

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF AGE, TENURE,  
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AND PRINCIPAL'S  
LEADERSHIP STYLE TO TEACHER  
JOB SATISFACTION

---

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY  
ELIZABETH W. SIBLEY, B. A.

---

DENTON, TEXAS

APRIL, 1980

### Acknowledgments

Thanks are offered to Dr. John McFarland who has offered the inspiration and encouragement needed for this project; to Dr. Paul Petty who has contributed valuable comments regarding the form and content of this paper; to Dr. Carole Crews who has freely given guidance, advice, and encouragement to every detail of this project during the two years from its beginning to its completion.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgements.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	4
Rationale for Study.....	4
Questions to be Answered.....	7
Null Hypotheses.....	8
Limitations.....	9
Definition of Terms.....	9
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	13
The Work of Herzberg and Maslow.....	13
Later Studies of Job Satisfaction.....	16
Studies Involving Age, Tenure, and Educational Level.....	18
Studies Involving the Role of the Supervisor....	21
Summary.....	24
III DESIGN OF STUDY.....	25
Sampling Procedures.....	25
Collection of Data.....	25
Instrumentation.....	26
Data Analysis.....	27
IV PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	29

V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS..... 50

VI REFERENCE LIST..... 55

VII APPENDIX..... 59

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Analysis of Variance Summaries for Main Effect of Age . . . . .	30
2 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect age: Rec Facet . . . . .	31
3 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Age: Ach Facet . . . . .	32
4 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Age: AU Facet . . . . .	32
5 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Age: Adv Facet . . . . .	32
6 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Age: Ind Facet . . . . .	33
7 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Age: Aut Facet . . . . .	33
8 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Age: Gen Facet . . . . .	33
9 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Age: Comp Facet . . . . .	34
10 Analysis of Variance Summaries for Main Effect of Tenure . . . . .	35
11 Analysis of Variance Summaries for Main Effect of Educational Level . . . . .	37
12 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect ED Level: Ind Facet . . . . .	39
13 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect ED Level: AU Facet . . . . .	39
14 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect ED Level: Adv Facet . . . . .	39

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
15 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect Ed Level: Ach Facet . . . . .	40
16 Analysis of Variance Summaries for Main Effect of LBDQ . . . . .	41
17 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: SHR Facet . . . . .	43
18 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: SSe Facet . . . . .	43
19 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: ST Facet . . . . .	44
20 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: Gen Facet . . . . .	44
21 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: AU Facet . . . . .	45
22 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: CW Facet . . . . .	45
23 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: Rec Facet . . . . .	45
24 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: Ach Facet . . . . .	46
25 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: CPP Facet . . . . .	46
26 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: Adv Facet . . . . .	47
27 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: Aut Facet . . . . .	48
28 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: MV Facet . . . . .	48
29 Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: Var Facet . . . . .	48

<u>Table</u>		Page
30	Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: SSt Facet . . . . .	49
31	Results of the Modified LSD for the Main Effect LBDQ: WC Facet . . . . .	49

## CHAPTER I

# A Study of the Relationship of Age, Tenure, Educational Level, and Principal's Leadership Style to Teacher Job Satisfaction

### Introduction

Deteriorating pupil achievement and declining teacher competence coupled with increasing discipline problems and a mounting tax bill has led to a public outcry against education ("Help! Teacher Can't Teach!" 1980, pp. 54-55). In June, 1978, the approval of a California voter referendum to limit property taxes, Proposition 13, focused attention on an apparent decline in the effectiveness of public education that has been in progress for at least a decade ("America's Teachers--Are They to Blame, 1978, p. 53).

Hechinger (1979) cites figures showing a steadily increasing outlay per pupil during the last ten years paralleling steadily decreasing student performance on the Scholastic Aptitude Test. Hunt and Buser (1977) point to increasing expenditures for education in spite of decreasing enrollments. These statistics show that reasons given for public discontent have at least some basis in fact.

Administrators and teachers, seeking to defend themselves and their institutions, have answered in various ways.

John Santillo, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Personnel for the Dallas Independent School District, says the blame must be shared by "the permissive society, television, teacher certification, universities and public education itself" (America's Teachers--Are They to Blame," 1978, p. 53). Joseph Califano, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, points to the relatively small amount of time devoted to actual teaching ("America's Teachers," 1978, p. 53). The Dallas Independent School District's Operation Involvement, a program for giving teachers a voice in the decision-making process, found that teachers are concerned about the loss of quality teaching time caused by special programs and standardized testing (Wycliff, 1978).

Teachers in various parts of the country have responded to charges of teacher incompetence as the cause of the degeneration of educational quality. In an NEA report, teachers cite the increase in student violence, lack of parental support, and the unwillingness of administrators to deal with incidents of violence realistically ("Teachers Talk," 1978). Teachers also mention pressure from administrators to relax their personal standards for student performance ("America's Teachers," 1978).

Whatever the reasons for the lack of quality in education, educators are being forced to take a hard look at themselves and their institutions. Taxpayer insistence on

accountability for tax dollars invested in education has begun to pressure educators to operate their schools with the same concern for a satisfactory end product that business exhibits. An increasing number of schools are borrowing techniques the business community has long used and are using them to set goals and evaluate teacher performance ("Quest for Better Schools," 1978).

The classroom teacher will certainly be a focal point in the movement toward improving education. Traditionally, education has relied upon a work force that has been destined to frequent turnover because teaching is an easy-entry occupation and salary schedules offer relatively high starting salaries but very little financial inducement for the teacher to stay in the occupation or to improve his or her teaching skills (Lortie, 1975). Maturity, experience, and advanced education are also frequently unrewarded in terms of personal satisfaction (Guba, Jackson, & Bidwell, 1959).

The principal, whose leadership responsibilities are rarely duplicated in a business setting, is quite possibly a key factor in teacher job satisfaction (Holdaway, 1978). Hunt and Buser (1977) state that under the present public pressure for quality performance in education, teachers are likely to feel that the principal must bear a significant portion of the burden of accountability. The principal



establishes the organizational climate in a particular building and has a great deal of control over factors that contribute to the working life of the teacher (Halpin, 1966).

If educators are to reverse the current downward trend in their field, they must consider those things that are likely to lure and hold the competent teacher much as industry has sought to lure and hold a competent work force.

#### Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of the respective factors of age, tenure, educational level, and principal's leadership style to twenty facets of teacher job satisfaction and to overall teacher job satisfaction.

#### Rationale for Study

Industry has shown an interest in the possible effects of employee attitudes and satisfaction on productivity, motivation, turnover, and absenteeism (Herzberg, Mauser, & Snyderman, 1959; Vroom, 1964; Lawler, 1973). Mirvis and Lawler (1977) noted that research has reached a point at which an approximate cost can be attached to various levels of employee motivation. This point is highly significant for industry, but the implications of teacher motivation and satisfaction are more complex and go beyond those of employee satisfaction in business and industry. Education involves unique human "products," and their potential value

to society is not easily measured. Sa'ad and Hamm (1977) pointed out the possible dangers of educators adopting industrial management theory in toto:

It is apparently very easy for educators to be seduced into thinking of students as "products" whose "molders" can be held strictly, numerically, accountable. This notion is nonsense, of course, because schools exist to optimize individual growth, not profits, and the value and complexity of an individual child are simply incalculable (p. 44).

