

TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION
AND VARIABLES OF KANSAS
INTERRELATED PROGRAMS

By

CHARLENE LITTLETON LINGO

Bachelor of Arts
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1961

Master of Science
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1980

Education Specialist
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 1987

Thesis
1987 D
L755t
cop.2



TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION
AND VARIABLES OF KANSAS
INTERRELATED PROGRAMS

Thesis Approved:

Barbara Wilkerson

Thesis Adviser

Patricia M. Perry

Imogene L. Lord

Michael A. Warner

Kenneth H. Clair

Norman N. Decham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank several persons who have been wonderful helpers, supporters, and advisers to me from the onset of this project to its finish. Dr. Barbara Wilkinson was my first instructor at Oklahoma State University and became my adviser and friend. Her advice and help with many obstacles has been invaluable. Dr. Katy Perry has spent many hours seeing me through the pitfalls of statistics; and I especially enjoyed all the times we visited along the way. Dr. Imogene Land has been a devoted friend, who along with Dr. Kay Bull took me under their wing and introduced me to the conference trail (and we also hiked many miles along other trails). Dr. Mike Warner has been an inspirational teacher, maneuvering me into looking at special education from new viewpoints and making valuable suggestions to me at the outset of my proposal attempts. Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, who graciously agreed to serve as my out-of-area committee member, has faithfully helped me from the Plan of Study meeting on. To him I owe a big thanks for encouraging me to examine my study more carefully. And to the memory of Dr. Bill Elsom, who extended special help to me from the first day I came to Oklahoma State University, I give special acknowledgement.

Two faithful friends at Pittsburg State University must also be mentioned. Dr. Hugh Morrison and Dr. Nick Henry encouraged me to further my education

and offered me my first opportunity to teach at the college level. They also badgered me into taking comps when my feet were cold. Without them I might still be reading journals and reviewing notes!

Special thanks go to my family and friends. Much love to all of them for everything they have done. To Mother and Carol, thanks for helping me finance the children's education and my own so I could fulfill this long-held dream. To Betty and LuVerne, thanks for your constant support by letters, cards, calls and visits; your advice has been true and good. To John G., Anna and Mary, thanks for always being proud of me and for not grumbling too much because I was so often busy. To John D., thanks for being a silent sufferer and a non-complainer; you've had to eat almost anything put in front of you and spend many an evening alone. To Lynette, special thanks for reminding me weekly to write, write, write!

Because of all of you, what I thought might be a dreaded project has turned out to be interesting and, if not fun, at least enjoyable. Again, thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Justification	6
Statement of the Research Questions	8
Limitations	9
Assumptions	10
Definition of Terms	10
Summary	12
II. RELATED LITERATURE	14
Overview of the Chapter	14
Introduction	14
Definitions of Job Satisfaction	16
The Measurement of Job Satisfaction	17
Diversity of Research	17
Job facet and Global Measures	18
Empirical Measurement	19
Intrinsic/Extrinsic Measurement	20
Current Research Emphasis	21
Work Related Studies	23
Job Satisfaction in Education	24
Overall Satisfaction With Teaching	24
Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction in Teaching	25
The Findings	27
Needs/values	27
Nature of the job	32
Working conditions	34
Demographic variables	39
Other	42
Noncategorical Programs	44
Support for Noncategorical Programming	44
Characteristics of the mildly handicapped	44
Identification	45
Labeling	46
Similarity of education needs	46
Noncategorical teacher-training programs	47

Chapter	Page
Opposition to Noncategorical Programming.	48
Identification.	48
Shared characteristics	50
Administrative convenience	52
Labeling	53
Teacher training programs	54
Kansas Interrelated Programs	56
Introduction.	56
Pilot Studies	56
Certification	57
Categories	58
Delivery Models.	58
Program Guidelines	59
Program Modification Guidelines	60
Summary	61
Summary of the Related Literature	61
III. METHODOLOGY	62
Subjects.	62
Instrumentation.	75
Procedure for Data Collection	78
Statistical Analysis	79
Statistical Hypotheses	81
Chapter Summary	84
IV. RESULTS	86
Introduction	86
Test of the Research Hypotheses	87
Hypothesis One.	87
Hypothesis Two.	89
Hypothesis Three	89
Hypothesis Four	89
Hypothesis Five	90
Hypothesis Six	91
Hypothesis Seven.	91
Hypothesis Eight	91
Hypothesis Nine	92
Summary	92

Chapter	Page
V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	93
Introduction	93
Summary of the Study	93
Interpretation of the Statistical Findings	94
Conclusions.	97
Discussion	98
Recommendations	110
A General Recommendation	111
REFERENCES	113
APPENDIXES	125
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTER	125
APPENDIX B - TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KANSAS INTERRELATED TEACHERS	127
APPENDIX C - JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX	133
APPENDIX D - FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD	139
APPENDIX E - PILOT COVER LETTER	141

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Age Level of Respondents.	63
2.	Gender of Respondents	63
3.	Standard Certification of Respondents	64
4.	Teaching Experience of Respondents	65
5.	Delivery Models Implemented by Respondents	66
6.	Total Number of Delivery Models Implemented	67
7.	Age Differences in Months of Students Served	68
8.	Respondents Serving Various Categorical Handicaps	69
9.	Total Number of Handicapping Conditions Served.	70
10.	Total Number of Students Served by Respondents.	71
11.	Size Community Served by Respondents.	72
12.	Means and Standard Deviations of Variables in the Study	73
13.	Correlation Matrix for Variables in the Study.	82
14.	Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses Between Job Satisfaction and Main Effect Variables	88
15.	Summary of Variables Not in the Equation	88
16.	Simple Regression Between Job Satisfaction and Each Main Effect Variable	90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the program options for special education that attained considerable popularity during the early 1970's was the placement of mildly handicapped students from various categories together for educational services (Idol-Maestas, Lloyd, & Lilly, 1981). Passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) slowed the momentum of this program model. The new law required the identification of students by categories of exceptionality which could then be used by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped for required reports of child-count information (Federal Register, 1977).

A 1981 date was set for full implementation of PL 94-142 (Federal Register, 1977). This timeline required school districts to provide an appropriate education for all handicapped students and resulted in the rapid growth of special education programs in the public schools (Kerr, 1983). As school systems struggled to meet this demand for increased services during the late 1970's and early 1980's, interest in merging the categories again surfaced (Belch, 1979; Blackhurst, 1981; Hallahan & Kauffman, 1977, Vallecorsa, 1983).

Belch (1979), Blackhurst (1981), Hallahan & Kauffman (1977), Idol-Maestas, et al. (1981) were among those writers and practitioners who felt that the shift toward grouping mildly handicapped learners together was a

move that would prove beneficial to students. They argued that students identified as learning disabled, behaviorally disturbed, and educably mentally retarded were more alike than different in their behavioral characteristics and academic needs. These supporters of noncategorical program models (also known as generic or interrelated models) pointed out that most teacher referrals are made on the basis of two student characteristics: (1) academic problems and (2) behavioral problems. The postulation has been made that if student characteristics are similar and overlapping, programs could be developed for children with similar needs (Lilly, 1977).

Alongside the position to group the mildly handicapped together was the move to certify teachers by competency standards rather than by completion of course work relating to a specific handicapping condition (Blackhurst, 1981). In September, 1977, Pennsylvania became the first state to abolish traditional special education categories of teacher certification and replace them with the Comprehensive Certificate (Belch, 1979). This certificate enabled the holder to teach classes for the mentally retarded, brain injured, emotionally disturbed, physically handicapped, or the learning disabled. Newhouse (1981) has characterized training for generic certification as competencies needed in the areas of curricular process, knowledge of assessment and diagnosis, knowledge of legal responsibilities, and knowledge of an interdisciplinary team.

Belch (1979) surveyed all state directors of teacher education and certification including the District of Columbia to see if a trend was developing toward allowing noncategorical programming within their jurisdictions. Within his survey, he asked two significant questions: (1) Did the state offer an

equivalent to Pennsylvania's Comprehensive Certificate in special education?

(2) If not, did the state expect to develop something like the Comprehensive Certificate in special education? The results (100 percent response) showed that by 1979, only two years after Pennsylvania was the first to abolish categorical certification, eleven states had adopted the equivalent of the Comprehensive Certificate. How many of these also abolished their categorical certificates in the process was not reported; however, twelve additional states answered that they were working toward noncategorical certification. These figures clearly show that as early as 1979 nearly half the states either had already adopted or were working toward comprehensive certification.

This shift in special education teacher preparation and certification practices and the accompanying change in programs offered at the local school level has been paralleled by considerable controversy. Problems in program preparation, implementation, and outcomes were anticipated by several writers in the field (Lieberman, 1980; Phipps, 1982; Sparks & Richardson, 1981). Phipps (1982, p. 154) has posed the question:

If we accept that differences in characteristics and curricular needs exist among the categories in the "severe" range of disability, can we ignore the possibility or the probability of these differences existing within the mild range?

Sparks and Richardson (1981) have reported that the results of a survey distributed by the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (ACLD) indicating that children were being grouped on the basis of deficient academic skills, but that no other factors were being taken into account as placement

criteria. Lieberman (1980) has charged that new teacher training programs, stressing generic approaches, have turned out teachers whose knowledge of the handicapped is cursory, and that they are poorly equipped to meet the wide array of problems facing them in the field. To date, there has been little empirical evidence presented to document the effectiveness of noncategorical approaches (Vallecora, 1983). Given the assumption that noncategorical teacher training programs would need to turn out teachers possessing all the competencies needed to address a vast variety of affective, academic, and in some instances, physical problems, Sparks and Richardson (1981) have asked where are all the superteachers coming from? The demands on teachers in such programs have been great. Newhouse (1981) has listed among his suggested competencies such encompassing knowledge areas as: conducting inservice training, administering and interpreting formal data, curricular and media design, classroom management and behavior techniques, and preparation to function in a range of diagnostic, consultant, resource, and itinerant roles -- and all this from personnel who go into the field with no previous educational experience in most cases. Newhouse (1981, p. 40) has gone on to say that his model stresses:

. . . assessing learning styles, professionally designing curricula in concert with auxiliary personnel, and developing interpersonal and leadership skills in conjunction with the more fundamental skills not always associated with teaching.

The demands placed upon teachers working in special education (and particularly the newer generic models) may be related to levels of job satisfaction. Lofquist and Dawis (1969) studied the relationship between vocational needs,

work reinforcers and job satisfaction. They defined work and the relationship between competence, needs, and job satisfaction as (Lofquist & Dawis, 1969, p. 132):

. . . the interaction between individuals and their work environment.

The work environment sets certain behavioral requirements for the individual; in turn, the individual has certain expectations of the work environment. Work adjustment may be thought of as the continuous process by which the individual and the work environment meet each others requirements.

In 1982, the Kansas Regent Institutions Special Project began to address the problem of job satisfaction in a study titled the "Kansas Survey Regarding Attrition of Special Education Personnel" (Kells, Banman, & Daub, 1983). One aspect of the study was to ask special educators within the state to rank 61 teaching competencies (grouped under ten general topic areas) in relationship to the affect or contribution to teacher attrition. Because one of the goals of the study was to determine which competencies needed to receive greater emphasis in preservice training programs, data were also collected regarding the effectiveness of the teachers' training at the preservice and inservice levels. In spite of a concerted effort by Kansas institutions to provide broad training in the ten areas of special education expertise, teachers reported percentages of "no training" responses ranging from 14.34 percent to 63 percent on those basic competency areas (Kells et al., 1983). As yet, no study had been conducted to examine the possibility that as the difficulty demands of the program increase, job satisfaction decreases.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a relationship between job satisfaction for teachers working in noncategorical programs and these variables: the number of handicapping categories being served, the number of students served, the age range of the students served, the number of delivery models implemented by the teacher, the number of areas in which the teacher holds standard certification, years of experience in regular education, age of teacher and the size community in which the teacher serves.

