with others in the same district, in other districts, and in other occupations (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). If they perceive other occupational groups, such as supervisor, principals, and custodians, being paid too much compared to them, they will be dissatisfied. Wage increases in neighboring school districts can produce the same results. Financial gains made by other occupations outside the field of education, even though the gains are beyond the control of education, cause teacher salary dissatisfaction.

Compensation as a motivational factor in job
satisfaction has been met with little response in teacher self-reports, and is said to fall into the category of extrinsic "hygiene" factors detailed by Herzberg (Jorde, 1984; Medved, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1967). In spite of this phenomenon, pay is one of the bi-polar factors that lead to job satisfaction when perceived as equitable but a contributor to dissatisfaction when lacking (Herzberg et al., 1959; Lester, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1967).

In recent years teachers' salaries have lost ground in the job market (Kerr, 1983, Smith, 1983; Sykes, 1983). The national average teacher's salary for the 1981-82 school year was approximately $19,050 which was below those of other professions requiring similar education. Teachers' salaries have not kept up with inflation as well as those in other occupations. The consequence of this on teacher job satisfaction is a major concern to those who are seeking to upgrade the profession.

Numerous reasons have been identified for leaving teaching, one of which is inadequate salary (Crane & Ervit, 1955; Dillon, 1978; Knight, 1978). The reasons for leaving have also been found in studies of reasons for entering the profession of teaching. Pay, job security, and prestige are three rewards that teaching can provide (Lester, 1985). When they are present, they will contribute to job satisfaction, whereas if they are lacking, they will contribute to job dissatisfaction, and
eventually may lead to the decision to leave the profession.

**Satisfaction With Opportunities for Advancement**

Satisfaction with opportunities for advancement is viewed like pay, as a function of the frequency of promotion in relation to what is desired and the importance of promotion to the individual (Locke, 1976). Again the equity concept provides some content for this model.

American culture has always stressed merit or ability to do the job as being the standard of justice in promotion. Yet there are groups of the population that disagree with this standard, such as public firms and unionized firms. Instead they stress passing examinations (civil service requirements) and seniority as a basis for promotion.

While equity is one factor that influences a person's standards concerning the desired number of promotions, it is not the only factor. An employee could conceivably appraise the promotional system in their company as fair, and still be dissatisfied with their opportunities for promotion simply because there was none. On the other hand, individuals might view the promotion system as unfair and still be personally satisfied with it because they do not desire to be promoted (Kahn, 1951).

Many promotions entail an increase in responsibility
and work difficulty. Individuals who do not feel up to the challenge will not desire to be promoted or will at least be in conflict at the prospect. Promotions are unattractive to some individuals because they require them to give up other important values, such as community ties (Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1974).

Two hundred engineers and accountants were inter­viewed in a study conducted by Herzberg et al. (1950) and were asked about events they had experienced at work which resulted in improved job satisfaction or a reduction in job satisfaction. Advancement was one of the five factors that stood out as strong determiners of job satisfaction, and more specifically had greater importance for lasting change of attitudes. These five factors appeared infre­quently when the respondents identified events that paral­leled job dissatisfaction.

Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory argued that the causes for satisfaction and the causes for dissatisfaction are quite separate. The motivation factors are associated with psychological growth and can lead one to job satis­faction. Included in these factors are achievement, recognition and the intrinsic nature of the job itself. The hygiene factors are associated with the context of the job—pay, security, supervision, and working conditions. When deficiencies exist in this category, dissatisfaction is likely to occur. Their presence cannot be a source of
job satisfaction and motivation. In Medved's (1982),
study of 70 teachers, it was found that the factors
Herzberg identified as motivators most often contributed
to the satisfaction of teachers, but if absent, most often
the cause for teacher dissatisfaction. Education, as a
profession, can provide satisfaction for employees because
of the intrinsic nature of the work itself and the sense
of accomplishment derived from it. The teachers in this
study did not feel their work was being recognized or
appreciated enough by their colleagues and supervisors.
It seems as if Herzberg's (1966) motivation-hygiene theory
is clearly a departure from the traditional thinking of
many school administrators (Jorde, 1984).

Work itself and opportunity for advancement accounted
for nearly all the variance in overall job satisfaction
when matching subjects for equal satisfaction on motivator
and hygiene aspects of the jobs (Halpren, 1966). A
stratified sample of manufacturing employees stated that
in terms of the job, work itself, achievement, and ad­
vancement were the most liked aspects about the job and
the company (Wolf, 1967). These results are buttressed by
the findings from Ronan's (1970) study where advancement
(fairness of promotion procedures) was viewed as substan­
tially important for all employees.

The critical incidents methodology used by Herzberg
et al. (1959) has shown the same results in a variety of
different settings and across many occupational groups. Job content, which includes opportunities for advancement, were mentioned as features relating to satisfying events (Dysinger, 1965; Myers, 1964; Schwartz, Jenisaitis, & Stark, 1963).

Advancement is one of the factors that was an important motivator in both Herzberg's et al. (1959) study of accountants and engineers and Myers' (1964) study of supervisors and scientists but is one important omission from the data on teachers. Advancement is not mentioned by teachers due to the lack of opportunity in the teaching profession for advancement. If one wishes to achieve upward mobility, he or she must leave teaching for a related education profession such as administration, supervision, and counseling. A differentiated teaching program can be established whereas teaching roles and reward systems can vary according to responsibility (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). Accomplishment of this task can be achieved by initiating the following:

1. Providing opportunities for teachers to advance within the ranks of teaching.

2. Altering responsibilities among the various teaching roles and keying advancement to responsibility.

3. Eliminating aspects of the work itself which are sources of dissatisfaction for teachers, thereby salvaging this factor as a motivator. Use of paraprofessionals would be helpful in this effort. (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973, pp. 77-78)
Advancement is one of the factors that appear to be bi-polar when arranged on a conceptual continuum, an alternate assumption proposed by Herzberg et al. (1959). Teachers perceive it as contributing to both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1967). In other words, if a factor accounting for dissatisfaction is altered or eliminated, job satisfaction will result. Or, failure to maintain a satisfaction condition will result in teacher dissatisfaction. Advancement as a potential factor as a satisfier appears to be lost for teachers under our present system due to the lack of opportunity for concrete advancement and in fact teaching assignments could be considered a terminal position.

Disregarding any demographic variables such as school location, size, county, school level, district, and school level within the district, teachers were found to be dissatisfied with advancement (Lester, 1984). These findings are somewhat consistent with other studies which found subgroups of teachers having some specific needs. For example, young men midway in their teaching careers need more opportunities to advance within the profession and gain status from teaching as a career (Medved, 1982). When individual work items were examined by teachers indicating either moderate or high satisfaction, 40% fell below these levels for 18 of 59 items used in Haughey and Murphy’s study (1982). One of these items related
directly to school board policies concerning personnel matters such as promotion, evaluation, and hours of preparation.

Overall, teachers are dissatisfied with the opportunities for advancement in spite of the fact that classroom teaching assignments are viewed as terminal positions. A differentiated teaching program has been suggested as a remedy of this problem (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973).

Satisfaction With Students and Student Discipline

The theoretical equivalent to teacher job satisfaction with students and student discipline in this study will fall under the category of agents. Although the agent category in numerous studies range from the self (the respondent himself) to nonhuman agent (nature, machinery, weather, neighborhood, and equipment), this research will concentrate on agents being defined as customer(s) of respondent (including students, patients, and buyers) (Locke, 1973).

Literature supports and provides evidence that job satisfaction with respect to agents is based on defensive bias. Individuals give credit to themselves for satisfying events that occur in the workplace more often than accepting blame for dissatisfying events, which is projected to nonself agents (Locke, 1973; Schneider & Locke, 1971).
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In a study completed by Wall (1973), 77 employees' scores on a measure of "ego defensiveness" correlated significantly with the proportion of all dissatisfying factors mentioned which were hygiene factors in Herzberg's (1966) system of classification. Since most of Herzberg's hygiene factors are agents (other persons), the previous results support the idea that his results are partially to blame on the defense mechanism of individuals.

People tend to take credit for good events and to blame others for bad events (Herzberg et al., 1959; Locke, 1973; Schneider & Locke, 1971). In dissatisfying events the attitudinal effects are referred away from the person himself (Herzberg et al., 1959).

In all three studies, the results for agents can be attributed both to defensiveness on the part of employees and to the fact that opportunities for other persons to cause dissatisfaction are greater than their opportunities to cause satisfaction (Locke, 1973).

Most findings from studies of teacher job satisfaction consistently indicate that the psychic rewards derived from the teaching job itself and the pleasure of working with children are far more important to educators than extrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975; Sergiovanni, 1980). On the other hand, interpersonal relations (subordinates) was also found to be a source of job dissatisfaction for teachers (Sergiovanni, 1967). Since students are the
focus of a teacher's work, they should account for many of the successes that teachers have. Students are considered the raw material for the achievement successes and acts of recognition which teachers perceive as sources of job satisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1967). Once establishing an appropriate relationship with students, teachers can pursue satisfaction from the job itself by capitalizing on this relationship. A good relationship with students is not strong enough to be a source of job satisfaction, but can be a source of job dissatisfaction if a poor relationship does exist.

Extensive research on the extrinsic, ancillary and psychic rewards teachers received from their careers and work was completed by Lortie (1975) in his Five Towns study. When answering questions specifically about satisfactions they received from teaching, they overwhelmingly cited task-related outcomes which Lortie has specified as psychic rewards. The major emphasis on their answers was that satisfaction accompanied desirable results with students. Respondents who believed they had influenced their students, experienced extreme gratification. Similar data was found in the national survey conducted by the National Education Association in 1963. When 20% of the respondents were asked questions in which they were requested to identify "sources of professional satisfaction and encouragement," students was the selected
answer by 80% of the respondents. The modal replies from Lortie's (1975) study reveal that concern with classroom results is dominant and that teaching is satisfying and encouraging when positive things happen in the classroom.

Student discipline and classroom control have been found in the literature to be synonymous (Lortie, 1975). Schools are thought of as organizations that have a mandated relationship with their clients (students) where neither organization nor client can exercise a choice concerning their participation (Carlson, 1964). One major feature of the school's social system is that of client control. Control of students therefore becomes a major portion in the work of teachers and can be the basis upon which teachers are assessed (Lortie, 1975; Willower, 1971).

One piece of research that addressed the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and student control indicated that the consistency of teacher beliefs and behavior with regard to pupil control did predict job satisfaction (Willower & Heckert, 1977). Other implications from this study, based on conjecture, was that people who are well adjusted will be consistent in most areas in belief and behavior and will be satisfied with their work. More specifically, the same personality type that predicts belief-behavior consistency will also predict job satisfaction. The results of this study should
point to the significance of the social context within which work occurs when investigating the dimensions of job satisfaction.

The lack of teaching time due to other factors such as excess paper work and disruptive students, has been an indicator by some teachers as a source of job dissatisfaction. Segregation of students is one method of discipline that protects teaching time by removing the disruptive elements of unselected clients from the main stream. Giving partial treatment to some students protects teaching time and channels the professional efforts toward those students for which the school is geared to supply the most adequate service, therefore creating greater job satisfaction for teachers (Lortie, 1975). Further support of these findings was found in a study done on why individuals leave the teaching profession. One of the top four reasons was that there is not enough time to teach; too much time is spent on classroom discipline and interruptions (McKinley & Merritt, 1985).

Sources of stress have been found to be negatively correlated to job satisfaction (Kyriaco & Sutcliffe, 1979). Several reasons were given for this phenomenon, two of which were directly related to students and student discipline. The first was when individual students continually misbehave and the second was an inadequate disciplinary policy of the school. Stress producing factors
identified in similar studies also included discipline problems (Cichon & Koff, 1978; Sparks & Hammond, 1981).

Even though the amount of hard data on student discipline is near nonexistent, there is an ongoing concern by educators on this topic. Evidence of this is found in most surveys and questionnaires seeking information regarding job satisfaction.

Satisfaction With Curriculum and Job Task

The nature of work itself, as a determinant of job satisfaction, has been consistently found in studies on the importance of different job characteristics. Opportunity to use one's skills and abilities, opportunity for learning, creativity, variety, difficulty, amount of work, responsibility, non-arbitrary pressure for performance, control over work methods and work pace (autonomy), job enrichment, and complexity are some of the work attributes that have been found to be related to both work interest and job satisfaction (Alderfer, 1967; Cooper et al., 1979; Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hall & Lawler, 1971; Locke, 1973; Maher, 1971; Patchen, 1970; Vroom, 1964).

Studies that have attempted to identify the major dimensions of job content have been made by Brief and Aldag (1974) and Hackman and Lawler (1971), with the most extensive research being completed by Hackman and Oldham (1975). Through the use of the Job Diagnostic Survey
(JDS), five core dimensions were found that involve some aspects of the job content that can affect an employee's work satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). The five core dimensions are skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback from the job itself.

Previous to their study, 13 different telephone company jobs were described using a subgroup of the five core dimensions identified by Hackman and Oldham—skill variety, autonomy, task identity, and feedback from the job itself (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). The purpose of the study was to specify the conditions under which jobs would facilitate the development of internal motivation for effective performance.

The following propositions were derived from their work:

1. The worker's perception of his job's core dimensions are positively related to various affective responses to his job (e.g., level of internal work motivation, general job satisfaction, and job involvement).

2. Jobs perceived as high on all four core dimensions are associated with maximum internal work motivation, and general job satisfaction.

3. Relationships between perceptions of the four core dimensions and the worker's affective responses to his job are stronger for those individuals having higher order need strength (desire for higher order needs) than
those individuals having less higher order need strength.

4. Workers from rural backgrounds have greater higher order need strength than workers from urban backgrounds.

A replication of this study was made by Brief and Aldag (1974). The outcomes from their research provide strong support for the presence of positive associations between a worker's perceptions of their job characteristics and their effective responses to that job.

When jobs are high on the four core dimensions, employees who are desirous of higher order need satisfaction tend to have high motivation, high job satisfaction, be absent from work infrequently, and be rated by supervision as doing high quality of work (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). The harder and better individuals perform on a job which is perceived as high on task variety, autonomy, task identify, and feedback, the more satisfaction they are likely to feel.

There are three general job characteristics that are central in developing a congruence between individual need satisfaction and organizational goal achievement (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). A job must provide workers with a feeling of responsibility for a meaningful portion of their work. They must realize the work they do is their own and believe they are personally responsible for whatever successes and failures occur as a result of their efforts.
Only when one possesses these feelings of ownership can they experience personal success and gain in self-esteem.

The second characteristic is a job must provide work outcomes which are intrinsically meaningful or otherwise experiences as worthwhile. If the results of one's efforts are not perceived as important, it is unlikely they will feel especially good when they work effectively. There are difficulties when specifying the kinds of job characteristics that will provide outcomes which are considered meaningful and worthwhile for people in general due to their different value structures. For individuals who have desires for higher order need satisfaction, however, a job that is high on both task identity and variety will provide opportunities to experience meaningfulness from their work (Turner & Lawrence, 1965).

The third job characteristic that is central in developing a congruence between individual need satisfaction and organizational goal achievement is the job must provide feedback about performance effectiveness. Such feedback may come from various sources such as the task itself or from significant others—an esteemed co-worker or a supervisor. In order for satisfaction to occur, the feedback must be present in a form that is believable to the worker (Hackman & Lawler, 1971).