The complexity of the educational organization itself is also difficult to assess, particularly as it relates to the teacher. Teaching lacks the milestones that indicate accomplishment and elevation of status in other professions. There are no changes in title or income that indicate excellence or mastery of skills. The only financial rewards, and these are relatively small, are for years of service and for additional coursework; no differentiation is made for those teachers who show unusual ability, talent, or effectiveness (Lortie, 1975). Teaching may simply be structured in such a way that education denies itself, because of its very organization, the benefits that come to other enterprises naturally as the age, experience, and training of the work force increases.

In the absence of financial and prestige incentives, teachers may rely on the intrinsic aspects of their jobs--working with students, achievement, recognition--to provide rewards and motivation (Holdaway, 1978; Lortie, 1975).

Holdaway (1978) further noted that the greatest dissatisfaction seems to stem from the extrinsic factors--attitude of society and administrative policies--the latter of which is a negotiable item that could be changed or moderated to provide the teacher with a more rewarding work experience.

The principal might be in a position to create an atmosphere for the teacher that will produce job satisfaction that does not come to teachers as a concomitant of age, tenure, and educational level. The principal establishes the organizational climate in a particular building and has a great deal of control over factors that contribute to the working life of the teacher. Goodlad(1978) noted that the principal is the educational leader in a particular building and is responsible for everything that happens in that building. Berg (1977) noted that "there are few instances in group activities that executive leadership is as much needed as in education; there is no group activity that is hindered more when it is lacking" (p. 212).

Because education is of importance to the quality of life in any society and because the work experience itself makes a major contribution to the quality of the life of the individual, teacher job satisfaction is worthy of investigation. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) said that "satisfaction is a legitimate goal in itself" (p. 3).

Holdaway (1978) concluded that more research should be devoted to the variables that might affect the job satisfaction of teachers. Schmidt (1976) suggested the need for further study of the relationship of demographic characteristics to the job satisfaction theory. Glenn, Taylor, and Weaver (1977) proposed that the age-satisfaction relationship merited further investigation since they found correlations that were significant but small. Ewen, Smith, Hulin, and Locke (1966) suggested further investigation of the relationship between certain job satisfaction variables and age, tenure, and job level. Guba et al. (1959) stated that further declining feelings of satisfaction, effectiveness, and confidence in principal's leadership experienced by the veteran teacher made teacher job satisfaction worthy of study.

Lortie (1975) felt that teachers themselves have a responsibility to contribute to the knowledge about their occupation.

Teaching is unique. No other occupation can claim a membership of over two million college graduates and tens of thousands with advanced degrees. To expect teachers to contribute to the development of their occupational knowledge seems reasonable; to the extent that they do, their future standing and work circumstances will benefit (pp. 243-244).

#### Questions to be Answered

In this study, the researcher considered the following questions:

(1) Is there a relationship between age and teacher job satisfaction?

(2) Is there a relationship between tenure and teacher job satisfaction?

(3) Is there a relationship between educational level and teacher job satisfaction?

(4) Is there a relationship between teacher perception of principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction?

#### Null Hypotheses

Null hypotheses tested in this study were as follows:

(1) There will be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers aged 20-30, 31-40, and above 40.

(2) There will be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers with 1-5 years tenure, 6-10 years tenure, 11-15 years tenure, and above 15 years tenure.

(3) There will be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers who hold a Bachelor's Degree, a Bachelor's Degree plus a minimum of 18 graduate hours, a Master's Degree, and a Master's Degree plus a minimum of 30 graduate hours.

(4) There will be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers who perceive

their principal's leadership style as person-oriented, goal-oriented, ideal, and neutral.

### Limitations

(1) The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) are self-report instruments that depend upon the honesty of the respondent for their accuracy.

(2) Since the participants in this study were volunteers rather than a random sample of a population, they cannot be considered representative of any particular population, and the results of the study cannot be generalized to any population.

### Definition of Terms

(1) Job facet. An element in the work environment that, along with other factors, makes up the entire work experience. The twenty job facets used in this study as measured by the MSQ and defined in items 2-21 below.

(2) Ability utilization. A job facet characterized by the opportunity to do something that makes use of one's abilities.

(3) Achievement. A job facet characterized by the feeling of accomplishment obtained from one's job.

(4) Activity. A job facet characterized by one's being able to keep busy all the time.

(5) Advancement. A job facet characterized by one's chances for advancement on his job.

(6) Authority. A job facet characterized by one's chance to tell others what to do.

(7) Company policies and practices. A job facet characterized by the way school board policies are put into practice.

(8) Compensation. A job facet characterized by one's pay and the amount of work one does.

(9) Co-Workers. A job facet characterized by the way one's co-workers get along with each other

(10) Creativity. A job facet characterized by the chance to try one's own methods of doing the job.

(11) Independence. A job facet characterized by the chance to work alone on the job.

(12) Moral values. A job facet characterized by being able to do things that do not go against one's conscience.

(13) Recognition. A job facet characterized by the praise received for doing a good job.

(14) Responsibility. A job facet characterized by the freedom one has to use his own judgment.

(15) Security. A job facet characterized by the way the job provides for steady employment.

(16) Social service. A job facet characterized by the opportunity to do things for other people.

(17) Social status. A job facet characterized by the chance to be "somebody" in the community.

(18) Supervision--human relations. A job facet characterized by the way one's boss handles his or her employees

(19) Supervision--technical. A job facet characterized by the competence of one's supervisor in making decisions.

(20) Variety. A job facet characterized by the chance to do different things from time to time.

(21) Working conditions. A job facet characterized by the actual job environment.

(22) General satisfaction. Satisfaction with the twenty facets of the work experience mentioned above. Overall job satisfaction or satisfaction with the job as a whole.

(23) Consideration. That dimension of leadership characterized by the ability to relate personally with members of the group and to contribute otherwise to group maintenance (Halpin, 1966).

(24) Initiating structure. That dimension of leadership characterized by the ability to organize the efforts of the group to accomplish the task at hand (Halpin, 1966).

(25) Leadership style. The particular combination of the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure exhibited by an individual leader as measured by the LBDQ. The four styles used in this study are defined in items 26-29.

(26) Person-oriented leadership style. That leadership style characterized by a score of 48 or above on the Consideration scale and below 38 on the Initiating Structure



scale of the LBDQ.

(27) Goal-oriented leadership style. That leadership style characterized by a score of below 48 on the Consideration scale and 38 or above on the Initiating Structure scale of the LBDQ.

(28) Ideal leadership style. That leadership style characterized by a score of 48 or above on the Consideration scale and 38 or above on the Initiating Structure scale of the LBDQ.

(29) Neutral leadership style. That leadership style characterized by a score of below 48 on the Consideration scale and below 38 on the Initiating structure scale of the LBDQ.

(30) Classroom teacher. An individual who spends at least one-half of his or her working day in the classroom as an instructor.

(31) Tenure. The number of years an individual has spent at least one-half of his or her working day in the classroom as an instructor. The levels considered in this study are 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and above 15 years.

(32) Educational level. The combination of degree or degrees and graduate coursework obtained by an individual classroom teacher. The levels considered in this study are a Bachelor's Degree, a Bachelor's Degree plus 18 hours, a Master's Degree, and a Master's Degree plus 30 hours.

## CHAPTER II

### Review of Literature

The relationship of the individual to his work experience has been of interest to researchers for some time. Traditional theory, the need-gratification theory of Maslow, and Herzberg's dual-factor theory have provided some insights to the phenomenon of job satisfaction. More recent investigations have examined the relationship of various situational and demographic variables to individual facets of the work experience and to overall job satisfaction. The job satisfaction entity is complex; therefore, the research is sometimes contradictory.