Justification

The need exists to determine the role which job satisfaction may play in affecting the teacher attrition rate in special education in Kansas. There have been major concerns about attracting and keeping good teachers in the workforce (Kottkamp, Provenzo, and Cohn, 1986). Satisfaction with work and with the conditions of work have long been considered indices related to the likelihood that individuals will remain in their jobs (Muncrief, 1979).

The Kansas Regent Institution Special Project (Kells et al., 1983) found that in 1981 alone the Kansas State Department of Education listed 200 special education vacancies. Of the 200 vacancies, almost one-half of those were replacement vacancies caused by personnel leaving a position, while other vacancies were in part caused by increased service offerings. Huntze and Grosenick (1980) have verified that shortages of special education teachers continue due to a combination of growth in the field and high attrition rates. A

comparison of interrelated teacher-rosters for the years 1984-85 and 1985-86 which were supplied by the Kansas State Department of Education, Special Education Division, has shown that 33 percent of the 1984-85 interrelated teachers did not return to teach in those programs. This comparison allowed for change of school district and/or special education cooperative.

The State of Kansas has addressed the problem partly by attempting to both reduce the number of positions needed and by easing certification requirements. Easing certification requirements has been accomplished by allowing teachers with categorical certification to be hired for noncategorical programs, providing the certificate held by the teacher is of the same category as the largest number of students identified for program placement (Kansas State Department of Education, 1983). They have also dropped criteria requiring special education teachers to have had two years of regular classroom experience.

The rapid growth of noncategorical programs is not unusual in states such as Kansas that have large rural populations (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1977). In these areas the number of students identified in any categorical special education area is often too small to justify hiring a teacher for each separate categorical program. In spite of Kansas' efforts, many positions remain unfilled.

Hulin (1968) investigated the effects of job satisfaction on levels of employee turnover and found that changes made to increase worker satisfaction resulted in a significant decrease in employee turnover. It is possible that attrition rates among interrelated program teachers may be predicted by job satisfaction

factors such as program demands, levels of teacher preparedness (as measured by experience and certification), and certain demographic characteristics.

Statement of the Research Questions

1. Can the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers be predicted by measures of number of categories of students served, total number of students served, age range of the students, number of delivery models implemented, number of areas in which the teacher is certified, number of years of regular teaching experience, size of community in which teacher serves, and the teacher's age level?
2. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the number of categories of handicapping conditions they serve?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the total number of students they serve?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the age range of the students they serve?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the number of delivery models they implement?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the number of areas in which they are certified?

7. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the number of years they have taught in regular education?
8. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the size of community in which they teach?
9. Is there a significant relationship between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and teacher age level?

Limitations

The conclusions drawn from the results of this study will be subject to the following limitations.

1. Because the responses of the teachers included in this study will be acquired by mail-in questionnaires, the sample will constitute a volunteer sample and may not accurately represent the entire population of Kansas interrelated teachers.
2. The time of year when the responses will be mailed (October) may affect responses which would be different had the mailings been scheduled at other times of the school year.
3. The information found in the study may not generalize to states having different program guidelines for noncategorical special education programs.
4. The generalizations derived from this study are based on the assumption that teacher job satisfaction is accurately measured by the instrument chosen.

5. The correlational nature of this study does not necessarily identify cause and effect relationships.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are acknowledged to underlie all findings of the study.

1. All information concerning program description was assumed to be reported in an objective fashion.
2. The program groupings were assumed to be made on a noncategorical basis regardless of the exact handicapping categories included within a given program.
3. The instrument designed for reporting job satisfaction in the larger population of workers is assumed to measure the same attribute for special education teachers.

Definition of Terms

All terms have been defined using definitions from either The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Federal Register, 1977) or the Kansas State Plan for Special Education (Kansas State Department of Education, 1985) unless otherwise designated.

Interrelated program: In the interrelated service unit children with similar learning characteristics and needs, but from two or more categories of exceptionality, are provided services in the same educational program. Instruction takes place in a multi-categorical setting with a teacher trained in at

least one of the exceptionalities served. Instruction focuses on the common learning characteristics or curricular needs of the students, with individual consideration for needs arising from specific categorical characteristics.

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction has been defined as the affective orientation of an individual towards the work role he is occupying (Vroom, 1964).

Mentally retarded: Mentally retarded means significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period, which adversely affects a child's educational performance.

Noncategorical programs: Noncategorical programs are programs in which different exceptionalities are mixed (Sparks & Richardson, 1981). These programs are also sometimes called generic, cross-categorical, multicategorical, and interrelated.

Seriously emotionally disturbed: Seriously emotionally disturbed is defined as follows: (1) The term means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree, which adversely affects educational performance: (A) An inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors, (B) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers, (C) Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances, (D) A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression, or (E) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems. (2) The term includes children who are schizophrenic or autistic. The

term does not include children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they are seriously emotionally disturbed.

Specific learning disability: Specific learning disability means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations. The term includes such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. The term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, of mental retardation, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

Special education: (1) The term special education means specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions. (2) The term includes speech pathology, or any other related service, if the service consists of specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, and is considered special education rather than a related service under State standards. (3) The term also includes vocational education if it consists of specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child.

Summary

It has been stated that there is a controversy among professionals

concerning the appropriateness of grouping handicapped students from the various categories for instructional and educational purposes. It has also been noted that many states, including the State of Kansas, now allow noncategorical special education programs to operate within the state. Higher education has adjusted to these changes by moving toward competency based teacher training programs. It has also been noted that within the state of Kansas the attrition rate among special educators has been sufficiently high to alert those in higher education to begin an examination of the possible causes. Finally, it has been postulated that some possible relationships to attrition among special educators teaching in interrelated programs have been low job satisfaction ratings relating to the levels of experience, certification, and program characteristics of their assignment. In Chapter II the literature relevant to the present study has been reviewed. Chapter III has stated the methodology utilized in implementing the collection and analysis of the data. Chapter IV contains a complete analysis of the data collected, including pertinent tables needed for a full understanding of the results. Chapter V is composed of the implications and resulting conclusions reached from a study of the data analysis.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Overview of the Chapter

In order to present the concepts of job satisfaction relating to this study in logical order, the review of the literature has followed this topical outline: introduction, definitions of job satisfaction, methods of measuring job satisfaction, related work studies, and job satisfaction in education. The final three topics review the stance favoring noncategorical (interrelated) special education programming, the stance opposing noncategorical (interrelated) special education programming, and possible factors relating to job satisfaction in special education interrelated programs.

Introduction

Job satisfaction studies have been the focus of a great deal of research since the turn of the century. Hopkins (1983) and Jorde (1984) have estimated studies numbering in the thousands. Definitions of job satisfaction, research emphases, and how satisfaction can be measured have been argued and revised. The earliest studies sought to link job satisfaction to individuals' contributions to organizational effectiveness (Hopkins, 1983; Jorde, 1984; Kahn,

1981). In recent years, the focus has switched to exploring the relationship between work and the well-being of individuals in the workplace.

The result of this diverse research has been a lack of agreement concerning the interpretation and value of many studies (Fraser, 1983; Hopkins, 1983; Jorde, 1984; Kahn, 1981; Wanous & Lawler, 1972). For example, research on job satisfaction in education has been conducted using a variety of measurement devices. A large number of factors have been hypothesized to influence job satisfaction among teachers (Haughey & Murphy, 1983; Jorde, 1984; Muncrief, 1979). To date, no comprehensive study has been conducted unifying the study of job satisfaction in education (Jorde, 1984). This fact indicates that research in educational job satisfaction is yet in the preliminary stages.

Published studies relating to job satisfaction in special education have been (1) largely aimed at problems within discrete handicapping conditions (Knox, 1968; Marozas & May, 1980; Meadow, 1981) or (2) comparisons of the job satisfaction of special educators with that of regular educators (Beck & Gargiulo, 1983; Zabel, Smith & White, 1984). Studies considering job satisfaction across all special education workers have been few, although special education has often been described as half of the dual system existing within our educational community, complete with its own administration, legal guidelines, teacher training, certification requirements, and student population (Mesinger, 1985; Lieberman, 1985; Stainback & Stainback, 1985). However, because of the overlapping nature of the studies, in this review the two have been examined together.

The empirical study of issues pertaining to noncategorical special education programs has been stagnant. To date, only one study has been conducted concerning the perceived satisfactoriness of noncategorical (interrelated) special education programs, and this study has dealt with the satisfaction of parents whose children are enrolled in such programs (LaGarde, 1983).

Definitions of Job Satisfaction

The various definitions of job satisfaction have made interpretation of research results complex. Muncrief (1979, p. 35) has said that job satisfaction, "is most often defined as a single concept and then treated in research as a complex set of variables." More recently, Hopkins (1983, p. 7) has stated that, "Job satisfaction can be simply defined as the fulfillment or gratification of certain needs of the individual that are associated with one's work."

Much earlier, Blum (1952) looked at the global concept of job satisfaction and defined it as embracing the individual's work attitudes. Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as the affective orientation of an individual towards the work role he is occupying. Porter and Lawler (1968) defined satisfaction as ego involvement in one's job.

In their Theory of Work Adjustment, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1964) defined job satisfaction in terms of the relationship between one's personality and the environment in which one works. Within this framework, the two dimensions of satisfactoriness and satisfaction are indicators of the quality of an individual's work adjustment. Satisfaction occurs when the work environment

fulfills the requirements of the individual. The worker is then defined as a satisfied worker.

Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state, resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences.

As has been shown, several definitions of job satisfaction have been used extensively in research. Each has had its following and has been useful in generating research hypotheses. For the purposes of this research, the broad definition expressed by Vroom (1964) will be utilized: job satisfaction as the affective orientation of an individual towards the work role he is occupying.

The Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Diversity of Research

Measuring job satisfaction has been approached in many ways. Wanous and Lawler (1972) have reviewed nine operational definitions of job satisfaction in their work on the measurement and meaning of job satisfaction and, in introducing their research, these investigators have said:

As a major construct studied by psychologists, job satisfaction has been used as both an independent and a dependent variable. Job satisfaction and satisfaction with various facets of the job have traditionally been measured by simply asking people to rate their jobs or facets of their jobs. . . . Recently, however, a number of different conceptual definitions of job satisfaction have been stated and this has led to satisfaction being measured in a number of ways. This

proliferation of different operational definitions of satisfaction raises the very important construct validity question concerning these measures. It is not at all clear whether many of the newer measures are, in fact, measuring the same thing as a simple satisfaction rating (p. 93).

Job Facet and Global Measures

As alluded to above, an initial distinction must be made between two broad types of job satisfaction: (1) overall job satisfaction, known as global satisfaction and (2) satisfaction with a particular phase of one's job, known as job facet satisfaction (Beehr & Newman (1978); Fraser, 1983; Hopkins, 1983; Keller, 1975; Wanous & Lawler, 1972). Some theories combine scores on job facet satisfaction to derive a single score for job satisfaction. Other instruments are designed to measure only a single global score representing overall job satisfaction. While facet-free measures of job satisfaction have been found to correlate highly with more complex measurements of job satisfaction (Hopkins, 1983), the most important criticism of this direct measure has been that it assumes that job satisfaction is unidimensional, when job satisfaction seems very likely to be multidimensional (Seashore & Tabor, 1975). Kahn (1981) has suggested that facet-free measures have tended to overestimate the degree of job satisfaction when compared to more complex measures.

Some examples of the job facets considered in measuring job satisfaction are those included in the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1967), and the Job Description Index (Smith, Kendall, and

Hulin, 1969). The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire includes 20 facets (called scales): ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision, variety, and working conditions. The five facets included in the Job Description Index measure satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with co-workers, satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with pay, and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion.

