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The importance of the role of the elementary school secretary was established along with the findings that job satisfaction may be related to job performance. It was also pointed out that the relationship between job satisfaction and the independent variables that may be related to or influence it have not been identified. This led to the problem of how job satisfaction may be improved and therefore possibly increase performance. Thus, the purpose of this study was to identify those independent variables that may be related to job satisfaction.

Literature regarding job satisfaction varied greatly and was very scarce in terms of this population. This review isolated nine relevant independent variables (amount of supervision, in-service, education, age, seniority, marital status, income, children, and ages of children). Four dependent variables (supervision, work, pay, and promotion) were identified as major component parts of job satisfaction.

A population of 210 public elementary school secretaries was drawn from four southwestern Michigan counties resulting in a return rate of 85%. The Job Description Index (JDI) was utilized to measure the four job satisfaction variables. A total of 54 points (median =
27) was possible for each variable. A demographic questionnaire was used to obtain data regarding the nine independent variables.

The interrelationship between family, personal, and school information with intrinsic and extrinsic areas of job satisfaction were the main areas of investigation. The \( t \) test, one-way ANOVA, and least square difference post hoc analysis were used to measure the interrelationships at the .05 level of significance.

Overall satisfaction with work and supervision were moderate to high, while satisfaction with pay and promotion were low. Little support was found for the 36 hypotheses. Statistical support was found in the relationship between work and in-service; pay and age and importance of salary; promotion and in-service as well as education. However, meaningful support was applicable only to the relationship between work and in-service.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

Introduction

Wells and Plate (1960) attributed improved teaching morale of a school system staff to the assistance received from the school secretaries and clerical staff. They specifically cited areas of assistance from the school secretaries and how teacher morale was positively influenced. Roe (1964) and Riley (1967) referred to the elementary school secretary as the office worker, administrative right hand, mother away from home, and public relations officer. White (1969) pointed out the human relations aspect that enters into the role of the elementary school secretary. She demonstrated how this role can be used daily to enhance the self-image of students. Therefore, secretaries play an important role in schools.

However, there is considerable uncertainty about the factors that contribute to their job satisfaction (Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison, & Pinneau, 1975). Their job satisfaction is important since it is related to turnover (Smith, 1965) and job performance (McLean, 1974). Also, research in the behavioral sciences attest to the high interest paid to the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Kesselman, Wood, & Hagen, 1974; Latham & Yukl, 1976). What seems to be common sense reasoning would direct most individuals to the belief that high job satisfaction will undoubtedly
lead to high job performance is, in fact, not clearly evident.

Contrary to the popular belief or the "common sense" approach, Brayfield and Crockett (1955) concluded that they found no significant relationship between morale and performance on the job. They reached this conclusion based on a review of the literature and an examination of how morale was usually measured. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Copwell (1957) discussed the relationship from the standpoint that you can accurately predict high job production given high satisfaction but you cannot as accurately predict low production given low satisfaction.

Athanasiou (1969), going beyond job performance and citing a 1959 study by Herzberg et al., attempted to clarify the job satisfaction problem by demonstrating that job satisfaction was a distinct dichotomy: the job content factors (intrinsic values) of achievement, recognition, and responsibility seem to contribute to job satisfaction while a deficiency of the context factors (extrinsic values) of pay, hours, and supervisory practices contribute to job dissatisfaction. Thus, the two factors function relatively independent of each other. The "theory" set forth by Herzberg et al. was that a deficit of intrinsic factors can reduce satisfaction but a surplus of extrinsic factors would not necessarily increase satisfaction.

Athanasiou (1969, p. 84) went on to cite Burke's 1966 review of the literature which offered another interpretation. Here, Burke summarized this review by concluding that you cannot separate extrinsic and intrinsic variables as was suggested by the 1959 work of Herzberg et al.
Vroom's (cited in Athanasiou, 1969) contribution to this investigation was to offer yet another suggestion as a result of Herzberg's earlier studies. Vroom concluded that nonpathological personality factors which interact with environmental factors might reasonably be expected to account for significantly more variance in the prediction of job satisfaction than either one (factor) alone.

Statement of the Problem

Generally, there is little doubt that the study of job satisfaction is indeed complex. Also, the elementary school secretary, as a contributor to school quality may be affected in his/her performance by their level of job satisfaction. It thus follows that herein lies the problem that the practitioner (supervisor, administrator, and/or principal) should be aware of what influences the job satisfaction of this population but he/she does not because the variables have not yet been identified. Therefore, the purpose of this study is intended to identify the independent variables that influence job satisfaction. In future studies, the relationship of job satisfaction with job productivity, for this population, may be examined. This progression of research will lead us to a better understanding of ways to enhance job productivity.

Rationale and Significance of the Study

The specific role of the elementary school secretary was selected for study due to its importance and for better control of extraneous variables that could possibly alter job satisfaction at
various other secretarial levels (i.e., secondary, college, university). Also, following an extensive review of the literature found in the Psychological Abstracts, Education Index, Business Periodical Index, Dissertation Abstracts, Social Sciences Index, and use of the On-Line Automated Reference Service, it was found that the role of the elementary school secretary has received very little discussion or research, especially in the area of job satisfaction. This is surprising in view of the fact that the practitioner (supervisor, administrator, and/or principal) generally views this role as one of critical importance. Also job satisfaction as it relates to any role has been demonstrated to be very complex in determining its relationship to performance in that role. Therefore, these two areas of sparse knowledge appear to be appropriate for scientific research and investigation.

Additional significance is found in the reciprocal nature of influence between the leader and subordinate. There has been considerable discussion (Boles & Davenport, 1975; McGee, 1971; Stoops, 1963) regarding the influences of leadership style and behavior on subordinates, but there is also evidence (Fiore, 1971; Greene, 1975; Herold, 1974; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Hilgendorf & Irving, 1969) that subordinate style and behavior influences leaders. By increasing the awareness of leaders as to which variables influence job satisfaction and perhaps increase positive job performance, they may also be able to determine which of these variables enhance their leadership styles or find leadership areas that are in need of alteration.
The results of this study could additionally be used to identify variables that significantly influence the job satisfaction of the elementary school secretary and, therefore, assist those who must make decisions used in the selection, improvement, or development of this role. These decisions could then be used on the individual level or have implications toward local school district policy regarding the elementary school secretaries. There are also several reasons why as many alternatives to job satisfaction other than the usual pay incentive would be desirable: declining enrollments, the resulting change of staffing patterns (i.e., reduction of full-time principals), the inevitable increase in secretarial responsibilities, and the current state of the economy. Reduction of turnover would also be a desirable outcome of such a study. However, with these uses in mind, limitations of this study should also be stated.

Limitation of the Study

Several things will limit the conclusions that may be drawn from this study. First, all intervening variables cannot be identified, measured, or controlled. Only selected independent variables will be studied. These will be selected according to the potential they appear to have to influence job satisfaction. This potential will be judged from reviews of previous research.

Some of the variables that will not be studied but logically influence job satisfaction are: the current status of the job market, the economy of the country, geographic norms or influence on the role of the elementary school secretary, individual personality
characteristics of the elementary school secretary, and health factors. Reasons for not studying these variables are time, expense, resources, and other types of research necessary to explore such variables.

The findings should be considered associative rather than causal. No causal claims can be made from the correlational investigation that is planned because association among variables does not prove causation. Finally, generalizability to groups other than elementary school secretaries will be limited by the degree of similarity of the populations and the validity and reliability of the measures.

Conceptual Framework

Putting all of the component parts of this problem into a conceptual framework developed primarily for use in this study and supported by the work of Selye (1956, 1974) and Caplan et al. (1975) will help to clarify this process.

At the basis of this framework are certain assumptions that can be made by the substantially strong evidence found in the literature while other assumptions are not as clear even though they also received considerable attention from researchers. Specifically, the assumptions include the role of the elementary school secretary as being primarily female as well as being critical to school quality (Stowell, 1974).

Also, the relationship of several job satisfaction variables (pay, promotion, supervision, and work itself) as identified by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) cut across several lines such as
age, occupation, position, education level (Seashore & Taber, 1975), family responsibilities (Kuiper, 1977; Weaver & Holmes, 1975), seniority (Ronen, 1978), in-service training opportunities ("How to Put," 1966), and the amount of supervision (Cook & Shapiro, 1970).

Therefore, what applies to one population may not be sufficient to describe job satisfaction for a different population.

Research also does not clearly show the direct relationship of job satisfaction to job performance (Ivancevich, 1976) but having been able to show a relationship of specific variables to job satisfaction, what does it mean in regard to performance? Based on these inconclusive findings, the practitioner (supervisor, administrator, and/or school principal) appears to try to increase job performance in a trial and error routine. Research does not provide a clear answer and in the midst of all the theoretical information available to the practitioner, there is an absence of a universal theory of job satisfaction (Seashore & Taber, 1975).

In summary, this conceptual framework is an attempt to take all of the above evidence, clear or not so clear, and combine it to lay a foundation for the study of job satisfaction of the elementary school secretary. Hopefully, with additional research, this will provide the practitioner with specific operational methods to increase job performance (see Figure 1). Reference to Figure 2 will provide definitions of the terms used in this framework.

Operationally, the conceptual framework as outlined for this study in Figure 1, and explained in the next section, proposes that several factors (stimuli) lead to either job satisfaction or
Figure 1

Influences on Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

Stimuli (Stressors)

- age
- education
- family responsibilities
- seniority
- in-service training opportunities
- amount of supervision

Response (Stress: Positive, Negative, (Homeostasis))

- Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

Consequences

Performance

Based on Perceptions of:

1. pay
2. promotion
3. supervision
4. work
STRESSOR  Stress producing factors (self, others, environment).

STRESS    A response (physical, psychological, behavioral) to a stressor.

Positive stress: A response which increases performance, i.e., motivation; increase job performance.

Negative stress: a response which decreases job performance.

HOMEOSTASIS  The ability to stay the same or neutral.

PERCEPTION  An individual's interpretation of what is based on judgment of what should be.

JOB SATISFACTION  Positive orientation of an individual towards specific aspects and/or the global work role which he/she is presently occupying. Dissatisfaction would be defined as a negative orientation.

PERFORMANCE  Measured output of the individual based on personal or superior objective or subjective evaluation.

Figure 2
Definitions of Conceptual Framework Terms
dissatisfaction (response) which in turn leads to observable consequence of that response, the performance level of the individual.

Research Questions

Putting all of the component parts of this problem into a conceptual framework developed for use in this study should help to clarify this process. At the basis of this framework are certain assumptions that can be made by the substantially strong evidence found in the literature while other assumptions are not as clear even though they also have received considerable attention from researchers. This section of the framework represents the results of stress research in regard to job satisfaction and a portion of the research results of those who study job satisfaction specifically. The feedback loop from performance (consequences) back to the level of stimuli can also be used to incorporate that portion of the research that suggests performance is the cause of job satisfaction.

The list of stimuli in this framework is a breakdown of the independent variables (age, education, etc.) while the dependent variables are pay, promotion, supervision, and work. It is the interaction or relationships among these variables that become the stimuli (stressors) which precipitate the onset of the response (negative stress, homeostasis or positive stress). The specific stimuli thus lead to a cognitive response state which is described in terms of perceived job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Finally, the observable consequences of such a response are measured in terms of performance on the job which may in itself serve as an additional
source of stimulation setting off the entire chain once again, in a cyclical fashion. However, caution should be exercised at this point. The conceptual framework is by no means exhausted but it is not intended to be. Its purpose is to provide a foundation for this study and possibly future research.

In conclusion, by identifying the independent variables that are related to job satisfaction and improving those that are specifically related to job dissatisfaction, job performance can hopefully be improved. In order to accomplish this task, the research objective of this study will be to attempt to identify the independent variables related to job satisfaction, analyze the relationships, and provide recommendations that will hopefully lead to increased job satisfaction and performance of the elementary school secretary that can be further studied in future research.

Therefore, within this conceptual framework the following research questions have developed:

1. What is the relationship between the amount of supervision and the job satisfaction variables of pay, promotion, supervision, and work?

2. What is the relationship between in-service training opportunities and the job satisfaction variables of pay, promotion, supervision, and work?

3. What is the relationship between education and the job satisfaction variables of pay, promotion, supervision, and work?

4. What is the relationship between age and the job satisfaction variables of pay, promotion, supervision, and work?
5. What is the relationship between seniority and the job satisfaction variables of pay, promotion, supervision, and work?

6. What is the relationship between family responsibilities and the job satisfaction variables of pay, promotion, supervision, and work?