Investigations of job satisfaction among teachers have revealed a work-worker relationship that equals that of other occupational groups in complexity and defies explanation through any systematic theory. Numerous variables interacting with factors peculiar to the teaching profession seem to explain, at least in part, job satisfaction among teachers.

#### The Work of Herzberg and Maslow

The contention of traditional theory in the field of job satisfaction was that if the presence of a given factor in the work situation created satisfaction, then its absence would create dissatisfaction (Ewen, et al., 1966). Later

theorists, however, suggested that the satisfactory relationship between the individual and the work experience could not be explained so simply. Herzberg et al. (1959) departed from traditional theory by suggesting that job satisfaction was dichotomous because man's needs were dichotomous. Herzberg (1966) stated that this dichotomy was a product of man's nature: man had animal needs that demand he avoid pain and human needs that urge him toward psychological growth. Since these two sets of needs functioned independently, the demands of one set could be met without the demands of the other set being affected. In a study among accountants and engineers, which resulted in the two-factor theory mentioned above, Herzberg et al. (1959) concluded that the factors influencing job satisfaction must be divided into two categories. Those factors that met man's needs for avoidance of pain--the extrinsic, environmental or context factors were termed hygiene factors. Hygiene factors included company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships with peers and superiors, and working conditions. Those factors that met man's need for psychological growth--the intrinsic, content factors were termed motivators and included achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, the work itself, and possibility of growth. Salary was found to be an ambiguous factor which could function either as a hygiene factor or as a motivator.

The hygiene factors were considered dissatisfiers, and, theoretically, improvement in these factors would only prevent dissatisfaction. According to this two-factor theory, hygiene factors could not create satisfaction because they contributed nothing to man's need for psychological growth. Expressed job satisfaction was found to be due to the motivators and resulted in improved job performance. In fact, the motivators seemed to be synonymous with the motivation to perform well on the job. The researchers conceded that a few individuals were influenced only by hygiene factors. These subjects were termed neurotic personalities--personalities that were somehow unable to move on to seeking the factors that contribute to psychological growth and, consequently, satisfaction.

Maslow (1954) proposed a general theory of motivation that has been used to define job satisfaction. He stated that man's behavior was governed by a sequential progression through a hierarchy of needs extending from the basic biological needs upward through the psychological needs. Maslow's hierarchy terminated in "self-actualization" which he defined as "the full use and exploration of talents, capacities, potentialities, etc." (p. 150). According to Maslow, man began his progress through the hierarchy by seeking to gratify his lower-level needs, and only when a lower need was gratified was he motivated to move to the

next level of the hierarchy.

#### Later Studies of Job Satisfaction

Wolf (1970), in relating Maslow's theory to the work experience, stated that when an individual found gratification for a currently active need in the work experience, then satisfaction resulted. If attempts at gratification were thwarted, or if there was no possibility for the gratification of individual needs, then dissatisfaction resulted. So, while Herzberg's theory operated on two separate continua, Maslow's was a single-continuum theory.

Later researchers subjected traditional theory along with the theories of Herzberg and Maslow to empirical investigation with contradictory results. Further, the addition of moderator variables and the investigation of satisfaction with the facets of the work experience in relation to overall job satisfaction provided additional insights.

Ewen et al. (1966) tested the two-factor theory and the traditional theory. One criticism of the Herzberg study was that his semi-structured interview technique created research bias because respondents tended to attribute positive events to themselves and negative events to factors in the work environment (Vroom, 1964). To combat this bias, the researchers used objective instruments as a measure-

ment of job satisfaction rather than the interview. The study considered only two intrinsic factors--the work itself and promotions--and one extrinsic factor--pay. The researchers were able to conclude that the intrinsic factors studied were more closely related to overall satisfaction than was the extrinsic factor. But unlike Herzberg, they found that the intrinsic factors were also related to overall dissatisfaction. They advanced the idea that the level of satisfaction with intrinsic factors might determine the effect of the extrinsic factors on overall job satisfaction.

Wofford (1971), in a study among white-collar and blue-collar workers, found the theories of Maslow and Herzberg unsupported. Workers' higher-level needs were significantly related to job satisfaction even when their lower-level needs remained ungratified. Contrary to Maslow's theory, Wofford suggested that perhaps the satisfaction of higher-level needs compensated for the lack of appeasement of lower-level needs. Further, Wofford found that rather than functioning as a hierarchy, that higher and lower-level needs both contributed to dissatisfaction if they remained ungratified. Wofford analyzed the questionnaire responses of individuals and discovered that, contrary to the dual-factor theory, 52% of the white-collar employees and 58% of the blue-collar employees either associated a satisfying experience with a hygiene factor or a dissatisfying ex-

perience with a motivator.

Holdaway (1978), in a study designed to examine the relationship between facet and overall satisfaction among teachers, found that sense of achievement, prospect of teaching as a lifetime career, recognition, and intellectual stimulation related most strongly to overall satisfaction. The relationship between overall satisfaction and salary, various leave provisions, and preparation time was considerably weaker. The most frequently-mentioned satisfying facet was "working with students." "Attitudes of society and parents" and "administration and policies" were the most prominent dissatisfying facets (p. 45). Holdaway concluded that his study lent some support to the dual-factor theory because the subjects found the intrinsic aspects of their work most satisfying and the extrinsic facets most dissatisfying. Reinecker (1972) also found that teachers valued intrinsic factors more than extrinsic factors.

#### Studies Involving Age, Tenure, and Educational Level

House and Wigdor (1967), in a review of research based on Herzberg's two-factor theory, found that satisfiers and dissatisfiers did not operate on separate continua. They noted that job level, available alternatives, age, sex, formal education, and culture influenced sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. House and Wigdor concluded that the two-factor theory was an oversimplification of the

complicated phenomenon of job satisfaction and its relationship to motivation.

Other studies have also found that demographic variables influenced job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mauser, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) found a relationship between job satisfaction and age, and job satisfaction and tenure. In both cases, job satisfaction began at a high level, declined for a time, then began a steady climb upward as age and tenure increased. Herzberg et al. (1957), found that increased job satisfaction paralleled advances in job level.

Hulin and Smith (1965) found tenure and age to be positively related to the job satisfaction of male workers without the decline in the early stages observed by Herzberg. These researchers also found that job level was positively related to job satisfaction. They explained these relationships as follows:

We would regard these results as indicating that working on a job involves a process of workers adjusting their expectations to what the environment is likely to provide...the longer a worker has been on a job....Concomitant with the changing level of the discrepancy between expectations and environmental return...the level of the return is increasing due to tenure-connected raises and promotions. We would argue, therefore, that an explanation based on linear relationships between discrepancies between expectation-return and tenure, and linear relationships between tenure and return would be sufficient to explain the findings of this study (Hulin & Smith, 1965, pp. 215-216).

A similar age-job satisfaction relationship was found



for females (Glenn et al., 1977).

Research has suggested that teachers may not experience the increased job satisfaction related to age and tenure that is frequently present in other occupational groups (Schleiter, 1971). Lortie (1975) suggested that teachers do not fit the age-tenure-satisfaction pattern experienced by other occupational groups because teaching is historically an "unstaged" career, offering relatively little reward for long service and little opportunity for promotion. Further, since teaching is an unstaged career, job level, mentioned by Hulin and Smith (1965), is not a practical consideration.

Guba et al. (1959) suggested that as tenure increased, individual teacher personality differences became vague and a "typical-teacher personality pattern" emerged, which showed a high degree of deference, order, and endurance. The more closely the teacher fit this pattern, the less he or she felt satisfied. Therefore, teachers might be prevented by the organizational framework in which they must function from enjoying the greater job satisfaction frequently related to age, tenure, and job level.