Empirical Measurement

The empirical measurement of job satisfaction has been accomplished by using a variety of methods. The most common measurements have been made with Likert-type scales, using either a five point range or a seven point range to directly express degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction (Wanous and Lawler, 1972). Porter's (1961) instrument for job satisfaction, adapted for use in educational studies by Sergiovanni (1967), gauges job satisfaction through discrepancy measures of the difference scores on Likert-type scales between ratings marked what ought to be and what is.

Some investigators have conceptualized the need to use a weighted sum of the job facet scores to account for individual differences in the value people place on various job facets (Wanous and Lawler, 1972). However, these authors compared nine measures of job satisfaction and found only sporadic improvements in the overall measure of job satisfaction when using importance-weighted scales.

Another distinction among measuring scales that use the discrepancy model are those which discriminate differences in the kinds of discrepancy responses asked for in job satisfaction measures (Wanous & Lawler, 1972). As described in their comparative study, some job satisfaction instruments ask for a response which yields a discrepancy score between what one thinks should be and what is. Others request a response which yields a discrepancy score between ratings of what one would like and what is now or between importance and is now or even the combination importance, would like and is now. The point has been made that these discrepancy scores are likely to be measuring different kinds of satisfaction, for importance, should be, and would like are not necessarily the same in an individual's mind.

Intrinsic/Extrinsic Measurement

A further distinction which must be made is between measurement scales which have distinguished between intrinsic/extrinsic job facets and those which have not. Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) conducted the first large scale studies of employee attitudes designed to tap the dynamics of extrinsic/intrinsic job satisfaction.

The two-tiered grouping of job satisfaction facets (intrinsic/extrinsic) theorized by Herzberg et al. (1959) has been known as the Motivator-Hygiene Theory. This theory is grounded on the premise that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are reactions to different job aspects. The theory's fundamental position has been that no given job aspect can contribute significantly to both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959, p. 81) defined the two

job aspects in this way, "The job satisfiers deal with the factors involved in doing the job, whereas the job dissatisfiers deal with the factors that define the job context." Based loosely on Maslow's (1968) hierarchy of needs, the "motivator" aspects of work are those which have the ability to satisfy the individual's need for self-actualization in his work. Halpern (1966, p. 198) emphasized that "those job aspects that relate to the job context are labeled 'hygiene' to symbolize the preventive role that they play in regard to job dissatisfaction."

During the 15 years following Herzberg's theory, much job satisfaction research concentrated on either verifying or refuting the grouping of job satisfaction facets into the intrinsic/extrinsic dichotomy (Dunnette, Campbell, & Hakel, 1967; Graen & Hulin, 1968; Halpern, 1966; Keller, 1975; Saleh & Grygier, 1969; Wernimont, 1966). Results of the multitude of studies have largely refuted Hertzberg's hypotheses about the differential correlations for the motivation and hygiene aspects of work (Hopkins, 1983).

After the controversy subsided, job satisfaction studies began to discuss the intrinsic/extrinsic dichotomy as references to the job itself and the job context, respectively. These new definitions have become an accepted phenomena relating to given variables aside from the motivator/hygiene theory. The distinction between the job itself and its context has remained an important one in the literature (Arvey & Dewhirst, 1976; Hopkins, 1983).

Current Research Emphasis

Hopkins (1983) has attempted to combine both approaches by studying 23

facets, some corresponding to individual needs and some representing specific aspects of jobs. Likewise, Jorde (1984) has suggested an integrative framework for the analysis of job satisfaction which indicates how the many personal and environmental variables relate to one another in influencing the individual's overall feelings about his work. Hopkins' (1983) plea for a multivariate approach to the measurement of job satisfaction has emphasized the present growth-stage of job satisfaction research and has highlighted the thrust of the most recent advances in the study of job satisfaction:

Although many of these work-related concepts have been utilized in previous research, they are usually linked together in a piecemeal way. By relying on bivariate hypotheses and first-order correlations, an overall model has not been tested. Virtually all scholars in this area agree with Seashore and Taber (1975, 361-66) on the need for multivariate research designs and analytical strategies. . . For such an analysis to be most fruitful, it is necessary to examine the theoretical underpinnings of the linkages among the components in the model (p. 10).

No attempt has been made here to review all the theories of job satisfaction; rather several theories which have been used widely in the research have been discussed. Further, this discussion has been intended to indicate that researchers have continued to construct job satisfaction measures which integrate and improve on earlier research. Recent examples of newly constructed measures were those presented in the literature by Blai (1979), Hopkins (1983), Zabel, et al. (1984), and Jorde (1984).

Work Related Studies

Closely related to the idea of job satisfaction are studies of attitudes toward work which have shed light indirectly on job satisfaction (Hopkins, 1983). These are: (1) studies of the desire to work at any job, (2) studies of occupational preference, and (3) studies known as second time around surveys.

Studies of the desire to work have generally asked whether or not the respondent would work at all if he had the money to live as comfortably as he would like for the rest of his life. The Survey Research Center (University of Michigan) has periodically asked this question of a national sample in the years 1953, 1960, 1969, 1973 and 1977 (Hopkins, 1983). With only minor fluctuations, over two-thirds of each sample consistently indicated they would work anyway. An analysis of the reasons for work, however, indicated that enjoying work was a factor for only about ten percent of the affirmative sample. These findings have suggested that work may have strong attraction for individuals apart from any satisfaction felt.

Both Kahn (1981) and Hopkins (1983) have reported great consistency among studies in which subjects have been required to rank order a list of jobs according to their desirability. The ten highest ranking jobs and the ten lowest ranking jobs have appeared to be quite stable regardless of the occupation of the ranker. Both authors have also noted that job satisfaction among those employed in highly preferred jobs has consistently been much greater than for those employed in the lowest rated jobs. These findings suggest that strong links between satisfaction and the kind of job may have been present.

Second time around studies have been undertaken by asking people what kind of work they would choose if they could start over again (Kahn, 1981). Hopkins (1983) has stated that the results have reflected the findings of occupational preference studies. Responses ranged from 16 percent of unskilled auto workers indicating they would have chosen the same occupation, compared to 93 percent of university professors indicating they would have made the same choice. Again, the suggestion from these findings has been that experienced opinions from workers indicate the type occupation itself may hold much potential for the presence of satisfaction/dissatisfaction. These work-related studies have been presented because consideration of the findings may temper interpretation of the results of job satisfaction research.

Job Satisfaction in Education

Overall Satisfaction with Teaching

Check (1971, p. 173) has stated that "dissatisfaction with particular aspects of teaching is felt by almost everyone in the profession." Haughey and Murphy (1983) found that fewer than 25 percent of their 528 respondents in British Columbia were moderately or highly satisfied with their teaching positions. Bentzen, Williams, and Heckman (1980) reported that 23 percent of elementary teachers and 34 percent of secondary teachers indicated they would not go into the teaching profession if they had it all to do over again. Similarly, McGuire's study (1979) confirmed that roughly one-third of all public school teachers would not go into teaching if they had the power to start college again. Learning

Magazine (1979) surveyed more than 1000 teachers, almost one-quarter of whom said that they were planning to leave teaching because of burnout: the ultimate dissatisfaction. Further, Bowman (1984) has quoted statistics revealing the fact that career attrition rates in teaching have ranged from 40 to 65 percent, with the highest drop-out occurring during the first four years of a teacher's career. Consistently, studies have shown that at least one-fourth of the teaching work force is dissatisfied with their professional choice.

The opposite of the job dissatisfaction figures have been, of course, those statistics indicating measures of teacher satisfaction. The studies cited above have shown that the vast majority (up to 75 percent) of teachers still in the profession have rated themselves as satisfied with their jobs to at least some extent. Yet, considering 75 percent a high percentage of satisfied responses is misleading, given that 90 percent of workers across all occupations have reported satisfaction (Kahn, 1981). This synthesis of job satisfaction studies has revealed that the percentage of satisfied workers has remained consistent across occupations over many years, in spite of substantial changes in the economy and the labor force. From this, we may be able to conclude that teachers, in general, have rated their occupational choice below that of the average worker.

Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction in Teaching

Job satisfaction in teaching can be expected to follow the expectations of job satisfaction in other occupations (Sergiovanni, 1967). That is, broad clusters of factors which have been theorized to influence satisfaction and dissatisfaction in other segments of the workforce should produce similar results when studied

in other segments of the workforce should produce similar results when studied in educational research.

Jorde (1984, p. 5) has analyzed the influences interacting upon teacher job satisfaction and stated that, "Satisfaction in teaching rests on (1) the nature of the individual's values and needs, as well as (2) the nature of the job and (3) work environment itself." (numbers added) In addition, (4) demographic characteristics have long been considered possible job satisfaction factors (Muncrief, 1979). A perusal of even a few past studies reveals a wide range of job facets that have been considered possible correlates of teacher job satisfaction. Correlates from some studies of teacher stress and burnout have been included in the listing, for as Fraser (1983) noted:

. . . in examining a stress/strain relationship of this type one must recognize that there comes a time when strain is equated not merely with reduction in satisfaction, but also in generation of dissatisfaction. . . It will be observed further that the same elements which are identified as generators of unacceptable stress are also defined as dissatisfiers or causes of dissatisfaction. Thus in a stress/strain analysis, dissatisfaction is a manifestation of strain; and, correspondingly, satisfaction is a manifestation of a well adapted response to a level of stress that tends towards the optimum (p. 55-56).

The formerly mentioned clusters of factors (values/needs, nature of the job, work environment, and demographic characteristics) have been used as topic headings for the discussion which follows. The misclassification of some factors

is open to debate; but generally, a factor has been delegated to a given cluster by virtue of its treatment in the literature.

The Findings

As noted above, the research findings reported in the literature have shown that combinations of factors have been at work influencing the job satisfaction of teachers. Check (1971, p. 175) reported that teachers may have a greater number of vexations than many other professions, partly because, "teachers and the schools are under closer scrutiny by the lay public than any other vocational group."

Many researchers have felt the importance of trying to distinguish between those factors which produce satisfaction and those which produce dissatisfaction (Wickstrom, 1973). No consistent division of this sort has yet been discovered (Hopkins, 1983). Instead, given the vast diversity of factors utilized in studies, the combinations of variables examined for possible relationships, and the tremendous variety of measurement devices utilized, direct comparisons of the findings have been difficult. The following sections have examined a part of the reported results.

Needs/values. Needs and values have been considered together in assessing teacher job satisfaction because they are not easily separated. A need has been defined in The American Heritage Dictionary (Morris, 1969) as a condition in which something necessary or desirable is required or wanted. A value, on the other hand, has been described as being useful or important to the

possessor. In describing the combination of these two elements, Jorde (1984) has noted that our cognitive processes shape and are shaped by the interaction between one's beliefs and life situation. In this framework, a need is likely to be used in value formation; for the greater the need, the more value its fulfillment will have for a given person. Maslow (1968) has added an interesting dimension by noting that until lower level needs have been met, higher level needs do not hold as much importance (i.e. value). Values and needs are symbiotic in that a change in one will likely be reflected in the other.

The use of need/values variables is based on the assumption that a teacher's degree of satisfaction with his occupation is related to how well the demands of the occupation satisfy his needs (Blai, 1979; Gottfried & Jones, 1970; Schaffer, 1953). Blai (1979) insisted that in the work environment, degrees of consciously-assessed job satisfaction vary with the strength of psychological needs satisfaction. In his model, the stronger the felt needs satisfaction, the greater the felt job satisfaction. Hypothetically, if the important needs of workers can be identified, job satisfaction can be predicted by fulfillment of those needs.