Numerous studies, completed in attempts to test the Herzberg et al. (1959) theory that job satisfaction and
job dissatisfaction are caused by qualitatively different job factors, have used intrinsic and extrinsic factors to describe job-related factors and environment-related factors. Work itself is in the first category along with recognition, achievement, advancement and responsibility, while salary, company policies and practices, technical aspects of supervision, and working conditions fall into the latter.

Studies that supported the findings of Herzberg et al. (1959) were carried out by Wernimont (1966); Schwartz et al. (1963), and Rosen (1963). Satisfaction with the job can be due to high levels of satisfaction with intrinsic factors, and dissatisfaction can be due to low levels of satisfaction with intrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors can cause both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, but individuals are more likely to say they have bad or dissatisfied feelings about these extrinsic factors. Work itself, achievement, and responsibility were found in most satisfying situations by the subjects (accountants and engineers) used in Wernimont's (1966) study. In describing dissatisfying situations, work itself was one of the factors that was endorsed next to advancement and recognition, which is consistent with Herzberg's et al. (1959) findings. The five strongest dissatisfiers, for both accountants and engineers, were all intrinsic factors (Wernimont, 1966).
Most studies of teacher job satisfaction have indicated that the psychic rewards derived from the teaching task itself and the pleasure of working with children are far more important to teachers than extrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975; Sergiovanni, 1980). Although this may be true, one must keep in mind that teaching is a complex job and not easily defined by a set of specific duties characteristic of teachers at all levels (Jorde, 1984). There are vast differences between what teachers do in one setting and another at a different school. Conditions may also vary from one demographic location to another. The result being that teacher's on-the-job responsibilities vary in significant ways (Richey, 1974).

The roles and responsibilities of teachers do have some similarities, such as mundane housekeeping responsibilities like keeping attendance records, monitoring study hall and collecting milk money. Teaching is also a complex job which involves intense interpersonal interactions with many students more or less simultaneously. The work itself entails diagnosis, evaluation, interpretation and decision making. The work day is comprised of an intense continuous flow in which the teacher is constantly on stage (Sanders & Schwab, 1980).

Teachers have considerable autonomy to run their classrooms as they want is an impression that most people have of teaching and may be a gross misconception.
Teachers are isolated from their colleagues much of the day. Within their own classrooms, they operate within the confines of complex expectations established by the curriculum material they should cover, the range of allowable activities, and a time structure that governs when those activities can happen. So what appears to some as autonomy, may indeed be viewed as isolation by the teachers (Chapman & Lowther, 1982).

Work itself appeared as a bi-polar factor in Sergiovanni's (1980) study of teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. As a factor indicating high or low attitudes of teacher's job feelings, it was found to produce both. A teacher's job requires considerable attention to maintenance type activities (attendance, scheduling details, and lunch duty). The work itself factor was found to be high in satisfaction potential, but was frequently cited as a source of dissatisfaction for teachers (Sergiovanni, 1980).

Conclusions from this same study indicated that teachers derive the most satisfaction from work-centered activity, which was reflected in the predominance of achievement, recognition, and responsibility as sources of teacher job satisfaction. Low job feelings were found in factors which were not in themselves work centered; rather, they focused on conditions and people which surround the actual work (Haughey & Murphy, 1982; Medved, 1982;
Sergiovanni, 1980).

When asked the question regarding what aspects of the job are most gratifying for teachers, the response most commonly found is contact with students. The rewards for teachers are the intrinsic ones: for example, knowing they have made a positive impact on their students. This response coincides with the findings of Lortie's (1975) study that teachers are highly intrinsically job motivated, based on his national survey of the teaching profession. Specific job constraints that interfered with intrinsic job satisfaction were listed by teachers as: (a) lack of planning time, (b) tedious paper and clerical work, (c) an out-of-touch and autocratic administration, (d) disruptive and unmotivated students, (e) extra teaching functions such as faculty meetings and "time wasting" workshops, (f) uncooperative parents, (g) lack of autonomy to prescribe curriculum, (h) feelings of failure, and (i) low occupational prestige (Lortie, 1975; Pagel & Price, 1980).

Many of these dissatisfactions are a result of activities which directly interfere with a teacher's involvement with students. Therefore they are concerned about parental and administrative demands which are indirectly related to the classroom (Pagel & Price, 1980). Another source of job dissatisfaction is the lack of their control over curriculum and their role of instructional
specialist. Administrators are perceived as interfering with teachers' area of expertise by imposing regulations and specific curriculum guidelines developed at the central office level.

Satisfaction With Co-Workers

Co-workers, as with pay, has been a major factor found in studies of job satisfaction. Social aspects of the job, on the average, were rated first in response to the question on what made people most satisfied or dissatisfied with their job (Herzberg et al., 1959). Since it is through personal relationships, such as with family and friends, that individuals view and receive life's pleasures from, it seems evident that social interactions at work are likely to provide a major source of satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979). The work situation being an extension of employed individuals' social interaction provides further support of this hypothesis.

One of the basic lower order needs professed by Maslow (1970) is the need for social interaction. There are numerous studies that have found that social isolation in work situations indicate demoralizing effects. One such study found that individuals isolated from others because of the design of the job tended to be more dissatisfied with their jobs than others (Walker & Guest, 1952). The findings from VanZelst's (1952) study
indicated that, where individuals were allowed to increase the social satisfaction from their work, job satisfaction increased. When individuals were allowed to choose their own work-mates, then job satisfaction as well as turnover and costs improved significantly. By allowing individuals to choose their co-workers there is evidence that people come together with roughly equal skills and performance. Where this phenomenon exists, work groups constituted in terms of similar skill levels, satisfaction and productivity increase (Cross & Warr, 1971).

The taxonomy of job situations constructed by Herzberg et al. (1959) was found to be an oversimplified portrayal of the mechanism by which job satisfaction or dissatisfaction comes about (Dunnette, Campbell, & Hakel, 1967). Dunnette et al. (1967) found that satisfaction or dissatisfaction can be caused by job content, job context, or both jointly. Satisfaction with co-workers, an extrinsic (context) job feature, for the six occupations studied by Dunnette et al. (1967), was found to be more salient for satisfying situations than for dissatisfying ones. These results are in opposition to those of Herzberg et al. (1959) who found that satisfaction with co-workers has the potential only for producing job dissatisfaction, and that it does not lead to job satisfaction even when it is unusually good.

Several studies have found that interpersonal
relationships between teachers and administrators and between teachers and co-workers is particularly important in teacher's self-reports of job satisfaction (Jorde, 1984). There does seem to be conflicting results in this area. The structural form of the school organization and the rigid time schedules that dictate the teacher's day, allow only marginal interaction during the teacher's day (Lortie, 1975). Their socialization patterns are characterized by individualism. The intrinsic job satisfaction of teachers is accomplished in isolation from their cohorts. Teacher-teacher interaction was not found to be a critical aspect of the work life of teachers in Lortie's study. In contrast to this, teachers may prefer an arrangement that is conducive to sharing ideas and resources with their colleagues. Collegial support is important if one of the goals of the organization is to achieve sustained involvement of its teachers (Jorde, 1984). Emotional support can reflect a concern for others and in addition provide the foundation for a nurturing cohesion that may enhance a teacher's sense of self (Hoy & Miskel, 1978; Sergiovanni, 1980).

Extending Herzberg's (1966) study, Sergiovanni (1967) sought to determine whether or not the factors reported by teachers would distribute themselves into mutually exclusive satisfaction and dissatisfaction categories. The results demonstrated that many factors which accounted for
high job feelings of teachers and many of the factors which accounted for low job feelings of teachers were mutually exclusive. Interpersonal relations with peers was a factor that produced low job feelings—job dissatisfaction. In the NEA Nationwide Teacher Opinion Poll completed in May 1980 (National Education Association, 1980), relationships with other teachers was also found to have a negative effect on their job satisfaction which provides further support to both Herzberg (1966) and Sergiovanni's (1967) findings.

The teaching profession has been considered a lonely profession (Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1971). Teachers have limited contact with other adults during the school day. Within traditional school settings, the loneliness and isolation that teachers endure can often be alleviated by support from both administrators and co-workers. When social support of any type is not available, the sense of isolation increases, resentment develops, and the stresses of teaching lead to burnout (Farber, 1982) and job dissatisfaction.

In the educational setting, when opportunities to contact and consult professional colleagues is minimal, there is a direct relation to work alienation (Forsyth & Hay, 1978). A positive group climate was found to be related to school effectiveness or a productive learning context for students by Garland and O'Reilly (1976).
Several studies indicate that interpersonal relations is one factor that relates job satisfaction to the organizational climate (Hellriegel & Slocum, 1974) which in turn affects school outcomes and participant behavior.

**Satisfaction With Parents and Community**

The theoretical base for the literature review on this topic will be the community, with parents being a subgroup of this larger social system.

Empirical documentation on the influence of community characteristics on job satisfaction and job performance have been made by Cureton and Katzell (1962), Katzell, Barrett, and Parker (1961), and Kendall (1963). Nonurban culture patterns were found to be positively correlated to small plant and small community syndrome and were both related to the job satisfaction and job performance of the work groups (Cureton & Katzell, 1962; Katzell et al., 1961). These authors explained their findings in terms of the relationship between small-town cultures and the needs and expectations of the workers. They hypothesized that the workers viewed high productivity as a means to the desireable end of high rewards.

Community characteristics were used to index frames of reference of the workers and the alternatives available to them in the community (Kendall, 1963). The findings from this research indicated that measures of satisfaction...
with various aspects of the job had no relationship to measures of performance and absenteeism, but high absence rates were related to unattractive community features and high performance was related to both personal background and unattractive community features. More importantly, Kendall found that high general job satisfaction, high satisfaction with pay, and high satisfaction with the work done on the job were related to unattractive community features.

Using the following predictions regarding job satisfaction and community characteristics:

1. Measures of job satisfaction should be associated with community variables which reflect the prosperity, the extent of slums, the amount of productive farming, and the amount of unemployment in the area.

2. Measures of a worker's satisfaction with his pay should be more strongly associated with community characteristics than are the other aspects of job satisfaction.

Hulin (1966) found that the less attractive the community in terms of slums, prosperity, and productive farming, the more satisfied are the workers with their jobs. Pay satisfaction was the satisfaction variable most strongly affected by community variables, while the percentage of unemployed workers did not appear to be related to job satisfaction to any significant degree (Hulin, 1966).
In a field study of 82 scientists and engineers regarding the reasons for them remaining or leaving the organization, it was found that elements in their work context or community environment might cause them to leave (Friedlander & Walton, 1964). A high proportion of the negative motivations did not pertain to the work process itself, but included promotion and pay, supervisory opinions, leadership and management, housing and home ownership, living costs, and schools. These variables are either job items external to the work process itself or elements within the community environment. Since these work context characteristics are related to negative motivations, they would seem to produce or prevent dissatisfaction but are ineffective in producing or preventing job satisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959).

There is a minimal amount of research on teacher job satisfaction that mentions teachers' satisfaction with the community. When mention was made, teachers were found to be dissatisfied with the isolation they felt working in small rural communities. The major disadvantages that were stated by these teachers were lack of privacy, involvement in the community, inadequate professional contacts, and unsatisfactory support services. Many of the respondents considered themselves isolated geographically, socially, recreationally and culturally (Cross, Bandy, & Gleadow, 1980; Haughey & Murphy, 1982).
Instead of focusing on satisfaction with the physical and cultural aspects of the community, the body of literature addresses the concept of teacher satisfaction with community and parent support. In the NEA Nationwide Teacher Opinion Poll completed in 1980, the following three factors were mentioned by respondents as having a negative effect on their job satisfaction: public attitude toward schools, status of teachers in community, and relationships with parents of students. Teachers are increasingly concerned or dissatisfied with the lack of recognition of their worth in society (Medved, 1982).

These findings parallel those of the Metropolitan Life survey of New York state teachers (Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1984). Sixty-one percent of New York teachers feel they are not respected in today's society and 48% feel there is not full parental or community support for education. This feeling of a lack of support for education is precipitated by the teachers' view that they are isolated from the larger community in facing problems in the schools. Lack of parental and community support is one of the five most frequent causes of burnout listed by teachers (deHaas & Raquepaw, 1984; Kyriaco & Sutcliffe, 1978).

Lack of perceived satisfaction or support from both administrators and the community has personified the frustrations of teaching in the last 15 years (Farber,
1982) and has decreased the amount of commitment teachers have to the profession. In 1962, 28% of all teachers had 20 or more years experience, by 1976 that number had been reduced in half (Dubrin et al., 1979). Only 59% of teachers last more than four years in the classroom (Mark & Anderson, 1978) while 60% of current teachers indicated that they plan to remain in teaching until retirement (McGuire, 1979).

Satisfaction With School Buildings, Supplies and Maintenance

For the purpose of this research, the three variables of school buildings, supplies and maintenance will be treated under the broader category of physical environmental factors.

The social and physical aspects of the environment have been studied and examined as causes of work behaviors and attitudes. Topics that have been investigated are the formation and maintenance of work groups (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), psychological climate (James & Jones, 1974), and stress and social support (Wineman, 1982). These studies would attest to the importance of good personal relationships for the benefit and effectiveness of the employees. Research dealing with aspects of the physical environment also suggests the influence it has on employee attitudes and behaviors as well (Mahoney & Frost, 1974; Sommer, 1974; Tognoli, 1973).
There are far too many aspects of the physical working environment to adequately summarize all of them. In general, employees value physical surroundings that are characterized by safety and comfort. Moderation rather than extremes, in terms of temperature, humidity, ventilation, lighting and noise, are preferred since extremes can cause discomfort and reduce one's ability to work. Employees also prefer a work place that is located close to home, new rather than old buildings, cleanliness, and adequate tools and equipment (Barnowe, Mangione, & Quinn, 1972).

Underlying the employees preference for pleasant working conditions are the principles of: (a) the desire for physical comfort, based on their physical needs; and (b) the desire for conditions which facilitate the attainment of their work goals (Locke, 1976).

In one study undertaken to assess the relative contribution the social and physical environment at work had in explaining employee attitude and perceptions of their work, the physical environment was consistently related to job satisfaction (Zalezny, Hawkins, & Farace, 1983). Findings from Oldham and Brass's (1979) study support the fact that the physical environment can contribute to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Their analyses indicated that changes in job characteristics that accompanied the change in facilities explained much of the decline in
satisfaction and motivation in employees.

Using 73 environmental factors, some of which were community aspects, the relationship between the importance of these factors and the satisfaction or dissatisfaction which these elicited was studied with the following results (Friedlander, 1965):

1. The satisfaction and the importance attributed to various environmental factors are unrelated when mean satisfaction-importance scores are correlated across all factors.

2. Satisfaction and importance are significantly related if environmental factors are dichotomized into satisfying and dissatisfying experiences.

3. Satisfying and dissatisfying environmental factors are of approximately equal importance. However, factors of extreme satisfaction and dissatisfaction are significantly more important than factors of mild satisfaction or dissatisfaction. (p. 163).

These findings shed some doubt on the assumption that the more dissatisfying factors in one's environment are more important. For the most satisfying factors, which include the work situation, the tendency is for the more important items to be more satisfying (Friedlander, 1965).