Increased educational level, unlike age, tenure, and job level, has not been found to relate to job satisfaction in teaching or in other occupations. Lortie (1975) found that involvement, which he measured in part by the teacher's

investment of time and money in additional coursework, did not necessarily produce greater satisfaction. Schleiter's (1971) findings supported this contention.

Herman, Dunham, and Hulin (1975) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and certain demographic and organizational variables. They found that higher levels of education were related to dissatisfaction with supervisors and decreased job involvement and job motivation among males.

#### Studies Involving the Role of the Supervisor

The role of the supervisor could be an important element in job satisfaction. Wernimont (1966) found that a positive relationship between an employee and his or her supervisor was the most significant extrinsic contributor to job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959) found that the supervisor was not usually the focal point for high morale, but that the supervisor was frequently the source of recognition for achievement. Since they did not find recognition itself to be a motivating factor unless it appeared with other motivating factors, they proposed that the ability of the leader to organize and plan was highly significant and that successful supervision and leadership might well lie in the ability to arrange work in such a way that workers were able to develop their creative potential.

Using the LBDQ as a basis for his research with Air Force personnel and educators, Halpin (1966) selected two

categories of leadership behavior that he felt most significant-- Consideration and Initiating Structure. Halpin felt that both of these dimensions were necessary for effective leadership because while a leader must be able to get things done, he or she must reach goals through other people; therefore, the leader's behavior must contribute to goal achievement and to group maintenance.

Halpin's studies supported his contention that successful leaders must possess both qualities, but he found that effective leadership in the Air Force situation correlated positively with high ability in Initiating Structure, while success in the educational leadership situation correlated positively with high ability in Consideration. However, Halpin did find some school principals high in Initiating Structure who maintained an organizational climate that was goal-oriented at the expense of the personal, Consideration dimension. Halpin observed that "many school faculties actually respond well to this type of militant behavior and apparently do obtain considerable job satisfaction within the climate" (1966, p. 178). Kunz and Hoy (1976) related this phenomenon to the typical-teacher personality (Guba et al., 1959) of deference and obsequiousness mentioned above. Guba et al. did note, however, that the typical-teacher personality pattern was related to lack of satisfaction with the administrator, which seems somewhat contradictory to

Halpin's observation. Thoms (1977) found that principal's perception of his or her own leadership style varied with the perception of the teachers who worked under that principal.

Bowers and Seashore (1966), in a study of the effects of peer and supervisory leadership upon job satisfaction and performance among insurance agents, found that four dimensions of supervisory behavior--support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation--were positively related to satisfaction with five facets of the work experience--company, co-workers, job, income, manager. The first two dimensions of supervisory behavior related approximately to Halpin's (1966) Consideration; the last two, to Initiating Structure.

Sergiovanni, Metzcus, and Burden (1969) found that despite differences in personal needs that teachers described as their personal preference a principal high in both Consideration and Initiating Structure. These researchers proposed that a leadership style that effectively integrates both the people and task dimensions can be effectively adapted to a variety of individual teacher needs.

Espy (1976) found no relationship between principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. However, he found that female principals had a more democratic leadership style and a greater degree of satisfaction among their teachers than their male counterparts.

Holdaway (1978) concluded that the most relevant administrative functions...may be provision of encouragement and support, removal or at least reduction of irritants, and facilitation of reasonable requests" (p. 46).

### Summary

Research results suggest that many variables interact to produce the final job satisfaction product and that the results are not general across occupations. Teaching has some qualities that make comparisons between it and other occupations difficult and/or illogical. Studies among teachers show generally that age and tenure do not produce the concomitant increases in job satisfaction that occur in other careers. Educational level, however, may produce a lack of satisfaction in teachers as it does in other occupations. The role of the principal in creating an atmosphere that allows the teacher to enjoy the intrinsic rewards of the teaching experience while remaining relatively free from the extrinsic irritants that can interfere with job satisfaction may be a significant factor in teacher job satisfaction. The puzzle of teacher job satisfaction seems to be a complicated one with many pieces yet to be fitted into their proper places.

## CHAPTER III

### Design of Study

The dependent variable for this study was satisfaction with the 20 job facets and general job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ. The independent variables were age, tenure, educational level, and principal's leadership style.

### Sampling Procedures

The subjects for this study were 198 volunteers enrolled in graduate education classes at Texas Woman's University during the Fall, 1979, and Spring, 1980, semesters.

### Collection of Data

Permission was obtained from the professors whose classes were involved in the study. The subjects were given a packet of materials containing the appropriate forms for consenting to participate in the study, a biographical information sheet, and MSQ (Long Form), and the LBDQ (Form 1957). Subjects were asked to fill out the consent form, to respond to the biographical information sheet and to the questionnaires during the class period, and to return the packets to the researcher.

Of the 198 subjects agreeing to participate, 174 returned packets that could be used, all or in part, in the analysis. Of this 174, 5 failed to report age, 3

failed to report tenure, 2 failed to report educational level, and 12 failed to complete the LBDQ.

### Instrumentation

The MSQ is a 100-question instrument using a 5 point Likert-type scale. From responses to these 100 items, a score for 20 facets of job satisfaction is obtained. A score for general job satisfaction is obtained by using 1 item from each of 20 job-facet scales. Hoyt reliability coefficients were computed for 27 occupational groups for the facet scales and the general satisfaction scale. Eighty-three percent of the coefficients were .80 or higher; only 2.5% were lower than .70. Validity was determined from construct validity, using the MSQ to test the Theory of Work Adjustment formulated by the University of Minnesota Work Adjustment Project. There are indications that when high need levels are reinforced by their job, then the respondents report a higher level of satisfaction than respondents with high need levels and low reinforcement from their job. The MSQ does discriminate between occupational groups and between disabled and nondisabled groups (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967; Albright, 1972).

The LBDQ contains 40 questions and a Likert-type scale to determine a group member's perception of a leader's performance on the Consideration and Initiating Structure

dimensions of leadership. The text manual reports reliability coefficients of .83 and .92 for the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions respectively. As to validity, in studies testing agreement among group members in describing the behavior of their leader, a "between-vs. within-group" analysis of variance conducted at the .01 level of significance found that followers agree in describing the same leader and that descriptions of different leaders differ significantly (Halpin, 1957).

#### Data Analysis

The researcher used a one-way analysis of variance to test the four null hypotheses.

The first independent variable was age and contained three levels: 20-30, 31-40, and above 40. The effect of this variable on each of the 20 facet scales of job satisfaction and the general satisfaction scale was tested using a one-way analysis of variance followed by the Modified LSD procedure for specific comparisons where significant  $F$  ratios were found.

The second independent variable, tenure, contained four levels: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more years. The effect of this variable on the 20 facets of job satisfaction and on general satisfaction was tested as above.



Educational level, the their independent variable, contained four levels: a Bachelor's Degree, a Bachelor's Degree plus a minimum of 18 graduate hours, a Master's Degree, and a Master's Degree plus a minimum of 30 graduate hours. The effect of this variable on the dependent variables was also tested using a one-way analysis of variance and the Modified LSD procedure for specific comparisons where indicated.

Teacher perception of principal's leadership style had four levels: person-oriented, goal-oriented, ideal, and neutral. The effect of this variable was tested similarly to the first three.

The .05 level of significance was used for all four null hypotheses.

## CHAPTER IV

### Presentation and Analysis of Data

Based on the analysis of the data, the researcher was able to reject three of the four null hypotheses considered in the study. The main effects of age, educational level, and perception of principal's leadership style produced significant differences in some mean satisfaction scores.