Some need/value factors which have been thought to affect teacher job satisfaction are: (a) ability utilization (the extent to which one perceives his abilities are being well utilized) (Muncrief, 1979), (b) adult relationships (the importance of) (Decker, 1981; Dunham, 1984; Muncrief, 1979; Youngs, 1978), (c) effects of teaching on personal life (Wickstrom, 1973), (d) moral values (Hoppock, 1935; Muncrief, 1979), (e) recognition for work and ability (Chase, 1951; Harris & Associates, 1984; Muncrief, 1979; Stunkard, 1982), (f) sense of achievement or lack of it (Decker, 1981; Hoppock, 1935; Muncrief, 1979;

Proctor, 1979; Stunkard, 1982; Wickstrom, 1973; Zabel & Zabel, 1980), (g) status and community recognition (Chase, 1951; Harris & Associates, 1984; Kaplan, 1952), (h) self-actualization (Blai, 1979), and (i) student/teacher relationships (Wickstrom, 1973).

Of the needs/values variables listed above, sense of achievement or lack of it has appeared most frequently in past studies. Bentzen, et al. (1980, p. 395) asked, "Hypothetically, which one of the following reasons would most likely cause you to leave your present position?" Two of the five most frequent responses pertained to needs/values: lack of satisfaction with my own job performance and obtained a higher-status job. Several researchers in the field of burnout have identified the achievement factor as a significant determinant. Proctor (1979) found that a perceived lack of job success contributed significantly to burnout. Beck and Gargiulo (1983) found achievement to be the most significant indicator among those utilized when they studied burnout of those in the education profession. And Meadow (1981), whose study indicated the linear relationship of burnout indices and job satisfaction, cited feelings of inadequacy in performing many activities as an identified source of poor job satisfaction in teachers.

Hoppock's (1935) classic study of job satisfaction found that satisfied teachers also felt more successful. While Stunkard (1982) found no significant differences in the job satisfaction of special and regular teachers, her results determined that teachers as a group need to feel occupational success. Wickstrom (1973) also found that a sense of achievement was linked to job satisfaction among common school personnel. In summarizing her findings,

Stunkard (1982) noted that when expectations of teachers were not met for student achievement (or job compensations), a lower job satisfaction resulted.

Recognition for work and ability was another specific area in which several studies reported high correlation with job satisfaction. Chase (1951) collected survey returns from 1,784 teachers in over 200 systems in 43 states to determine factors for satisfaction in teaching. Among the variables he considered, only recognition for work and ability fell in the category of needs/values. Nevertheless, 74 percent of the teachers surveyed reported that it was a necessary condition for job satisfaction. Harris and Associates (1984), in the Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher, noted that 70 percent of teachers they polled in their United States sample agreed that they were satisfied with the fulfillment of this occupational need. And Stunkard's (1982) study of six districts in the metropolitan Chicago area found that teachers wanted to receive recognition for their work and responsibilities within the educational community.

Status and community recognition was the third most frequently researched variable in this category. Chase (1951) noted that large numbers of teachers stressed improved professional status and greater community recognition for teachers when asked to list the changes which would do most to increase satisfaction in teaching. Haughey and Murphy (1983) revealed that one major source of dissatisfaction with their 528 rural respondents was society's perception of teachers, with 36 percent of the teachers replying unfavorably to this item. In related items, their survey also asked for responses concerning the satisfactoriness of society's attitude toward education and the attitude of parents toward education. Percentages of 56 percent and 46 percent unsatisfactory

responses were returned in these two categories respectively. Harris and Associates (1984) found 47 percent of American teachers satisfied with their status in society. Only Kaplan (1952) related that just 10 percent of his respondents cited teacher annoyances related to professional status.

Investigations of other needs/values variables yielded interesting results. An investigation conducted by Blai (1979) found that among professionals, including teachers, 70 percent selected self-actualization as a necessary element for job satisfaction to be present. Muncrief (1979) found that the only area considered to be of moderate to high importance to teachers, (i.e. values, as measured by adjusted scale values on the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire that also correlated significantly at the .05 level with high teacher satisfaction) was the opportunity to utilize their abilities in their job.

Another factor that has been speculated upon as a cause of teacher satisfaction is the opportunity or lack of opportunity for interpersonal relationships with other adults on the job (Haughey & Murphy, 1983; Youngs, 1978). Youngs (1978) hypothesized that lack of opportunity for interpersonal relationships with adults and other teachers contributed to burnout. On the other hand, Haughey and Murphy (1983) found that their sample of rural teachers gained significant satisfaction from their professional colleagues in terms of recognition, social relationships, intellectual stimulation and sense of achievement.

A further area of satisfaction expressed by 85 percent of the teachers in Haughey and Murphy's (1983) study concerned the pleasure gained from relationships with students. Specific items in this area related to satisfaction with students' attitudes towards learning, their general behavior, and the necessity of

working with students from various cultural backgrounds. Wickstrom (1973) also noted that interpersonal relationships with students were linked to the job satisfaction of public school personnel.

Nature of the job. The nature of the job has sometimes been referred to as the job characteristics. Hertzberg et al. (1959) described it as factors which affect the work itself. Occupations have been described as jobs with identical or similar characteristics that are descriptive of what a person in that occupation does on the job, or by the unchanging dimensions of the job (Kahn, 1981). The variables representing the nature of the job, therefore, describe the unchanging dimensions or characteristics which are similar in all teaching positions.

While Kahn (1981) concluded that the evidence confirms the dependency of job satisfaction on the characteristics of both the job and the individual who holds it, he also concluded that the situational factors are probably the more powerful. In summarizing his chapter on "Workers and Jobs: Goodness of Fit", Kahn (1981, p. 104) stated, "If we must predict job satisfaction from only one kind of information, we can do best by basing our predictions on the characteristics of the job itself."

Numerous studies have incorporated variables representative of the nature of the job. Factors which have been measured in this category are: (a) administrative leadership (Chase, 1951; Bowman, 1984), (b) authority/decision making (Chase, 1951), (c) definition and attainability of aims and goals (Chase, 1951), (d) duties (Blai, 1979; Bowman, 1984), (e) out-of-class work (Check, 1971; Kaplan, 1952), (f) paperwork (Check, 1971), (g) parent problems (Check,

1971), (h) responsibility opportunities (Stunkard, 1982; Wickstrom, 1973), and (i) unrelated tasks (Check, 1971). Please note that duties, out-of-class work, and unrelated tasks are terms that may have represented the same concept. Finally, some researchers (Decker, 1981; Wickstrom, 1973) have asked questions requesting satisfaction information concerning simply the work itself.

From among the studies noted, these findings were reported: In the previously mentioned study by Blai (1979), it was found that 70 percent of the respondents selected "interesting duties" as an element necessary for job satisfaction to be present. Wickstrom (1973) reported that responsibility, the work itself, and perceptions of unsatisfactory administration were strongly correlated to job satisfaction. Kaplan (1952) has stated that among those he surveyed, 50 percent of teacher annoyances were related to student behaviors and 15 percent were linked to extra-curricular school obligations and responsibilities, both of which elements may be considered inherent in the job. And Stunkard (1982) found that teachers' satisfaction included a need to have job responsibilities delineated.

In another study, Check (1971) asked his 119 respondents to rank order the 20 most often identified grievances of elementary and secondary teachers. The five most frequently listed as sources of major dissatisfactions were (in order): (1) too much outside work, (2) too many unrelated tasks, (3) rudeness and inconsiderateness of parents, (4) too much paper work, and (5) lack of cooperation between school and home. Posed in different terms, each would be considered to be related to the nature of the job itself since each (outside work,

unrelated tasks, parent problems, paperwork and school/home relationships) are inherent in the teaching profession.

Haughey and Murphy (1983) found that the number of hours of non-teaching duties assigned and preparation time during the day were perceived as sources of dissatisfaction by 41 percent and 32 percent of the teachers respectively. Personnel policies concerned with the promotion and evaluation of teachers were perceived to be unsatisfactory by approximately a third of the teachers. Sources of satisfaction were found to be the professional autonomy associated with teaching, which was reported by over 70 percent of the respondents.

Working conditions. Working conditions have been defined as the environmental setting, or immediate context, in which work is performed (Hopkins, 1983) More than the job itself, these variables are considered to be situation specific. Further, working conditions have been considered to relate less to the interpersonal aspects of the job and more to the physical aspects of the job.

Among the factors which have been employed as correlates in the area of working conditions are: (a) advancement opportunities (Blai, 1979; Dunham, 1984; Muncrief, 1979), (b) fringe benefits (Check, 1971), (c) evaluation practices (Crane, 1974; Finger, 1985; Wickstrom, 1973), (d) job security (Blai, 1979), (e) program model (Zabel & Zabel, 1980), (f) salary (Bowman, 1984; Chase, 1951; Check, 1971; Dunham, 1984; Harris and Associates, 1984; Muncrief, 1979; Stunkard, 1982), (g) school policies (Decker, 1981; Dunham,

1984; Kaplan, 1952; Muncrief, 1979; Wickstrom, 1973), (h) teaching load (Chase, 1951; Dunham, 1984), and (i) working condition of school plant, equipment and supplies (Chase, 1951; Dunham, 1984). As before, some investigators (Bowman, 1984; Muncrief, 1979) included the heading working conditions as a variable. Wickstrom (1973) posed two factors: school policy and working conditions.

In their study of stress in teaching, Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) found that four of the seven sources of stress showing a significant relationship with job satisfaction ($p < .05$) were related to working conditions: teaching load, advancement opportunities, salary, and school policies. Overall, the correlation between self-reported teacher stress and job satisfaction was found to be significant and negative ($r = -.27$; $p < .01$). In their concluding remarks, these writers speculated that the conditions of work rather than the experience of teaching (the work itself) may provide the sources of stress which most strongly contribute to job dissatisfaction and intention to leave teaching.

Dunham's (1984) naturalistic research explorations identified three important kinds of pressures generated from poor working conditions: physical, financial and organizational. The physical aspects of working conditions included badly constructed buildings with inadequate soundproofing and high noise levels, split-site schools with the difficulties of commuting between buildings, small work areas, and large class sizes. The financial aspects were reflected by lower levels of expenditures for equipment, supplies, texts, release of teachers, and the narrowing of promotion opportunities. Organizational pressures identified by Dunham (1984) were difficult and frustrating staff

relationships, little support by top administration, poor coordination between academic and affective concerns, conflicts between departments, age levels, and/or cliques school policy and time pressures resulting from poor planning of meetings and deadlines.

The variable most frequently considered by researchers relating to working conditions is salary. Kahn (1981) stated that he feels pay is so important that its effects generalize. He explained that the amount of pay in relation to a worker's needs and expectations would determine satisfaction not only in its own right, but would strongly affect satisfaction with the job as a whole. Kahn (1981) found that persons differ, however, on the importance attached to money, and his synthesis of research has led him to state:

Men rate pay more important than women do, according to past research, although that may change in the future. Young workers rate pay more important than older ones. And some fragmentary evidence suggests that personality differences affect the relative importance attached to monetary rewards; people whose self-assurance is low consider pay more important than those who are more self-assured and less anxiety ridden (p. 156).

Certainly the literature reflects that researchers have suspected salary's importance. Chase (1951) reported that job satisfaction tends to increase with salary and with the amount of recent salary increase. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) found that salary was significantly related to job satisfaction. And in a different vein, Holdaway (1978) asked his teacher-sample questions relating to the use of experience and levels of education in determining salary. Their

responses indicated high levels of satisfaction (above 80 percent) with these methods of determining salary.