Summary

The importance of the role of the elementary school secretary was established along with the findings that job satisfaction may be related to job performance. Also, it was pointed out that the relationship between job satisfaction and the independent variables that may be related to or influence it have not been identified. This leads to the problem of how job satisfaction may be improved and therefore possibly increase performance. Thus, the purpose of this study is to identify those independent variables that may be related to job satisfaction.

A review of the selected related literature follows.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

There is one central theme that can be found in reviewing the literature regarding job satisfaction: an absence of a universal theory. The literature does, however, reflect a variety of concepts explaining specific aspects of job satisfaction, but nevertheless, no single definition has been accepted. Herzberg (1966) suggested that job satisfaction is the absence of job dissatisfaction. On the other hand, Kalleberg (1977) expanded this definition by concluding that job satisfaction is "an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying" (p. 52). Kuieck (1980) thoroughly summarized this wealth of information in his review of the literature.

Researchers generally agree that job satisfaction is a multifaceted phenomenon. Those authorities believing that job satisfaction is not a static affective state within the worker, but rather a dynamic affective state . . . that is an accommodative process. (p. 16)

Therefore, the job satisfaction identified today may not be identifiable tomorrow. Job satisfaction, then, is not only complex but also transient. Each job satisfaction paradigm such as human resources, human relations, and human rewards utilizes a very different set of assumptions regarding appropriate remedies (Katz & Van Maanen, 1977). What is appropriate for one population, age group, income
level, etc. may not be appropriate in terms of job satisfaction for another population, age group, income level, and so on (Naar, 1978; Ronan, 1970).

In conclusion, Greeneberg (1976), as cited by Kuieck (1980), offered this query:

What then can studies of job satisfaction offer the practitioner, given the various profound differences in approach, the unresolved issues, the empirical difficulties of data collection and the sheer number of variables that affect job satisfaction? (p. xii)

This review attempts to isolate some of those variables (amount of supervision, in-service training opportunities, education level, age, seniority, and family responsibilities), however, job satisfaction literature in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion regarding secretaries in general, and educational secretaries specifically, was very limited. Much of the review was therefore selected from disciplines other than secretaries and education.

Job Satisfaction: Dependent Variables

Supervision

There are several outcomes that have been discovered from the study of the satisfaction of the subordinate with his/her supervisor.

In two separate studies, O'Reilly (1973a, 1973b) concluded that secretaries who felt that their supervisors were very reasonable were significantly more successful than secretaries who felt that their supervisors were less reasonable. In addition, they found that there was a relationship between the secretary's overall attitude toward
her supervisor and success. Secretaries who liked their supervisors were more successful. Firman (1973) later supported these general findings in his study of female secretarial and clerical workers. Here, job satisfaction was measured using the Job Description Index (JDI) and a questionnaire consisting of 29 statements about human behavior. The indication was that a positive relationship existed between the attitude of the supervisor and the behavior of the subordinate (partially measured in terms of subordinate satisfaction with the supervisor) while in yet another variation of the supervisor/subordinate relationship, Stoops (1963) and later McGee (1971) found that supervisors were more successful when they included subordinates (staff) in the development of standards and goals. Increased supervisor success as well as subordinate satisfaction and output were observed when the supervisor represented the desires and purposes of the subordinates.

More specifically, the reciprocal nature of this relationship was examined in two separate investigations (Greene, 1975; Kenis, 1978). The conclusion being that subordinate performance caused changes in leader emphasis on both consideration and structure. Others (Herold, 1973; Kenis, 1978) have found that the level of independence of the subordinate also had a moderating effect on the consideration of the leader. Considerate supervisors were found to be more effective with respect to increasing job satisfaction of subordinates who had a higher need for independence and lower authoritarianism than those subordinates with a need for lower independence and higher authoritarianism. Also, those leaders who were perceived
by the highly independent subordinates to be high in influence were related to higher job satisfaction of the subordinates. Herold (1973) summarized these investigations by providing an interpretation of the findings:

Perhaps the need for independence also expresses a need to influence one's own life by affecting one's outcome in a situation. The considerate, upwardly influential, supervisor can act as a facilitator of this self-determination process and thus satisfy his employees. Conversely, the supervisor who lacks upward influence may attempt to exercise greater control or influence downward. If he does this in a considerate manner he may fill a satisfying, paternalistic role for dependent subordinates while stifling the attempts at self-determination on the part of independent subordinates. (p. 651)

The author suggested further study of follower characteristics as opposed to the emphasis on the leader in leader/follower studies.

Stowell (1974) did precisely that in his study of public elementary school secretaries and their decision patterns in the absence of the principal. He found that there was a variety of response reactions believed to be appropriate under various circumstances in the absence of the principal. The principals preferred delayed action by the secretary in all administrative task areas containing conceptual skills, while on the other hand, they preferred personal action in areas containing technical skills but referred action in nearly three-fourths of the areas containing human skills. The principals and secretaries appeared to be in agreement concerning the type of administrative actions that should be taken in the absence of the principal.

This investigation reflected the critical nature of the relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate. The growing
reality of less supervisory time, increasing responsibilities of those left in charge, and the importance of the subordinates satisfaction with his/her supervisor, in this case the public elementary school secretary, can also be gleaned from this study.

In summary, the satisfaction of the subordinate with his/her supervisor was found to be important; also, the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate was reciprocal in nature and was likewise found to influence attitude, decision making, and job satisfaction. A review of the literature regarding satisfaction with work will be discussed in the next section.

Work

Carrell (1978), in a longitudinal study, found that employees who perceive inequitable treatment from their supervisor or organization will strive to reduce that inequity over time. The point being made was that employees find participation in work and decision making as an integral correlate to their job satisfaction. Along this same vein, Norton (1976), in support of Herzberg's (1966) theory, found that work satisfaction was positively correlated with employee centered management and participation. Prior to this, Dickson (1973), and Kirsch and Lengermann (1972), before him, demonstrated that employee discretion in work situations, rather than mere job rotation or enlargement, was significantly related to job satisfaction. Conversely, lack of control led to an attitude of meaningless work and powerlessness.
Additionally, Beehr, Walsh, and Taber (1976) found a correlation of .51 at the .01 level of significance indicating that role ambiguity and nonparticipation were negatively related to highly valued organization states of effort to do a large quantity of work, effort to do high quality work, and job involvement. Also, through an earlier, but more in depth, study Organ and Greene (1975) dichotomized satisfaction in the areas of specific work satisfaction and general job satisfaction in relation to role ambiguity and external locus of control. They were able to demonstrate a .42 correlation between locus of control and role ambiguity at the .01 level of significance. In turn, role ambiguity was negatively related to work satisfaction ($r = -.30; p < .01$) and general job satisfaction ($r = -.14; p < .01$). These researchers theorized that role ambiguity may elicit negative attitudes that are specific to the task but not generalized to the overall organization. They also suggested that people who are more intrinsically oriented seem to have more knowledge of the world of work and also have a strong belief that they can control their destiny and will be more alert to those aspects of the environment which provide useful information for future behavior and are thus more able to deal with role ambiguity.

In support of this intrinsic orientation toward work and its relationship to job satisfaction, several researchers (Battis, 1978; Schackmuth, 1979; Wood, 1974) indicated that high job (work) involvement acts as a moderator of job satisfaction. Those more intrinsically involved in work will derive greater satisfaction from the performance of the task than will those who are more extrinsically
oriented and therefore rely more heavily on external consequences for job satisfaction.

In summary, employee centered management, reduction of role ambiguity, and high job involvement led to satisfaction with work. Those variables that lead to satisfaction with pay will be discussed next.

**Pay**

Several variations of need fulfillment have been cited by researchers in regard to increasing job performance and job satisfaction in general. Some of these variations include flexibility in work schedule hours (Evans, 1973), perception of self-control, increased ego involvement, and increased self-esteem (Dermer, 1974) and rewards such as recognition and promotion (Battis, 1980; Jacob & Solomon, 1977; Kirsch & Lengerman, 1972; "Rebellion," 1980).

Additional researchers investigated pay as a specific form of reward. Flanagan (1972) and Schoff (1977) found that private sector secretaries were generally displeased with various aspects involved in their job, including pay. These surveys indicated that secretaries perceived the pay they received as inadequate for the type and amount of work performed. Therefore, this need was not being fulfilled.

On the other hand, researchers found additional moderating variables, other than work, that are related to pay as a need satisfier. While part-time employment as compared to full-time employment did not indicate a significant difference in satisfaction with pay
(Miller & Terborg, 1979), Naar (1978) found that in a national survey conducted in the United States, job satisfaction improved steadily with higher family income. Of those families with a combined yearly income of $5,000, only 13% indicated job satisfaction while 27% in the $10,000-$15,000 range indicated job satisfaction with 39% in the $25,000 plus range being satisfied with their jobs.

Dyer and Theriault (1976), while supporting the work of Naar, offered additional insight into the determinants of pay satisfaction in their study involving both male and female employees. This research indicated that the potential for pay to fulfill the need of an employee was based on several factors:

(a) the employee's perception of the amount of pay he/she should receive;
(b) the employee's perception of the amount of pay he/she feels is received;
(c) nonmonetary outcomes from work;
(d) the employee's pay history;
(e) the employee's perception of how others are paid for the same job;
(f) the current cost-of-living;
(g) the employee's financial needs;
(h) the financial condition of the employer.

Conversely, employers have found that regardless of the above findings, pay can be used to increase job performance when it (pay) is contingent upon performance. Shapiro (1975) found that 80% of the employees studied indicated that they exerted significantly more work effort when their pay was based on performance. Kesselman et al.
(1974) found similar results, including greater satisfaction with pay, as measured by the JDI.

Finder (1976), also supportive of Shapiro (1975) and Kesselman et al. (1974), raised the concern that although performance tended to increase with the pay/performance contingent group, those employees whose pay was not contingent upon performance tended to derive more intrinsic orientation from work as well as greater job satisfaction. These findings were thus supportive of Herzberg's (1966) theory that pay is an extrinsic source of need fulfillment that does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction when sufficient but can lead to dissatisfaction when perceived as inadequate by the employee. Shapiro (1975), Weaver and Holmes (1975), and Burton and Pathak (1980) also supported these findings.

Shapiro (1975) stated that pay motivates if it satisfies the individual's needs while Weaver and Holmes (1975) went a step further by showing that in combined family incomes, dissatisfaction with pay only occurred when individual income did not lead to a family income equal to or above the perceived average American family income.

Burton and Pathak (1980) summarized the use of pay as a reward or need satisfier in their research with educational secretaries. They found that pay was not a motivator when this need was perceived as being fulfilled. They cited a situation where the educational secretary's pay was only a supplement to other income and that although: "She may consider financial incentives as important she may also consider her financial need fulfilled as long as her present salary ... meets her family's needs" (p. 25).
In conclusion, pay serves as a motivator only when the need was perceived as not being fulfilled. The amount of pay was not necessarily the deciding factor in terms of perceived need. On the other hand, promotional opportunities may not be as variable in terms of the relationship to job satisfaction. This relationship will therefore be discussed next.

Promotion

While Hilgendorf and Irving (1969) were able to find that a group of secretaries related job security to status, recognition, and opportunities for promotion, Kirsch and Lengeman (1972) theorized that without the opportunity for promotion (when perceived as a need), workers in general may tend to find the work activity as a means rather than a fulfilling end. However, Fiore (1971) cautioned that haphazard promotional opportunities may also lead to problems. He cited a situation where there must first be a measurement of performance against which to judge promotability in a group of secretaries. Once measured, a decision could be made regarding what type of promotion would be best suited for the individual employee. He warned that promotion into an area requiring a technical skill, such as typing for a secretary who dislikes typing, would certainly not fulfill a need for promotion. In fact, such a promotion would lead to job dissatisfaction.

Dissatisfaction was also found in two separate secretarial surveys (Flanagan, 1972; "Rebellion," 1980) where promotional opportunities were perceived as need fulfilling but lacking in availability.
Conversely, where they were not only available but also contingent upon performance levels, several researchers found high job satisfaction (Gomez & Mussio, 1975; Kesselman et al., 1974; Shapiro, 1974).

In conclusion, opportunities for promotion, when perceived to be a source of need fulfillment and also perceived to be sufficiently available and contingent upon performance, not only increased performance, but also job satisfaction.

Summary: Dependent Variables

The review of the literature thus far indicated that the satisfaction of the secretary with her supervisor and the resulting relationship may be strongly related to performance and job satisfaction in general. The level of satisfaction with work was found to be related to employee centered management, reduction of role ambiguity, and high job involvement while satisfaction with pay was much more variable in its relation to job satisfaction. Finally, satisfaction with promotional opportunity, when perceived as a need, was found to be positively related to increased performance and job satisfaction.