Job satisfaction with environmental factors studies and research can be in numerous working places and careers. One such study, which adds specificity to the environmental factors, was completed on the attitudes of 277 college faculty members about their work. The results indicated that the dissatisfiers arose from working conditions which included poor facilities and equipment.
Teachers have constantly been subject to financial burdens which are worsening rapidly: shrinking public school budgets (Dubrin et al., 1979). State revenues have decreased or become nonexistent for some school districts combined with tighter fiscal policies have cut deeply into school supplies and equipment. Audio-visual equipment, recreation equipment, crafts and sports supplies have enabled teachers to diversify and create activities that were a relief for both students and teachers. Budget cuts have made these less available, placing more burden and responsibility on the teacher to fill up every minute of the daily schedule.

Literature in environmental psychology emphasizes the subtle yet powerful impact of our physical surroundings. Architecture and physical design of work environments can influence psychological and physiological states as well as social behavior (Craig, 1973; Weinstein, 1979). In the school context, environmental variables such as heating, lighting, noise level, ventilation, and layout of design in order to measure comfort, teacher's work efficiency and pupil performance have been investigated. Additional variables such as color, form, texture, spatial dimensions and general environmental quality have also been studied.

School designs have been categorized as being either cohesive or isolating. The latter design facilitates
interaction with larger groups, promoting greater staff involvement. Some spatial arrangements inhibit teachers from observing and working with each other—often found in elementary schools. Implications of this spatial arrangement pose certain problems for teachers that may well affect satisfaction (Dreeben, 1973).

Changes that would augment teacher job satisfaction with facilities was centered on books, more audiovisual equipment, and more or better designed space in Lortie's (1975) Five Town Study. The teachers in this study did not feel sufficiently well supplied with physical materials. Further support of these findings was established in studies completed by Murnane and Phillips (1977), Haughey and Murphy (1982), and the teacher opinion poll completed by the National Education Association in 1980. All three of these studies indicated a concern of teachers and a slight dissatisfaction of the physical facilities, materials, supplies, and equipment. One piece of research also stated that faculty members were dissatisfied with the procedures used for obtaining them and found that departmentalized programs complicated the use of materials (Murnane & Phillips, 1977).

The results of 500 teachers surveyed in New York are in direct opposition to the studies stated above. The majority felt positive about the availability of teaching materials and supplies in their school and gave positive
marks to their school's physical facilities (Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1984).

**Satisfaction With Communication**

Communication flow pattern, frequency, directional flow of information and organizational climate contribute significantly to job satisfaction, as well as verbal recognition of an employee's performance (Locke, 1973; Maher & Piersol, 1970). Communication variables such as listening, understanding, and quality of communications studied by Falcione, McCorskey, and Daly (1977), were found to have an impact on job satisfaction also. Open communication (Burke & Wilcox, 1979), tolerance for disagreement (Richmond & McCorskey, 1979), and the employee's ability to initiate communication about personal needs and goals (Long, 1979), along with management communication style (McCorskey, Richmond, & Davis, 1981), have positive correlations to job satisfaction. Of particular importance is the nature and quality of employee communication with supervisor (Buller, Moore, Luttrell, & Furr, 1981; Falcione et al., 1977).

These studies have emphasized the importance of communication with a supervisor as it relates to job satisfaction. Both communication satisfaction with the supervisor and supervisor receptivity to information seem to be prominent communication-with-supervisor variables.
from the employee's perspective. The first variable, communication satisfaction with supervisor, is communication related and may have a significant contribution to job satisfaction. Hecht (1978), views this concept as an organizational communication counterpart to interpersonal communication satisfaction and approaches it in terms of "Discriminate fulfillment . . . with the expectation of positive consequences" (p. 254).

Supervisor's receptivity to information and communication from subordinates is closely related to communication satisfaction (Falcione, 1974). Flexibility and tolerance in listening to feedback, as well as openness to input of ideas, opinions, suggestions, and innovations offered by employees are seen to be components of supervisor receptivity. These factors, which are important for maintenance of relationships are provided by supervisor receptivity (Fiedler, 1966). An empathetic sense of caring and concern are important to understanding job satisfaction.

In addition to communication satisfaction and supervisor receptivity, communication strategies involving employee participation in decision making have received considerable attention. Decision-participation is a continuum of access to and involvement in decision making (Dachler & Wilpert, 1978). From the perspective of Wheelless, Wheelless, and Howard (1984),
decision-participation references two factors: (1) the amount of participation in decision making allowed by the supervisor, and (2) the discrepancy between the amount of participation allowed by the supervisor and the amount desired by the subordinate. While little or no research has been done on the second factor, numerous efforts have been made to obtain a positive correlation between the amount of participation allowed and employee satisfaction. These efforts, directly concerned with job satisfaction, have produced conflicting results. Research has found only partial support for a positive relationship between participation and job satisfaction (Coch & French, 1948; Lawler & Hackman, 1969). Findings by Vroom (1964), Falcione (1974), and later by Harrison (1981) show a significant relationship. While decision-participation appears to be a factor of job satisfaction, a discrepancy between the amount desired by subordinates appears to be negatively related to their satisfaction.

A digest of research findings in the discipline of organizational communication was compiled by Goldhaber, Yates, Porter, and Lesniak (1978). Their review focused on three areas: (1) historical overview of the major findings from North America and Europe, (2) major findings from the International Communication Association (ICA) audit, and (3) implications of all major findings for future research. The following findings are based on a
review of articles that used the ICA audit (Goldhaber et al., 1978):

1. Most employees want to receive, more than send, information.

2. Employees desire much job-related information from supervisors and more organizational information from top management.

3. Information from top management is of lower quality than from other key sources, and employees would like more face-to-face information with top management.

4. Employees seem to receive less than adequate information regarding reasons for changes of innovation, the relative performance of their organization or department opportunities for advancement and the financial health of the organization.

5. Employees like working and enjoy healthy interpersonal relationships built upon trust with those closest to them.

6. The greater the distance between communication sources and receivers in organizations, the less information received, the less opportunity to request information, the less follow-up, the poorer the information quality and the greater the grapevine communication.

7. Immediate supervisors and co-workers are the most trusted, most valued as sources, and most often turned to for information. The supervisor also is the most important link within the organization hierarchy and acts as a direct mediator of rewards and sanctions for the individual. (p. 94)

These findings indicate that employees desire information about their work environment, and enjoy interpersonal relationships with supervisors, co-workers, and top management.

One of the most important decisions a manager must
make in organizations is that of determining effective communication strategies to influence subordinates (Recciello & Trenholm, 1983). If the influence techniques can be determined then communication between supervisor and subordinate should be more effective, which should in turn lead to reduced conflict and increased subordinate motivation and satisfaction (Richmond, Davis, Saylor, & McCroskey, 1984).

A number of organizational variables have been found to impact employee satisfaction with one significant variable receiving little attention—power. The source of power an individual chooses to employ is reflected in the communication behavior of that individual (Richmond & McCroskey, 1983). Literature suggests that communication between supervisor and subordinate has an impact on subordinate satisfaction (Falcione, McCroskey, & Daly, 1977; Richmond & McCroskey, 1979; Richmond et al., 1984). More specifically, employee's perceptions of the communication behavior of their supervisors have a significant impact on their satisfaction. Two hundred elementary and secondary teachers were the subject of research to verify this position (Richmond et al, 1984). The results of this study using the Behavior Alteration Techniques (TATs) and Messages (BAMs) instrument developed by Kearney, Plax, Richmond, and McCroskey (1983), indicated that teachers use of the BATs with their supervisors is most associated
with their satisfaction with supervision and the proportion of significant associations with work and position satisfaction were only slightly better than chance. Although supervisors may treat satisfied subordinates differently from dissatisfied subordinates, it seems reasonable to conclude that supervisors' use of some BATs leads to less subordinate satisfaction (Richmond et al., 1984).

When investigating the relationship of bureaucratic structure to communication satisfaction of teachers, Moore (cited in Goldhaber et al., 1978) found respondents in authoritarian schools more satisfied with communication than they were dissatisfied. Findings also indicated that teachers were less satisfied with the seven components of communication satisfaction, from the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) than were teachers in professional schools. They were significantly less satisfied with organizational integration, communication with supervisors, communication climate, horizontal communication, and media quality. Respondents working in authoritarian schools were also less satisfied with general organizational perspective and personal feedback than were teachers in professional schools (Moore, cited in Goldhaber et al., 1978). The study produced results which concluded that teachers in schools with professional bureaucratic structure are more satisfied with communication than are
teachers in authoritarian schools.

Communication variables that relate to teacher job satisfaction are consistent with those found in other organizational settings. The communication needs of the individual appear to be related to the level of communication satisfaction, communication satisfaction appears to be related to overall job satisfaction, and each school has its own unique sanctions and mores regarding organizational communication are some of the principals that run parallel in both bodies of literature and research (Gould, 1982; Lee, 1983).

Summary

Teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction has long been an area of intense interest to educational researchers in school personnel management. Some of the dimensions of job satisfaction found in the Teacher Satisfaction Survey, developed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, parallel the aspects of job satisfaction in other organizational settings and others are found in a slightly different context (Schmitt & Loher, 1986). The contents of this summary will provide an overall perspective found in the review of literature.

Employees' satisfaction with their supervisor(s) is based on the perceived behavior demonstrated by a particular superordinate—either task oriented or relation
oriented. Workers tend to be more satisfied with leaders who demonstrate behaviors that are considerate and supportive rather than indifferent and hostile. Even though literature supports this concept, one must be aware that individuals do differ in their preferences. The amount of employee participation was also found to affect their job satisfaction with their supervisor. Variables that will affect this relationship are the amount of desire and ability of the employee, the type of decision, the personality and needs of the subordinate, and the trust they have in their supervisor.

Teacher satisfaction with their supervisor parallels the findings found in other organization settings. Supervisory behavior that promotes an environment which allows autonomy in making decisions, increases individual responsibility in developing and implementing teaching programs, and stresses professional skill development will enhance job satisfaction for teachers.

Pay is the job characteristic most likely to be a source of employee dissatisfaction if not perceived as being equitable. Employees' pay satisfaction can be based on both the equity and discrepancy theories. They judge their pay by making social comparisons and appraise their compensation in terms of the perceived discrepancy between it and the minimum pay required to fulfill their present wants and needs.
Compensation as a motivational factor in job satisfaction has been met with little response in teacher self-reports, and falls into the category of extrinsic hygiene factors detailed by Herzberg (1966). Pay is one of the bi-polar factors that lead to job satisfaction when perceived by teachers as equitable, but a contributor to dissatisfaction when lacking.

Satisfaction with opportunities for advancement is viewed like pay, a function of the frequency of promotion in relation to what is desired and the importance to the individual. Advancement is a strong determiner of job satisfaction and has great importance for lasting changes of employee attitudes.

In education, advancement is infrequently mentioned by teachers as a major source of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction due to the lack of opportunities in the teaching profession for upward mobility. In spite of the lack of emphasis teachers place on this dimension of job satisfaction, they do perceive it as a contributor to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. If promotional opportunities are available for them, job satisfaction will result. Failure to maintain these opportunities will result in teacher dissatisfaction.

Agents is the category used in this research to parallel the study of teacher satisfaction with students and student discipline. Literature supports and provides
evidence that job satisfaction with respect to agents (customers and clients) is based on defensive bias. Individuals give themselves credit for satisfying events that occur at work more often than accepting blame for dissatisfying events, which is projected to nonself agents. Opportunities for other persons to cause dissatisfaction are greater than their opportunities to cause satisfaction.

Psychic rewards, which Lortie (1975) has specified as task-related outcomes, derived from the teaching job itself and the pleasure of working with children are far more important to educators than extrinsic rewards. When teachers have good relationships with students, job satisfaction is not necessarily the outcome, but poor student relationships can be a source of job dissatisfaction.

Student discipline can be a source of job dissatisfaction if it continually disrupts classroom activities. Disruptive students, along with other factors such as excess paper work, decreases teaching time which teachers derive the most satisfaction from. One of the top four reasons why individuals leave the teaching profession was the lack of quality teaching time, free from discipline problems and interruptions.

Opportunities to use one's skills and abilities, opportunity for new learning, creativity, variety, difficulty, amount of work, responsibility, nonarbitrary
pressure for performance, work autonomy, job enrichment, and complexity are some of the work attributes that have been found to be related to job satisfaction. Jobs that provide workers with a feeling of responsibility for a meaningful portion of their work, provide work outcomes which are intrinsically meaningful and worthwhile, and provide feedback about performance effectiveness are central in developing a congruence between individual need satisfaction and organizational goal achievement. Work itself is the intrinsic factor that is the major source of job satisfaction.

The work itself factor for teachers is high in satisfaction potential, but can be a source of dissatisfaction. Due to the nature of the teachers' job, which includes maintenance type of activities (attendance, scheduling, and details) work can appear as a bi-polar factor of teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Satisfaction occurs when teachers are involved in activities that involve and have an educational impact on their students and dissatisfaction precipitates as a result of activities which directly interfere with these activities.

Another source of job dissatisfaction for teachers is the lack of their control over curriculum and their role of instructional specialist. They view administrators as interfering with their area of expertise by imposing regulations and specific curriculum guidelines developed
at the central office level.

Social interaction is one of the basic lower order needs professed by Maslow (1970) and has been a major factor of job satisfaction. Isolation from co-workers has demoralizing effects and individuals who experience this isolation have been found to be less satisfied with their jobs than others.

The structural form of the school organization and the rigid time schedules followed by teachers dictate their day allowing only minimal interaction with their colleagues. They prefer an arrangement that is conducive to sharing ideas and resources with their co-workers but do not view teacher-teacher interaction a critical aspect of their work life. Emotional support from their colleagues is a vital part of their needs which enhances their sense of self and decreases the amount of job dissatisfaction caused by isolation.

Satisfaction with the community has different implications for individuals working in noneducational institutions than it does for teachers. Community characteristics are used to index frames of reference of the workers and the alternatives available to them in the community. High absentee rates are related to unattractive community features and high performance is related to both personal background and unattractive community features for non-educators. Generally, high job satisfaction is related to
unattractive as well as high satisfaction with pay and high satisfaction with the work done on the job.

Minimal research has been completed on teacher job satisfaction that mentions their satisfaction with the community. Lack of privacy, lack of community involvement, inadequate professional contacts, and unsatisfactory support services, however, were concerns of teachers who worked in small rural communities and were dissatisfied by this isolation factor.

The focus on satisfaction with the community for teachers is not on the physical and cultural aspects, but on the amount of support given to them by both the community and parents. Negative public attitudes toward schools, status of teachers in the community, and lack of parental support are major factors of job dissatisfaction for teachers and have been mentioned as causes for the decreased commitment teachers have to the profession.

Aspects of the physical environment have an influence on employee attitudes and behaviors. In general, they value physical surroundings that are characterized by safety and comfort. Employees prefer a work place that is located close to home, new rather than old buildings, cleanliness, and adequate tools and equipment. The physical environment is consistently found to relate to job satisfaction.

Monetary restraints and budget cuts have made
supplies and equipment availability decrease for many teachers, placing more burden and responsibility on them to fill up every minute of the daily schedule. Consequences from the lack of adequate supplies and lack of revenues to update the existing structures of school building include both an on-going concern for teachers and has precipitated a slight degree of dissatisfaction.

Communication flow pattern, frequency, directional flow of information, and organizational climate contribute significantly to job satisfaction. Other communication variables that have also been found to have an impact on job satisfaction include listening, understanding, quality of communication, open communication, tolerance for disagreement, employees' ability to initiate communication about personal needs and goals, and management communication style.