As a powerful dissatisfier, Harris and Associates (1984) reported that 63 percent of teachers in their national survey felt that teaching did not allow them the opportunity to earn a decent salary. Check's (1971) survey of elementary and secondary grievances found that inadequate salary and fringe benefits comprised the second largest category of dissatisfiers, representing the opinions of a third of the 119 respondents. Bowman (1984) compared groups of current and resigned mathematics and kindergarten teachers and noted that on the three factors related to earnings, a marked disparity existed between the status of current and resigned teachers. More than three-fourths of the current teachers in his sample regarded the financial factors as negative job facets compared to less than half of the resigned teachers working in new jobs.

But not all research has attributed the highest importance to salary. Bentzen, et al. (1980) noted that more than money, school policy (i.e. personal conflict with the administration) and inadequate plant and physical materials were among the most frequently marked reasons for hypothetically leaving the profession. Blai (1979) found that 39 percent of those he surveyed selected advancement as the most necessary element for career educators' job satisfaction, while salary did not prove to be a significantly related element. Boeck (1980) similarly found salary to be a nonsignificant variable in the job satisfaction of special education teachers.

In a related finding, Blai (1979) also did not find job security to be significantly related to satisfaction in the teaching profession, while 70 percent of

service personnel and 71 percent of trades-manual personnel found this to be a necessary element. These findings were in contrast to Holdaway's (1978) findings which pictured 88 percent of his Canadian sample as satisfied with their job security.

Another group of studies have focused on a cluster of working conditions which includes school policy, administrative practices, and teacher evaluation. Several studies have found these to be the focus of dissatisfaction, as noted above in the discussion of Bentzen et al.'s (1980) findings. Similarly, Wickstrom (1973) found that inappropriate school policies and the general heading working conditions were related to job dissatisfaction. Kaplan's (1952) research found that 25 percent of teacher annoyances were connected to school organization. Decker (1981) found only one strong cluster of job dissatisfaction items in his study of the variables affecting special education teachers of the mentally retarded: company policy and administration. Haughey and Murphy (1983) noted that provisions for sabbatical leave and negotiation over working conditions were sources of discontent. Chase (1951) found that teachers rated by superintendents as superior tended to have a higher degree of job satisfaction than those with low evaluation ratings. And Holdaway (1978) described more than 50 percent of his sample as dissatisfied with the methods used to evaluate and promote teachers.

Other facets of the working conditions category have appeared less frequently in the literature. Haughey and Murphy (1983) noted that 40 percent of the teachers surveyed expressed some dissatisfaction with the physical conditions of staff rooms and offices. Weiskopf (1980) found work overload to be

related to dissatisfaction. Check (1971) noted that many of his respondents indicated meager fringe benefits were a serious problem. Zabel and Zabel (1980) revealed that among special education teachers those employed as consultants and those assigned to programs for the emotionally disturbed were significantly less satisfied than those employed in resource rooms or self-contained rooms and that those employed to teach the behaviorally disordered were more dissatisfied than those teaching students of other handicapping categories. All in all, a wide variety of job facets have been examined under the concept of working conditions.

Demographic variables. Demographic characteristics are the most easily measured of the factors considered to influence job satisfaction. Most information of this nature has been gathered by self-report instruments. Almost every investigator has included at least some demographic measures as correlates of job satisfaction.

Among the demographic characteristics which have been considered as factors influencing teacher job satisfaction are: (a) age (Decker, 1981; Federman, 1984; Finger, 1985; Hoppock, 1935; Muncrief, 1979; Zabel & Zabel, 1980), (b) community size (Hoppock, 1935), (c) education of teacher (Decker, 1981; Zabel & Zabel, 1980), (d) elementary vs. secondary teaching (Chase, 1951; Check, 1971; Federman, 1984; Zabel & Zabel, 1980), (e) ethnic origin (Decker, 1981), (f) handicapping label (Zabel & Zabel, 1980), (g) marital status (Chase, 1951; Zabel et al., 1984), and (h) professional organization membership (Decker, 1981; Hopkins, 1983).

Research using demographic variables has produced an array of findings. A few investigations have used demographic variables in direct measures of job satisfaction. Chase (1951) investigated common school personnel and found that: (1) elementary teachers tended to be more satisfied than did teachers in secondary schools, (2) women teachers tended to be slightly more satisfied than men teachers, (3) married teachers tended to be slightly more satisfied than single teachers, and (4) job satisfaction tended to increase with years of teaching experience. Hoppock (1935) found that satisfied teachers were slightly older and were teaching in cities above 10,000 in population.

More often, demographic variables have been considered in relationship to other job satisfaction correlates. Demographic information has been thought to have a moderating effect on factors more directly related to job satisfaction (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979; Smith et al., 1969). In these studies, the effects of hypothetical variables are often secondarily examined by application of the demographic information.

In a study of special education teacher burnout, Zabel and Zabel (1980) discovered that certain demographic variables appeared to be important factors. Age and experience of teachers appeared to be related in a substantial linear manner to all three measures of burn-out: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. The findings showed that, in general, the older the teacher, the less emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and the greater the sense of personal accomplishment. Similarly, teachers with more experience had less emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, with experienced teachers (especially those in regular

education) appearing to have different feelings of personal accomplishment than those reported by the older group.

Zabel et al. (1984) considered demographic variables (among others) in their job satisfaction study of special education teacher educators. This group analyzed five clusters of variables (social/community conditions, advancement opportunities, program quality, financial conditions, and department resources) by the demographic variables of age, sex, and marital status. Specific findings ($p < .05$) indicated there were significant differences found for marital status and social community conditions, with both married and single faculty more satisfied than divorced/single subjects. When advancement opportunities were considered, males were found to be more satisfied than females, with no significant differences among marital subgroups. Financial conditions were also analyzed, and males were found to be more satisfied than females; subjects above the age of 40 years were found to be more satisfied than subjects below 40; and married respondents were found to be more satisfied than single ones.

An investigation of attrition among teachers of the mentally retarded by Knox (1968) pointed to age and sex as significant variables. Knox (1968) found that those who had quit with two or less years of experience tended to be younger men; thus, being female and older tended to correlate with perseverance in teaching, one indicator of satisfaction.

The only demographic variables Muncrief (1979) found to be significantly correlated to satisfaction were the number of years in the present teaching position and sex (female). Both were significantly related to higher levels of satisfaction.

Some researchers have found little used demographic variables to be significantly related to satisfaction in teaching. Boeck (1980) did not find age or years of experience to be related to the job satisfaction of special education teachers, but found the only significant relationship to exist with size of the school district. In the discussion of the results, Boeck (1980) speculated that this finding could have reflected the large amounts of paperwork associated with large systems. A suspected relationship of job satisfaction and compliance with the mandates of P.L. 94-142 failed to reach significance. Further, this study found special education teachers to be relatively satisfied.

Zabel and Zabel (1980) also found that among their demographic variables, level of teaching assignment was significantly related to job dissatisfaction for junior high teachers. These professionals showed the highest levels of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Other. Several variables defying inclusion in the categories presented have appeared in the literature. Hoppock (1935) used survey methods and attitude scales to determine the job satisfaction levels of several occupational groups, including teachers. In his writings, Hoppock noted that differences equivalent to three times the standard error indicated that the satisfied teachers enjoyed better human relationships with co-workers. His discovery of the strong relationship between life satisfaction (satisfaction in marriage and outside-work relationships) and job satisfaction has consistently been verified (Federman, 1984; Iris & Barrett, 1972), although often excluded from the variables considered.

Crane (1974) found that expected adjustment to teaching among third-year education majors, as measured by expected job satisfaction, was related to the degree of self-acceptance and acceptance of others. A relationship of expected job satisfaction and ratings by university professors failed to reach significance, as did the relationship between practice teaching grades and the attitude scales.

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) studied job satisfaction, along with absenteeism and intention to leave teaching, as correlates of teacher stress. Intention to leave teaching was chosen over actual attrition because it explored the motivation to leave. Approximately 24 percent of the respondents indicated that it was fairly or very unlikely that they would still be teaching in ten years. Two of the stress factors that showed significance ($p < .05$) for intention to leave were also significant for job satisfaction: student behavior and salary. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) reminded the reader that any random sample of teachers is a sample of a survival population. Others, for numerous reasons, have already left.

Hauser (1982) investigated the relationship of regular and special education elementary teachers' self-esteem and job satisfaction. With both groups significant, positive relationships were found ($r = .273$; $p < .05$) for the hypothesis. Hauser (1982) also found a significant, negative relationship ($r = -.257$; $p < .05$) between job satisfaction and future plans in the profession for both groups of teachers.

The studies cited have illustrated the wide range of research undertaken to understand teacher job satisfaction and its correlates. Certainly all possible factors have not yet been investigated nor have all existing studies been cited. The present research project has wished to focus on variables peculiar to certain

special education programs known as noncategorical or interrelated classes. The topics which follow will lay the groundwork for understanding the variables chosen for this project.

Noncategorical Programs

Noncategorical programming has been the focus of a great deal of controversy during the past decade. While supporters and opponents have not settled their differences, implementation of the model has proceeded very quickly. Since 1978, the State of Kansas has moved from no programs of this type (Belch, 1979) to over 587 programs designed as interrelated (Kansas State Department of Education, 1985). The interrelated program option has allowed several different exceptionalities to be grouped together in various instructional settings. Because more variety is tolerated within noncategorical (interrelated programs) an overview of the model conception and both favorable and unfavorable viewpoints have been reviewed.

Support for Noncategorical Programming

Characteristics of the mildly handicapped. Lilly (1977) has pointed out that the majority of all referrals made by regular classroom teachers have been based on only two types of problems: (1) The child exhibited behaviors that were inappropriate to the school environment or were age inappropriate. (2) The child was having academic difficulties. Much of the time, both reasons have been cited, and these problems have existed regardless of the eventual categorical identification made. Reynolds (1979) further noted that there has been

overlapping of the behavioral characteristics among the categories, especially in the areas of personality and social adjustment, I.Q., and underachievement. Lilly's (1977, p. 60) argument for proceeding with the move to noncategorical programming has asked what was being "sacrificed in doing away with the search for causes (insert: i.e. categorical identification and placement)? Only a great deal of administrative effort which at this point has had little instructional payoff." These observations have summarized the characteristics of the mildly handicapped which have served as the basic rationale for noncategorical programming.

Identification. Educators such as Hallahan and Kauffman (1977), who have embraced the move to noncategorical programming, point out that this programming option is based on the behavioral characteristics of the three groups most often included in the term mildly handicapped: the learning disabled, the mildly mentally retarded (educable), and the mildly emotionally disturbed. They have pointed out that it is often extremely difficult to assign a given child to one specific category. This is due in large part to the unclear definitions of the terms learning disabilities and emotional disturbance. The charge has been made that these definitions have been construed to mean what adult service providers have needed them to mean. For example, no consistent definition exists for the category of emotional disturbance. It was pointed out (Hallahan and Kauffman, 1977, p. 140) that "it appears that a child is disturbed when a adult authority says he is, i.e., when the child's behavior is seriously discrepant from that desired by his adult caretaker."

Labeling. It has also been pointed out by supporters of the noncategorical approach that labeling children may produce undesirable side effects (Dunn, 1968; Hallahan & Kauffman, 1977; Reynolds & Balow, 1972). Hallahan and Kauffman (1977) have described the labeling scenario as one of widespread disenchantment, and as a practice that is no longer acceptable.

Reynolds and Balow (1972) have pointed out that category labels tend to become stigmatic and permanent, an excuse for poor educational programs, conveyors of negative expectations, vehicles for self-fulfilling prophecy, and easily confused with educational classifications. Suffice it to say, that indeed, the serious limitations imposed by labeling students on the basis of medically derived systems has been recognized (Gearheart & Weishahn, 1980).