However, prior to drawing final conclusions or hypotheses based on the review of literature, a discussion of demographic or individual differences (independent variables of amount of supervision, in-service training opportunities, education level, age, seniority, and family responsibilities) related to these job satisfaction components should be included for further understanding of job satisfaction. Each will be discussed as a separate entity.
Job Satisfaction: Independent Variables

Amount of Supervision

In terms of fulfilling the need for eliminating task ambiguity via goal setting and its effect on performance, Dossett (1978) and Lathan and Yukl (1976) found that specific goals led to higher performance but that the amount of subordinate participation in goal setting was not as important as actually setting the goal itself. Similar findings were discussed by Ivancevich (1976) along with the evidence that job satisfaction did not increase significantly for the participative group (employee helps to establish goals with the supervisor) while it did for the assigned group (no employee participation in goal setting). More specifically, Kim and Hamner (1976) were able to identify a significantly positive relationship between assigned goals and performance when the moderators of self and supervisory feedback (regarding achievement of goals) were investigated separately and even greater performance when they (self and supervisory feedback) were combined.

Therefore, this writer concluded that, if goal setting with feedback produces appropriate levels of performance and, as the previously cited research indicated, secretaries are more satisfied when they have higher job control, are independent in work, and are capable of decision making in the absence of supervision, then it may logically follow that the lesser amount of supervisory time, the greater the amount of job satisfaction. Thus, the first research hypothesis was developed: Elementary school secretaries who report having
part-time supervisors (principals) in their school will tend to report greater job satisfaction (in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion) than those who report having full-time principals.

In-Service Training Opportunities

In terms of secretaries in general and public elementary school secretaries specifically, several researchers (Gallo, 1969; Luck, 1951; Smith, 1965) stated that these populations have desired, but lacked high job involvement, an intrinsic level of work orientation. These researchers suggested professional, formal training as a means of appropriate involvement (preparation) in the role of secretary. Unfortunately, they add that programs are not always readily accessible for those aspiring to the role of secretary. However, on-the-job or in-service training is another alternative to professional, formal training. As Luck pointed out: "Training, understanding and attitudes toward her tasks will play an important role in the success or failure of the particular school or office in which she works" (p. 42).

Supporting this, Smith (1965) found low morale, high turnover, and excessive errors and cost prior to in-service training. Following in-service training there was an increase in morale and a decrease in error, cost, and turnover. In another in-service training program ("How to Put," 1966) emphasis was placed on providing the school secretaries with additional skills and knowledge which would enable them to assume greater responsibility. Performance and morale also increased. Additionally, speculation could be made regarding
the positive influence that such training would have on a situation
where less than full-time administrators were available in the
schools.

In conclusion, the previously cited research has shown that al­
though satisfaction with one's supervisor, work, pay, and promotion
are critical in terms of the part they play in overall job satisfac­
tion of secretaries in general and perhaps the public elementary
school secretary, so also is the amount of job control and involve­
ment (in-service training). Therefore, the public elementary school
secretary, being an intrinsically oriented employee who prefers high
job control and involvement (in-service training) may also tend to
have high job satisfaction when provided on-the-job in-service train­
ing opportunities. Thus, the second research hypothesis was devel­
oped: Elementary school secretaries who report on-the-job in-service
training opportunities as available in their school district will
also tend to report greater job satisfaction, in terms of supervision,
work, pay, and promotion, than those who report in-service training
opportunities as not available.

Education

The level of formal education, such as less than high school
completion, high school graduate, some college, and college graduate,
has been of interest to employers primarily because they want the
best qualified person for the job being offered (Arratia, 1968). In
her survey of businesses in the New York City area, Arratia found
that employers looked favorably upon post high school education in
terms of some college experience or an earned college degree. Her survey indicated that of the employers hiring executive level secretaries 43% preferred some college or a college degree while those hiring legal secretaries preferred the same only 33% of the time. In another study involving job motivation of females, Shapiro (1975) found somewhat different evidence. This research indicated that a negative correlation (-.17) existed between job motivation and the education level of female employees. Reportedly, this group perceived being hired below their educational qualification levels and were therefore less motivated on the job. Shapiro summarized by suggesting, without further explanation, that employers should be careful not to hire below a person's educational qualification level, especially regarding female applicants. However, the negative correlation cited should be considered as being low and therefore interpreted cautiously when forming judgments.

In comparison of the works of Arratia (1968) and Shapiro (1975) it was apparent that the perceptions of two polarized groups (employers and employees) were being investigated thus explaining the difference. Interestingly, neither study dealt with ability or performance in relation to educational levels. This was accomplished by Schmidt (1975) in her study of the prediction of success in clerical occupations in relation to ability test scores. Schmidt's study indicated that there was no significant relationship between performance ratings and ability levels but that there was an inverse relationship between job satisfaction and ability level (p < .05). Although not clearly stated, the assumption that was gleaned from this
study, with support from the work of Fiore (1971), was the possibility that perhaps this was a poor choice of professions to begin with or the job did not meet prior expectations for need gratification of those with higher ability. Fiore suggested that many times persons enter roles without prior knowledge of the likelihood that the chosen role will gratify their needs, such as the need to challenge ability.

Proceeding further, clarification regarding the relationship between education and performance was enhanced by the work of Lathan and Yukl (1976). They found that personality, experience, and education level did not influence the participation/performance relationship in a study investigating assigned versus participative goal setting. In other words, performance levels were not significantly different for various educational levels regardless of the amount of participation in job or task goal setting. Nevertheless, it should not be readily assumed that appropriate performance levels would be provided, regardless of ability and education levels being in excess of job qualifications, and that no other problems would arise (Kirsch & Lengerman, 1972). This 1972 study pointed out that younger and more educated employees have higher expectations than their older and less educated colleagues. These higher expectations were found to intensify the relationship between perceived alienating conditions on the job (powerlessness, meaningless work, lack of opportunity for promotion) and "self-estrangement" where the worker's activity becomes only a means rather than a fulfilling end, thus resulting in decreased job satisfaction and possible voluntary job termination (Battis, 1980).
In summary, educational levels or qualifications were perceived to be important to both employers and employees but the perceptions may be polarized. Regardless of this, job performance levels should be appropriate for those employees with minimum or more than sufficient ability to perform the task or job. Likewise, when the employee perceived his/her amount of education or training as appropriate for the task or job, performance also tended to be appropriate. Contrary to this, when the level of education exceeded the needs of the job, job dissatisfaction was evident.

With these findings as a foundation, including the indirectly supported assumption that higher education (beyond high school completion) is not a necessary qualification for the role of elementary school secretary, the third research hypothesis was developed: The higher the educational level of the elementary school secretary, the lower the level of reported job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion.

The next area of review will focus on age.

Age

Researchers (Burton & Pathak, 1980; Glenn, 1977; Wright & Hamilton, 1978) generally agree that job satisfaction tends to increase with age.

Glenn's (1977) survey with over 1,500 males and females indicated that as one gets older extrinsic rewards also increase thus the increase in job satisfaction was partially explained.
Adding further to the explanation, Wright and Hamilton (1978) listed three possible reasons for the increase in job satisfaction with age. First, they suggested that the "now" or younger generation of workers subscribe to a set of post material values that contradict the demands of the industrial system and cause greater work discontent. Second, the standards of the older workers were systematically eroded by their years in the system such that they were satisfied with less. Finally, older workers simply have better jobs. They offered data derived from a University of Michigan study for support of the third reason. The first two reasons were offered as yet untested hypotheses.

In a much more simplified manner, Burton and Pathak (1980) suggested that the longer one is on a job and the older they get, the more satisfied they tend to be with their job. These researchers also pointed out the possibility that with age and seniority comes greater job security consciousness. Thus, perceived job security may be a strong moderator of job satisfaction.

Regarding performance levels and age, Schwab and Heneman (1978) were not able to find a significant relationship in a population of secretaries while Cook and Shapiro (1970) were able to find significance in this relationship in the age range of 30-39 for a similar population. The differences in the findings were attributed to the differences in data collection. Cook and Shapiro being more thorough.

Regarding age and job motivation, Shapiro (1975) was able to find a significant relationship between age and job motivation for females (r = .54). Hill (1975), in support of Shapiro, cited 38.2
as the mean female age most significant in terms of the age and job 
motivation relationship while Naar (1978), speaking more generally in 
terms of job satisfaction, indicated an age range between 24 and 44. 
He suggested, along with Kirsch and Lengerman (1972), that younger 
workers tend to be more dissatisfied with work.

Therefore, when considering that job satisfaction increases with 
age for both females and secretaries in general, the fourth research 
hypothesis was developed: Older elementary school secretaries will 
tend to report greater job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, 
pay, and promotion than younger elementary school secretaries.

Like age, the relationship between seniority and job satisfac­
tion was recognized as significant in the work of Burton and Pathak 
(1980). A more in depth discussion follows.

**Seniority**

The topic of seniority in relation to job satisfaction received 
sparse attention in the literature but was generally felt to be re­
lated to job satisfaction for all groups studied including educa­
tional secretaries (Burton & Pathak, 1980), secretaries in general 
(Cook & Shapiro, 1970; Schwab & Heneman, 1978), females (Kesselman 
et al., 1974), and workers in general (Ronen, 1978).

In terms of the relationship between performance and seniority, 
several researchers (Cook & Shapiro, 1970; Kesselman et al., 1974; 
Schwab & Heneman, 1978) agreed that there was no significance.

To summarize, Ronen (1978) hypothesized that after a brief 
period on the job (0 to 1 year), the newness had worn off and
uncertainty and lack of security dropped satisfaction levels. Then, as time progressed and seniority increased, the employee's expectations became more realistic. Thus, using the JDI, Ronen found that between 2 to 5 years on the job (seniority), there was less satisfaction reported while those with 6 years or more seniority reported higher overall job satisfaction. He concluded by theorizing that changes in the level of overall job satisfaction with time seemed to parallel the trend of satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of the job while extrinsic aspects, although available, became less influential with job satisfaction.

In conclusion, job satisfaction was generally found to be related to job seniority, therefore, the fifth research hypothesis was developed: Elementary school secretaries reporting higher job seniority will also tend to report higher job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion than those with less seniority.

To conclude this review of individual differences, the next section of this chapter will focus on family responsibility.

Family Responsibility

In a recent study ("Some Secretary Opinions," 1978) involving 177 secretaries, it was found that 51% indicated significant after work activities involving their families, 66% were working mothers and 54% of the working mothers had up to three children. With these significant percentages it was not surprising that Kuiper (1977) found that another population of female secretaries indicated a concern for harmony among self, home, and career ideals. This same
population also expressed their like of work as being strongly related to an intrinsic aspect of work, altruism, rather than economic motivation or promotional aspirations. In support of these findings, others (Weaver & Holmes, 1975) have indicated that full-time married female employees when compared to full-time housewives differed in job satisfaction only when the income of the employed did not provide or contribute to a family income perceived as equal to or above that of the average American family. Thus, like of work, job satisfaction, and family responsibilities were all interrelated.

However, in addition to general family responsibilities moderating job satisfaction (Matteson, McMahon, & McMahon, 1974), Ilgen and Hollenback (1977) later indicated that the number of children living at home, especially when less than 7 years of age, acted as a form of role pressure (family) that was perceived as an additive to job pressures (peer criticism and work waiting for you when you get back) and thus was significantly correlated with absences ($r = .41$) and job satisfaction (.43) at the .01 level of significance.

Therefore, with the additive influences of family responsibilities, the sixth research hypothesis was developed: The greater the amount of family responsibilities (defined as marital status, importance of income, having children, and ages of children), the lower the tendency toward job satisfaction (in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion) for elementary school secretaries. The four dimensions of family responsibility were selected on the basis of their representativeness as possibly mediating influences on job satisfaction.
Summary: Independent Variables

Job satisfaction theories, definitions, and application methods varied greatly and, therefore, what was appropriate for one population, age group, income level, etc. was not necessarily appropriate for others. Thus, this review was an attempt to isolate some of those variables that may also apply to elementary school secretaries but because of the scarcity of available literature, much of the review was selected from disciplines other than secretaries and education. The four areas of supervision, work, pay, and promotion were reviewed in terms of being major component parts that make up job satisfaction.

Subordinate satisfaction with the supervisor, work, and promotion were all related to increased productivity and overall job satisfaction but were themselves specific forms of job satisfaction. Pay, on the other hand, was found to be less of an influencing factor in terms of its relationship to job satisfaction but when perceived as a need, that relationship was strongly positive.