The communication variables that relate to teacher job satisfaction are consistent with those found in other organizational settings. Individual communication needs are related to the level of communication satisfaction (which in turn) is related to overall job satisfaction. Most schools have a unique communication system limited by its own sanctions and mores and can lead to satisfaction or dissatisfaction based on the needs of the individual or individuals working in that building.

Overall the factors of job satisfaction for teachers
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have a tendency to focus on the work itself, while the dissatisfication factors tended to focus on the conditions of work. It does not appear that a teacher can experience work satisfaction without either altering or eliminating dissatisfiers first.

Leadership Behavior

Definition of Leadership

Historically, leadership has been defined in numerous ways by numerous authors with most definitions containing, at least in part, a common theme—a process of influencing people toward the accomplishment of a goal or task (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Koontz & O'Donnell, 1959; Terry, 1960; Tannebaum, Weschler, & Massarik, 1959). Explicit in these definitions is the concept of dynamic interactions between leaders and followers working toward mutually formulated goals. For the purposes of this study and to remain consistent with recent theorists, leadership will be defined as the process of influencing the activities of an individual or individuals toward the attainment of a specified goal.

Leader Behaviors

Implicit in the definition used in this study is that leaders be concerned about both tasks and human relations. These leadership concerns paralleled two of the earliest
schools of thought in organizational theory—scientific management and human relations. In the former theory, people were manipulated by the leaders much like the machines that were emphasized to increase output. The primary focus in scientific management was meeting organizational goals and not the needs of the individual. In the 1930s the human relations movement was initiated by Mayo (1933). Human feelings and attitudes were taken into consideration when analyzing and developing the organization. The leaders' functions were to facilitate cooperative goal attainment and to provide personal growth and development opportunities.

Concern for task reflected the thoughts and concepts found in the scientific management movement, while the human relations movement placed its emphasis on the concern for relationships. These two concerns were further developed by the following theorists: Blake and Mouton (1964), Fiedler (1966), and Hersey and Blanchard (1982). An overview of the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957) will clarify and provide additional background for the expositions of these theorists.

Ohio State Studies

In 1945 the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University did extensive research in leadership, attempting to identify various dimensions of leader behavior
(Stogdill & Coons, 1957). These studies led to the conclusion that leader behavior can be described by two dimensions—initiating structure and consideration (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957). Initiating structure and consideration were defined by Fleishman (1969) as:

Consideration (c). Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. (p. 1)

Structure (s). Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. (p. 1)

Through the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which gathered data on observed behavior, and the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), self-perceptions that leaders have about their own leadership style, the Ohio State staff found that initiating structure and consideration were two independent behavioral dimensions. The LOQ was used in this study to determine the leadership styles of high school principals.

The Ohio State studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957) concentrated on two theoretical concepts—task accomplishment and the development of personal relationships. Blake and Mouton (1964) incorporated similar language into their schematic, labeled the "managerial grid." The grid is defined into quadrants, each of which identified one of
five different types of leadership based on concern for production (task) and concern for people (relationship). The horizontal axis measures the concern for production, while the vertical axis measures concern for people. The leadership style of an individual can be described by plotting a leaders' behavioral description in terms of their people orientation versus their task orientation. The scales for each orientation range from 0 to 9, thus, a leader's behavior can be described by any numerical combination from 1-1 to 9-0.

Contingency Theory

Extensive research on leadership style as it pertains to task orientation or relationships orientation was also done by Fiedler (1967). His leadership contingency model is based on three major situational variables which seem to determine whether a given situation is favorable to leaders: (1) their personal relations with members of their group (leader-member relations), (2) the degree of structure in the task that their group has been assigned to perform (task structure), and (3) the power and authority that their position provides (position power) (Fiedler, 1967). In his model, Fiedler defined eight possible combinations of these three situational variables that can occur. A leadership situation will fall into one of these eight categories as it varies from high to low on
the three variables. The most favorable situation for leaders is one in which there is good leader-member relations, high position power is possessed by the leader, and there exists high task structure.

In his work, Fiedler (cited in Hersey & Blanchard, 1982) attempted to determine what the most effective leadership style was—task-oriented or relationship-oriented—for each of the eight situations. He concluded that:

1. Task-oriented leaders tend to perform best in group situations that are either very favorable or very unfavorable to the leader.

2. Relationship-oriented leaders tend to perform best in situations that are intermediate in favorableness. (p. 95)

Hersey and Blanchard's Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) developed leadership models using the terms task behavior and relationship behavior to describe concepts similar to consideration and initiating structure found in the Ohio State studies (Stodgill & Coons, 1957). Their basic model is composed of four quadrants, each describing one of four basic leader behaviors—high task and low relationship, high task and high relationship, high relationship and low task, and low relationship and low task.

The model depicts four leadership styles with some combination of task behavior and relationship behavior.
being used to describe a person's leadership style.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) define task behavior and relationship behavior as:

**Task behavior** - The extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do and when, where and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished.

**Relationship behavior** - The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, "psychological strokes" and facilitating behaviors. (p. 96)

Patterned after Reddin's (1967) 3-D Management Style Theory, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) recognized that leadership style interrelates with the situation in which it is used and added an effectiveness dimension to the task behavior and relationship dimensions of the Ohio State Leadership model. They theorized that effective or ineffective use of a particular leadership style is based on its appropriateness to a given situation, with the difference not being based on the actual behavior of the leader but the appropriateness of this behavior to the environment in which it is used (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

**Summary of Leadership Behavior**

From the Ohio State leadership studies, two major leader behaviors were found—consideration and initiating
structure (Stodgill & Coons, 1957). Using the same conceptual framework, Blake and Mouton (1964) developed a managerial grid. An analysis of an individual's leadership style in terms of concern for production (task) and concern for people (relationship) can be accomplished by establishing their position on the grid.

In Fiedler's (1967) contingency theory, a leader's effectiveness depends on the favorableness of the situation for the leader. The favorability is measured in terms of three situational variables—leader-member relations, position power, and task structure.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) paralleled the findings of the Ohio State studies to develop a leadership model in terms of task behavior and relationship behavior. Their model was composed of four quadrants depicting the basic leader behaviors labeled high tasks and low relationship, high relationship and low task, and low relationship and low task. By adding a third dimension of effectiveness, they proposed that the appropriateness of a leader's behavior is based not only on the leadership style being used but the interaction of this style with the environment the leader is operating in.

Relationship Between Literature and Study

Job satisfaction is defined in this review of the literature as one's affective response to various facets
of the work environment (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) and more specifically teacher satisfaction with the nine scales found in the National Association of Secondary School Principal's Teacher Satisfaction Survey. Although the amount of research and literature pertaining to the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and school size is limited, sufficient work has been done to indicate the feasibility of measuring both the satisfaction of high school teachers with the nine scales and the size of the building (based on student enrollment) they work in.

Extensive research has been done in the measurement of both teacher satisfaction or morale (Robinson et al., 1964). One education reform suggested by the work of Coleman (1974), Martin (1974), and Brown (1973) is the creation of small schools, while the results of small-group research indicate group size affects member satisfaction and attitudes. Organizational size affects member satisfaction and participation by setting limits on communication control, role specialization and coordination processes (Indik, 1965).

One purpose of this study is to establish the effects that high school size (based on student enrollment) has on teacher job satisfaction. Inferences have been established by this review of the literature to support these relationships. The conceptual hypothesis is that school size does effect the satisfaction of the teaching staff.
The establishment of this relationship can aid in the future decision-making processes regarding the appropriate size of schools.

The behavior of the supervisor is an important determinant of an employee's job satisfaction, but the relationship between them has been found to be complex and inconsistent in both the research and literature. Scientific management and the human relations movement, proposed by Mayo (1930) in the 1930s, made major contributions that influenced the thinking of behavioral scientists on leader behavior. Concern for task reflected the thoughts and concepts found in scientific management theory, while the human relations movement placed its emphasis on the concern for relationships. These two concerns were further developed by other theorists—Blake and Mouton (1964), Fiedler (1966, and Hersey and Blanchard (1982).

The Ohio State Leadership studies paralleled these same theories and identified consideration and initiating structure as the two dimensions that best described leader behavior (Stodgill & Coons, 1957). Leadership style is any combination of the two, and can be measured by the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ).

Consideration, "behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff" (Halpin,
1959, p. 4), is one behavior that has a predictable effect on employee satisfaction. Subordinates tend to be more satisfied with supervisors who are considerate and supportive rather than indifferent and hostile (Yukl, 1971). Five out of seven studies indicated a strong positive relationship between consideration and employee satisfaction with their supervisor, while the remaining two showed a significant curvilinear relation between consideration and two objective measures of job satisfaction—turnover and grievances (Fleishman & Harris, 1962; Skinner, 1969).

The effects of a task oriented supervisor on subordinate satisfaction have been less predictive. In some studies, employees have been more satisfied with leaders who demonstrate high task-orientation while other studies indicate greater employee satisfaction with leaders who demonstrate low task-oriented behavior (Kerr et al., 1974; Yukl, 1971).

Two additional conceptual hypotheses found in this study are:

1. The leadership style of the principal is related to teacher job satisfaction.

2. There is a relationship between the leadership style of the principal and school size.

The review of the literature supports the first hypothesis while the findings of research on small groups and organizations buttress the thinking of some theorists
that size does effect job satisfaction. One goal of this research is to determine if the leadership style found in different size high schools contributes to the satisfaction level of the teaching staff. The knowledge gained on this topic can, in the future, effect decisions made on the size of school buildings that can be considered effective and enhances employee job satisfaction.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is two-fold—to determine the effects of school size on teacher job satisfaction and to determine the nature of the relationship between both leadership styles and school size and the effects of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. Tests were also made to determine the difference of job satisfaction based on age, sex and ethnicity. This chapter is organized in five sections: (1) the population and sample, (2) the instrumentation used to obtain the data, (3) the design and methodology, (4) the data analysis, and (5) the hypotheses.

Population and Sample

The accessible population for this research is all public high schools in the state of Michigan. A list of 525 high schools was obtained from the College Board's Guide to Secondary Schools (1985) and a random sample was taken to obtain an n of 60 buildings. The list of 60 high schools was generated by using a random number table, matching the selected numbers with the corresponding high school from the College Board's Guide to Secondary Schools.
If a private or parochial school was one of the random numbers, they were omitted and additional numbers were chosen to complete the list. Random sampling methodology provides a normal distribution of high schools of various sizes based on enrollment figures guaranteeing an adequate number of schools for research.

High school is defined as any public educational institution housing at least grades 9-12.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this research were the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Teacher Satisfaction Survey (Halderson et al., 1987) and Fleishman's (1969) Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). The rationale for selecting the Teacher Satisfaction Survey is based not only on the validity and reliability data, but also that 90% of secondary school administrators belong to the NASSP whose staff developed this instrument specifically for use in schools. The rationale for selecting the LOQ is also two fold—the fact that it is intended for self-assessment and the validity and reliability data.

The Teacher Satisfaction Survey

The Teacher Satisfaction Survey was developed by Schmitt and Loher (1986) at Michigan State University. The entire battery of survey instruments in the National
Association of Secondary Principal's Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE), which includes the Teacher Satisfaction Survey, has been given to over 1,500 teachers, 14,600 students, and 4,400 parents during the national pilot study and national study to establish norms. These figures are in addition to pilot studies and field tests conducted during the developmental stages of the instruments. The CASE Task Force based the development of the instruments on an extensive review of literature and the development of a data bank of items found in existing measures of climate and satisfaction in school environments. The task force, therefore, acted as an expert panel in changing the items for the instruments and has determined that the four instruments have high face validity as well as satisfactory psychometric properties (Halderson et al., 1987). The fact that each scale, found in the instruments, is measuring a distinct construct and that the items for each scale were selected by factor analysis established the instruments satisfactory psychometric properties.

The reliability of the Teacher Satisfaction Survey was evaluated in two ways. First, internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) were calculated for each scale based on data from the validation study, providing estimations of the degree to which items in a given scale are similar in their meaning to the respondents.
### Table 1

**NASSP Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE) Internal Consistency Estimates of Reliability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Advancement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and Discipline</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Job Tasks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings, Supplies, &amp; Maint.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1 indicates the number (n) of teachers responding to each question from the 35 representative schools.

The second method is the calculation of the test-retest reliability, not completed at the time of this writing, which will provide an index to estimate the consistency of responses across repeated administrations. Since the data will not be available until the targeted...
date of June 1, 1989, it is not possible to compare the test-retest reliability with the Cronbach's alpha. The time between the test and the retest, however, will be three weeks.

The use of this instrument should be a concern for further research since the printing preempted the completion of all the psychometric analyses.

The Teacher Satisfaction Survey used in the on-going study on effective school climate was developed by Schmitt and Loher (1986), with the assistance of others, based on extensive review of the literature and existing instrumentation from school climate studies. The National Association of Secondary School Principals' Task Force on effective school climates established content validity of the instrument using the following procedures (Halderson et al., 1987). First, several hundred items from various instruments measuring satisfaction in school environments were grouped using the scale titles in the satisfaction instrument. These items established a data bank from which the task force removed or revised redundant and ambiguous items. These procedures produced the first draft of the instrument. School personnel provided input and feedback during the pilot tests and field tests.

The sample of schools for the national pilot study in February of 1985 was purposive, not random. Randomizing techniques were not employed by members of the task force.
so that the sample would include schools from both the public and private sectors, from urban to rural areas, and from each geographic region of the country. A nomination process was used by the task force members to accomplish this objective.

The nomination procedure was initiated by asking each task force member to nominate 8 to 10 senior high and middle level schools for a combined sample of about 50 schools. The end result was the participation of about 22 high schools and 6 middle level schools. Five of the schools that participated were private. The predominate location of the schools was the midwest (15) with only three in the east and one on the west coast.

The sample for the national validation study in November of 1985 was also collected nonrandomly. The regional accrediting associations, representing the four regions of the country—east, south, midwest, and west—were asked to nominate schools to participate. Fifty-four out of more than 90 schools nominated by the regional or state accreditation directors were asked to participate in the validation study. The sample that actually agreed to participate was as follows (Keefe, 1987, Unnumbered):

10 East: 9 high schools (4 private); 1 junior high school

5 South: 4 high schools; 1 junior high

10 Midwest: 5 high schools (1 private); 5 middle/junior high schools; 4 high schools; 1 junior high
10 Midwest: 5 high schools (1 private); 5 middle/junior high schools
10 West: 6 high schools (2 private); 4 middle/junior high schools

A carefully selected random sample of 12 schools was also invited to participate, in addition to the nominated sample. The purpose of this randomization was to check for representativeness on the nonrandom sample. Only two of the random group agreed to participate— one high school in Ohio and one in California. These two schools were added to the existing sample to make a final count of 37 participating schools.

The Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE) instruments were also tested for construct validity. Factor analysis was used to investigate the underlying dimensions of the constructs of satisfaction and climate. This analysis also served as a guide for instrument revision. Items which did not load strongly with a particular factor were either rewritten or dropped from subsequent versions.

**Scoring the Teacher Satisfaction Survey**

The answer sheet for the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey can be scored locally or commercially, by computer and mark-sense scanning equipment. If commercial scoring is preferred, the NASSP should be consulted to identify available resources. Computer programs have been
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developed for both main-frame computers and microcomputers for scoring purposes. The answer sheets used for this research project will be computer scored at Western Michigan University, an NASSP approved sight for such purposes.