Similarity of educational needs. Hallahan and Kauffman (1977) have noted that the educational needs of these mildly handicapped children are quite similar in that all are lacking in basic skills. They further point out that the assignment of a correct label does not in itself help us teach that child. In fact, they have contended that categorical grouping has no rational basis in terms of instructional effectiveness. Idol-Maestas, et al. (1981) have also commented on the shared educational needs of the collective group saying:

Mildly handicapped (Title I, learning disabled, behavior disordered) students placed in a resource-type service for instruction, share some basic characteristics regardless of labeled exceptionality. In essence they all lack the basic literacy and arithmetic skills necessary to perform in a given curriculum at an acceptable level (p. 215).

To support the claim that the mildly handicapped share common characteristics that make noncategorical programming a desirable option, Idol-Maestas, et al. (1981) presented pupil progress data, collected as part of a generic teacher education program. They desired to demonstrate both the similarities of academic problems and the fact that different categories of students responded similarly to direct, data-based instruction, regardless of category. For example, using the oral reading criteria of 95 percent accuracy in word recognition and 80 percent responses on comprehension on a 100-word timed passage as the basis of reading grouping, the following gains were reported: All groups of students made gains comparable to one and one-half to two months per month of instruction. The learning disabled, Title I, and behaviorally disturbed groups gained an average of two months progress in one month. The educable mentally retarded group averaged one and one-half month's progress in one month.

It should be stated that none of the authors who have supported the concept of generic classes have recommended the educational model for any students other than those classified as "mildly" handicapped. Nor did any of these educators recommend that noncategorical classes be programmed in any manner other than in a behaviorally, data-based, direct instruction type program. In addition, all supporters have adhered to a policy of grouping by skill levels as opposed to age or categorical consideration.

Noncategorical teacher-training programs. Heward, Cooper, Heron, Hill, McCormick, Porter, Stephens & Sutherland (1981) again stressed the use of

behaviorally based programs for teaching mildly handicapped learners. In their discussion of the teacher training program at Ohio State University, Hewart et al. (1981) pinpointed the degree program changes that have resulted from the three following motivators:

(a) faculty members' increasing awareness of and dissatisfaction with the inherent fallacies of the categorical approach with mildly handicapped children; (b) faculty members' commitment to a behavioral approach toward meeting the instructional needs of mildly handicapped children; and, (c) the faculty's work toward a competency-based training program as part of a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) personnel preparation grant (p. 207).

Their behaviorally based approach has also focused on specific instructional variables such as reading rate, number of times off-task, meeting criterion on tasks, and reliance on direct and daily measurement to evaluate student progress.

In summary, those favoring the move to noncategorical programming have been motivated by their belief in these factors: the similarity of the characteristics of the mildly handicapped, the similarity of educational needs, the nonproductiveness of program duplication by category, the effectiveness of direct teaching of basic skills, and the debilitating effects of labeling.

Opposition to Noncategorical Programming

Identification. Those who have favored retaining services to students based on traditional categories have stressed the following points: (1) There are real

differences in the characteristics among the exceptionalities. (2) The definition of the term "mild" has not been established. (3) Teacher preparation programs for noncategorical certification may be too generalized and gloss over differences in exceptionalities. (4) Grouping children may be primarily an administrative and financial convenience. (5) There is a lack of field evidence to support the claims of field efficacy other than in model programs.

Sparks and Richardson (1981, p. 60) have capsulized the feelings of the opposition by stating, "The adoption of Public Law 94-142, and its erroneous interpretation by many as a 'mainstreaming' law, appears to have given many states the impetus to use the concept of 'least restrictive environment' in a distorted manner."

Those educators who are opposed to noncategorical grouping and who favor retaining the traditional categories for services to students believe that there are indeed major differentiating characteristics among the groups (Lieberman, 1980; Phipps, 1982; Sparks and Richardson, 1981). Phipps (1982) has stated:

There is general agreement, however, that mental retardation is different from emotional disturbance, and that there are children who have specified perceptual process functions that are unique but who are neither mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed (p. 154).

Phipps (1982) further postulated that if differences are evident among the severe range, there is a great possibility that differences to a lesser degree are present within the mild range. Sparks and Richardson (1981) have charged that deficient academic skills, the main area of commonality among the groups, has been used as the only placement consideration while criteria are being revised by the states.

Shared characteristics. One of the serious drawbacks to the consideration of noncategorical programs has been the recent trend to narrow eligibility for EMR and LD identification. The result has been the placement of those who are now more severely disabled -- those whose characteristics often fall outside the range of those considered "mildly handicapped".

Polloway and Smith (1983) documented the systematic change in the EMR population being served since 1973. Before that time the ceiling intelligence score for EMR classification was an IQ of 85. When the newer guidelines of the American Association on Mental Deficiency were applied, that ceiling was lowered another standard deviation to an IQ score of below 70. In addition, an insufficient rating on a test of adaptive behavior was required as a second criterion for EMR identification. After the new criteria were implemented, the EMR group included large numbers of Downs-Syndrome children formerly grouped within the moderately retarded range. The overall result has been a dramatic drop over the last decade in the functioning level of those classified as educably mentally retarded.

Polloway and Smith (1983) have hypothesized that the shift in the EMR population has resulted in these changed group characteristics:

- (1) Children in this group have become increasingly affected by factors such as chromosomal abnormalities.
- (2) With the EMR population more handicapped than before, discrepancy between chronological age and achievement has become greater than before and has decreased the likelihood that these individuals will, as a group, reach

a stage of partial literacy. (3) As a group the shift in the EMR population has increased the incidence of language delay (p. 156).

Their conclusion was that program delivery models and curriculum would need to be revised to include a broad base of instruction in areas such as personal, social, and vocational development. The ultimate question posed was: Would a curriculum appropriate to this population also be appropriate for students of other mildly handicapping conditions?

Others have disagreed with the view that the groups are so similar. Zigler, Balla, and Hodapp (1984) have presented the view that there are three variables that should be considered when assessing the functioning of a given individual. The first is IQ, which is basically a measure of the rate of intellectual development; the second is MA, the measure of what he or she is capable of doing; and the third is CA, which determines how long it took the individual to reach his level of mental age. Of the three dimensions, CA has been largely overlooked as a measure which has control over many variables. Age affects less cognitively demanding social behavior and interests; thus, a learning disabled child with a chronological age of nine and a mental age of eight would necessarily have very different social behaviors and interests from a 14 year old retarded child with a mental age of eight. Needless to say, the grouping of children for academic purposes is based in large part on ability level, but social level cannot be ignored.

A concurrent shift in the learning disabled population has also been taking place. States, alarmed with the burgeoning LD identification rates, have instituted stricter criteria for identification and placement. A case in point has

been the 1983 guidelines for all new identifications in learning disabilities within the state of Kansas (Kansas Guidelines for Identifying Children and Youth with Specific Learning Disabilities, 1983). These new guidelines have had the effect of significantly reducing the number of new placements and bringing into question whether those now eligible may be classified as "mildly" handicapped. The effect of these new guidelines has not yet been evaluated in terms of academic programming, but with fewer, more severely handicapped being identified, it may be postulated that intensive education along compensatory lines rather than solely emphasizing basic skill remediation may be needed.

Identification in the field of emotional disturbance has always been a murky problem, as pointed out earlier by Hallahan and Kauffman (1977). None of the authors reviewed addressed the problem of further defining guidelines for identifying those labeled as "mildly" disturbed. However, it should be noted that the federal guidelines for identification of this group have not allowed for services for the "mildly emotionally disturbed", but have instead confined their definition to those classified as "severely emotionally disturbed" (Federal Register, 1977).

Administrative convenience. A further point has been presented by those opposed to noncategorical grouping of students. Opponents have stated that they fear grouping will include students who are not within the "mild" range of disability or within the categorical groups originally intended for grouping because of administrative or financial convenience. Helge (1984) has noted that this has been particularly apt to happen when the service area for a given school district or special education cooperative has a low given disability group and/or a

large service area to cover. In citing these dangers, Hallahan and Kauffman (1977) have conceded:

First Children often must be grouped, especially in sparsely populated areas, as a matter of convenience or economic necessity. In such cases, we must recognize the children are being served in the same class or by the same teacher for administrative reasons and not for instructional purposes (p. 147). (Emphasis added)

Labeling. Opponents to noncategorical programming have not questioned the adverse effects of labeling, but rather have pointed out that P.L. 94-142 has set guidelines that have tied identification of handicapped students and funding for programs around categorical criteria.

Lieberman (1980) has pointed out that labels for handicapped individuals are inevitable since our vocabulary demands identification by name; and that although labels are periodically changed, connotations (often negative) continue to be associated with them. The suggestion has been that, regardless of effect, labeling in some form will always be present.

Since labeling in some form is likely to be present, opponents to non-categorical programming have suggested that the disadvantages of labeling be tempered by consideration of other drawbacks of generic programs. Sparks and Richardson (1981, p. 60) have observed that, "What seems to be an attempt to diminish labeling of children, an old entreaty, may be an attempt to save money by grouping children."

Teacher training programs. The problems of university competency programs for special education teachers are varied, especially when approached from the stance that real differences in exceptionalities exist. Lieberman (1980) pointed out that programs training teachers to work in noncategorical programs had the following weaknesses: (1) These programs tended to minimize the indepth study of each handicapping condition. (2) These programs operated under the faulty assumption that generic course work in classes such as "remedial strategies" would generalize to all children with inadequate skills. (3) These programs were minimizing the fact that program decisions at the implementation level would still have to be made by classification. (4) These programs were decreasing the amount of individualized programming available to students and minimizing the evaluation of each student's strengths and weaknesses.

In addressing the problem of indepth study of handicapping conditions (Blackhurst, 1981) compared coursework in the traditional categorical preparation programs at the University of Kentucky to their newer coursework requirements for noncategorical certification. Although fewer hours (range 18-24 hours) were required in the traditional certification programs in operation before 1978, a third of those hours focused on the specific exceptionality. Under the current noncategorical certification plan, coursework devoted to the study of specific areas has been omitted. Only one four-hour course of a survey nature, an introduction to special education has been required.

Universities have faced other problems making the new generic certification programs less than ideal. While some universities have instituted programs for

noncategorical certification at the graduate level, others have moved to undergraduate certification programs. Regardless of the program level, universities are left in a double bind (Blackhurst, 1981). Even when faculties agreed on program components, state certification committees' standards needed to be defined and met. Certification committees have had the power to decide which categories were to be included in the new comprehensive certificate, whether severity of handicap should be addressed, what functions (delivery models) may be staffed by teachers holding the new certificate, and what the relationship would be to general education certificates (must a teacher first receive general certification?).

Furthermore, University programs and state requirements have had to be in general agreement for certification standards to be met by university programs. On one hand, state departments of education have wanted to see programs in operation before they decided on the merits of certification, thereby satisfying local education agencies' needs. Universities, on the other hand, have wanted to know certification requirements before they designed course offerings and released graduates on the job market.

Some states, such as Kansas, have opted to side-step the certification standards battle by simply allowing categorical certification in the area of the majority of the program's students. For example, if six of the ten students in a given program were learning disabled, then a teacher certified in learning disabilities could be designated to teach the class regardless of the disability area of the other four students (Kansas State Department of Education, 1985). Generic programs instituted for the reasons given above may be far from

appropriate and, many fear, be a reduction in services to children. In summary, the factors that have been conceptualized as possibly contributing to a reduction in services include: over-simplification of categorical similarities, complications in setting new generic certification standards, funding pressure from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, unfounded fears concerning labeling, lack of field research confirming efficacy of the new model, and pressures from state departments of education to implement new program models quickly to meet demand in the field.

Kansas Interrelated Programs

Introduction

For the remainder of this review, "interrelated" will be the sole terminology used to describe noncategorical or generic programs, since this is the descriptor used in the Kansas State Department of Education (1985). The next few topics have been included to present the context from which the possible factors influencing job satisfaction in Kansas interrelated programs were chosen.