Null Hypothesis 1, that there would be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers aged 20-30, 31-40, and above 40, was rejected. The main effect of age produced significant differences in mean scores on the facets of Independence, Authority, Ability Utilization, Compensation, Advancement, Recognition, Achievement, and General Satisfaction (see Table 1).

The 20-30 group had significantly lower mean scores than the 31-40 and above 40 groups on the facets of Recognition and Achievement (see Tables 2 and 3). On the Ability Utilization and Advancement facets, the mean for the 20-30 group was significantly lower than the 31-40 group (see Tables 4 and 5). The 20-30 group had significantly lower scores than the above 40 group on the Independence and Authority facets and on General Satisfaction (see Tables 6, 7, and 8).

Table 1

Analysis of Variance Summaries  
for Main Effect of Age\*\*

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
SSe					
Between Ss	24.87	2	12.43	.17	1.764
Within Ss	1148.92	163	7.05		
Cre					
Between Ss	49.75	2	24.88	.08	2.564
Within Ss	1620.37	167	9.70		
MV					
Between Ss	30.97	2	15.49	.10	2.316
Within Ss	1109.97	166	6.69		
Ind					
Between Ss	168.46	2	84.23	.01	4.451*
Within Ss	3141.14	166	18.92		
Var					
Between Ss	58.04	2	29.02	.07	2.699
Within Ss	1784.90	166	10.75		
Aut					
Between Ss	87.13	2	43.56	.04	3.365*
Within Ss	2149.11	166	12.95		
AU					
Between Ss	173.43	2	86.72	.01	4.650*
Within Ss	3077.08	165	18.65		
SSt					
Between Ss	94.51	2	47.26	.09	2.457
Within Ss	3154.34	164	19.23		
CPP					
Between Ss	5.32	2	2.66	.90	.106
Within Ss	4192.77	167	25.11		
SHR					
Between Ss	34.99	2	17.50	.58	.554
Within Ss	5237.80	166	31.55		
Sec					
Between Ss	69.08	2	34.54	.09	2.440
Within Ss	2349.97	166	14.16		
Com					
Between Ss	262.01	2	131.01	.01	5.119*
Within Ss	4248.69	166	25.59		
WC					
Between Ss	77.72	2	38.86	.18	1.740
Within Ss	3706.28	166	22.33		

\*significant at the .05 level

\*\*For explanation of abbreviations used in this table, see appendix, p. 60

Table 1 (continued)

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
Adv					
Between Ss	178.31	2	89.15	.04	3.192*
Within Ss	4665.04	167	27.93		
ST					
Between Ss	35.44	2	17.72	.50	.705
Within Ss	4195.56	167	25.12		
CW					
Between Ss	.72	2	.36	.98	.022
Within Ss	2672.33	166	16.10		
Res					
Between Ss	8.43	2	4.22	.60	.516
Within Ss	1364.56	167	8.17		
Rec					
Between Ss	213.51	2	106.76	.02	4.093*
Within Ss	4355.31	167	26.08		
Ach					
Between Ss	72.13	2	36.07	.02	3.906*
Within Ss	1532.71	166	9.23		
Act					
Between Ss	31.06	2	15.53	.22	1.518
Within Ss	1698.07	166	10.23		
Gen					
Between Ss	1045.71	2	522.86	.01	4.812*
Within Ss	18144.31	167	108.65		

\*significant at the .05 level

Table 2

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: Rec Facet

	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>
	(20-30)	(31-40)	(above 40)
	N=42	N=79	N=49
Mean	<u>15.40</u>	<u>17.90</u>	<u>18.14</u>

Table 3

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: Ach Facet

Age	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>
	(20-30)	(31-40)	(above 40)
	N=42	N=78	N=49
Mean	<u>19.95</u>	<u>21.40</u>	<u>21.55</u>

Table 4

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: AU Facet

Age	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>
	(20-30)	(above 40)	(31-40)
	N=42	N=47	N=79
Mean	<u>18.45</u>	<u>20.57</u>	<u>20.90</u>

Table 5

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: Adv Facet

Age	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>
	(20-30)	(above 40)	(31-40)
	N=42	N=49	N=79
Mean	<u>13.86</u>	<u>15.76</u>	<u>16.39</u>

Table 6

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: Ind Facet

Age	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>
	(20-30)	(31-40)	(above 40)
	N=42	N=79	N=48
Mean	<u>17.07</u>	<u>18.59</u>	<u>19.81</u>

Table 7

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: Aut Facet

Age	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>
	(20-30)	(31-40)	(above 40)
	N=42	N=79	N=48
Mean	<u>17.29</u>	<u>18.72</u>	<u>19.17</u>

Table 8

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: Gen Facet

Age	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>3</sub>
	(20-30)	(31-40)	(above 40)
	N=42	N=79	N=49
Mean	<u>70.17</u>	<u>74.58</u>	<u>76.88</u>

Both the 20-30 and the 31-40 groups had significantly lower mean scores than the above 40 group on the Compensation facet (see Table 9).

Table 9

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect Age: Comp Facet

Age	A <sub>1</sub> (20-30)	A <sub>2</sub> (31-40)	A <sub>3</sub> (above 40)
	N=42	N=78	N=49
Mean	<u>10.02</u>	<u>10.90</u>	<u>13.22</u>

The researcher failed to reject the second null hypothesis, that there would be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers with 1-5 years tenure, 6-10 years tenure, 11-15 years tenure, and above 15 years tenure. The main effect of tenure did not reveal any significant differences in the mean job satisfaction scores of the groups considered (see Table 10).

The third null hypothesis, that there would be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers who hold a Bachelor's Degree, a Bachelor's Degree plus a minimum of 18 graduate hours, a Master's Degree, and a Master's Degree plus a minimum of 30 graduate hours, was rejected. Significant differences occurred on the facets of Independence, Ability Utilization, Advancement, and Achievement (see Table 11). However, grouping on the main effect of educational level resulted in an uneven distribution. The groups contained approximately

Table 10

Analysis of Variance Summaries  
for Main Effect of Tenure\*

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
Sse					
Between Ss	16.89	3	5.63	.50	.795
Within Ss	1161.62	164	7.08		
Cre					
Between Ss	18.15	3	6.05	.61	.609
Within Ss	1670.38	168	9.94		
MV					
Between Ss	14.79	3	4.93	.54	.725
Within Ss	1136.06	167	6.80		
Ind					
Between Ss	40.81	3	13.60	.57	.680
Within Ss	3341.93	167	20.01		
Var					
Between Ss	4.84	3	1.61	.93	.146
Within Ss	1839.14	167	11.01		
Aut					
Between Ss	84.40	3	28.13	.09	2.183
Within Ss	2152.34	167	12.89		
AU					
Between Ss	93.96	3	31.32	.18	1.645
Within Ss	3161.39	165	19.04		
SSt					
Between Ss	70.77	3	23.59	.30	1.218
Within Ss	3196.08	165	19.37		
CPP					
Between Ss	92.09	3	30.70	.29	1.246
Within Ss	4139.58	168	24.64		
SHR					
Between Ss	36.74	3	12.25	.76	.385
Within Ss	5309.05	167	31.79		
Sec					
Between Ss	32.26	3	10.75	.52	.752
Within Ss	2387.42	167	14.30		
Com					
Between Ss	184.72	3	61.57	.08	2.338
Within Ss	4398.23	167	26.34		
WC					
Between Ss	16.42	3	5.47	.87	.240
Within Ss	3812.31	167	22.82		
Adv					
Between Ss	93.93	3	31.31	.36	1.078
Within Ss	4877.77	168	29.03		

\*For explanation of abbreviations used in this table, see appendix, p. 60.