If local district scoring is preferred, optical scanners should be used to read data from the answer sheets into the computer. Both data from the Background Information section and the data from the survey responses should be entered. Valid responses for the survey items are "1" through "6." A "6" response may be used for frequency data but should not be used for computing a scale score since this response represents an I don't know how I feel about this aspect of the school, or I don't know whether this statement fits my school answer.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) is a product of the Ohio State Leadership Studies in efforts to determine the dimensions of leader behavior. Through the process of factor analysis, Halpin and Winer (1957) found consideration and structure to have the highest variance (83%) between the four dimensions of consideration, structure, production emphasis, and sensitivity (Gibb, cited in Buros, 1972).

Split-half and test-retest methods were employed for determining reliability. A variety of groups were used
and the scores were found to range from .62 to .89 for the consideration scale and between .79 and .88 for the structure scale. These scores are indicative of a fair degree of reliability for the LOQ (Kirchner, cited in Buros, 1965).

Factor analysis studies have provided evidence that the structure and consideration dimensions are independent (Doppelt, cited in Buros, 1965). Correlation coefficients have been reported for 13 groups, varying from -.23 and .08. These results, along with the item selection procedure used to develop the consideration and structure measures, provides support for the construct validity. Fleishman, the author of the LOQ, states that is necessary to do further validation studies in particular organizations (Doppelt, cited in Buros, 1965).

Kirchner (cited in Buros, 1965), in summation, found:

Overall, this is not a bad instrument. It has been developed through careful statistical techniques. It appears to be reliable, presents good evidence of validity, and presents reasonably good norms. It seems well suited for research activities and training activities, although it is probably not the best thing to use as an evaluative instrument of supervisory performance. (p. 1372).

**Scoring the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ)**

The LOQ is a self-scoring instrument, but will be scored by the researcher for this study. There are five
alternatives for each item that are scored as 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 which is completed automatically by the scoring format. Complete scoring directions are provided in each answer sheet. There are 20 items in each scale yielding a maximum possible score of 80 on each scale with scores generally ranging from 30 to 70 (Fleishman, 1969).

Design and Procedure

After identifying the high schools selected for participation through random sampling, permission was sought from the building principal to conduct the survey. A letter was sent to the building administrator with a self-addressed post card enclosed, which required a participatory or nonparticipatory response. The purpose of the study and the use of the data was included in the initial letter.

Upon receiving permission to conduct this research, the surveys were mailed to the building principals of participating schools, in one packet with directions for collecting data at a faculty meeting. The survey materials were mailed first class and contained a cover letter describing the purpose of the study, directions for conducting the survey, and a self-addressed, return envelope. One member of the instructional staff collected the surveys, placed them in the self-addressed envelope and mailed them from a location outside the building. The
individual charged with this task was given a $2.00 stipend for his or her inconvenience.

Sixty packets were mailed to the schools who agreed to participate in the study. Forty-five packets of survey were returned producing a 75% response rate.

Confidentiality was maintained by coding the return envelope for each school. Upon receipt of the packet, the contents were separated from the envelope and the code numbers used only to identify who has responded. The returns were then mailed to Western Michigan University, the chosen site for data collection and computation by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. The nonrespondents were contacted by telephone urging them to complete the survey.

A Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was included in each packet of surveys with instructions for the principal to complete. An explanation and purpose of the data generated by the LOQ was enclosed. The principal's anonymity was guaranteed by using the same procedures used for teachers. Code numbers on the return envelopes were used solely for identification of respondents and nonrespondents. From the 60 LOQ's mailed, 40 were returned by the building principals producing a 67% return rate.
Hypotheses

Job Satisfaction and School Size

The mean scores for teacher job satisfaction were generated from their responses on the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey. There were nine separate scores corresponding to the nine scales defined in the instrument. Means were then established for each participating school for each of the nine satisfaction scales.

After determining the size of the school, based on enrollment, nine separate hypotheses were established to determine if there were differences in the mean satisfaction scores among small, medium or large high schools. The alternate hypothesis was that the satisfaction means will not be equal among the three sizes of high schools.

Leadership Style and School Size

The conceptual hypothesis stated in Chapter 2 is as follows: There is a relationship between the leadership style of the principal and school size. Leadership style is operationally defined by the principal's mean scores for the consideration and structure dimensions that were generated by their responses on the LOQ. School sizes were already established from the enrollments reported by the participating schools. Code numbers on the LOQ were matched with the code numbers on the Teacher Satisfaction
Survey to determine the size of the school that the principal worked in.

The hypothesis tested using the data from the LOQ and the school enrollments was that leadership style and school size are independent. The alternate hypothesis was that the principal's leadership style as measured by the LOQ was dependent on school size.

Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction

Using the operational definitions for teacher job satisfaction and leadership style, hypotheses were established to determine the effects that leadership style had on teacher job satisfaction. Multifactor analysis of variances was applied using each of the nine satisfaction scales and the two leadership dimensions to find (a) whether there was a difference in satisfaction means under a consideration style of leadership, (b) whether there was a difference in satisfaction means under a structure style of leadership, and (c) whether there was a difference in satisfaction means caused by the combined effects of the consideration and structure style of leadership. The alternate hypothesis for (a) and (b) was that at least one pair or combination of satisfaction means differ while the alternate hypothesis for (c) was that there is a difference among satisfaction means that cannot be attributed to neither the consideration nor the structure dimension. In
other words, there was an interaction between the leadership dimensions.

**Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction**

The demographic variables of age, sex, and ethnicity were operationalized by their responses to the appropriate categories on the Teacher Satisfaction Survey. By using these responses and the satisfaction means of the corresponding demographic variables, hypotheses were established to determine: (a) if there were differences in the mean satisfaction scores between male and female teachers, (b) if there were differences in the mean satisfaction scores among the three different age groups, and (c) if there were differences in the mean satisfaction scores among the different ethnic groups. The alternate hypotheses for (a) was that there was a difference in satisfaction means for male and female teachers. The alternate hypotheses for (b) and (c) respectively was there did exist differences in the satisfaction means between at least two of the different age groups and that at least one pair or combination of satisfaction means for the ethnic groups differs from the rest. Each of the demographic variables was tested using the nine satisfaction scales defined in the Teacher Satisfaction Survey.
Data Analysis

The Teacher Satisfaction Survey generated nine distinct scores which correspond to the nine scales of job satisfaction found in the NASSP's instrument. Means were figured from these scores for each person completing the survey along with the building mean satisfaction score. Analysis of variance was employed to test the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the mean satisfaction scores of teachers (using each of the nine satisfactions scales) among the three sizes of high schools. The alpha level of significance for testing this hypothesis was .05. A comparison depicting the job satisfaction norms of Michigan teachers in different size schools will be made to teachers on a nationwide scale in order to prevent false conclusions from being made if significant differences are found among the three school sizes. In the event differences are found, but the satisfaction means fall into national norms, perhaps the differences are meaningless.

School Size

Teachers were asked to put the student enrollment in the appropriate space on the answer sheet. The enrollments were then listed in chronological order from the highest to the lowest. The list was then divided into thirds, with the top third being classified as large high
schools, the middle third medium high schools, and the bottom third small high schools. Principals were then asked to identify the student enrollment of their building on their answer sheet of the LOQ also. These enrollments were categorized by the same procedure.

**Leadership Style**

The LOQ produced two scores, one for the consideration dimension and the other for the structure dimension. The mean of the principals' scores for each dimension was established. These means were used to develop a grid from which four categories of leadership style were identified: (1) low consideration and low structure, (2) high consideration and low structure, (3) low consideration and high structure, and (4) high consideration and high structure.

Analysis of variance was used to test the hypothesis that there is no difference in the mean satisfaction scores of teachers due to the leadership style of the principal. Chi square was used to test for independence of leadership style and school size.

**Age**

To investigate the demographic variables of age, three intervals were established a priori. Teachers were categorized young if their age fell into the interval $21 \leq n \leq 30$. The interval $31 \leq n \leq 40$ characterized medium
aged teachers and older teachers fell into the category \( n \geq 41 \). Analysis of variance was used to test the null hypothesis, at the .05 alpha level, that there is no difference in the mean satisfaction scores of young, medium aged, and older teachers.

**Sex**

The second demographic variable investigated was sex. Two-tailed tests were used to test the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the mean satisfaction scores of male and female teachers. The alpha level of significance for testing this hypothesis was .05. The same procedure was used to compare each of the nine satisfaction scales.

**Ethnicity**

Respondents were provided six choices of ethnic origins on the answer sheet, established by the authors of the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey (Halderson et al., 1987). The null hypothesis tested was: There is no difference in the mean satisfaction scores for teachers of different races. Analysis of variance will be used to complete this test at an alpha level of .05 using each of the nine satisfaction scales found in the survey instrument.

The Tukey method was used for a post hoc analysis on
the satisfaction scales if differences in the satisfaction means were found among the three sizes of high schools.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this study nine scales of teacher job satisfaction found in the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey were analyzed to determine whether there were significant differences among teachers working in large, mid-size and small high schools. Two additional analyses were performed in this project. First, the chi-square test was used to determine if any particular style of leadership (high consideration/high structure, high consideration/low structure, low consideration/high structure or low consideration/low structure) was found in certain size high schools and second, the nine satisfaction scales were analyzed to determine whether there were significant differences among teachers working for principals with a particular leadership style.

The findings of this research will be reported in three sections of this chapter. The first section will include the general characteristics of the sample, including response rates of both the schools and their principals according to school size. The second section will be the testing of the nine research hypotheses on teacher job satisfaction and school size. A comparison of Michigan
high school teachers' job satisfaction with national norms will be illustrated graphically. The second section will include a discussion of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire comparing national norms with the scores from the responding principals, construction of leadership subgroups, and tests of the remaining hypotheses by statistical analysis. In addition, three demographic variables, age, sex, and ethnicity, will be treated with the same analytical procedures as school size. The chapter is concluded with a summary of the findings.

General Characteristics of the Sample

A random sample was taken from 525 public high schools in the state of Michigan to obtain a sample size of 60 buildings and principals that agreed to participate in this study. Of the 60 packets of surveys mailed to the high schools, 45 high schools returned their Teacher Satisfaction Surveys and 40 principals returned the LOQ. A demographic analysis of the respondents indicated a fairly equal distribution of response according to the size of the high schools (see Tables 2 & 3).
Table 2
Distribution of High Schools Responding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of high schools that returned surveys</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Distribution of Principal Responses According to School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Mid-size</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of principals who returned the LOQ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of respondents</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A follow-up letter was sent approximately one month later. No additional packets were received. Telephone calls to the respondents did not generate any further returns either. Four high school principals provided reasons why participation was not possible at this time—teachers were already involved in the identical survey.
with the NASSP, a change in the building leadership, the principal was extensively involved in a strategic planning program for his entire school district, and due to the school district returning to a core curriculum program, teachers were concerned about their job security. The principal indicated that the insecurity felt by the teachers would not provide a climate conducive for a job satisfaction survey.

Data Analysis and Findings

Teachers Satisfaction and School Size

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the satisfaction scores of teachers among the three sizes of high schools they work in—large, mid-size, or small. The critical value statistic drawn from an F-distribution table was 3.22 for a df of 2 for the numerator and a df of 42 for the denominator. If the test statistic is larger than 3.22, the probability that a Type I error is made by rejecting the null hypothesis is less than .05. If the test statistic is less than 3.22, the null hypothesis is retained which means that the research hypothesis has not been supported.

Administration

The null hypothesis used to test the effects of
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school size on teachers' satisfaction with the administration was that there is no difference in the teachers' mean satisfaction scores among the three school sizes. In testing the hypothesis the observed $F$ did not exceed the critical value ($F = 1.26; p > .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 4).

Table 4
Administration and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>17.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>13.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Compensation

The null hypothesis used to test the effects of school size on teacher satisfaction with their compensation was that there is no difference in the teachers' mean satisfaction scores among the three school sizes. In testing the hypothesis the observed $F$ did not exceed the
critical value \( (F = 2.89; p > .05) \). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 5).

Table 5
Compensation and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Opportunities for Advancement

The next hypothesis, in its null form, stated there would be no differences found in the teachers' mean satisfaction scores for opportunities for advancement among the three sizes of high schools. In testing the hypothesis for the effects of school size on this satisfaction scale, the observed \( F \) did not exceed the critical value \( (F = .26; p > .05) \) and the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 6).
Table 6
Opportunities for Advancement and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Student Responsibility and Discipline

The null hypothesis used to test the effects of school size on teachers' satisfaction with student responsibility and discipline was that there is no difference in the teachers' mean satisfaction scores among the three different sizes of schools. In testing the hypothesis the observed $F$, as shown in Table 7, was nonsignificant ($F = .914; p > .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected.
Table 7

Student Responsibility and Discipline and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source df  MS  \( F \)  \( p \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Curriculum and Job Tasks

The null hypothesis used to test the effects of school size on teachers' satisfaction with curriculum and job tasks was that there is no difference in teachers' satisfaction with curriculum and job tasks among the three different sizes of high schools. In testing the hypothesis the observed \( F \) did not exceed the critical value (\( F = 1.13; \ p > .05 \)). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 8).
Table 8
Curriculum and Job Tasks and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Co-Workers

The next hypothesis, in its null form, stated there would be no difference found in the teachers' mean satisfaction scores with their co-workers among the three sizes of schools. In testing the hypothesis for the effects of school size on this satisfaction scale, the observed $F$ did not exceed the critical value ($F = .435; p > .05$) and the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 9).
Parents and Community

The null hypothesis used to test the effects of school size on teachers' satisfaction with parents and community was that there would be no differences in their mean satisfaction scores among the three different sizes of high schools. In testing the hypothesis the observed $F$ was found significant ($F = 4.76; p > .05$) and the null hypothesis rejected (see Table 10). It appears that teacher satisfaction for this scale decreases as the size of the school decreases. Teachers in large high schools have the highest satisfaction mean followed by teachers in medium size and small high schools respectively.

Using the Tukey Method, a post hoc comparison of the
mean scores for this scale indicated that only the difference between the largest and smallest size schools is significant at the .05 level.

Table 10
Parents and Community School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>15.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source df MS F p

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.54</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

School Buildings, Supplies, and Maintenance

The null hypothesis used to test the effects of school size on teachers' satisfaction with school buildings, supplies and maintenance was that there is no difference in the teachers' mean satisfaction scores among the three school sizes. In testing the hypothesis the observed F did not exceed the critical value (F = 1.33; p > .05). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 11).
Table 11
School Buildings, Supplies and Maintenance and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>16.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source df MS F $p$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Communications

The next hypothesis, in its null form, stated there would be no differences found in the teachers' mean satisfaction scores for communications among the three sizes of high schools. In testing the hypothesis for the effects of school size on this satisfaction scale, the observed $F$ did not exceed the critical value ($F = .349$; $p > .05$) and the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 12).
Table 12
Communications and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source df MS F E .

Between Groups 2 2.53 .349 .707
Within Groups 42 7.27

Alpha = .05

Michigan Teachers' Satisfaction Versus National Norms

Through statistical analysis, differences in teacher satisfaction were found among the three different sizes of high schools for one of the nine satisfaction scales. Large, medium size and small high schools appear to be representative of the national norm groups in that the mean scores of the sample do not deviate from the national mean scores by more than one standard deviation (see Figures 1, 2, & 3). These norms were established by a second national study which was preceded by the three pilot tests, one of which was given nationwide.