Pilot Studies

A pilot study was conducted by this researcher in the fall of 1984, to determine the acceptability of Kansas' interrelated certification practices to various professionals in the education community, including teachers of interrelated classes within the state. Questionnaires were sent to 60 people, with a return rate of over 90 percent. The results of this study indicated that teachers

working in interrelated programs are divided almost evenly between those who feel the certification practice of allowing a categorical certification to serve as the basis for mixed categorical groupings is adequate and those who feel this practice is inadequate. Opinions among the other groups were strongly directional, with superintendents of schools strongly favoring the interrelated approach and higher education special education teachers strongly opposed to the approach. Returns from the parents of exceptional children revealed moderate opposition to mixed grouping of the categories, however, the number of returns for this group were too small to be reliable. Nevertheless, the responses from teachers left reason to doubt if they, as a group, were satisfied with the efficacy of the model.

Certification

A look at the development of interrelated programs in the state of Kansas shows that at the time of Belch's (1979) study, Kansas did not include itself among the states who had already changed or were considering change toward operating interrelated instructional programs. To date, the state has not offered a plan for generic certification. Instead, the state has required the interrelated teacher to be certified in the predominant area of exceptionality served within the class (Kansas State Department of Education, 1985). Provisional certification has been acceptable if an available fully certified teacher could not be found.

Categories

The Kansas State Plan has not addressed the problem of which specific categories may be included in an interrelated program. As recently as the school year 1984-85 these groupings were found among the interrelated classrooms of Kansas (Kansas State Department of Education, 1985):

1. learning disabled/personal social adjustment
2. learning disabled/educable mentally retarded
3. learning disabled/personal social adjustment/educable mentally retarded
4. educable mentally retarded/trainable mentally retarded
5. trainable mentally retarded/severely mentally retarded

The Kansas State Plan for Special Education has not mentioned the term mild as a criterion for placement in interrelated programs. Instead, it has referred to grouping "in accordance with similar learning styles rather than in accordance with the traditional categories" (p. 20).

Delivery Models

In Kansas, interrelated services may be offered through the following delivery models according to the Special Education State Plan for Fiscal Year 1985 (Kansas State Department of Education, 1985, p. 20):

1. special instructional materials and/or equipment only
2. consulting teacher plan
3. itinerant teacher plan

4. resource room plan
5. self-contained special class
6. special day schools
7. residential schools
8. hospital instruction

Program Guidelines

The Special Education State Plan for Fiscal Year 1985 (Kansas State Department of Education, 1985, p. 22) gives these criteria for state approval of interrelated delivery models:

1. Systematic and ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness, based on student performance.
2. Availability of alternatives for delivery of special education services to children who are not appropriately served in interrelated service units.
3. Teaching personnel with at least provisional endorsement in one of the major areas of exceptionality being served in the interrelated service unit.
4. Provisions for providing instructional personnel with assistance from appropriately trained categorical specialists or support personnel as necessary. The local education agency shall provide adequate supervision and support systems for teachers of interrelated programs.
5. Adequate supervision and support systems for teachers of interrelated programs; and

6. Class size/caseload shall not exceed the lowest maximum enrollment for any of the categorical groups of students served in the delivery model being used. For example, if LD and PSA students are receiving services in a resource room, the maximum caseload would be 14 as specified in the PSA standard for a resource room rather than 18 as allowed in the LD standards. Requests for approval of variations from this standard may be made to the Special Education Administration Section. (underlining added)

Program Modification Guidelines

Additionally, modifications of the above standards may be required from the State Department of Education. The Special Education State Plan for Fiscal Year 1983 (Kansas State Department of Education, 1983, p. 21) has issued the following guidelines for reviewing requests for variance (modifications):

- a) The type of handicapping condition.
- b) The severity of the handicap.
- c) The chronological age span of the learners in a particular instructional setting.
- d) Travel distance required for teacher and/or students.
- e) The number of facilities in which services are to be provided.
- f) Professional competencies of the specialist in regard to the variety of handicapping conditions.
- g) Homogeneity of the student population being served. This instructional

group characteristic shall also respond to the identified differences in student needs.

- h) Amount of time individual students will be receiving education services in the special education setting.
- i) Availability and use/responsibility of categorical support assistance and/or resources.

Summary

The preceding information has made evident the wide variety that has been allowable within and among Kansas interrelated programs. Because program modification can be allowed for so many variables, it has been difficult to assess precisely what age ranges, delivery models, type certification, numbers of students, or categorical handicaps have been interacting to affect the job satisfaction of teachers working in these programs.

Summary of the Related Literature

This chapter has reviewed definitions of job satisfaction, the measurement of job satisfaction, current research emphasis in job satisfaction, related work studies, job satisfaction in education, and the findings of some job satisfaction research in education. The chapter further discussed noncategorical special education programs, including the stance supporting noncategorical special education programs, the stance opposing noncategorical special education programs, and possible factors influencing the job satisfaction of Kansas interrelated program teachers.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter begins with a description of the subjects involved in the study. The instruments used are presented and discussed. Procedures for data collection and analysis of the data are outlined. The statistical hypotheses are then presented, followed by the chapter summary.

Subjects

The 364 subjects for this study represented the 587 interrelated teachers employed by the State of Kansas. By Kansas law, these interrelated special education teachers may possess any special education categorical certification and be placed in an interrelated classroom as long as the majority of students in their program are of the same handicapping category as their area of teacher certification. A 1985-86 roster was secured from the Kansas State Department of Education listing all districts having interrelated programs and the personnel presently under contract to teach in those programs. Tables 1 to 12 contain various demographic and descriptive information about the respondents.

The ages of the 364 respondents who returned usable questionnaires (62.9 percent) were nearly evenly divided among four age groups represented by the levels 25 to 29 years (22.2 percent), 30 to 34 years (22.2 percent), 35 to 39 years

Table 1

Age Level of Respondents
N = 364

Age Level	Frequency	Percent
45+	72	19.8
40-44	31	8.5
35-39	81	22.3
30-34	82	22.5
25-29	82	22.5
20-24	<u>16</u>	<u>4.4</u>
Total	364	100.0

Table 2

Gender of Respondents
N = 364

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	49	13.5
Female	<u>315</u>	<u>86.5</u>
Total	364	100.0

Table 3

Standard Certification of Respondents

N = 364

Category	Frequency	Percent*
Specific Learning Disabilities	179	49.2
Mental Retardation	205	56.3
Emotionally Disturbed (Personal/Social Adjustment)	59	16.2
Severely Multiply Handicapped	9	2.5
Early Childhood Handicapped	3	.8
Deaf Education	0	0.0
Visual Impairment	1	.3
Regular Elementary	236	64.8
Regular Secondary	119	32.7
Not Answering	0	0.0

*Percent of 364 responding

Table 4

Teaching Experience of Respondents
N = 364

Area of Experience	Frequency	Percent
Interrelated		
10+ yrs.	57	15.7
6-9 yrs.	94	25.8
3-5 yrs.	134	36.8
1-2 yrs.	65	17.9
0 yrs.	14	3.8
Special Education, Other		
10+ yrs.	55	15.1
6-9 yrs.	71	19.5
3-5 yrs.	89	24.5
1-2 yrs.	51	14.0
0 yrs.	98	26.9
Regular Classroom		
10+ yrs.	39	10.7
6-9 yrs.	25	6.9
3-5 yrs.	37	10.2
1-2 yrs.	69	19.0
0 yrs.	194	53.3

Table 5

Delivery Models Implemented by Respondents
N = 364

Delivery Model	Frequency	Percent*
Hospital or Homebound	10	2.7
Special Instructional Materials	27	7.4
Consulting Teacher	97	26.6
Itinerant Teacher	37	10.2
Resource Room	298	81.9
Self-Contained Class	154	42.3

*Percent of 364 responding

Table 6

Total Number of Delivery Models Implemented
N = 364

Number	Frequency	Percent*
5	2	.5
4	10	2.7
3	52	14.3
2	117	32.1
1	<u>183</u>	<u>50.3</u>
Total	364	100.0

Table 7

Age Differences in Months of Students Served

N = 364

Age Range in Months	Frequency	Percent
159-173	1	.3
144-158	3	.9
129-143	1	.3
114-128	10	2.8
99-113	6	1.7
84-98	19	5.1
69-83	33	8.7
54-68	80	21.5
39-53	112	30.4
24-38	72	18.6
9-23	<u>27</u>	<u>9.7</u>
Total	364	100.0

Table 8

Respondents Serving Various
Categorical Handicaps
N = 364

Categorical Handicap Served	Frequency	Percent*
Speech/Language/ Hearing Impaired	119	32.7
Early Childhood Handicapped	6	1.6
Mentally Retarded	243	66.8
Persona/Social Adjustment (Emotionally Disturbed)	237	65.1
Physically and Other Health Impaired	62	17.0
Severely/Multiply Handicapped	15	4.1
Specific Learning Disabilities	327	89.8
Visually Impaired	20	5.5
Not Answering	0	0.0

*Percent of 364 responding Table 8

Table 9

Total Number of Handicapping Conditions Served
N = 364

Number of Categories	Frequency	Percent
1	32	8.8
2	115	31.6
3	130	35.7
4	63	17.3
5	22	6.0
6	2	.5
Not answering	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>

Table 10

Total Number of Students Served
by Respondents
N = 364

Numbers of Students Served	Frequency	Percent of Total
60-64	1	.1
55-59	2	.2
50-54	1	.1
45-49	2	.2
40-44	1	.1
35-39	2	.2
30-34	9	2.0
25-29	15	4.0
20-24	32	8.0
15-19	73	20.0
9-14	159	43.0
3-8	<u>67</u>	<u>18.0</u>
Total	364	100.00

Table 11

Size Community Served
by Respondents
N = 364

Community Size	Frequency	Percent
50,000 plus	64	17.6
25,000 to 50,000	25	6.9
15,000 to 25,000	24	6.6
5,000 to 15,000	72	19.8
2,500 to 5,000	73	20.1
Less than 2,500	<u>106</u>	<u>29.1</u>
Total	364	100.0

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations of
Variables in the Study
N = 364

Variable Name	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total Number of Handicapping Categories	2.819	1.050
Number of Students Served	14.508	8.154
Range in Months of Students Served	53.882	25.259
Total Number of Program Models Implemented	1.712	.851
Total Areas of Standard Certification	2.401	.893
Years Taught in Regular Education (By Levels)	2.027	1.370
Age of Teacher (By Levels)	3.673	1.516
Size of Community Served (By Levels)	2.948	1.815
Total Score on Job Description Index	131.313	24.976

(22.3 percent), and over 45 years (19.8 percent). The majority of the respondents were female (86.5 percent).

Standard certification in elementary education was held by the majority (64.8 percent) of the interrelated teachers, with a smaller portion (32.7 percent) holding standard certification in secondary education. Of those holding standard categorical certificates, the majority (56.3 percent) hold certification in the area of

mental retardation, followed closely by those certified in learning disabilities (49.2 percent). The largest group of responding teachers (36.8 percent) had taught in interrelated programs from three to five years. The largest group reporting special education teaching experience (other than that in interrelated programs) was the group reporting no experience (26.9 percent). The majority of the respondents (53.3 percent) reported no experience in regular education.

Of the delivery models implemented by the teachers, the vast majority (81.9 percent) reported delivering instruction to some students in a resource room setting in which students are served not more than half of the school day. Another 42.3 percent reported delivering service to some students who were self-contained. The third largest tally for delivery model implementation showed 26.6 percent of the teachers utilizing the consulting teacher plan. Slightly more than half (50.3 percent) of the teachers responded that they delivered services by implementing only one delivery model, while 31.6 percent reported implementing two models.