Finally, six research hypotheses were developed as a result of the review of the demographic (independent) variables which were discussed in terms of their moderating effects on job satisfaction:

1. The lesser the amount of supervisory time, the greater the amount of job satisfaction.

2. Those secretaries who report having in-service training opportunities will be more satisfied with their jobs than secretaries
who do not have similar opportunities.

3. The higher the level of education, the lower the level of job satisfaction.

4. The higher the reported age of secretaries, the greater the level of job satisfaction.

5. The higher the years of seniority, the greater the level of job satisfaction.

6. The greater the family responsibilities, the lower the level of job satisfaction.

The methodology employed in this study will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was primarily developed to identify and determine the relationship between the independent variables that influence job satisfaction and the corresponding levels of job satisfaction. This chapter will focus on a review of the research hypotheses, a description of the population, and a discussion of the instruments utilized in this study. Additional discussion will review the pilot study that was conducted prior to this investigation. Data collection and analysis methods are also examined.

Review of the Research Hypotheses

The conceptual framework discussed in the first chapter led to a series of six research questions which were then investigated in the literature review of the second chapter. The result of that review was the development of the six research hypotheses for this study:

1. Elementary school secretaries who report having part-time supervisors (principal) in their school will tend to report greater job satisfaction, in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than those who report having full-time principals.
2. Elementary school secretaries who report on-the-job inservice training opportunities as available in their school district will tend to report greater job satisfaction, in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than those who report in-service training opportunities as not available.

3. The higher the educational level of the elementary school secretary, the lower the level of reported job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion.

4. Older (age) elementary school secretaries will tend to report greater job satisfaction, in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than younger elementary school secretaries.

5. Elementary school secretaries reporting higher job seniority will also tend to report higher job satisfaction, in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than those with less seniority.

6. The greater the amount of family responsibilities (defined as marital status, importance of income, having children, and ages of children), the lower the tendency toward job satisfaction, in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, for elementary school secretaries.

Closer examination of the six main hypotheses indicates that there are several subhypotheses within each. The first five hypotheses are comprised of five specific independent variables (supervisors, in-service, educational level, age, and seniority, respectively). The sixth hypothesis focuses on family responsibilities which consists of four independent variables (marital status, importance of income, having children, and ages of children). All six hypotheses consist
of a total of nine independent variables (discussed in Chapter II).

Each hypothesis also consists of satisfaction with four dependent variables (discussed in Chapter II: work, pay, promotion, and supervision). The nine independent variables were examined in terms of their relationship to the four dependent variables for a total of 36 (9 x 4) subhypotheses which were tested in the null form.

Population

The total population (N = 240) consisted of the public elementary school secretaries from Allegan, Kent, Muskegon, and Ottawa counties in southwestern Michigan. The list of schools was taken from the Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide (1979). A school was considered to be elementary and applicable for use in this study if it met the following criteria: considered public rather than private or parochial and listed as an elementary school in the Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide. This included some combination of the grades prekindergarten through eight. This combination excluded schools which were designated preschool only, junior high or middle schools (grades 5 through 7, 6 through 8, 7 through 9), and senior high schools.

This geographic area was selected due to its general representativeness of all southwestern Michigan counties (County and Regional Facts, 1970; Verway, 1979) in several of the variables involved in this study: age, education, and income. Also, several other similarities were noted: race, percentage of home owners, property values, percentage of private versus public school attendance, and
personal per capita income changes from 1972 through 1977. Several similarities were also found in comparisons at the state level in Michigan: unemployment, school district size ranges, percentage of income growth, age, education, and sex distributions.

Caution in generalizability of results was suggested due to lack of evidence that all variables being studied (i.e., seniority, family size, amount of supervision) were also representative of each geographic area not included in the actual research.

Furthermore, these counties were selected due to accessibility, ease of follow up, and sufficiency of numbers for reliable data collection (Hinkle, 1979). However, 30 members of this population from Kent County were excluded due to their prior participation in a pilot study resulting in a usable population of 210 (N = 210).

Instrumentation

**Job Description Index: Dependent Variables**

The Job Description Index (JDI) developed by Smith et al. (1969) and reproduced with permission of Bowling Green State University, was used to measure job satisfaction (dependent variable). This instrument was selected due to its reported high validity, reliability, and ease in administration and scoring (Robinson, Athanasiou, & Head, 1969):

Corrected split-half internal consistency coefficients are reported to exceed .80 for each of the scales. Some evidence for stability over time is reported. . . .

Hulin (1966) reports a correlation of -.17 between satisfaction and turnover (over a twelve month period)
for female clerical employees. Other studies involving convergent and discriminant validity have been carried out.

In addition to the extensive high quality of research done on the JDI, there are several factors intrinsic to the scale which recommend its use. The verbal level of the items is quite low and does not require the respondent to understand complicated or vague abstractions.

It seems quite evident from the numerous studies with the JDI that one's perception of his job is highly colored by his satisfaction with it. The JDI is a face valid instrument which can be easily administered and scored in a short time. (p. 105)

The four scales of the JDI that were utilized in this study consisted of: pay, promotion, supervision, and work. Each scale measured the perception of the respondent, defined as "an individual's interpretation of what is based on judgment of what should be" (see Chapter I) by having them answer a list of adjectives or descriptive phrases which best describes their pay, promotion, supervision, and work with a "yes" and "no" for each item which does not. If the respondent is undecided, a question ("?") response is used. Responses are scored: Three points for a favorable answer, zero points for all unfavorable answers, and one point for all omissions and "?." A total of 54 points was possible for the work and supervision scales while the total possible for the pay and promotion scales was 27 points. The pay and promotion scores were doubled, according to JDI test procedures, in order to make them numerically equivalent to the scores on the other scales. Thus, the total possible for each scale was also 54 points. The actual items comprising the JDI may be found in the Appendix. Each scale, for purposes of interpretation, was considered either an extrinsic or intrinsic job feature as defined by Herzberg.
Extrinsic was defined as the source of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (context factors) derived from means other than oneself (which is an intrinsic source) such as supervision, pay, or the organization. Intrinsic was defined as job content factors such as achievement, recognition, and work. It is the personal feeling or belief about the job content factors that is the source of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

The distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic sources of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction was made due to its significance in the interpretation of the research findings. Specifying the source (self or other) of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction was considered essential in guiding the practitioner in the use of these findings and in his/her application of them. Would it be better to increase pay (extrinsic source) or improve the work environment (intrinsic source) in order to increase job satisfaction and, hopefully, performance?

The scale "work," an intrinsic job feature, was the first section of the JDI. It was used as measurement of the respondent's perception of the actual type of work he/she engages in on a daily basis and included such descriptive adjectives as fascinating, boring, useful, challenging, frustrating, and simple. There were 18 response items.

The second section, nine-item "pay" scale examined the respondent's perception of current wages received from the present position as elementary school secretary. Wages were defined as monetary reimbursement received in the form of a "pay check" for services provided
as an elementary school secretary. This did not include "fringe benefits" such as insurance, vacation, and sick leave. The test items covered the employees perception regarding pay as adequate, bad, less than I deserve, or highly paid. This scale was considered an extrinsic job feature.

The third section, "promotion," also a nine-item extrinsic job feature, measured the respondent's perception of the opportunities available, from their employer, for advancement. This scale included items such as: good opportunities for promotion, promotion on ability, and infrequent promotions.

The fourth section of the JDI, the 18-item extrinsic job feature of supervision, examined the respondent's perceptions about the supervisor (principal)/subordinate relationship and the supervisor him/herself. Again, using descriptive adjectives, responses were made to such items as: asks my advice, tactful, stubborn, and intelligent.

The final section of the JDI, the measurement of job satisfaction based on perception of the people with whom one works has received criticism from Herzberg (1966), while Cook and Shapiro (1970) were not able to find sufficient evidence to support its use in a study of educational secretaries. Therefore, the dependent variable of people was not incorporated into this study but may be of interest to future researchers.
Questionnaire: Independent Variables

The second phase of data collection from each respondent was the completion of a "demographic" questionnaire (Information Sheet, see Appendix) developed for use in this study based on the support of the reviewed literature and a previously conducted pilot study.

The information sheet consisted of three major categories: family, personal, and school information. Each major category consisted of several subcategories that were used as the independent variables for this study.

The selection of the subcategories was based on several considerations (Babbie, 1973; Berdie & Anderson, 1974; Kerlinger, 1973): pilot study, clarity and preciseness of questions, prior knowledge of the group, support of the previously cited literature, implications for comparison with the dependent variables, and concerns for practicality such as time, expense, administration, and scoring.

Section 1, family information. This section referred to: marital status (yes, no, or separated response), pay as a major source of income (yes or no response), do you have children (yes or no), and the age of each child (in years).

The range of responses in each subcategory was based on the rationale involved in the selection of the subcategories (pilot study, prior knowledge of the group, supportive literature, etc.). The range of answers for marital status and pay as a major source of income was specifically selected for analysis due to the findings of Ilgen and Hollenback (1977) and others (Ganesan, 1970; Matteson
et al., 1974; Weaver & Holmes, 1975). These researchers have found marital status, family responsibilities, and need for pay to be either additives or moderators of job satisfaction.

The subcategories involving children were developed from the work of Ilgen and Hollenback (1977) and Davidson and Kline (1979) who discussed the additive effects of children at various ages and satisfaction with the work role. The preschool period and early elementary school ages of children (0 to 7) received emphasis. Some of the assumptions that appeared to be most important in regard to this age group included the higher dependency on parents in such areas as health care, physical care, nurturing, toilet training, and so on. Also, the interest and motivation toward the parenting role may be equal to or predominant over the work role for many families with very young or perhaps a first child. Therefore, the age range of 0 to 7 was selected for comparison with the age range of 8 and above. However, in order to maintain the critical statistical assumption of independence of comparison groups, where one subject could not be in more than one group at one time, and because of the support for the unique needs of the 0 to 7 age group, any secretary who reported having children in both age groups was assigned to the younger age group only (0 to 7) for analysis. Those secretaries who reported having children in the older age group (8 and above) were therefore accordingly assigned to that group.

Section 2, personal information. Included in this section were age, education, and total consecutive years as an elementary school
secretary (seniority). In terms of specific ranges for each sub-category, for purposes of analysis, the literature was not clear. Therefore, one specific answer was requested for each: age in years, highest grade completed, and consecutive years as an elementary school secretary in your district.

The purpose of this section was to determine if each of these distinct variables of age, education, and seniority were moderators of each of the four components of job satisfaction (supervision, work, pay, and promotion).

Age ranges that were selected for analysis included: youngest respondent through 35, 36 through 45, 46 through 55, and 56 and above. The available literature did not specify support for any particular age grouping other than "younger versus older" secretaries; therefore, this writer selected the above groupings based on this finding and prior knowledge of age variations within this population based on findings from an earlier unpublished survey.

Again, for purposes of analysis, education groupings were established to include the major ranges of completed education as follows: partial high school, high school graduates, partial college, and college graduates (4 years or more).

Seniority categories were based on the research of Ronen (1978) where job satisfaction was measured using the JDI with three groups: 0-1 years seniority, 2-5 years seniority, 6 years seniority and above. The supported hypothesis here was that relatively new employees tend to be more satisfied with the newness of the job, while after a few years uncertainty and lack of security drops satisfaction levels.
However, it climbs as the employee's expectations become more realistic.

Section 3, School Information. This section consisted of: on-the-job in-service training opportunities for elementary school secretaries, a "yes" or "no" response was requested, and the amount of time that the elementary school principal was assigned to their (secretary) particular school. Two types of assignment response choices were given: part-time and full-time. Part-time assignments were defined as responsibility for more than one elementary school and/or other major assignments resulting in 50% or more time away from the particular school building where the respondent is employed. Full-time was defined as an assignment for the building principal where he/she is responsible for one elementary school and no other major assignments, and therefore, he/she is present more than 50% of the time.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in Kent County, Michigan. A random sample of 30 elementary school secretaries was selected from the available population of 129 (N = 129). Ten secretaries were not allowed to respond due to school district policy regarding surveys. Those who responded totaled 19 (n = 19) for a return rate of 95%. All responses (n = 19) were returned within 2 weeks from the date of mailing. Follow up of the one actual nonrespondent was not attempted.
The procedure for the pilot study was carried out via the United States mail. Each respondent received a cover letter which identified the researcher and explained the rationale, purpose, and importance of the study. The respondents were also assured of confidentiality. Each respondent was also asked to take the 15 minutes necessary to complete the survey and return it within a specified 2-week period in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Each of the respondents were then thanked for their cooperation.