These graphic illustrations provide scale means, standard deviations (SD) and standard standardized scale...
## Scale Name | Items | Mean | S.D. | S.S. | Mean | S.D.
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Administration | 1-8 | 25.86 | 4.59 | 46.0 | 28.8 | 6.9
Compensation | 9-13 | 17.75 | 2.38 | 56.0 | 14.7 | 4.7
Opportunities | 14-17 | 9.95 | 1.46 | 47.0 | 10.9 | 3.7
Student Resp. & Disc. | 18-22 | 14.51 | 3.36 | 46.0 | 16.3 | 4.4
Curriculum and Jobs | 23-29 | 24.78 | 2.10 | 48.0 | 25.7 | 4.7
Co-workers | 30-36 | 26.81 | 1.71 | 46.0 | 28.6 | 4.5
Parents and Commun. | 37-42 | 18.56 | 4.61 | 49.0 | 18.9 | 4.8
Building, Supplies | 43-49 | 21.23 | 13.18 | 49.0 | 25.4 | 5.3
Communication | 50-56 | 22.01 | 3.12 | 45.0 | 24.5 | 5.2

 Responses = 561

Figure 1. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Largest Schools, Fall 1987.
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Figures 2


Figure 2. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Mid-Size Schools, Fall 1987.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>School Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Resp. &amp; Disc.</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Jobs</td>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Commun.</td>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Supplies</td>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>50-56</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses = 190

Figure 3. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Smallest Schools, Fall 1987.
scores (SS) of the responding teachers from large, medium and small Michigan high schools. The standardized scale scores (SS) were calculated using a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. A scale score was figured by adding the responses of all respondents to the items included in a given scale and a mean scale score was computed from that data. The scale mean for the norm group was subtracted from the scale mean for the school response group and then divided by the standard deviation of the norm group. The score (z-score) obtained from these computations was multiplied by 10 and 50 added to the total to yield the standardized scale scores. The values for each of these measures is broken down by the nine scales found in the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey and the number of the questions used to score each scale. The last two columns represent the national norm data (means and standard deviations) established by the National Association of Secondary Principals.

The rectangular regions on the graph represent the national norms while the X's depict the scores of the Michigan high schools that responded in this study.

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire Results

National norms were reported for nine groups of supervisory personnel by Fleishman (1969). Under the heading of general supervisory personnel, the national
mean for the consideration score is 53 and the national mean for the structure score is 50. Sixty-two is the mean consideration score, while 42 is the mean structure score reported for educational supervisors.

Principals in general produced a mean consideration score of 56 (estimated standard error of the mean was .80). This score represented a mean 3 points higher than general supervisory personnel and 6 points lower than the national norm for educational supervisors. The mean consideration score for principals of large high schools in the state of Michigan is 55.1, 2.1 points above the mean for general supervisory personnel, but 6.9 points below the national mean consideration of educational supervisors. The same pattern exists for principals of both medium and small Michigan high schools. The mean consideration score for principals of medium size schools is 56.5, 3.5 points higher than the general supervisory personnel yet 5.5 points lower than the national norms for educational supervisors. Principals of small high schools produced a mean consideration score of 56.2, 3.2 points above the general supervisory personnel and 5.8 below the educational supervisory personnel.

Findings for the mean structure score was the reverse for that of consideration. A mean structure score for the sample population was 45.5 (estimated standard error of the mean was 1.01), 4.5 points lower than the national
norm for general supervisory personnel but 3.5 points higher than the mean for educational supervisors. The mean for principals of large high schools was 47.1, 2.9 points lower than general supervisory personnel but 5.1 points higher than the norm for educational supervisors. Medium sized high school principals have a mean of 43.8, 6.2 points lower than the structure mean for general supervisors and 1.8 points higher than the national norm for educational supervisors. Principals of small high schools in the state of Michigan scored a structure mean of 45.6, 4.4 points lower than the national norm for general supervisory personnel, but 3.6 points higher than the mean of educational supervisors.

Principals of high schools in the state of Michigan, in general were lower in consideration but higher in structure when compared to the national norms for educational supervisors; however, when compared to general supervisory personnel nationwide, they were higher in consideration and lower in structure.

Leadership Style

Four subgroups of leadership style can be formed based on the consideration and structure scores taken from the LOQ—high consideration/low structure, high consideration/high structure, low consideration/low structure, and low consideration/high structure (see Figure 4). Since
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part of this research is to determine the relationship between the leadership style of the principal and the nine scales found in the NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey, the means derived from the LOQ for this sample were used to determine the four groups. The LOQ itself does not report a leadership style, but produces two distinct scores, consideration and structure, which can be used to classify individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Consideration</th>
<th>High Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HC/LS)</td>
<td>(HC/HS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Consideration</td>
<td>Low Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LC/LS)</td>
<td>(LC/HS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Leadership Style Subgroups

The consideration and structure means derived from the sample of principals produced four groups (see Table 13). The low consideration/low structure (LC/LS) group produced consideration scores less than 56 and structure scores less than 45.5. Principals having consideration scores higher than 56 and structure scores less than 45.5 formed the high consideration/low structure (HC/LS) group. The group with both a high consideration score above 56, and a high structure score, above 45.5, is the high consideration/high structure (HC/HS) group. The remaining group, low consideration/high structure (LC/HS) included
scores for consideration lower than 56 and structure scores higher than 45.5.

Table 13
Leadership Style Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>High S</th>
<th>School M</th>
<th>Low L</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 40 principals responding, 8 were placed in the LC/LS subgroup, 11 were placed in the HC/LS subgroup, 8 were placed in the HC/HS subgroup, with the remaining 13 being placed in the LC/HS subgroup.

Leadership Styles and School Size

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was used to determine the leadership styles of the responding principals. The nonparametric test, chi square ($x^2$), was used to determine if any of the four leadership styles, high consideration/high structure, high consideration/low structure, low consideration/high structure and low consideration/low structure were predominate in a certain size
high school. The null hypothesis tested was that leadership style is independent of the size of the high school. The initial analysis rendered 12 expected frequencies less than five (see Table 14). Even though the lack of continuity in \( \chi^2 \) distribution, resulting from these small expected frequencies, is of lesser consequence for contingency tables larger than \( 2 \times 2 \) a combination of adjacent rows was used to avoid distorting the data (see Tables 15 & 16).

Table 14

The Relationship Between Leadership Style and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>HC/HS (Frequency)</th>
<th>HC/LS (Frequency)</th>
<th>LC/HS (Frequency)</th>
<th>LC/LS (Frequency)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>4 (4.1)</td>
<td>5 (4.9)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Size</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>4 (4.2)</td>
<td>3 (2.6)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>3 (2.4)</td>
<td>3 (3.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.9)</td>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two tables (15 & 16) represent a combination of leadership styles that had high consideration and low consideration. Of the 40 principals, 19, or 47.5%, had high consideration as part of their leadership style while
21, or 52.5%, had low consideration as part of their leadership style (Table 15). On the other hand, 21 of the 40 principals, or 52.5%, possessed high structure tendencies while 19, or 47.5%, possessed low structure tendencies (Table 16). Since the $x^2$ value was found to be .04 and did not exceed the $x^2$ critical value of 5.99, the null hypothesis was retained for the dimension of consideration. For the structure dimension, the $x^2$ value was found to be .38 and did not exceed the $x^2$ critical value of 5.99. Therefore the null hypothesis was again retained. By retaining the null hypothesis there was no support that indicated that a relationship existed between leadership style and school size.

Table 15
The Relationship Between the Consideration Dimension of Leadership Style and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>High Consideration</th>
<th>Low Consideration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (Frequency)</td>
<td>7 (7.1)</td>
<td>8 (7.9)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Size (Frequency)</td>
<td>6 (6.2)</td>
<td>7 (6.8)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (Frequency)</td>
<td>6 (5.7)</td>
<td>6 (6.3)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 16**  
The Relationship Between the Structure Dimension of Leadership Style and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>High Structure</th>
<th>Low Structure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>8 (7.9)</td>
<td>7 (7.1)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Size</td>
<td>6 (6.8)</td>
<td>7 (6.2)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>7 (6.3)</td>
<td>5 (5.7)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers found under each leadership style represent the number of principals who were found to exhibit that particular style in small, medium or large high schools (observed frequencies). The second number, in parentheses, represents the expected frequency which is determined by the formula:

$$\text{expected frequency} = \frac{fr \times fc}{n}$$

using the marginal totals. For example, in Table 14, three principals with a high consideration/high structure leadership style were found in small high schools while two were found in medium size high schools and three in large high schools. The expected frequencies were determined by multiplying the marginal totals 8 and 15, 8
and 13 and 8 and 12 together and then dividing each product by 40. The remaining parts of the table were constructed using the identical procedure.

Leadership Style and Teacher Satisfaction

Two-way analysis of variance procedures were used to determine the effects of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. The four styles of leadership HC/HS, HC/LS, LC/HS, LC/LS along with the nine scales of satisfaction found in NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey were employed to complete the statistical analysis. The two independent variables were the consideration and structure dimensions of leadership. Each hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance. The critical value statistic drawn from an $F$-distribution table was 4.12 for a $df$ of 1 for the numerator and a $df$ of 34 for the denominator. If the test statistic is larger than 4.12, the probability that a Type I error is made by rejecting the null hypothesis is less than .05. If the test statistic is less than 4.12, the null hypotheses are retained which means that the research hypotheses have not been supported.

After completing the ANOVA test for each of the nine scales of satisfaction and the four styles of leadership, the $F$-ratios observed did not exceed the critical value of $F(4.12)$ for each of the tests (see Tables 17-25). Therefore the null hypotheses were not rejected.
Table 17
Administration and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
Table 18
Compensation and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54.73</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
Table 19

Opportunities for Advancement and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
Table 21
Curriculum and Job Tasks and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.45</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
Table 22

Co-Workers and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.27</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.88</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
Table 23
Parents and Community and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.27</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
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Table 24
Buildings, Supplies and Maintenance and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.88</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.91</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
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Table 25
Communication and Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC/HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC/LS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.18</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC/LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48.88</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Demographic Variables

In addition to school size, the relationship among three demographic variables were investigated—age, sex and ethnicity. They are secondary in this study and should be judged for a recognition that they exist in schools and not for the ramifications they may have on teacher job satisfaction.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the difference of the mean satisfaction scores of teachers among the three age groups—young, medium-aged and older.
The critical value statistic drawn from an F-distribution table was 3.00 for a df of 2 for the numerator and a df of 895 for the denominator. If the test statistic is larger than 3.00 the probability that a Type I error is made by rejecting the null hypothesis is less than .05. If the test statistic is less than 3.00, the null hypothesis is retained which means the hypothesis has not been supported.

The lack of response to the category of ethnicity did not warrant tests to be made and therefore had to be omitted from this study.

Age

Age intervals were established a priori. Teachers were categorized young if their age was found in the interval \( 21 \leq n \leq 30 \). The interval \( 31 \leq n \leq 40 \) characterized medium-aged teachers and older teachers fell into the category \( n > 41 \). Analysis of variance was used to test the null hypothesis, at the .05 alpha level, that there is no difference in the mean satisfaction scores of young, medium aged, and older teachers for all nine scales of satisfaction.

Administration

In testing the null hypothesis that there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for
administration among the three age groups the observed $F$ exceeded the critical value ($F = 8.03; p < .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 26
Administration and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 41$</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\leq 30$</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>419.0</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Compensation

In testing the null hypothesis that there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for compensation among the three age groups the observed $F$ did not exceed the critical value ($F = .43; p > .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 27).
Table 27

Compensation and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 41</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Opportunities for Advancement

When the null hypothesis, there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for opportunities for advancement among young, medium-aged and older teachers, was tested, the observed $F$ exceeded the critical value ($F = 14.8; p < .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 28).
Table 28
Opportunities for Advancement and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>( s^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \geq 41 )</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \leq 30 )</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source  \( df \) | MS  | \( F \) | \( p \)

| Between Groups | 2   | 194.1 | 14.8 | < .001 |
| Within Groups  | 895 | 13.1  |      |        |

Alpha = .05

Student Responsibility and Discipline

The next hypothesis, in its null form, stated there will be no differences found in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for student responsibility and discipline among the three age groups. In testing the hypothesis the observed \( F \) did not exceed the critical value (\( F = .78; p > .05 \)) and therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 29).
**Table 29**

**Student Responsibility and Discipline and Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 41$</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\leq 30$</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

**Curriculum and Job Tasks**

In testing the null hypothesis that there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for curriculum and job tasks among the three age groups, the observed $F$ exceeded the critical value ($F = 3.53; p < .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 30).
Table 30
Curriculum and Job Tasks and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>s²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 41</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Co-Workers

In testing the null hypothesis that there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for co-workers among young, medium-aged and older teachers the observed F exceeded the critical value (F = 4.57; p > .05). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 31).
Table 31
Co-Workers and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 41$</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$31 - 40$</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\leq 30$</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113.7</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Parents and Community

When the null hypothesis, there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for parents and community among the three age groups, was tested the observed $F$ exceeded the critical value ($F = 8.60; p < .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 32).
Table 32
Parents and Community and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>s^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥ 41</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

School Buildings, Supplies, and Maintenance

In testing the null hypothesis that there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for school buildings, supplies and maintenance among the three age groups the observed F did not exceed the critical value (F = 2.15; p > .05). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected (see Table 33).
Table 33
Buildings, Supplies, and Maintenance and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 41$</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt; 30$</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Communications

In testing the null hypotheses that there is no difference in teachers' mean satisfaction scores for communications among the three age groups the observed $F$ exceeded the critical value ($F = 5.55; p < .05$). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected (see Table 34).
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Table 34
Communications and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( s^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \geq 41 )</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>174.9</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Teacher Satisfaction by Sex

As was stated previously, two-tailed t-tests were used instead of ANOVA due to the dichotomous independent variable. The relationship for testing \( H_0: \bar{\mu}_1 = \bar{\mu}_2 \) is the F-ratio computed for analysis of variance is equal to \( t^2 \). ANOVA and the t-test for independent samples provide identical results. The sample size dictated a critical value of 1.96 to be used. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 alpha level. Using the t-test, it was determined that all of the null hypotheses would be rejected except one--there were differences found between male and female teachers' mean satisfaction scores for the compensation scale (see Tables 35-43). Female teachers appear to be
more satisfied with their pay than male teachers.

Table 35
Administration and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Table 36
Compensation and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

Table 37
Opportunities for Advancement and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
### Table 38

**Student Responsibility and Discipline and Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( s^2 )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

### Table 39

**Curriculum and Job Tasks and Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( s^2 )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05

### Table 40

**Co-Workers and Sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( s^2 )</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .05
### Table 41
Parents and Community and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X̄</th>
<th>s²</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alpha = .05**

### Table 42
Buildings, Supplies, and Maintenance and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X̄</th>
<th>s²</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alpha = .05**

### Table 43
Communication and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X̄</th>
<th>s²</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alpha = .05**
Michigan High School Teachers and National Norms (Age and Sex)

Even though differences were found among age groups and between male and female teachers for certain satisfaction scales, young medium-aged and older teachers as well as male and female teachers appear to be representative of the national norm groups in that the mean scores of the sample in this study do not deviate from the national mean scores by more than one standard deviation (see Figures 5-9).