Table 10 (continued)

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
ST					
Between Ss	13.28	3	4.43	.91	.174
Within Ss	4262.63	168	25.37		
CW					
Between Ss	30.47	3	10.16	.59	.637
Within Ss	2661.71	167	15.94		
Res					
Between Ss	6.40	3	2.13	.85	.262
Within Ss	1371.11	168	8.16		
Rec					
Between Ss	84.40	3	28.13	.37	1.052
Within Ss	4492.67	168	26.74		
Ach					
Between Ss	19.30	3	6.43	.57	.677
Within Ss	1587.56	167	9.51		
Act					
Between Ss	8.11	3	2.70	.85	.262
Within Ss	1725.24	167	10.33		
Gen					
Between Ss	225.79	3	75.26	.58	.659
Within Ss	19185.58	168	114.20		

Table 11

Analysis of Variance Summaries for  
Main Effect of Educational Level\*\*

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
SSe					
Between Ss	12.87	3	4.29	.61	.603
Within Ss	1165.65	164	7.11		
Cre					
Between Ss	62.66	3	20.89	.09	2.16
Within Ss	1625.87	168	9.68		
MV					
Between Ss	30.30	3	10.10	.22	1.50
Within Ss	1120.55	167	6.71		
Ind					
Between Ss	352.26	3	117.42	.00	6.471*
Within Ss	3030.47	167	18.15		
Var					
Between Ss	61.33	3	20.44	.13	1.915
Within Ss	1782.65	167	10.67		
Aut					
Between Ss	46.50	3	15.50	.32	1.182
Within Ss	2190.23	167	13.12		
AU					
Between Ss	177.09	3	59.03	.03	3.183*
Within Ss	3078.25	166	18.54		
SSt					
Between Ss	133.70	3	44.57	.07	2.347
Within Ss	3133.15	165	18.99		
CPP					
Between Ss	53.73	3	17.91	.54	.720
Within Ss	4177.94	168	24.87		
SHR					
Between Ss	71.38	3	23.79	.52	.753
Within Ss	5274.41	167	31.58		
Sec					
Between Ss	52.14	3	17.38	.30	1.226
Within Ss	2367.54	167	14.18		
Com					
Between Ss	4.69	3	1.56	.98	.057
Within Ss	4578.26	167	27.41		
WC					
Between Ss	54.60	3	18.20	.49	.805
Within Ss	3774.13	167	22.60		

\*significant at the .05 level

\*\*For an explanation of abbreviations used in this table, see appendix, p. 60.

Table 11 (continued)

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
Adv					
Between Ss	282.57	3	94.19	.02	3.375*
Within Ss	4689.12	168	27.91		
ST					
Between Ss	28.23	3	9.41	.77	.372
Within Ss	4247.67	168	25.28		
CW					
Between Ss	17.72	3	5.91	.78	.369
Within Ss	2674.46	167	16.01		
Res					
Between Ss	15.39	3	5.13	.59	.633
Within Ss	1362.12	168	8.11		
Rec					
Between Ss	94.96	3	31.65	.31	1.186
Within Ss	4482.11	168	26.68		
Ach					
Between Ss	96.87	3	32.29	.02	3.571*
Within Ss	1509.98	167	9.04		
Act					
Between Ss	49.43	3	16.48	.18	1.634
Within Ss	1683.92	167	10.08		
Gen					
Between Ss	394.79	3	131.60	.33	1.163
Within Ss	19016.57	168	113.19		

\*significant at the .05 level

67, 46, 44, and 13 respectively. This distribution should be considered when reading the results.

The Bachelor's group had a significantly lower mean score on the Independence facet than did the Bachelor's plus 18 and the Master's plus 30 groups (see Table 12). The Master's plus 30 group had a significantly lower mean score on the Ability Utilization and Advancement facets than the Bachelor's plus 18 group (see Tables 13 and 14).

Table 12

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect ED Level: Ind Facet

ED Level	EL <sub>1</sub> (Bachelor's)	EL <sub>3</sub> (Master's)	EL <sub>2</sub> (Bachelor's + 18)	EL <sub>4</sub> (Master's + 30)
	N=68	N=44	N=45	N=14
Mean	<u>17.01</u>	<u>18.43</u>	20.02	21.14

Table 13

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect ED Level: AU Facet

ED Level	EL <sub>4</sub> (Master's + 30)	EL <sub>1</sub> (Bachelor's)	EL <sub>3</sub> (Master's)	EL <sub>2</sub> (Bachelor's + 18)
	N=13	N=67	N=44	N=46
Mean	<u>18.00</u>	<u>19.66</u>	<u>20.11</u>	21.63

Table 14

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect ED Level: Adv Facet

ED Level	EL <sub>4</sub> (Master's + 30)	EL <sub>1</sub> (Bachelor's)	EL <sub>3</sub> (Master's)	EL <sub>2</sub> (Bachelor's + 18)
	N=14	N=68	N=44	N=46
Mean	<u>12.14</u>	<u>15.12</u>	<u>15.89</u>	17.04

A significant difference in the four groups occurred on the facet of Achievement, but the Modified LSD procedure

failed to specify which groups had significant differences between them. The means are reported in Table 15 in ascending order. The Master's plus 30 group had the lowest mean followed by the Master's, the Bachelor's and the Bachelor's plus 18 groups.

Table 15

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect ED Level: Ach Facet

ED Level	EL <sub>4</sub> (Master's + 30)	EL <sub>3</sub> (Master's)	EL <sub>1</sub> (Bachelor's)	EL <sub>2</sub> (Bachelor's + 18)
	N=14	N=44	N=68	N=45
Mean	20.36	20.66	20.68	22.33

The fourth null hypothesis, that there would be no significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of teachers who perceive their principal's leadership style as person-oriented, goal-oriented, ideal, and neutral, was rejected. Significant differences occurred on the facets of Social Service, Moral Values, Variety, Authority, Ability Utilization, Social Status, Company Policy and Practices, Supervision-Human Relations, Working Conditions, Advancement, Supervision-Technical, Co-Workers, Recognition, Achievement, and on General Satisfaction (see Table 16). However, the subjects were distributed very unevenly on the basis of this main effect. The neutral group contained

Table 16

Analysis of Variance Summaries  
for Main Effect of LBDQ\*\*

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
SSe					
Between Ss	72.85	3	24.28	.02	3.496*
Within Ss	1083.40	156	6.94		
Cre					
Between Ss	59.55	3	19.85	.11	2.012
Within Ss	1568.86	159	9.87		
MV					
Between Ss	87.75	3	29.25	.00	4.768*
Within Ss	969.36	158	6.14		
Ind					
Between Ss	1.71	3	.57	.99	.028
Within Ss	3264.64	158	20.66		
Var					
Between Ss	96.36	3	32.12	.03	3.123*
Within Ss	1635.25	159	10.28		
Aut					
Between Ss	148.72	3	49.57	.01	3.966*
Within Ss	1987.20	159	12.50		
AU					
Between Ss	154.04	3	51.35	.05	2.675*
Within Ss	3032.40	158	19.19		
SSt					
Between Ss	208.94	3	69.65	.01	3.686*
Within Ss	2985.56	158	22.85		
CPP					
Between Ss	472.94	3	157.49	.00	6.948*
Within Ss	3603.83	159	22.67		
SHR					
Between Ss	1525.94	3	508.65	.00	22.259*
Within Ss	3610.56	158	22.85		
Sec					
Between Ss	91.15	3	30.38	.11	2.056
Within Ss	2334.66	158	14.78		
Com					
Between Ss	123.96	3	41.32	.19	1.609
Within Ss	4057.65	158	25.68		
WC					
Between Ss	353.89	3	117.96	.00	5.850*
Within Ss	3206.31	159	20.17		