The purpose of the pilot study was to test the questionnaire for clarity of items, familiarize this researcher with the population and sampling methods, and to investigate the potential use of the JDI. No conclusions were made using statistical procedures; however, improvement of the questionnaire and procedural methods resulted.

Data Collection

Following the granted approval of the Human Subjects Review Board of Western Michigan University, each respondent, excepting those employed by the Grand Rapids Public Schools, was sent a cover letter (see Appendix), a copy of the JDI, and the information sheet along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope and postcard via the United States mail. Prior approval to conduct a survey was obtained from the Grand Rapids Public Schools and a separate cover letter was sent along with the JDI, etc., to this group (see Appendix). One new dimension was included here that was not a part of the pilot study. The respondents were told that along with each survey, a postcard was included. The purpose of this postcard was for follow up of
nonrespondents, should it be needed (see Appendix).

They were then told that their responses would be kept strictly confidential and to further insure confidentiality, the results of the survey would be compiled along with other respondents resulting in a group score. The respondents were urged to participate and simultaneously, but separately, return the completed survey and postcard within 2 weeks.

The follow-up procedure was conducted at the end of the 2-week period from the initial mailing. A second postcard was sent to each respondent who had not returned the first survey postcard. The request was in the form of a reminder, "If you have already returned the Job Satisfaction Survey and Information Sheet, please disregard this reminder. If not, please help. Without you, I am nothing" (see Appendix). Respondents were also provided the opportunity to call the researcher if they had any questions or concerns regarding the survey. One more week was allotted for return of the survey. Of those who did not respond, 66% were called and asked why they did not respond (too busy, forgot, lost, against district policy, not willing). They were also asked what their overall level of job satisfaction was (low, moderate, high). This final attempt was made in an effort to glean information about nonrespondent characteristics. Sixty-six percent was selected due to cost factors.

Data Analysis

The data analysis procedures employed were derived from inferential statistics. The one-way analysis of variance and the t test for
independent means were the statistical procedures of choice to test the hypotheses in the null form at the .05 level of significance.

For the independent variables of education and seniority, the one-way analysis of variance was the most appropriate data analysis procedure due to the measurement scales of the data (Hinkle, 1979) which are required to meet the basic assumptions incorporated into this procedure. The dependent variables of pay, promotion, supervision, and work were considered to be measurements on the interval scale while the independent variables of age of secretary and seniority were on the ordinal scale. Table 1, developed for use in this study, represents a breakdown of each variable scale utilized in this study.

The other major assumptions involved in the use of one-way analysis of variance were recognized in terms of the experimental design. The independence and randomness of the groups were assured by the fact that no respondent was used simultaneously in more than one group at a time. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was met to some degree by the fact that ANOVA is robust when group sizes are large and independent (Hinkle, 1979).

For post hoc analysis of the data where the null hypotheses were rejected in ANOVA, the protected least squares difference procedure (Nie, Hull, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975) was employed at the .05 level of significance. This procedure determines which group differs significantly after significance has been found in ANOVA. This method was also selected due to its flexibility in basic assumptions that characterize it: the homogeneity of variance or equality of sample
Table 1

Measurement Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (a)</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>I (a) Marital status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (b)</td>
<td>Income as major source</td>
<td>I (b) Income as major source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>I (c) Children</td>
<td>III (a) In-service opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III (b) Amount of supervision time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (d)</td>
<td>Ages of children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>II (a) Age of secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II (b) Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II (c) Seniority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Pay
2. Promotion
3. Supervision
4. Work

Note. I = family responsibility or family information; II = personal information; III = school information.
sizes are not critical assumptions with this procedure.

For the independent variables of marital status, income as a major source, in-service opportunities, children, amount of supervision, ages of children, and education, the t test of independent means was the most appropriate data analysis procedure due to the comparison of only two groups for each variable and the measurement scales of the data (Hinkle, 1979). Again, Table 1 represents a breakdown of those scales. However, a special note should be made regarding the variable of education, which was originally intended for one-way ANOVA analysis. This variable was collapsed into two groups due to the few number of respondents in the categories of some high school (n = 3) and college graduate (n = 4).

In terms of assumptions regarding the use of the t test for independent means, as in the use of one-way ANOVA, the independence of groups and homogeneity of variance were adhered to. All statistical analysis was conducted through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al., 1975) at the Western Michigan University Computer Center.

This analysis was completed following the assignment of numerical values to all responses in each survey packet. These figures were then coded and transferred to an optical scanning sheet for each respondent. The coded data were then transferred to computer tapes and verified by the computer center personnel. The data were then analyzed using all appropriate descriptive statistics to assist in the interpretation of the inferential statistics.
Summary

A population of 210 public elementary school secretaries was drawn from Allegan, Kent, Muskegon, and Ottawa Counties in the state of Michigan. The initial mail survey was followed by one more request for participation. Of those elementary school secretaries who still did not respond, 66% were called for further clarification.

The Job Description Index was used to ascertain the levels of job satisfaction in four categories of the dependent variables. A demographic Information Sheet was used to obtain data that served as the independent variables in the major topic areas of family, personal, and school information.

The interrelationship between various levels of family, personal, and school information with the various intrinsic and extrinsic areas of job satisfaction were the main areas of investigation. The one-way ANOVA and t test were used to investigate the significance of the interrelationships while the protected least squares difference procedure was used to identify specific subgroup significance (where appropriate). Descriptive statistics of subgroups and the total group were used in understanding the inferences involved. Findings are reported in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify independent variables that influence job satisfaction in terms of work, pay, promotion, and supervision. The population was the elementary public school secretaries in the four southwestern Michigan counties of Allegan, Kent, Muskegon, and Ottawa. Chapter I provided a rationale for the problem and research questions. Chapter II provided a description of the independent and dependent variables based on a critique of writings taken from the pertinent literature. Chapter III described the methodology used in this study.

Chapter IV provides a description of the findings in terms of the participants and nonparticipants. Following this, the results of the major research hypotheses are discussed, independently of each other, with the .05 level of significance required for rejecting the nulls of all hypotheses. The chapter concludes with a summation of the findings. Conclusions will be given detailed discussion in Chapter V.

Description of the Secretaries

Of the 210 surveys sent to the elementary public school secretaries, eight schools reported not having a secretary. Of the
remaining 202 eligible surveys, 172 were received resulting in a total of 30 nonrespondents and a return rate of 85%. All returned surveys were usable.

**Nonrespondents**

Twenty, or 66%, of the nonrespondents were telephoned in an attempt to determine why they did not respond. Examination of Table 2 indicates that, of those called, none of the secretaries felt that the survey was contrary to school district policy while 5 (25%) said they forgot to respond, 7 (35%) were too busy, 5 (25%) said they lost the survey, and only 3 (15%) felt that they were not willing to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason given</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against district policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not willing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering the high rate of return (85%) and accepting reasons for not responding at face value, it appeared that little bias existed against the survey. Of those three secretaries who were
not willing to respond, one indicated a perceived need to comment beyond the confines of the survey and therefore would not respond to it. The remaining two secretaries who were not willing to respond indicated that they were in the process of settling a new union contract and, for personal reasons, preferred not to respond.

None of the nonrespondents indicated low job satisfaction (see Table 3), while 8 (40%) perceived their job satisfaction to be moderate. Twelve (60%) perceived their job satisfaction to be high.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents

Examination of the survey data from the 172 respondents (see Table 4), all of whom were assumed to be female, indicated that 155 (90.1%) were married while 17 (9.9%) were not.

Regarding salary as a major source of family income (see Table 5) 45, or 26.2%, responded in the affirmative while 124 (72.1%) did not perceive their salary as a major source of family income.
Table 4

Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Salary as a Major Source of Family Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 167 (97.1%) indicated having children (see Table 6) while only 5 (2.9%) of the respondents did not.

Table 6

Respondents With Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those respondents who reported having children, two did not indicate the ages of those children; therefore, the frequency of those without children (Table 7) reflects the missing data. As shown in Table 7, the frequency of children was most often between one (35.9%) or two (32.6%) per family with a very distinct decrease in frequency as family size increased. The largest family consisted of seven children with no respondents indicating a family of eight children.

Table 7

Frequency of Children by Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes missing data.
The range of children's ages was between 1 and 44 with a mean age of 21.46 (standard deviation = 5.61). The age groupings, for purposes of data analysis as described in Chapter III and outlined in Table 8, indicated that seven people had 10 children under the age of 7 while the vast majority (158) had 92% (443) of their children in the age range of 8 and above. Again, a total of seven were either respondents without children (5) or missing data (2) for a total of 4%.

Table 8
Age Groups of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and above</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Age range = 1-44; mean age = 21.46; standard deviation = 5.61.

Examination of Table 9 indicates that the mean age of the secretaries was 46.96 with a standard deviation of 9.51. The actual range of ages was 23 to 64 with nine respondents (5%) not participating in this part of the survey. For purposes of analysis, described in Chapter III, the actual ages were collapsed into four separate groups. Further examination of this table indicates that as a total group,
the secretaries tended to be middle-aged, 36-45 (34.0%); 46-55 (27.3%). A total of 10.5% were in the youngest age group (35 and below) while only 23.3% were in the oldest group (56 plus).

Table 9
Secretary Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 and below</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 plus</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Secretary age range = 23-64; mean secretary age = 46.96; standard deviation = 9.51.

In terms of education (see Table 10), the majority, 58.1% (N = 100), of the secretaries indicated that they either had some high school or had completed high school while 41.9% (N = 72) had attended college.

The seniority range of the respondents was between 1 and 29 years with a mean of 9.46 and a standard deviation of 6.28 while the seniority groupings, for purposes of data analysis, as described in Chapter III, were 0 to 1 years (8.2%), 2 to 5 years (23.8%), and 6 years and above (67.4%). This data indicated that the respondents tended to be on the job longer than 6 years in the majority of cases (see Table 11).
Table 10

Education Level of Secretaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Seniority Groups of Secretaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of seniority</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and above</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Seniority range = 1-29; mean years of seniority = 9.46; standard deviation = 6.28.

Table 12 provides an examination of the amount of supervision that each respondent received in terms of either part- or full-time principals in their school. A total of 47, or 27.3%, indicated that they were supervised by part-time principals, while 121 (70.3%) indicated having full-time supervisors (principals). This data indicated that the vast majority of the secretaries have full-time supervisors available for supervision.
Table 12
Supervisory Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding in-service opportunities, the respondents indicated that 43 (25.0%) have the opportunity available in their schools while the vast majority, 122 (70.9%), do not have in-service opportunities available in their schools (see Table 13).

Table 13
In-Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the level of job satisfaction (see Table 14) reported by the respondents, based on a possible 54 point total for each category, was moderate to high for work (daily tasks: mean = 40.738; standard deviation = 6.995) low to moderate for pay (wages: mean =
16.500; standard deviation = 10.767), low for promotion opportunities (advancement: mean = 13.919; standard deviation = 9.708) and moderate to high for supervision (supervisor him/herself: mean = 44.715; standard deviation = 10.117). The absolute percentage of those who reported job satisfaction below the midpoint of possible satisfaction scores (27) for each category was: work 5.8%, pay 82.0%, promotion 92.4%, and supervision 8.1%. The indication here was that the overwhelming majority was at least moderately satisfied with work and supervision, while the overwhelming majority had very little satisfaction with pay and promotion.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Percentage below job satisfaction midpoint</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>40.738</td>
<td>6.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>16.500</td>
<td>10.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>13.919</td>
<td>9.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>44.715</td>
<td>10.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, 172 surveys were analyzed representing a return rate of 85%. The nonrespondents were either moderately or highly satisfied with their jobs. Of those who responded, the vast majority were married (90.1%) and did not regard their salary as a major source of family income (72.1%). The overwhelming majority of
respondents (N = 167) had children (approximately 1 to 2) with a mean age of 21.46.

The mean age of the secretaries was 46.96 with a higher tendency toward high school education (58.1%) and a mean job seniority of 9.46 years. Most secretaries reported full-time supervision (70.4%) but relatively little opportunity for on-the-job in-service training in their school district (25.0%).

In conclusion, the levels of job satisfaction were overwhelmingly distinct. The secretaries indicated moderate to high job satisfaction with work and supervision and low job satisfaction in terms of pay and promotion. Statistical analysis of all hypotheses will be discussed next.

Analysis of the Research Hypotheses

First Research Hypothesis

The first research hypothesis which stated that those respondents who report having part-time supervisors (principals) in their school will tend to report greater job satisfaction, in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than those who report having full-time principals was not supported at the .05 level of significance. Although both groups were satisfied with work itself and their supervisors, part-time versus full-time supervision did not make a significant difference in their satisfaction at the .05 level. In terms of the low satisfaction with pay and promotion, the amount of supervision also did not make a significant difference at the .05
level. Table 15 lists the means, standard deviations, probabilities,
etc. for the \( t \)-test analysis.