Figures 5-9 provide means, standard deviations (SD) and standard scores (SS) of the responding teachers for both the three different age groups and male and female teachers. The values for each of these measures is broken down by the nine satisfaction scales found in the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey and the number of questions used to score each scale. The last two columns represent the national norm data (means and standard deviations) established by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Halderson et al., 1987).

The rectangular regions on the graph represent the national norms while the X's depict the scores of the Michigan high school teachers that responded in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Resp. &amp; Disc.</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Jobs</td>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Commun.</td>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Supplies</td>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>50-56</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses = 105

Figure 5. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Teachers 21-30 Years Old, Fall 1987.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Resp. &amp; Disc.</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Jobs</td>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Commun.</td>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Supplies</td>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>50-56</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses = 292

Figure 6. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Teachers 31-40 Years Old, Fall 1987.
### Scale Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>School Mean</th>
<th>School S.D.</th>
<th>School S.S.</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>National S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Resp. &amp; Disc.</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Jobs</td>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Commun.</td>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Supplies</td>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>50-56</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses = 501

---

**Figure 7. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Teachers Over 40 Years Old, Fall 1987.**
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Figure 8. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Male Teachers, Fall 1987.
### Scale Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>National S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Resp. &amp; Disc.</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Jobs</td>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Commun.</td>
<td>37-42</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Supplies</td>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>50-56</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses = 533

![Box plot diagram](image)

1. Administration
2. Compensation
3. Opportunities
4. Student Resp. & Disc.
5. Curriculum and Jobs
6. Co-workers
7. Parents and Commun.
8. Building, Supplies
9. Communication

Figure 9. NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey: Female Teachers, Fall 1987.
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Summary

The findings of this descriptive research on the effects of school size and leadership style on teacher job satisfaction have been presented in this chapter. Although differences were found in teacher job satisfaction among school sizes for one of the nine scales found in the NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey (parents and community), Michigan high school teachers' satisfaction levels fell within national norms for all nine scales regardless of the size high school they were teaching in.

The chi-square test was used to investigate the relationship between the leadership style of the principal and school size. There was no evidence found that would support the fact that a relationship exists between leadership style and school size for the population from which the sample in this study was drawn.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the effects of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. No significant differences in any of the nine scales of satisfaction were found in the study to support the research hypothesis that leadership style effects teacher job satisfaction.

Differences in satisfaction means were found in six of the nine scales for teachers of different ages. Young teachers were the most satisfied with the administration, opportunities for advancement, curriculum and job tasks,
and communications, while older teachers were more satisfied with their co-workers and the parents and community. In spite of these findings, Michigan high school teachers in all three age groups appear to be representative of the national norm groups in that the mean scores of the sample did not deviate from the national mean scores by more than one standard deviation.

No significant differences in satisfaction were found between male and female teachers except for the compensation scale. Female teachers were more satisfied with their pay than male teachers. Both genders, again, appear to be representative of the national norm groups in that the mean scores of the sample did not deviate from the national mean scores by more than one standard deviation.

Ethnicity was dropped from the study due to lack of adequate response to warrant a statistical analysis.

Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study, conclusions derived from the findings, and implications for further research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

A summary of the study and conclusions will be contained in this chapter. It will conclude with implications for further research.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of school size and leadership style on teacher job satisfaction.

If school size or leadership style were found to affect teacher job satisfaction then the results of this study could provide meaningful contributions in the following areas: (a) the identification of specific areas that need to be improved to enhance school climate, (b) the provision of information beneficial to school districts when planning future building use, (c) the provision of strategies for changing leader behaviors that would have a positive impact rather than a negative impact on teacher job satisfaction, and (d) the provision of
intervention strategies that can be employed in the work place to increase job satisfaction among specific groups of dissatisfied individuals.

The significance of the study originated from beliefs that teachers were constantly dissatisfied with some aspect of the work place or with the behavior of the principal in certain situations. These observations initiated the questions about the dissatisfaction being unique to certain size schools and about certain leadership behaviors causing the negative feelings of the teaching staff.

Review of Pertinent Literature

The satisfaction and dissatisfaction of both teachers and specific educator groups has historically been an area of intense interest to researchers in education. As late as 1982, when a task force was established by the National Association of Secondary School Principals to study effective school climate, teacher job satisfaction was considered a primary component of the school environment.

Literature pertaining to school size was found to be very limited but the results of small-group research indicated that group size affects member satisfaction and attitudes, while organizational behavior research indicates that group size may affect these outcomes only indirectly. Additional literature provided evidence that
organizational size affects member participation and satisfaction by setting limits on communication, control, role specialization and coordination processes.

The leadership style of a supervisor has been found to be an important determinant of an employee's job satisfaction. Complex and inconsistent best describe the literature that has been attempted to find the relationship between leader characteristics and subordinant satisfaction. Most authorities in educational research agreed, however, that administrator behavior was found to be a direct factor of job satisfaction for teachers. Their behavior is one of the factors relating to the condition of work that is a necessary component in promoting an environment which will enhance job satisfaction for teachers.

Along with the definitions of job satisfaction, school size and leadership, the following topics were covered in detail in the review of the literature: (a) satisfaction with administration; (b) satisfaction with compensation; (c) satisfaction with opportunities for advancement; (d) satisfaction with students and student discipline; (e) satisfaction with curriculum and job tasks; (f) satisfaction with co-workers; (g) satisfaction with parents and community; (h) satisfaction with school buildings, supplies and maintenance; and (i) satisfaction with communications. In addition, three conceptual
frame-works on leadership behavior were synthesized—The Ohio State studies (Stodgill & Coons, 1957), Fiedler's (1966) Contingency Theory, and Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model.

**Design and Methodology**

To determine the effects of school size and leadership style on teacher job satisfaction and to determine the relationship between leadership style and school size, two instruments were used—the National Association of Secondary School Principals' (NASSP) Teacher Satisfaction Survey and the Leader Opinion Questionnaire. The first instrument is subdivided into the nine scales of satisfaction covered in the Review of the Literature while the second is a self-assessment of an individual's leadership style.

The accessible population for this research was all public high schools in the state of Michigan. A random sample was taken to obtain an n of 60 high schools. The principals of those buildings were the sample used to study leadership behavior.

After the high schools were selected, permission was sought from the building principal to conduct the survey. Upon obtaining permission, the survey materials were mailed to the building administrators along with directions for collecting the data at a faculty meeting.
Confidentiality was maintained by coding the return envelopes. Four weeks after the initial mailing of surveys, a follow-up letter was sent as a reminder. Approximately two weeks later, a personal telephone call was made to each of the principals who had not responded to either the first mailing and the follow-up letter.

Findings

The findings of the study were obtained through an analysis of the obtained data reported by teachers in 45 high schools (75%) and the 40 principals (66.7%) who responded to the questionnaires.

A list of findings is as follows:

1. Nine null hypotheses were tested at the .05 alpha level to determine the effects of school size on teacher job satisfaction. The results indicated that one of the nine scales of satisfaction was affected by school size—parents and community. A post hoc comparison (Tukey Method) of the mean scores for this scale showed that only the difference between the largest and smallest size schools is significant at the .05 level. The eight dependent measures not effected by school size were administration, compensation, student responsibility and discipline, opportunities for advancement, curriculum and job tasks, co-workers, buildings, supplies and maintenance and communication. In spite of these results, the
satisfaction levels of Michigan high school teachers fell within national norms for all nine scales, regardless of the size high school they were teaching in.

2. Using the chi-square test, no evidence was found that would support the fact that a relationship exists between leadership style and school size for the population from which the sample in the study was drawn.

3. Nine null hypotheses were also tested at the .05 alpha level to determine the effects of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction—one for each scale in NASSP's Teacher Satisfaction Survey. Through the use of ANOVA, no significant differences were found between satisfaction means for teachers working under principals with one of the four leadership styles—high consideration/high structure, high consideration/low structure, low consideration/high structure or low consideration/low structure. Therefore there is no evidence to support the hypothesis that leadership style effects teacher job satisfaction in this study.

4. The results of nine hypotheses tested to determine differences in satisfaction between various age groups of teachers indicated that six of the nine scales were effected. Young teachers were the most satisfied with the administration, opportunities for advancement, curriculum and job tasks, and communications. Older teachers were more satisfied with their co-workers and the
parents and community. In spite of these findings, Michigan high school teachers in all three age groups fell within the national satisfaction norms.

5. Differences in satisfaction means between male and female teachers were also sought using nine separate null hypotheses. A significant difference was found for one satisfaction scale—compensation. Female teachers were more satisfied with their compensation than male teachers. Both genders fell within the national norms of satisfaction.

6. Ethnicity was dropped from the study due to the lack of adequate response to warrant a statistical analysis.

Conclusions

The following conclusions appear to be justifiable based on the findings in the study:

1. This study did not support the hypothesis that school size effects teacher satisfaction with their administrator. Selected literature in the area of employee satisfaction indicated a dependency on both the characteristics of the employees and the supervisor with no mention of organization size. Yukl (1971) and Kerr et al., (1974) found employees more satisfied with leaders who demonstrate high task orientation in some studies while greater employee satisfaction with leaders who are low in
2. Pay is a job characteristic most likely to be a source of employee dissatisfaction (Lawler, 1971). In this study satisfaction decreased as the size of the high school decreases. The literature suggests that teachers, both as individuals and as groups, compare their earnings with others in the same district, in other districts, and in other occupations (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1971). The lower satisfaction mean of teachers in smaller high schools may be attributed to their perceptions that neighboring districts are receiving higher pay or that occupations, with similar educational backgrounds, may be causing the decreasing satisfaction mean. Teachers, overall, may still, to some degree, be dissatisfied with their pay regardless where they teach due to the fact that teaching salaries have lost ground in the job market in recent years (Kerr, 1983; Smith, 1983; Sykes, 1983).

3. Advancement as a potential factor for job satisfaction appears to be lost due to the lack of opportunity in the teaching profession for advancement. Teachers may be satisfied with their duties and responsibilities of the classroom and do not desire the increased work load and hours commensurate with an administrative position. Inconsistent with the findings of this study, teachers have been found to be dissatisfied with advancement.
disregarding any demographic variables such as school location, size, county, school level, and district (Lester, 1984).

4. Teacher satisfaction with student responsibility and discipline decreased as the size of the high school decreased. Most findings from studies on teacher job satisfaction consistently indicate that the psychic rewards derived from the teaching job itself and the pleasure of working with children are far more important to educators than extrinsic rewards (Lortie, 1975; Sergiovanni, 1980). Students are the focus of a teacher's work and are considered the raw material for the achievement successes and acts of recognition which teachers perceive as sources of job satisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1967). Teachers in larger schools may not have the awareness of or have the need to be knowledgeable of student problems especially if they are satisfied with the results they are obtaining in their classroom. Schools having smaller enrollments would have difficulty masking behavioral problems due to the close proximity of the staff during working hours and the increased communication networks found in smaller buildings. Increased knowledge of student responsibility (or lack of) and discipline provides more opportunities for teachers to judge their satisfaction or dissatisfaction levels.

5. What teachers do in one setting and in another
can be vastly different. Conditions may also vary from one demographic location to another. Teachers' on-the-job responsibilities vary in significant ways (Richey, 1974). The findings of this study buttress some of the literature as work itself was found to be high in satisfaction potential, but was frequently cited as a source of dissatisfaction for teachers (Sergiovanni, 1980). Specific job constraints that interfered with intrinsic job satisfaction (work itself) were listed by teachers as (a) lack of planning time, (b) tedious paper and clerical work, (c) an out-of-touch and autocratic administrator, (d) disruptive and unmotivated students, (e) extra teaching functions such as faculty meetings and "time wasting" workshops, (f) uncooperative parents, (g) lack of autonomy to prescribe curriculum, (h) feelings of failure, and (i) low occupational prestige (Lortie, 1977; Pagel & Price, 1980).

6. The teaching profession has been considered a lonely profession due to the limited contact with other adults during the school day (Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1971). When this social support is not available, the sense of isolation increases, resentment develops and the stresses of teaching may lead to job dissatisfaction (Farber, 1982). Larger schools may decrease the amount of contacts during the day and may be constructed in such a way that is not conducive for providing teachers opportunities to socialize with their colleagues. The
findings of this research did not parallel the literature as there were no differences in satisfaction means of teachers with their co-workers among the different sizes of high schools.

7. School size may or may not be a contributing factor to teacher satisfaction with parents and community. It did effect the satisfaction of teachers in this study, however, public attitude toward schools, status of teachers in the community and relationships with parents of students have been mentioned as factors having a negative effect on teacher job satisfaction (National Education Association, 1980). Teachers, in general, have been increasingly concerned or dissatisfied with their perceived lack of recognition of their worth in society (Medved, 1982).

8. Teachers have constantly been subject to financial burdens which are worsening rapidly (Dubrin, 1979). Shrinking public school budgets as well as decreasing or nonexistent state revenues, combined with tighter fiscal policies have become the norm rather than the exception in Michigan. For these reasons deep cuts have been made into school supplies, equipment, building programs and maintenance. These factors affect all sizes of schools. They are not limited to large, medium-size or small school districts.

9. Communication variables that relate to teacher
job satisfaction are consistent with those found in other organizational settings. The communication needs of the individual appear to be related to the level of communication satisfaction, communication satisfaction appears to be related to overall job satisfaction, and each school has its own unique sanctions and mores regarding organizational communication (Gould, 1982; Lee, 1983). This study does not support this relationship as school size was found not to affect the satisfaction of teachers with communication.

10. The behavior of a supervisor is an important determinant of employee job satisfaction. The relationship between leader characteristics and subordinate satisfaction is complex and inconsistent; however, employees appear to be more satisfied with leaders who demonstrate behaviors that are considerate and supportive rather than indifferent and hostile (Yukl, 1971). Even though workers tend to be more satisfied with leaders who have these behaviors, individuals do differ in their preference. Some consider task-oriented supervisors more satisfying to work for due to their commitment to job completion. The inconsistencies found in the literature are also found in the results of this study. The leadership style of the principal did not effect the satisfaction of teachers with them.

11. Pay is a bi-polar factor that leads to job
satisfaction when perceived by teachers as equitable, but a contributor to dissatisfaction when lacking (Herzberg et al., 1959; Lester, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1967). Principals normally do not have any input towards determining the compensation levels of the teaching staff. Therefore their leadership style would not appear to affect teachers' satisfaction with their pay—the findings of this research.

12. Advancement is infrequently mentioned by teachers as a major source of satisfaction or dissatisfaction due to the lack of opportunities in the teaching profession for upward mobility. Teachers perceive it as contributing to both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Sergiovanni, 1967).

13. If classrooms are continually being disrupted by student discipline problems, quality teaching time is decreased which teachers derive the most satisfaction from. The leadership style of the principal may or may not influence the discipline that takes place in a given building. Support from the instructional staff as well as from central office and the community are prerequisites for effective discipline programs. Regardless of style, the principal must cultivate and maintain a school climate conducive to effective teaching—free from interruption and frequent discipline problems.

14. Teaching itself and the pleasure of working with
children are far more important to teachers than extrinsic rewards, such as pay (Lortie, 1979; Sergiovanni, 1980). One specific job constraint mentioned by teachers that interferes with this intrinsic job satisfaction is an out-of-touch and autocratic administration (Pagel & Price, 1980). This constraint is a reflection of a perceived leadership style of the principal. If building leaders are concerned with both task accomplishment and human relations and can achieve a balance between them, they will impact the satisfaction of teachers with the curriculum and their job tasks.