\*significant at the .05 level

\*\*For an explanation of abbreviations used in this table, see appendix, p. 60

Table 16(continued)

Facet	SS	df	MS	p	F
Adv					
Between Ss	530.39	3	176.80	.00	6.677*
Within Ss	4210.24	159	26.48		
ST					
Between Ss	1102.49	3	367.50	.00	19.386*
Within Ss	3014.21	159	18.96		
CW					
Between Ss	220.38	3	73.46	.00	4.845*
Within Ss	2395.43	158	15.16		
Res					
Between Ss	38.74	3	12.91	.19	1.610
Within Ss	1275.57	159	8.02		
Rec					
Between Ss	548.68	3	182.89	.00	7.592*
Within Ss	3830.50	159	24.09		
Ach					
Between Ss	108.10	3	36.03	.01	3.915*
Within Ss	1454.40	158	9.21		
Act					
Between Ss	33.01	3	11.00	.36	1.084
Within Ss	1603.43	158	10.15		
Gen					
Between Ss	3140.49	3	1046.83	.00	10.929*
Within Ss	15229.41	159	95.78		

\*significant at the .05 level

approximately 60; the goal-oriented, 52; the ideal, 46; the person-oriented, 4. This uneven distribution must be considered when reading the results of the analysis.

The neutral group had significantly lower mean scores on the facets of Supervision--Human Relations, Social Service, and Supervision--Technical than the goal-oriented and ideal groups (see Tables 17, 18, and 19). The neutral group also had a significantly lower mean score on General Satisfaction than the goal-oriented and ideal groups (see Table 20).

Table 17

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: SHR Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=60	N=4	N=53	N=45
Mean	<u>14.63</u>	<u>17.00</u>	19.21	22.16

Table 18

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: SSe Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=59	N=4	N=52	N=45
Mean	<u>21.08</u>	<u>21.25</u>	22.44	22.51



Table 19

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: ST Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=60	N=4	N=53	N=46
Mean	<u>14.87</u>	<u>16.25</u>	18.77	<u>21.20</u>

Table 20

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: Gen Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=60	N=4	N=53	N=46
Mean	<u>68.63</u>	<u>69.75</u>	76.04	<u>78.93</u>

The neutral group had significantly lower mean scores on the Ability utilization, Co-Workers, Recognition, and Achievement facets than did the ideal group (see Tables 21, 22, 23, and 24).

Table 21

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: AU Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=60	N=4	N=52	N=46
Mean	19.12	19.75	20.13	21.54

Table 22

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: CW Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=60	N=52	N=4	N=46
Mean	18.72	20.65	21.00	21.48

Table 23

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: Rec Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=60	N=53	N=4	N=46
Mean	15.13	17.45	19.00	19.65

Table 24

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: Ach Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=60	N=4	N=52	N=46
Mean	<u>20.10</u>	<u>20.25</u>	<u>21.33</u>	22.07

The person-oriented and neutral groups had significantly lower mean scores than the ideal group on the facets of Company Policy and Practices and Advancement (see Tables 25 and 26).

Table 25

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: CPP Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=4	N=60	N=53	N=46
Mean	<u>10.75</u>	<u>14.23</u>	<u>16.32</u>	17.93

Table 26

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: Adv Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ1 (person- oriented)	LBDQ4 (neutral)	LBDQ2 (goal- oriented)	LBDQ3 (ideal)
	N=4	N=60	N=53	N=46
Mean	<u>10.25</u>	<u>13.73</u>	<u>16.11</u>	17.65

The analyses of variance resulted in significant F ratios for the facets of Authority, Moral Values, Variety, Social Status, and Working Conditions, but the Modified LSD procedure failed to point out the groups between which the differences occurred. The group means for these facets are reported in ascending order in Tables 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31. On the facet of Authority, the neutral group had the lowest mean score, followed in ascending order by the goal-oriented, ideal, and person-oriented groups (see Table 27). On the facets of Moral Values, Variety, Social Status, and Working Conditions, the person-oriented group had the lowest mean scores followed in ascending order by the neutral, goal-oriented, and the ideal groups (see Tables 28, 29, 30 and 31).

Table 27

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: Aut Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)
	N=60	N=53	N=46	N=4
Mean	17.15	18.81	19.35	19.50

Table 28

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: MV Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=4	N=60	N=52	N=46
Mean	20.00	21.30	22.44	22.85

Table 29

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: Var Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=4	N=60	N=53	N=46
Mean	18.00	19.22	20.45	20.85

Table 30

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: SSt Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=4	N=60	N=53	N=45
Mean	14.50	15.92	16.58	18.56

Table 31

Results of the Modified LSD for the  
Main Effect LBDQ: WC Facet

LBDQ	LBDQ <sub>1</sub> (person- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>4</sub> (neutral)	LBDQ <sub>2</sub> (goal- oriented)	LBDQ <sub>3</sub> (ideal)
	N=4	N=60	N=53	N=46
Mean	16.00	16.78	19.64	19.85

In this study, the main effects of age, educational level, and perception of principal's leadership style produced significant differences in the mean scores on some facets of the work experience. The main effect of tenure resulted in no significant differences.

## CHAPTER V

### Summary and Conclusions

The results of this study did show a relationship between some facets of teacher job satisfaction and age, educational level, and teacher's perception of principal's leadership style. Principal's leadership style and age were also related to general job satisfaction. Tenure, on the other hand, had no relationship to any aspect of teacher job satisfaction.

The positive relationship between age and job satisfaction found by Hulin and Smith (1966) and Glenn et al. (1977) was confirmed to some extent. Teachers who were above 40 reported more general job satisfaction than those 20-30. Findings regarding satisfaction with certain facets of the work experience also supported the positive age-satisfaction relationship. Teachers 31 and above displayed more satisfaction with the Recognition and Achievement aspects of their jobs than did those below 31. Teachers in the above 40 group were also more satisfied with the facets of Independence and Authority than were those in the 20-30 group, and teachers above 40 were more satisfied with the compensation they received than either of the other groups. Perhaps the older teacher is more likely to be given the assignments and responsibilities

that would promote positive feelings about recognition, achievement, independence, and authority. On the other hand, perhaps with maturity comes acceptance of the limitations of the job in these areas and of the salary received.

On two facets, Ability Utilization and Advancement, the 31-40 group displayed more satisfaction than did the youngest group. Perhaps young teachers eager for advancement and for the opportunity to make use of their abilities move into other careers, leaving those teachers in the 31-40 group who accept the "unstaged" characteristic of teaching.

The findings of Lortie (1975) and Schleiter (1971) regarding a negative relationship between educational level and satisfaction were at least partially supported by the results of this study. Those teachers with a Master's Degree plus 30 graduate hours were less satisfied with the facets of Ability Utilization and Advancement than were teachers with a Bachelor's Degree plus 18 graduate hours. Perhaps advanced educational level increases the individual's expectations regarding promotions and opportunities to make use of his or her abilities. The teachers having the highest educational level also displayed less satisfaction with the Achievement facet of their work than did the other three groups, which could be explained similarly.