Table 15

Summary Table of the \( t \) Test for the First Research Hypothesis: Amount of Supervision and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t )-Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( p^* )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>43.74</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>- .86</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>39.57</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>41.31</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>- .41</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^aPT = \) part time (N = 47); \( FT = \) full time (N = 121).

\( ^* \)Level of significance = .05; one-tailed test.

Second Research Hypothesis

The second research hypothesis stated that elementary school secretaries who report on-the-job in-service training opportunities as available in their school district will also tend to report greater job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion,
than those who report in-service training opportunities as not available. Table 16 indicates that there was no significant support for the hypothesis in terms of a difference between the two groups regarding pay and supervision at the .05 level of significance. However, such was not the case with work (.005 probability) and promotion (.016 probability). Although not supportive of the hypothesis, a significant difference was found in the opposite or inverse direction for work thus indicating a negative relationship. Those respondents who reported in-service opportunities as available, although moderately satisfied with their work, were (statistically) significantly less satisfied with their work than those who reported not having in-service opportunities available. This was contrary to the findings in the literature.

Those respondents who reported available in-service opportunities also reported more statistically significant satisfaction with promotion as was predicted (.016 probability). However, both groups reported low satisfaction with promotion itself (mean = 16.74; 13.03, respectively) and, therefore, making the statistical significance practically or realistically insignificant. In other words, both groups had low satisfaction with promotional opportunities.

**Third Research Hypothesis**

Examination of the data (see Table 17) regarding the third research hypothesis, which stated that the higher the educational level of the elementary school secretary, the lower the level of reported job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion,
indicated that statistical support was not found at the .05 level for supervision (.208 probability), work (.331 probability), and pay (.062 probability). Interestingly, although not statistically significant, was the fact that, contrary to the prediction of the hypothesis and the support of the literature, those secretaries with a college education tended to be slightly more satisfied with work and supervision. This issue will be discussed in Chapter V.

Table 16
Summary Table of the t Test for the Second Research Hypothesis: In-Service Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groupa</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>38.28</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>-.06b</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aIO = in-service opportunities (N = 43); NI = no in-service opportunities (N = 122).

bSeparated variance estimate.

*Level of significance = .05; one-tailed test.
Table 17
Summary Table of the t Test for the Third Research Hypothesis: Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>44.18</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>- .82</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>- .44</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>41.01</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>HS = high school (N = 100); COLL = college (N = 72).

*Level of significance = .05; one-tailed test.

Regarding promotion, as predicted, the hypothesis was supported for those with college education being less satisfied. However, due to the generally low level of satisfaction (mean = 14.98; 12.44, respectively) with promotion, the statistical significance appeared to have little practical significance. In other words, both groups had low satisfaction with promotion.
Fourth Research Hypothesis

The fourth research hypothesis, analyzed using the one-way ANOVA at the .05 level of significance, stated that older elementary school secretaries will tend to report greater job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than younger elementary school secretaries. Table 18 indicates that support for the hypothesis regarding supervision was not established for any age group (35 and below, 36-45, 46-55, 56 and above). However, overall satisfaction with supervision was considered moderate to high (mean = 44.64; standard deviation = 10.25).

Table 18
One-Way ANOVA: Age and Satisfaction With Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>106.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 &amp; below</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44.47</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 &amp; above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.88</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>44.64</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.05 level of significance.
Table 19 provides an examination of the data regarding the section of the fourth research hypothesis that explores the relationship between age and satisfaction with work. Again, significance was not found using the one-way ANOVA at the .05 level. Therefore, contrary to the supportive literature and utilizing this method of analysis, age was not significant (.86 probability) in terms of its relationship to satisfaction with work. However, it should be noted that satisfaction with work in general was considered at least moderate to high with a mean score of 40.58 and a standard deviation of 7.03. In other words, all groups were satisfied with their work and age did not necessarily make a difference.

Table 19
One-Way ANOVA: Age and Satisfaction With Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 &amp; below</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 &amp; above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.90</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.05 level of significance.
Again, support was not found for the hypothesis that age was significantly related to satisfaction with promotion (mean = 13.80; standard deviation = 9.58) as indicated by Table 20.

Table 20

One-Way ANOVA: Age and Satisfaction With Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>131.64</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 &amp; below</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>14.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 &amp; above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.05 level of significance.

The final aspect of the fourth research hypothesis, which tested the relationship between satisfaction with pay and age, yielded statistically significant findings. The hypothesis was supported (.023 probability) at the .05 level, however, the overall level of satisfaction with pay was low (mean = 16.43; standard deviation = 10.68) thereby making the statistical significance of little practical value. In other words, all groups had low satisfaction with pay but the post
hoc analysis (LSD at the .05 level of significance) indicated significance between Group 2 (36-45 years of age; mean = 13.59; standard deviation = 10.27) and Group 3 (46-55 years of age; mean = 19.19; standard deviation = 11.46). Additionally, significance was found between Group 2 and Group 4 (55 years and above; mean = 18.35; standard deviation = 9.15). Again, the post hoc analysis findings are statistically significant but due to the low overall satisfaction with pay scores may not be practically significant. Generally speaking, all the secretaries had low satisfaction with pay but some significantly lower than the others. Table 21 summarizes the one-way ANOVA data while Table 22 summarizes the post hoc analysis data.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>357.24</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>109.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 &amp; below</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>10.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 &amp; above</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.05 level of significance.
Fifth Research Hypothesis

The fifth research hypothesis stated that elementary school secretaries reporting higher job seniority will also tend to report higher job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than those with less seniority was not supported in all four dependent variables using one-way ANOVA for analysis at the .05 level of significance. However, it should be noted that overall satisfaction with supervision (mean = 44.75) was considered moderate to high as was satisfaction with work (mean = 40.78). Overall satisfaction with pay (mean = 16.55) and promotion (mean = 14.00) were low.

Table 23 describes all four one-way ANOVA while Table 24 describes the frequencies, means, and standard deviation for all four tests.
Table 23
One-Way ANOVA: Seniority and Satisfaction With Supervision, Work, Pay, and Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>( p^* )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>240.48</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>101.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92.94</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>289.81</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>114.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>94.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 level of significance.

Sixth Research Hypothesis

The sixth and final research hypothesis stated that the greater the amount of family responsibilities (defined as marital status, importance of income, having children, and ages of children), the lower the tendency toward job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion for elementary school secretaries. All comparisons were statistically tested using the t test for independent means at the .05 level of significance with the exception of the independent variables having children and ages of children. The
Table 24

Frequency Mean and Standard Deviation Summary
Table: Seniority and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seniority groups</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>43.62</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.61</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>40.78</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample sizes varied too extensively to be used for appropriate data analysis. Of the 172 survey respondents, 167 reported having children while only five did not and 158 had children 8 years of age and older, while only seven respondents had children in the age range of 0-7 (see Tables 6 and 7, respectively).

In terms of marital status, no statistical significance was found with any of the four dependent variables. Table 25 describes the data.

Table 25

Summary Table of the t Test for the Sixth Research Hypothesis: Marital Status and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groupa</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40.81</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>40.12</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>.77b</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aM = married (N = 155); NM = not married (N = 17).
bSeparate variance estimate.

*.05 level of significance; one-tailed test.
The fourth aspect of this hypothesis, the importance of salary as a major portion of family income, was also found to be statistically nonsignificant with three levels of the dependent variable (supervision, work, and promotion). The variable pay was found to be significant (.017 probability). All four of the variable relationships were in the predicted (negative) direction.

Again, pay was found to have a statistically significant difference between the two groups. The practical interpretation of this data is simplistically found in the statement that both groups have low satisfaction with pay, but pay that is important to family income (Group 1) was more so as demonstrated statistically. Table 26 describes the findings.

Summary

A return rate of 85% was achieved resulting in 172 usable surveys. Follow-up of nonrespondents indicated that they were generally well satisfied with their jobs.

Of those who responded, 90.1% were married and 72.1% felt that their salary was not a major source of family income. A total of 97.1% had children with 68.4% having at least one or two children with the vast majority (92%) in 8 years old and above range (mean age = 21.46). The secretaries themselves averaged 47 years of age and had high school education (58.1%) with approximately 9 years of secretarial seniority with full-time supervisors (70.4%) but little on-the-job in-service training opportunities (25%).
### Table 26
Summary Table of the t Test for the Sixth Research Hypothesis: Importance of Salary and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group^a</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>41.08</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aII = income as important (N = 45); NI = income as not important (N = 124).

*.05 level of significance; one-tailed test.

Overall satisfaction with work and supervision were considered to be moderate to high (mean = 40.7; 44.7, respectively). On the other hand, overall satisfaction with pay (mean = 16.5) and promotion (mean = 13.9) were considered low.

In terms of the six research hypotheses, little significance was found in the 36 subhypotheses that were tested at the .05 level of significance using the t-test, one-way ANOVA, and LSD post hoc analysis where appropriate. The two independent variables, respondents...
with children and age groupings of children, produced such small sample sizes in one group (respondents without children and age grouping 0-7, respectively) that valid $t$ tests were not possible. For the remaining $t$ tests (see Table 27) statistical significance was found in the relationship between in-service opportunities and the dependent variables of work and promotion. Practical or realistic significance was reported only for the work variable because, as a group, the overall satisfaction with promotion was significantly low independent of other variables. The same was the case for the statistical but not practical significance between education and promotion and importance of salary and pay.

Table 27
Overall $t$-Test Summary of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Amount of supervision</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Importance of salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>No$^a$</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$No = not significant.

*Yes = significant at the .05 level.
The one-way ANOVA analysis indicated statistical significance only with the relationship between age and pay but again practical significance was not indicated nor was there support of the literature findings, older groups are more satisfied. The LSD post hoc analysis indicated that the age group of 46-55 was more satisfied (but at a low overall level) than the 56 and above group. The literature indicated that older groups would be more satisfied with pay. Table 28 summarizes the one-way ANOVA data.

Chapter V will focus on the conclusions drawn from these findings.

Table 28
Overall One-Way ANOVA Summary of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Seniority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>No(^a)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Yes(^*)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)No = not significant.

\(^*\)Yes = significant at the .05 level.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapters I and II provided the conceptual framework, statement of the problem, and literature review pertinent to this study. Chapter III provided the methodological approach used in analyzing the major questions raised in Chapter I. Chapter IV was a review of the analysis results found in testing the hypotheses.

Chapter V focuses on a summation of the complete work, conclusions, and implications of the study. Specifically, this chapter will be divided into several major sections: (a) Summary of the Study; (b) Summary of the Findings and Conclusions; (c) Limitations; (d) Implications, and (e) Recommendations.

Summary of the Study

Purpose and Rationale

It was determined that the study of job satisfaction was indeed complex and, specifically, the job satisfaction of the elementary school secretary was important. Furthermore, it was determined that those variables which may influence the job satisfaction of this population had not yet been identified. Therefore, it was the purpose of this study to identify those variables.
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In terms of the rationale for this study, it was stated that the practitioner generally views the role of the elementary school secretary as one of critical importance. The relationship between job satisfaction and performance in the role of elementary school secretary was also complex and unclear. However, before the practitioner could begin to focus attention on performance via job satisfaction he/she must first be able to identify the variables that influence job satisfaction.

Several other significant factors supported this study: (a) the reciprocal nature of influence between leader and subordinate; (b) improvement and/or development of the elementary school secretary role; (c) the need for several alternative ways of enhancing job satisfaction; (d) possible reduction of costly turnover.

Literature Review and Hypotheses

Although a universal theory of job satisfaction was absent in the literature, a variety of concepts were available (Herzberg, 1966; Kalleberg, 1977; Kuieck, 1980). Kuieck (1980) summarized these concepts by stating that researchers generally agreed that job satisfaction is a "multifaceted phenomenon" which displays itself in a dynamic affective state that is an accommodative process. Therefore, job satisfaction is not only complex but also transient and what is appropriate for one population, etc. may not be appropriate for another (Naar, 1978; Bonan, 1970).

This review attempted to isolate some of the independent variables (amount of supervision, in-service training opportunities,
education level, seniority, and family responsibilities) that influence job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was defined in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion as dependent variables.

Due to the scarcity of available literature regarding elementary school and secretaries in general, much of the review was taken from other disciplines.