15. The structural form of the school organization and the rigid time schedules that dictate the teacher's day allow only marginal interaction with their colleagues (Lortie, 1975). Leaders with relationship behavior are concerned with developing personal relationships with themselves and their staff. They have a concern for people. In they extend their concern to enhance relationships between co-workers, their leadership style could affect the satisfaction of teachers with other members of the staff which is inconsistent with the findings of this study that indicated that the leadership style of the principal did not effect teacher satisfaction with their co-workers.

16. Part of a building administrator's responsibility is to solicit parent and community support
for both their school and school district. If they are concerned about their staff and support them, they will portray a positive image of them to the parents and the community. This behavior is characteristic of leader behavior with consideration qualities and may influence teacher satisfaction levels with the parents; however, if the students of a teacher are experiencing success, the parents of those children will react in a positive and supportive manner in spite of the principal's actions. Research and literature buttress the fact that teachers, in general, are concerned and dissatisfied with the support they receive from parents and community (National Education Association, 1980), but does not mention the leadership style of the principal as an influencing factor.

17. Principals, as well as teachers, realize the impact of the budget cuts and shrinking state revenues. Tighter fiscal policies have placed burdens on the administration to accomplish district educational goals with decreasing funds. Even if the leadership style of the principal favored task-orientation they would still have the chore of budgeting funds to the teachers to facilitate their instructional programs. In many cases, the principal lacks control over the amount of financial support they receive to purchase supplies, and maintain their programs and buildings regardless of their leadership
style.

18. Supervisors and co-workers are integral factors to the satisfaction of employees with organizational communications (Goldharber et al., 1978). They are the most trusted, most valued as sources, and most often turned to for information. Principals may be the most important link within the organization hierarchy and act as direct mediators of rewards and sanctions for the teaching staff (Goldharber et al., 1978). They have the responsibility to make decisions that determine effective communication strategies to influence the teachers. A leader will communicate in a manner that is representative of their leadership behavior. Their communication patterns will be characteristic of their orientation—concern for people or a concern for task accomplishment. Therefore the inference would be that the principal's leadership style would effect teacher's satisfaction with communications— inconsistent with the findings of this research.

19. The principal of a high school may first determine how favorable a situation is before using a task-oriented or a relationship-oriented behavior which is theorized by Fiedler. Following Hersey and Blanchard's model, the effectiveness of the principal's leadership style is based on its appropriateness to a given situation. The difference not being based on the actual
behavior of the principal but the appropriateness of this behavior to the environment in which it is used (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Principals, therefore, should choose a leadership style that would be conducive to accomplishing the goals and objectives unique to their schools.

20. Consistent with educational literature, age was one of the demographic variables found to vary satisfaction levels with the supervisor (Medved, 1982). Older teachers, presumably with more tenure than young teachers, may have had contacts with principals that had less than satisfying results for them. They have become mistrusting or skeptical with administrative motives and actions. Younger teachers, on the other hand, may not have had the opportunity to make judgments or build up defenses against an administrator's decisions.

21. Compensation is one aspect of work that an individual teacher has no control over. They are victims of negotiated contracts and will be satisfied or dissatisfied based on the perceived equity of their compensation (Locke, 1969) or based on their spending power and needs (Goodman, 1974). When teachers perceive financial gains being made by other occupations outside the field of education they become dissatisfied. This is compounded by their knowledge that teacher salaries have lost ground in the job market over the years (Kerr, 1983; Sykes, 1983).

22. Older teachers appear to be less satisfied with
opportunities for advancement than the other two age groups. They may have applied for promotions several times during their younger years but for some reason were denied. As they achieved more tenure, the increase in responsibilities, work difficulty, and work hours are no longer desired or will at least be in conflict at the prospect. Younger teachers, on the other hand, need more opportunities to advance within their profession and gain status from teaching as a career (Medved, 1982).

23. Regardless of age, students are the focus of a teacher's work (Sergiovanni, 1967). A good relationship with students is not strong enough to be a source of job satisfaction but can be a source of job dissatisfaction if a poor relationship does exist. Student discipline and responsibility can contribute to teacher satisfaction levels regardless of what age group they fall in—older, medium-age or younger.

24. Teachers derive the most satisfaction from work-centered activity. Teaching is a complex job and not easily defined by a set of specific duties characteristic of teachers at all levels (Jorde, 1984). There are vast differences between what teachers do in one school and another at a different school. Teacher satisfaction with curriculum and job tasks is based on what tasks are commensurate with their assignment and has little if nothing to do with their age.
25. Social aspects of the job have been found to be a major priority for people in regards to job satisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). Satisfaction with co-workers means decreased as the age of the teacher decreased. Perhaps younger teachers have not had the time to establish relationships unlike their older co-workers. Their teaching assignment may be located in their buildings which cause isolation and therefore not conducive for making social contacts.

26. Although differences were found between teacher satisfaction with parents and community among the three age groups, research supports the premise that teachers are generally dissatisfied with the public attitude toward schools, status of teachers in the community, and relationships with parents of students (National Education Association, 1980). This lack of support is one of the five most frequent causes of burnout listed by teachers (deHaas & Raquepaw, 1984; Kyriaco & Sutcliffe, 1978).

27. With public schools being subjected to shrinking budgets and decreasing state aid, teacher's age would not appear to affect their satisfaction with school buildings, supplies and maintenance. Budget cuts have made supplies less available and have decreased expenditures for new buildings as well as renovations and improvements. These factors have placed more burden and responsibility on all teachers, not just a select age group.
28. Employees desire information about their work environment and enjoy interpersonal relationships with supervisors, co-workers, and top management (Goldhaber et al., 1978). Schools have unique communication systems that are limited by their own sanctions and mores (Gould, 1982; Lee, 1983). Satisfaction or dissatisfaction appears to be based on the needs of the individual or individuals working in a given school and not necessarily on any specific age group as the findings of this study may imply.

29. Out of the nine scales of satisfaction, a significant difference was found between males and females and their satisfaction means for one scale—compensation. Female teachers had the highest satisfaction mean. Many women in the teaching profession provide a secondary income for their family. They enjoy working with young people and are very committed to their job. Being under the same contract as their colleagues, the identical financial gain is realized by both males and females without competition from others. Social comparisons with other professionals with the same amount of educational background may cause female teachers to be more satisfied with their pay than male teachers.

In general, both male and female teachers may or may not be satisfied with the nine aspects of the work environment covered in this study. The existence of other
intervening variables, besides sex, is too great to imply any causation of significant differences in the satisfaction levels of teachers.

30. The results of this study of demographic variables and teacher job satisfaction are inconclusive. Beyond the amount of insufficient data, facts and literature to support the findings, teachers in all three age groups as well as both male and female teachers had means that were within the national satisfaction norms.

Summary

The major hypotheses of this study were that school size and leadership style does effect teacher job satisfaction. It was concluded that no support was established for either hypotheses even though differences were found between school size and one of the nine satisfaction scales. Michigan high school teachers, who participated in this study, were found to fall into national teacher satisfaction norms for the variables of school size, age and sex. No significant differences were found between leadership style of the principal and teacher satisfaction means.

Finally, the chi-square test provided no evidence to support the fact that a relationship exists between leadership style and school size in this study.
Recommendations for Future Research

It is not recommended that school size be solely used as a variable to study the effects it has on certain aspects of education except for possibly cost effectiveness and student programs. Even though differences were found among the three sizes of high schools for one of the nine scales of teacher satisfaction, there could exist numerous other variables, such as teacher tenure, teacher-administration relations, climate of labor relations, and demographic location of both the school and school district, that could be affecting satisfaction beyond the size of the school. The fact that the satisfaction of Michigan high school teachers fell within national satisfaction norms, in spite of the differences found in this study, is indicative of the insignificance of size as a variable to investigate.

What might be of greater interest and beneficial for future research is to investigate the satisfaction level of the students. If the complete battery of the National Association of Secondary School Principals CASE instruments are used by individual schools, efforts can be directed toward improving the school climate by all major stake holder groups—teachers, students and parents.

Leadership style could also be investigated in conjunction with student satisfaction. It is recommended, that if research is conducted on this topic, it be limited
to a single aspect of school life such as student discipline. If leadership style of the principal is considered to be situational, multiple variables may contaminate such a study.

One further recommendation for future research is a correlation study between teacher job satisfaction and school size or leadership style and teacher job satisfaction be done. Findings from such a study, in conjunction with the findings of this study, could be beneficial to schools or school districts indicating concern about either of these two areas.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Cover Letter
Dear

Your school has been selected as part of a random sample of Michigan high schools. If you agree to do so, teachers in your school will be asked to complete the NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey.

Data collected will be treated as confidential. All respondents will remain anonymous. No identification will be made of any individual or building in any reporting of data.

The data collected will be used in completion of my dissertation research. I am a doctoral student enrolled at Western Michigan University. Data will also be shared with the NASSP Task Force on Effective School Environments for use in ongoing studies of effective schools.

In addition to the satisfaction survey, you will be asked to fill out the Leader Opinion Questionnaire. The answers given to this instrument will yield a self-perception score of your leadership style. The data will be used to test the leadership style of the principal against school size and against the nine scales of job satisfaction found on the Teacher Satisfaction Survey. All data collected, again, will be treated as confidential. All respondents will remain anonymous.

If you are willing to have your school participate in this study, please complete and return the enclosed post card.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jon C. Haasebrouck
Appendix B

Directions to the Principal for Administering the Teacher Satisfaction Questionnaire
Dear Principal,

The optimal setting to complete the Teacher Satisfaction Survey would be a scheduled faculty meeting (recommended by the authors). By placing survey completion on your agenda, teacher planning time and instructional time will not be interrupted. Collection and return rate will also be enhanced.

At administration time, please use the following format:

1. Distribute an answer sheet, a copy of each instrument, and #2 pencils, if needed, to each respondent.

2. Read (or distribute copies of) the "Administration Directions" (enclosed).

3. Upon completion of the survey, solicit a staff volunteer to collect surveys and answer sheets. A two dollar stipend has been included for this person to place survey materials in the return envelope and mail them outside the building.
Administrative Directions

Procedures:

1. **Purpose:** "The purpose of this meeting is to give you an opportunity to provide some important information to the people who work in your school. We are constantly working to make this a good school, and we need to know how conditions look to you as a teacher."

2. **Materials:** "Each of you should have:
   a. a copy of the Satisfaction Survey for teachers,
   b. an aqua and white machine scorables answer sheet, and
   c. a #2 pencil. The pencil is important: no other marks can be read by the scanner, including, often, those made by a mechanical pencil."

3. **Directions:**
   a. "Please do not write on the survey. All responses will be coded on the answer sheets for machine scoring. Be sure to use a soft, #2 pencil.
   b. You will not be asked to identify yourself individually; however, we do request some information to help us understand the group's answers.
   c. Let's look at the answer sheet together. In the upper right as you lay the sheet out lengthwise, there is a section with the heading "Background Information." Section 1 asks for the school code. For our school, the code is _____.
those numbers in the squares, and then fill in the circle below each box which corresponds with the number. Section 2 asks for sex. Please darken the appropriate circle. Section 3 asks for race. The code is on the surveys. Darken the "1" if you are American Indian, "2" if you are Asian American, "3" if you are Black, "4" if you are Hispanic, "5" if you are White, and "6" if you are other.

Section 4 asks for your role relative to the school - "2" for teacher.

Section 8 is for your age and student enrollment. Please write your age in the first two squares, and then fill in the circle below each box which correspond with the numbers. Please write your student enrollment starting in the fourth square, and then fill in the circle below each box which corresponds with the number.
Appendix C

Letter to the Teachers
Dear Colleagues,

Your high school has been randomly selected from all public high schools in the state of Michigan to participate in a research project. Under the auspices of Western Michigan University, this study has a twofold purpose — to provide data to investigate the nature of the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and school size and to share information with the National Association of Secondary School Principals' task force for their ongoing study of effective school climates.

Your honesty and accuracy when completing the survey will be greatly appreciated and very important to the results of this study. Keep in mind that confidentiality and anonymity will be observed to the fullest during the entire project. One of your staff members will be asked to collect the surveys, place them in an envelope and mail them outside the building to ensure that the information is used exclusively for research purposes.

The code number on the enclosed envelope will be used only to determine what schools have responded. Upon receiving the surveys, the contents will be separated from the envelope so that respondents will not be identified.

Your principal will provide you with directions for completing the survey, which should take less than 10 minutes to complete. Thank you for both your involvement and cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jon C. Haezebruck

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix D

The Teacher Satisfaction Survey
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

188-191, The Teacher Satisfaction Survey
193-195, Leadership Opinion Questionnaire
Appendix F

Human Subjects Approval Form
DIRECTIONS: Please type or print each response - except signatures. Refer to the Western Michigan University Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects to determine the appropriate level of review.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jon C. Haezebrouck

DEPARTMENT: EDLC

Home Phone: (313) 9397970

Office Phone: (313) 6890644

Home Address: 38922 Sutton Dr.

Office Address: 3179 Livernois

Sterling Heights, MI 48310

Troy, MI 48084

PROJECT TITLE: The Relationship Between Teacher Job Satisfaction and School Size

SUBMISSION DATE: PROPOSED PROJECT DATES: June 1986 to June 1987

APPLICATION IS: X New ___ Renewal ___ Continuation ___ Supplement

SOURCE OF FUNDING: None

STUDENT RESEARCH (Fill out if applicable):

Name of Student: Jon Haezebrouck

Phone: 9397970

Address: 38922 Sutton Dr.

Sterling Hts, MI 48310

The research is: ___ Undergraduate Level ___ Graduate Level

Faculty Advisor: Dr. David Cowden

Department: EDLC

Signature of Faculty Advisor: ___________________________

Signature of Investigator: ___________________________

VULNERABLE SUBJECT INVOLVEMENT (Fill out if applicable):

Research involves subjects who are: (check as many as apply)
1. __ children
2. __ mentally retarded persons
3. __ mental health patients
4. __ prisoners
5. __ Other subjects whose life circumstances may interfere with their ability to make free choices in consenting to take part in research
6. __ Other subjects whose life circumstances may interfere with their ability to make free choices in consenting to take part in research

(Describe)
LEVEL OF REVIEW: Please indicate here if you think that the research project is exempt from review, subject to expedited review, or subject to full review.

- ☑️ Exempt (Forward 1 application to IRB Chair)
- Which category of exemption applies? ☑️ 163
- ☑️ Expedited (Forward 1 applications to IRB Chair)
- ☑️ Subject to full IRB review (Forward 2 applications to IRB Chair)

Comments:

Your application was reviewed and the Human Subject Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) has determined that:

1. The proposed activities, subject to any conditions and/or restrictions indicated in Remarks below, have (a) provided adequate safeguards to protect the rights and welfare of human subjects involved, (b) established appropriate procedures and/or documents to obtain informed consent, and (c) demonstrated that the potential benefits of the research substantially outweigh the risks.

2. The proposed activities, for reasons indicated in Remarks below do not provide adequate protection for the rights and welfare of the human subjects.

At its meeting on __________, the HSIRB (approved) (provisionally approved... see remarks) this application with regard to the treatment of human subjects. The HSIRB categorized this application as:

- ☑️ 1. Involving subjects at no more than minimal risk.
- ☑️ 2. Involving subjects at more than minimal risk.

REMARKS:

[Handwritten remarks]

Signature of IRB Chair: __________________________
Date: __________________________
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