In only one instance did a group with a lower educational level report significantly less satisfaction than a group



with a higher educational level. The Bachelor's Degree group was significantly less satisfied with the facet of Independence than the group with a Bachelor's Degree plus 18 or the Master's plus 30 group. Perhaps teachers in the Bachelor's group, many of whom would be beginning teachers, are more closely supervised and have less chance to work alone than would teachers in the other two groups.

Teacher perception of principal's leadership style had a significant effect on General Satisfaction and on more job facets than any other main effect considered. Those teachers who had neutral principals displayed less general satisfaction than did those with goal-oriented or ideal principals. The neutral group displayed less satisfaction with Ability Utilization, Co-Workers, Supervision--Human Relations, Supervision--Technical, and Social Service than did the ideal group. The relationship of the neutral leadership style to dissatisfaction with both supervision facets is obvious, but the neutral leadership style might also frustrate the teacher at other points. Perhaps the neutral style creates an atmosphere in which teachers do not work well with each other and in which teachers feel their abilities are untapped and their opportunities to be of service to others are limited.

On the facets which produced significant differences, teachers with ideal principals consistently had the highest

satisfaction scores. This result was in keeping with the proposal of Sergiovanni et al (1969) that a leadership style that is both person and goal-oriented can meet a variety of teacher needs.

On two facets, Company Policy and Practices and Advancement, the person-oriented group displayed dissatisfaction similar to that of the neutral group. The goal-oriented group, on the other hand, showed satisfaction similar to that of the ideal group on the facets of Supervision--Human Relations, Supervision--Technical, and Social Service. This similarity also occurred on General Satisfaction. Halpin (1966) did note that some school faculties responded well to goal-oriented leadership and maintained a considerable degree of satisfaction. Significantly higher satisfaction involving the goal-oriented group did exist only on 3 of 20 job facets, but the fact that 2 of these facets dealt with supervision perhaps lends some support to Halpin's (1966) finding.

Lortie's (1975) suggestion that a positive relationship does not exist between tenure and job satisfaction in teaching because teaching offers little advancement was supported by this study. No relationship was found between tenure and job satisfaction.

The findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

- (1) A relationship existed between ~~age~~, educational

level, principal's leadership style, and job satisfaction.

(2) General satisfaction increased with age as did satisfaction with several facets of the work experience.

(3) A higher educational level seemed to create dissatisfaction with the chances for advancement and other evidences of accomplishment.

(4) Principal's leadership style apparently had the most wide-ranging effect on job satisfaction, producing general dissatisfaction and dissatisfaction with more facets than any other main effect.

(5) Tenure apparently bore no relationship to job satisfaction for the participants in this study.

Since principal's leadership style had the most profound effect on teacher job satisfaction for the subjects in this study, further study among subjects in another setting might prove worthwhile. Also studies that attempt to pinpoint the specific reasons for changes in teacher job satisfaction that seem to occur with changes in age and educational level could provide useful insight into the job satisfaction phenomenon.

## REFERENCE LIST

### Books

- Albright, L. E. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The seventh mental measurements yearbook (Vol. II). Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Halpin, A. W. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, 1957.
- Halpin, A. W. Theory and research in administration. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.
- Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. New York: The World Pub. Co., 1966.
- Herzberg, F., Mauser, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. Job attitudes: review of research and opinion. Pittsburg: Psychological Service of Pittsburg, 1957.
- Herzberg, F., Mauser, B., & Snyderman, B. B. The motivation to work (2nd ed). New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Lawler, E. E. Motivation in work organizations. Monterrey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1973.
- Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher: a sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row, Pub., 1954.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: a strategy for the study of attitudes. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, 1967.

Articles from Periodicals

- America's teachers--are they to blame? U. S. News & World Report, September 11, 1978, 95(10), 53-54.
- Berg, K. A. Educational leadership. The Clearing House, 1977, 50, 212-214.
- Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1966, 2, 238-263.
- Espy, A. M. The principal's leadership style and the job satisfaction of teachers in a selected urban school district (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36 7770A. (University Microfilms No. 76-12, 017)
- Ewen, R. B., Smith, P. C., Hulin, C. L., & Locke, E. A. An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 544-550.
- Glenn, N. D., Taylor, P. A., & Weaver, C. N. Age and job satisfaction among males and females: a multivariate, multisurvey study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 189-193.
- Goodlad, J. I. Toward the third era. Educational Leadership 1978, 35, 332-334.
- Guba, E. B., Jackson, P. W., & Bidwell, C. E. Occupational choice and the teaching career. Educational Research Bulletin, 1959, 38, 1-12, & 27.
- Hechinger, F. M. Schoolyard blues: the decline of public education. Saturday Review, January 20, 1979, 20-22.
- Help! teacher can't teach! Time, June 16, 1980, 115(24), 54-63.
- Herman, J. B., Dunham, R. B., & Hulin, C. L. Organizational structure, demographic characteristics, and employee responses. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 13, 206-232.
- Holdaway, E. A. Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14, 30-47.

- House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: a review of the evidence and a criticism. Personnel Psychology, 1967, 20, 369-389.
- Hulin, C. L., & Smith, P. C. A linear model of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 209-216.
- Hunt, J., & Buser, R. L. Evaluating the principal--partnership or paternalism? NASSP Bulletin, December, 1977, 10-15.
- Kunz, D. W., & Hoy, W. K. Leadership style of principals and professional zone of acceptance of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1976, 12, 49-64.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Lawler, E. E. Measuring the financial impact of employee attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 1-8.
- Quest for better schools. U.S. News & World Report. September 11, 1978, 95(10), 50-52.
- Reinecker, D. H. The relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction of teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 120A (University Microfilms No. 72-20, 208)
- Sa'ad, F., & Hamm, R. L. Teacher autonomy and/or administrative leadership: myth or reality? Contemporary Education, 1977, 48, 225-227.
- Schleiter, R. C. A study of the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the organizational climate of schools (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 2668A (University Microfilms No. 72-31, 812)
- Schmidt, G. L. Job satisfaction among secondary school administrators. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1976, 12, 68-86.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., Metzcus, R., & Burden, L. Toward a particularistic approach to leadership style: some findings. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 62-79.

- Teachers talk about the vanishing joys of teaching. U.S. News & World Report. September 11, 1978, 95(10), 53-54.
- Wernimont, P. F. Intrinsic and extrinsic factors in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 41-50.
- Wofford, J. C. The motivational bases of job satisfaction and job performance. Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 501-518.
- Wolf, M. G. Need gratification theory: a theoretical reformulation of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and job motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 87-94.
- Wycliff, D. DISD teachers concerned by lack of time to teach. Dallas Times Herald. November 24, 1978, p. 18.

#### Unpublished Works

- Thoms, M. Study of the correlation between the principal's self-perception of leader behavior and how his leader behavior is perceived by his staff. Unpublished master's thesis, Texas Woman's University; 1977.

## APPENDIX



Explanation of Abbreviations Used in  
Analysis of Variance Summaries

SSe	.....	Social Service
Cre	.....	<b>C</b> reativity
MV	.....	<b>M</b> oral Values
Ind	.....	Independence
Var	.....	Variety
Aut	.....	Authority
AU	.....	Ability Utilization
SSt	.....	Social Status
CPP	.....	Company Policies and Practices
SHR	.....	Supervision--Human Relations
Sec	.....	Security
Com	.....	Compensation
WC	.....	Working Conditions
Adv	.....	Advancement
ST	.....	Supervision--Technical
CW	.....	Co-Workers
Res	.....	Responsibility
Rec	.....	Recognition
Ach	.....	Achievement
Act	.....	Activity
Gen	.....	General Satisfaction