**Dependent variables.** Satisfaction of the subordinate with his/her supervisor was found to be important in terms of job success for the worker (Firman, 1973; McGee, 1971; O'Reilly, 1973a, 1973b; Stoops, 1963). This relationship was also found to be reciprocal in nature therefore influencing attitude, decision making, and job satisfaction (Greene, 1975; Herold, 1973; Kenis, 1978).

Satisfaction with work was found to be largely dependent upon the subordinate's involvement in his/her work (Beehr et al., 1976; Dickson, 1973; Herzberg, 1966; Kirsch & Lengerman, 1972; Norton, 1976) while Organ and Greene (1975) found role ambiguity to be negatively related ($r = -0.30; p < .01$) to work satisfaction. Organ and Greene also theorized, with the support of several others (Battis, 1978; Schackmuth, 1979; Wood, 1974), that those more intrinsically involved in work will derive greater satisfaction from the performance of the task. Those who are extrinsically oriented will rely more heavily on external consequences for job satisfaction such as pay.

Regarding satisfaction with pay, researchers (Flanagan, 1972; Schoff, 1977) indicated that secretaries were not satisfied with it
whether they worked part or full time (Miller & Terborg, 1979). However, several researchers (Kesselman et al., 1974; Pinder, 1976; Shapiro, 1975) found that there was a relationship to increased job performance when pay was contingent upon performance.

Pinder (1976), in support of Herzberg (1966), also found that with employees whose pay was not contingent upon performance there was more intrinsic orientation from work as well as greater job satisfaction. Pay was theorized to be an extrinsic source of need fulfillment that does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction when sufficient but can lead to dissatisfaction when perceived as inadequate by the employee (Burton & Pathak, 1980; Shapiro, 1975; Weaver & Holmes, 1975).

Burton and Pathak (1980) also found that pay was not a motivator for educational secretaries when this need was perceived as being fulfilled. Thus the amount of pay was not necessarily the deciding factor in terms of perceived needs. If their income was perceived as more than supplemental to family needs then it was considered important.

In terms of promotion, secretaries related job security to it as well as status and recognition (Hilgendorf & Irving, 1969). They also tended to find the work activity as a means rather than a fulfilling end (Kirsch & Lengerman, 1972) and were dissatisfied (Flanagan, 1972; Rebellion, 1980) when they perceived promotion as an unfulfilled need. Conversely, Gomez and Mussio (1975), Kesselman et al. (1974), and Shapiro (1974) found high job satisfaction where promotion opportunities were not only available but also contingent
upon performance.

In summary, satisfaction of the subordinate with his/her supervisor was found to be important. Also, this relationship was reciprocal in nature and was likewise found to influence attitude, decision making, and job satisfaction. In terms of work, employee centered management, reduction of role ambiguity, and high job involvement led to satisfaction. On the other hand, pay did not necessarily lead to satisfaction but would lead to dissatisfaction when perceived as either inadequate or not fulfilling this need.

Promotional opportunities were found to be related to job security, increased performance, and job satisfaction when perceived to be a source of need fulfillment.

Independent variables. It was concluded that goal setting leads to higher performance (Dossett, 1978; Ivancevich, 1976; Kim & Hamner, 1976; Lathan & Yukl, 1976) and that secretaries are more satisfied when they have higher job control. Secretaries were also found to be independent in work and capable of decision making in the absence of supervision. Therefore, the first research hypothesis was developed: elementary school secretaries who report having part-time principals in their school will tend to report greater job satisfaction (in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion) than those who report having full-time principals.

The second research hypothesis was developed from the findings that secretaries in general and public elementary school secretaries specifically desired but generally lacked high job involvement
When they had high job involvement or in-service training, morale increased; turnover, errors, and costs decreased. This second hypothesis therefore stated that elementary school secretaries who report on-the-job in-service training opportunities as available in their school district will also tend to report greater job satisfaction, in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion, than those who report in-service training opportunities as not available.

Regarding education levels or qualifications, there was an apparent polarized perception between employers and employees (Arratia, 1968; Shapiro, 1975). However, job performance should be appropriate if minimum or more than sufficient ability exists (Lathan & Yukl, 1976) but there was a possibility of dissatisfaction if the level of education exceeded the needs of the job. Therefore, with these findings, along with the indirectly supported assumption that high school completion was sufficient for the role of elementary school secretary, the third research hypothesis was developed. This hypothesis stated that the higher the educational level of the elementary school secretary, the lower the level of reported job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion.

The fourth research hypothesis was clearly supported by the literature (Burton & Pathak, 1980; Glenn, 1977; Hill, 1975; Shapiro, 1975; Wright & Hamilton, 1978). This hypothesis stated that older elementary school secretaries will tend to report greater job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion than younger elementary school secretaries.
The fifth research hypothesis was likewise developed from clear support of the literature (Cook & Shapiro, 1970; Kesselman et al., 1974; Ronen, 1978; Schwab & Heneman, 1978). This hypothesis stated that elementary school secretaries reporting higher job seniority will also tend to report higher job satisfaction in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion than those with less seniority.

The sixth research hypothesis, regarding family responsibilities, evolved from findings ("Some Secretary Opinions," 1978) that 51% of the surveyed secretaries indicated having significant after-work activities involving their families. Sixty-six percent of these were working mothers. Also, the like of work, job satisfaction, and family responsibilities were all interrelated (Weaver & Holmes, 1975). Therefore, it was hypothesized that the greater the amount of family responsibilities (defined as marital status, importance of income, having children, and ages of children) the lower the tendency toward job satisfaction (in terms of supervision, work, pay, and promotion) for elementary school secretaries.

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to identify and determine the relationship between the independent variables that influence job satisfaction and the corresponding levels of job satisfaction. A population of 210 elementary school secretaries from four southwestern Michigan counties was utilized. Data was collected by means of a mail survey with two follow-up mailings and one telephone follow up.
There were two instruments used in the survey. The Job Description Index developed by Smith et al. (1969) and an Information Sheet (questionnaire) developed for use in this study were mailed to this population.

The t test for independent means, one-way ANOVA, and where appropriate, protected least squares difference were used to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance.

Summary of the Findings and Conclusions

Description of the Respondents

The willingness to cooperate or participate in this study was demonstrated by the 85% return rate obtained. Even those who did not respond to the survey itself, and were part of the nonrespondent follow up, willingly discussed their job satisfaction levels.

The vast majority of respondents were married (90.1%) and did not regard their salary as a major source of family income (72.1%). The overwhelming majority (167) had either one or two children with a mean age of 21.46.

The secretaries themselves had a mean age of 46.96, a high school education (58.1%), and 9.46 years of seniority under full-time supervision (70.4%) with relatively little opportunity (25.0%) for in-service training. Their levels of job satisfaction were overwhelmingly distinct. The respondents indicated moderate to high satisfaction with supervision and work. In terms of pay, satisfaction was found to be low. Also, when considering the fact that the
distinct majority perceived their income as insignificant in terms of family needs, it can be concluded that pay was perceived as very inadequate for the type and amount of work performed (Flanagan, 1972; Schoff, 1977). Satisfaction with promotion was also low and may possibly indicate the perception of an unfulfilled need (Flanagan, 1972; "Rebellion," 1980).

Research Hypotheses: Findings and Conclusions

This section will focus on the findings, their relationship to the literature, and conclusions drawn from each hypothesis. However, special note should be made of the fact that in all of the hypotheses, the same trend was repeated. All groups that were compared expressed moderate to high satisfaction with supervision and work while simultaneously expressing little satisfaction with pay and promotion. Therefore, in all cases where statistical significance was found with pay and promotion, practical significance was not established. The reader should keep this in mind while reviewing this section.

The limitations, implications, and recommendations will follow this section.

First hypothesis. The first hypothesis, amount of supervision and satisfaction, was not supported. The amount of time supervised was not supported in terms of its relationship to the supervisor, work, pay, or promotion. It was apparently of little concern to the secretaries if they were given part- or full-time supervision as determined by their satisfaction.
Second hypothesis. The second hypothesis regarding in-service opportunities and satisfaction yielded mixed findings. There was no support for the hypothesis found in terms of pay and supervision, but there was with work and promotion. In relation to work, a negative or inverse relationship was found. This was somewhat surprising in terms of the literature findings which indicated that there was a positive relationship between job involvement and satisfaction (Beehr et al., 1976; Dickson, 1973; Herzberg, 1966; Kirsch & Lengerman, 1972; Norton, 1976). Morale was also found to increase with those who reported in-service training (Gallo, 1969; Luck, 1951; Smith, 1965). Perhaps it should be speculated that because satisfaction with promotional opportunities was low, this served to offset the satisfaction with in-service training. In other words, the secretaries may have received training but their jobs were viewed as limited due to poor promotional opportunities. However, they were more satisfied with promotion, although the overall score was low, than the group that did not receive in-service training. Therefore, the trained group may have been somewhat less satisfied with work, while still in the moderate range, and simultaneously more confident and/or realistic about promotion. Further speculation seemed to indicate that, following in-service training, a method of improving job role and function, this population was frustrated, because they found difficulty putting into practice what they had recently learned.
Third hypothesis. The third hypothesis was not supported in terms of the relationship between the level of education (high school; some college) and satisfaction with supervision, work, and pay. Although the hypothesis was not supported, this was contrary to the findings in the literature. From this, it may be possible to speculate that those secretaries who received additional education, beyond the high school level, perceived higher self-esteem and, consequently, greater satisfaction with their supervisor and work. The rationale for this phenomena may be found in the fact that the majority of their associates (teachers and principals) were college-educated persons. College training put the secretaries on a perceived education level that was somewhat more compatible. The higher satisfaction with pay is pure conjecture as well as practically insignificant.

On the other hand, the relationship between education level and promotion was supported as predicted (Arratia, 1968; Shapiro, 1975). Those secretaries with a college level education were statistically but not practically more satisfied with promotion. The conclusion here was that the college educated group may be more confident about a promotion should it exist.

Fourth hypothesis. Regarding the relationship between age (35 and below; 36-45; 46-55; 56 and above) and satisfaction, the fourth hypothesis was not supported in the areas of supervision, work, and promotion. Age was not found to be related to these three areas of satisfaction.
On the other hand, support was found for the hypothesis regarding satisfaction with pay. The post hoc analysis demonstrated, with the support of the literature (Burton & Pathak, 1980; Glenn, 1977; Hill, 1975; Shapiro, 1975; Wright & Hamilton, 1978), that the two older secretary groups were more satisfied with their pay than the younger secretaries. The conclusions that seem most appropriate here are that older workers are more job security conscious, have expectations closer to those of the organization, and may have less need for the money (Mumford, 1970; Seashore, 1975). Nevertheless, elementary school secretaries listed their satisfaction with pay, as they did with promotion, relatively low. Contrary to this, they were moderately to highly satisfied with their supervisors and work. However, age did not make a practically significant difference with any of the satisfaction variables.

Fifth hypothesis. In terms of the fifth hypothesis, seniority and satisfaction, overall support was not found in any of the four categories of supervision, work, pay, and promotion. This was a vast difference from the strong support found in the literature. Therefore, it seems appropriate only to speculate.

Elementary school secretaries possibly have a unique role and as a group they tended to be well satisfied with their supervisors and work. Conversely, they expressed low satisfaction with pay and promotion, but once again, the overall level of satisfaction (supervision, work, pay, and promotion) was not related to seniority. Further research may be helpful in clarifying why the differences found
were contrary to the literature and/or support the contention that this population is very unique.

Sixth hypothesis. The final hypothesis originally consisted of four subhypotheses regarding family responsibilities (marital status, importance of income, having children, and ages of children) as they relate to satisfaction. Sample sizes varied too extensively for appropriate analysis regarding the first two subhypotheses: having children and ages of children. Apparently, this population was either unique or much too small for meaningful analysis in terms of their children. Nearly the entire population (n = 167) had children. Most of the secretaries (n = 158) had children too old for this analysis, as supported by the research of Ilgen and Hollenback (1977).

The third subhypothesis, marital status, was not supported in terms of its relationship to all four satisfaction variables.

The dichotomy between married and unmarried secretaries was insignificant. However, a very slight trend was noted where the married group appeared to be more satisfied in all ages. Perhaps a much larger sample size would have produced a more definite trend. If this were the case, it would not be in support of the hypothesis and may be an indication that married people, as previously cited, are more job security conscious and therefore more easily satisfied. Again, additional research would be necessary to further support this contention.

The fourth subhypothesis, salary as a major portion of family income and satisfaction, was not supported in terms of its
relationship to supervision, work, and promotion. The hypothesis concerning pay was supported but was not practically meaningful. All four of the variable relationships were in the predicted (negative) direction. The group who perceived their salary to be a major portion of family income was somewhat less satisfied with supervision and work but the overall satisfaction level was relatively high. In terms of pay and promotion the overall satisfaction level was low for both groups but more so for those who perceived their salary as a major portion of family income. Therefore, it may be concluded that both groups have little satisfaction with pay similar to other secretaries (Flanagan, 1972; Schoff, 1977). Furthermore, the higher need group may not have had the opportunity to realistically explore the potential of this job to meet their financial needs (Fiore, 1971). Also with current economic conditions and growing family needs, they may have found themselves with even less satisfaction in this area. Again, further research would be helpful in clarifying these findings.

This concludes the summary of findings. Prior to summarizing them in terms of implications and recommendations, a review of limitations is in order.

Limitations

As described earlier in this study, several things will limit the conclusions. Only selected variables were studied. Many of the unstudied variables may influence job satisfaction but cannot be controlled in a study of this nature due to time, expense, resources, and other types of research necessary to explore such variables.
Also, the findings are considered associative rather than causal and therefore show relationships among variables, not causation. In addition, the statistically significant findings were offset by the lack of practicality of significance.

Sample sizes of the comparison groups surfaced as an additional limitation that was not originally anticipated and therefore eliminated some analysis altogether. The validity and reliability of the measures should also be regarded as limitations as they (measures) were not, apparently, used previously with this population. Also, the ex post facto nature of this research has limitations inherent in its use regarding internal validity.

Finally, generalizability to groups other than elementary school secretaries is not recommended due to the several findings that were not supportive of the related literature.

Implications

Intrinsic/Extrinsic Orientation

The general trend indicated that this elementary school secretary population was both intrinsically (work) and extrinsically (supervision) oriented in terms of relatively high satisfaction. Simultaneously, they did not appear to rely on other extrinsic sources (pay and promotion) to keep them on the job. Furthermore, this population did not demonstrate a significant preference for either part-time or full-time supervision in relation to satisfaction. Thus, it would appear that, as suggested by Kuiper (1977), there is a
more predominantly intrinsic orientation toward this role found in the work itself.

The extrinsic aspects did not appear to be reasons for continued job maintenance. They were moderate to highly satisfied with their supervisors but whether they (supervisors) were in school for part of or the entire day was not significant. At the same time, pay and promotional opportunities, viewed with little satisfaction, could not be considered motivators or need fulfillers. In fact, Finder (1976) demonstrated that when pay was not contingent upon performance there was a more intrinsic orientation to work with greater job satisfaction. Burton and Pathak (1980) went on to say that pay was not a motivator for educational secretaries, while Flanagan (1972), with support of another study ("Rebellion," 1980), found promotion to be an unfilled need.

The overall implication of this intrinsic/extrinsic role orientation may be found in future trends where the desire to fulfill needs such as pay and promotion exceed the like of work and supervision and thus lead to job termination. This trend has already started and is gaining momentum (Battis, 1980; Maimon & Ronen, 1978; Nicholson, Brown, & Jones, 1977; Schoff, 1977; "Secretary," 1967; Waters & Roach, 1973). The danger of decreased performance also exists (Dermer, 1974; Fiore, 1971; Johnson & Stinson, 1975; Tannebaum & Kuleck, 1978; Wanous, 1974).

Finally, it can only be speculated, but as younger persons move into the ranks of the elementary school secretary with more technical training and/or additional experiences, awareness of job perceptions,
trends, and rights, less satisfaction will be evident. This may inevitably lead to new employee expectations and demands. The old stereotypical attitude "love of my work" may be forced out with current economic trends, employee rights, and needs. To deal with this Fiore (1971) suggested more thorough exploration of needs before and during the job, while others before him (Gallo, 1969; "How to Put," 1966; Luck, 1951; Roe, 1964; Spring, 1965) have suggested formalized professional training and/or professional recognition.

Being able to identify who or what aspect of the population will be more likely to move in this direction will not be easy if at all possible. An examination of the implications from the independent variables involved in this study will explain why this will be difficult.

Independent Variable Implications

It must be stated that this specific population tended to be somewhat older (mean = 46.96) than the median female age group (25-34) in this country (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 394) and with several years on the job. Therefore, they entered this role at a time when women's rights were in the spring of their existence. At the present time, the equal rights amendment is working its way through the political morass and the Supreme Court has just ruled that women have the right to equal pay even though they have different jobs than men. What this may translate into is a new perception of the school secretary role. As younger persons fill the role, as attitudes change, and with the continued growth in the trend of women
remaining single (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 43) and therefore more dependent on their own salary, pay may become a major source of job dissatisfaction.

Although this change is not, at present, seemingly strongly evident among elementary school secretaries, clear distinguishing relationships were not established regarding satisfaction. Generally speaking, all comparison groups were moderately to highly satisfied with supervision and work and poorly satisfied with pay and promotion.

What should be done with these findings, in terms of their limitations and implications will be summarized by way of recommendations.

Recommendations

As pointed out in the second chapter, there was an absence of a universal theory of job satisfaction. Until this is accomplished future study will be difficult as well as questionable. It seems logical that a clear understanding of what will be studied is essential.

One method of developing a universal theory can be found in studies such as this that provide data regarding several different populations over a long period of time. Therefore, this study, as a contributor to a theory of job satisfaction could be replicated and, if possible, conducted in a longitudinal fashion. This would not only add to the existing research but could also be used to test the implications of future employee trends as previously discussed. The longitudinal study would provide data regarding the changing attitude,
perceptions, and expectations of the younger and, perhaps, more experienced secretaries and their relationship to satisfaction levels.

Future researchers should also be concerned with a larger population for study. As this particular population may have been unique or simply too small, certain variables were not testable. Alternative research methods may also prove to be more reliable and valid in terms of demonstrating relationships among variables especially in the area of performance and satisfaction.

Finally, we must accept certain facts. Expectations and responsibilities are increasing for the elementary school secretary; perceived needs of the secretaries are changing and boards of education are not able to balance the two or come up with motivators or adequate rewards (Tannebaum & Kuleck, 1978). Thus it follows that specific steps need to be taken if the job satisfaction of the elementary school secretary is to remain at a status quo or to be improved. In view of current trends, a status quo may lead to decreased performance and/or turnover, both of which are costly to any organization.

Therefore, as they relate to the findings and implications of this study, the following recommendations are offered as means to at least maintain but also improve the job satisfaction of the elementary school secretary.

Over the past 3 decades researchers (Burton & Pathak, 1980; Gallo, 1969; Hilliard, 1978; "How to Put," 1966; Luck, 1951; Riley, 1967; Roe, 1964; Smith, 1965) have suggested the development of a job description, in-service training, increasing awareness of the global impact of this position on school district procedure, policy, and
goals as well as membership in professional associations as means of upgrading this role.

Along with upgrading this role, several other steps must be considered. Ronen (1978) suggested that the secretary role should be viewed as being intrinsically oriented and, therefore, expectations in regards to extrinsic rewards, i.e., pay and promotion, be carefully reviewed by those aspiring to the role of elementary school secretary.

Tannebaum and Kuleck (1978) suggested increasing rewards in the early years with a leveling off in the later years. Their rationale for this recommendation was based on the findings that under a traditional reward system, younger workers are most often less satisfied and have higher needs and greater expectations than their older colleagues.

Burton and Pathak (1980) suggested that status pay (recognition), privilege pay (value of opinion and expression), and power pay (influence and authority in planning and decisions) are all valuable "reward" alternatives to monetary pay. However, when monetary pay is used it should be viewed only as a maintainer not a motivator for this population (Shapiro, 1975). When financial conditions permit, monetary rewards should be upgraded substantially and given higher priority if wages are to be considered viable as a maintainer.

Careful analysis of job enrichment or enlargement schemes is also warranted (Dickson, 1973; Fiore, 1971). These schemes may not always serve as rewards if the ability and needs of the employee are not balanced with those of the organization. A criteria for
promotability should be established and it should be clear that the secretaries already on staff are eligible for promotions as they occur.

Safeguards for self-esteem must be employed (Hilliard, 1978) while sexist and stereotypical attitudes avoided (Clark, 1972). The elementary school secretary, being intrinsically oriented and being more satisfied when in control of their role should be asked to participate in changing work habits that need improvement or development. Specific job goals should be clearly set whether the secretary participates in their development or not (Dossett, 1978; Kim & Hamner, 1976).

If these recommendations are followed, a basis for minimally maintaining and improving the satisfaction variables for elementary school secretaries will be established. Additional research can serve to add to and improve upon these recommendations. Ignoring them leaves the schools open for the likely implications of costly decreases in performance and/or turnover of this critical asset to school operations.
## Job Satisfaction Survey

### Directions:
1. Put "Y" beside an item if the item describes the particular aspect of your job.
2. Put "N" beside an item if the item does not describe that aspect.
3. Put "?" beside an item if you cannot decide.

### I. Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiresome</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthful</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On your feet</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endless</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income adequate for normal expenses</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory profit sharing</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barely live on income</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income provides luxuries</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than I deserve</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly paid</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpaid</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Promotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity somewhat limited</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion on ability</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead-end job</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good chance for promotion</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair promotion policy</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent promotions</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular promotions</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly good chance for promotion</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asks my advice</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to please</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impolite</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praises good work</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't supervise enough</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick-tempered</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tells me where I stand</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoying</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubb un</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows job well</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves me on my own</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around when needed</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Job Satisfaction Survey Information Sheet

Directions: Please check the appropriate box.

**Family Information**

Are you married?

- Yes
- No
- Separated

Do you consider your salary as a major source of family income?

- Yes
- No

Do you have children?

- Yes
- No

Age of each child (in years)

- ____________

**School Information**

Principal (supervisor) assigned to your building:

- Part-time
  (responsible for more than one elementary school and/or other major assignment resulting in 50% or more time away from your building)
- Full-time
  (responsible for one elementary school and no major assignments; present more than 50% of the time)

Does your district provide on-the-job in-service training for elementary school secretaries?

- Yes
- No

**Personal Information**

Age in years:

- ____________

Education (highest grade completed):

- Some high school (years completed)
- High school graduate
- Some college (years completed)
- College graduate
  (4 years or more)

Consecutive years as an elementary school secretary in your district:

- Total

Return to:

John Chirco
4702 Cranwood
Wyoming, MI 49509

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
April 18, 1981

College of Education  
Department of  
Educational Leadership

Dear Friend:

I am a graduate student at Western Michigan University completing doctoral studies involving the elementary school secretary and what issues affect job satisfaction. To date, research indicates this role is very important, but little has been done to determine how the secretary personally feels about the job. The results of this survey will identify those issues that affect job satisfaction.

Your assistance is requested to study this topic. Approximately fifteen minutes of your time is needed to complete the survey. Your response is urgently needed. Please do not assume that others will respond and that your response will not make a difference. The greater the number of responses, the greater the accuracy of the results. Your response will be kept strictly confidential. All surveys received will be compiled into a group score, further insuring confidentiality.

Please return the survey within two weeks. An addressed, stamped envelope is provided for your convenience. Also enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped postcard. Please mail the completed postcard and survey on the same day.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

John Chirco

Richard Munsterman, Ph.D.  
Doctoral Advisor
April 18, 1981

Dear Friend:

I am a graduate student at Western Michigan University completing doctoral studies involving the elementary school secretary and what issues affect job satisfaction. To date, research indicates this role is very important, but little has been done to determine how the secretary personally feels about the job. The results of this survey will identify those issues that affect job satisfaction.

Permission to conduct this study was granted by the Office of Curriculum Planning and Evaluation and the Coordinator of Elementary Secretaries for the Grand Rapids Public Schools.

Your assistance is requested to study this topic. Approximately fifteen minutes of your time is needed to complete the survey. Your response is urgently needed. Please do not assume that others will respond and that your response will not make a difference. The greater the number of responses, the greater the accuracy of the results. Your response will be kept strictly confidential. All surveys received will be compiled into a group score, further insuring confidentiality.

Please return the survey within two weeks. An addressed, stamped envelope is provided for your convenience. Also enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped postcard. Please mail the completed postcard and survey on the same day.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

John Chirco
John Chirco  
4702 Cranwood, S.W.  
Wyoming, MI 49509

Mr. John Chirco  
4702 Cranwood, S.W.  
Wyoming, MI 49509

I have completed and returned the Job Satisfaction Survey.

Name of School

School Address

City Zip Code
First Survey Follow-Up

HELP!!!

If you have already returned the Job Satisfaction Survey and Information Sheet, please disregard this reminder.

If not, please help! Without you I am nothing.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call (616) 531-4633.

Thank you
John Chirco
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