The teachers who were surveyed provided service to students of varying ages. The age range between the youngest and oldest students served in a given program ranged from nine months in one program to 13 years eight months in another. The total number of handicapping categories served by these teachers ranged from one category in a program for one teacher, to six categories in a program for another teacher, with the greatest number of teachers (35.7 percent) responsible for students from three categories. Among the disability categories most frequently served by teachers in these interrelated programs were specific learning disabilities (89.8 percent), mental retardation

(66.8 percent), and personal/social adjustment (65.1 percent). The total number of students served ranged widely from three to sixty, with the modal number served being 13.

The size community in which the responding teachers work was closely spread among the three smallest size groupings, representing 69 percent of the return: communities of less than 2,500 (29.1 percent), communities between 2,500 and 5,000 (10.1 percent), and communities between 5,000 and 15,000 (19.8 percent). A rather large group (17.6 percent) came solely from one urban school district which has a community population of over 50,000.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in the collection of data. One instrument, the Teacher Questionnaire for Kansas Interrelated Programs (TQKIP) (Lingo, 1985) was designed by the researcher to collect demographic information. This instrument was designed to secure objective teacher/program data for the purpose of defining the predictive variables of the study. The information recorded on the questionnaire served to categorize responses into six groupings appropriate for analysis and comparison: Program Information, Certification, Teaching Experience, Job Orientation, About Yourself, and an open-ended response area entitled Additional (see Appendix B).

The TQKIP was piloted during March/April of 1986, with a group of special education teachers currently employed in modified programs in a neighboring state whose districts are similar in structure and delivery to those used in the formal study. Modified programs are an approach which is roughly the

equivalent of the Kansas interrelated programs. Subjects' names were secured from the state department of education, special education division. Thirty-five (35) questionnaires were mailed in late March; by mid-April, thirty-two (32) had been returned. The purpose of the pilot was to discover and correct any ambiguities which may have existed in the questionnaire. Instructions included in the mailing packet asked for suggestions for item clarification and completion of the questionnaire (see Appendix E). An analysis of the responses resulted in minor changes (e.g. rescaling to make responses definitive and mutually exclusive).

The second instrument (see Appendix C) to be used in the research project was the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith et al., 1969). The JDI was used to get a single overall measure of job satisfaction. This 72-item instrument was developed by Smith et al. (1969) to measure satisfaction in five areas: the work itself, supervision, pay, co-workers, and opportunities for advancement. Responding yes, no, or ?, each respondent is asked to indicate his level of agreement with a short statement or to an adjective describing a particular aspect of his job. A revised scoring system developed by the authors was used in scoring the results. This scoring system, the result of efforts to improve the normal distribution of scores, gives a value of 3 to a positive/correct response, a value of 0 to a negative/incorrect response, and a value of 1 to an undecided (?) response. The possible range of score values for the test is 0-210.

The five job facets finally incorporated in the JDI were the result of careful analysis of previous research on job satisfaction (Baehr, 1954; Brayfield & Rothe, 1951; Brayfield, Wells & Strate, 1957; Dabas, 1958; Ewen, 1964; Harrison,

1961; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Hulin, 1966; Kendall, 1963; Morse, 1953; Twery, Schmid & Wrigley, 1958). The discriminate and convergent validity of the JDI was established by four separate studies conducted by the authors. Each study was assessed by using cluster analysis or principal component analysis.

The first study evaluated the effects of item selection on validity, with items having no discriminating power being eliminated. The second study was designed to test the generality of the results from the previous study using several methods of measurement, with the direct scoring method showing the strongest loadings on the resultant varimax rotation of principal component factors. As a result of this study, four of the nine resulting factors were deleted from further consideration, leaving the five job facets incorporated in the final version of the JDI. The third study was a field test of the final version of the JDI in an electronics industry. When subjected to yet another principal component analysis, the discrimination demonstrated among the areas was quite strong. The scales formed using positively and negatively phrased items showed closely similar loadings. The fourth study was a factor analysis of the individual JDI items using responses from employees of a large bank. The results of this study showed that 75 percent of the individual JDI items had the highest loadings on the appropriate factor for this sample.

B. A. Kerr, reviewing for The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook, (Mitchell, 1985) has described the scales as possessing good content validity and impressive construct validity. This reviewer also cites evidence from a review of JDI research by Schriesheim and Kinicki (1984) indicating a good

predictive validity for a number of job withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover.

The JDI authors have reported the split-half reliability of the JDI to range from .80 to .88 on the five dimensions, utilizing application of the Spearman-Brown formula. Mitchell (1985) has cited revised split-half estimates of internal consistency of .79 and test-retest reliability over brief periods (two to six weeks) that have been fairly high. Schriesheim and Tsui (1981) have reviewed the psychometric properties of the JDI thoroughly and concluded that the JDI is overall a high-quality measuring instrument, and that there is no existing measure of job satisfaction with as much positive evidence concerning its validity and reliability.

Procedure for Data Collection

The entire population of 587 presently employed teachers of Kansas interrelated special education programs were mailed a survey packet in late September of 1986. The contents of each mailing packet were identified by a code number which was used to identify non-respondents. A cover letter (Appendix A) and the two survey instruments made up the contents of the packet. The surveys were mailed on a Sunday to assure delivery on a day other than Monday or Friday, since these days are judged to be busier than usual for classroom teachers and could reduce the probability of return. The first mail-out resulted in a response total of 58 percent (336). Two weeks later, a follow-up card (Appendix D) was mailed to all nonrespondents reminding them to complete the survey and drop it in the mail. The follow-up resulted in an additional 12

percent (69) return. This represented a total response rate of 69 percent (405). Of the questionnaires which were returned, 364 were completed satisfactorily, thereby resulting in a useable return of 62 percent of the total 587 interrelated teachers.

Statistical Analysis

The design used in this study was correlational. Correlational research is used when it is desirable to establish the relationship(s) that exist between two or more variables (Gay, 1981).

Correlational research has several characteristics that allowed it to be the method of choice for this study. One of these characteristics is that correlation may be used where variables are very complex and do not lend themselves to the experimental method, which requires controlled manipulation. A second characteristic is that it permits the measurement of several variables and their interrelationships simultaneously in a realistic setting. A third desirable characteristic is that correlation determines the degree of relationship rather than presenting the all-or-nothing results achieved by experimental design. A final advantageous characteristic is that correlation may be used as both a descriptive and an inferential statistic.

One major limitation is the fact that correlation implies nothing about causation. Correlation is used to investigate the extent to which variations in one factor correspond with variations in one or more other factors based on correlation coefficients. As such, it can be used to predict the occurrence of related events, nothing more.

Other limitations include: (1) the fact that correlation is less rigorous than the experimental approach because it exercises less control over the independent variables, (2) the tendency to identify nonrelevant relationship patterns or elements which have little or no reliability or validity and/or which may be arbitrary and ambiguous. The overall result of these limitations is that if care is not exercised in carefully choosing the variables to be included in the study, the results may defy meaningful or useful interpretation.

A multiple regression analysis was used to estimate the relationship between Job Satisfaction and selected program/teacher variables. The equation consisted of the dependent variable (Job Satisfaction), and the eight independent variables (Number of Handicapping Categories Served, Number of Students Served, Age Range of Students, Number of Program Delivery Models Implemented by a Teacher, Number of Areas of Standard Teacher Certification, Years of Regular Teaching Experience, Size of Community in which Subject Teaches, and Age Level of the Teacher and Sex of the Teacher).

The data set was examined prior to analysis for any univariate or bivariate discrepancies that would violate the assumptions of regression thus yielding unstable or inaccurate results. The SPSSX FREQUENCIES program (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1983) permitted full scrutiny of the univariate data set. The SPSSX REGRESSION program (Nie, et al., 1983) permitted evaluation of the bivariate correlations. Examination of the histograms for individual variables indicated that all variables in the study were normally distributed. Examination of the bivariate scatterplots and the residual scatterplot for job satisfaction revealed that there were no violations of the requirement for

homoscedasticity. Similarly, a review of the individual bivariate correlations dissolved the possible existence of multicollinearity or singularity within the data set. Bivariate correlations among the data set ranged from $-.225$ to $.555$ (see Table 13).

A stepwise procedure was used to estimate the respective contribution of each independent variable to the explained variance in Job Satisfaction. The order of entry was determined by the magnitude of the variance explained by the variable. Variables which failed to account for a significant amount of the variance ($p < .05$) in Job Satisfaction were not entered into the equation. Additionally, the bivariate correlations for each independent variable with the dependent variable were examined.

Statistical Hypotheses

After a review of the relevant literature related to both job satisfaction and non categorical special education programming it has been hypothesized that:

1. Measures of the number of categories of students, total number of students served, age range of students, number of delivery models implemented, number of areas in which the teacher has standard certification, number of years of regular teaching experience, community size, and teacher's age level will not form a significant equation for the prediction of job satisfaction among teachers who work in interrelated programs.
2. There is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of categories of students served by teachers who work in interrelated programs.

Table 13

Correlation Matrix for Variables
in the Study
N = 364

Variable	Variables								
	HC TOT	HC NUM TOT	AGE DIFF	MODEL TOT	CER TOT	TE REG	AGE	COMSIZE	TOTJDI
HC TOT									
r	1.000	.148	.059	.068	.075	.095	.053	-.150	.013
p	.999	.002*	.130	.009*	.007	.077	.158	.002*	.402
HC NUM TOT									
r		1.000	.148	-.019	.178	.068	.173	.297	-.073
p		.999	.002*	.360	.000*	.098	.000*	.000*	.083
AGE DIFF									
r			1.000	.130	.009	.119	.037	-.225	-.075
p			.999	.007*	.432	.011*	.240	.000*	.078
MODEL TOT									
r				1.000	.160	-.040	-.082	-.185	-.137
p				.999	.001*	.221	.059	.000*	.004*
CER TOT									
r					1.000	.056	.132	.006	-.045
p					.999	.142	.006	.453	.196
TE REG									
r						1.000	.555	.021	.020
p						.999	.000*	.348	.353
Age									
r							1.000	.132	.014
p							.999	.006	.393
COM SIZE									
r								1.000	.009
p								.999	.430
TOTJDI									
r									1.000
p									.999

Note: Full variables names are given on following page.

*p < .05.

Table 13 (Continued)

Abbreviated Variable	Full Variable Name
HC TOT	Total Number of Handicapping Categories
HC NUM TOT	Total Number of Students Served
AGE DIFF	Age Range of Students in a Single Program
MODEL TOT	Total Number of Delivery Models Implemented
CER TOT	Number of Areas of Standard Certification Held
TERES	Years of Regular Teaching Experience
AGE	Age Level of Teacher
COM SIZE	Size Community Served
TOT JDI	Total Job Description Index Score

3. There is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the total number of students served across the various categories of handicapping conditions by teachers who work in interrelated programs.

4. There is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the age range of students who are served by teachers in interrelated programs.

5. There is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of delivery models implemented by teachers who work in interrelated programs.

6. There is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of areas in which teachers who work in interrelated programs are certified.

7. There is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of years taught in regular education by teachers who work in interrelated programs.

8. There is no significant difference between measures of job satisfaction and the size of the community in which teachers who work in interrelated programs work.

9. There is no significant difference between measures of job satisfaction and the age levels of teachers who work in interrelated programs.

Chapter Summary

Chapter III has presented a description of the methodology to be used in the study. The subjects, instruments, and instrument pilot have been discussed.

Procedures for data collection and statistical analysis have been reviewed; and the statistical hypotheses in null form were presented, completing the explanation of the methodology for the study relating to the job satisfaction of Kansas teachers of interrelated programs.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the results of the statistical analyses for the nine hypotheses formulated for this investigation. The major focus of this study is to determine which factors or set of factors are significant predictors of job satisfaction among teachers of interrelated special education programs.

The results of this study provide information on both the combined and unique contributions of the independent variables in the prediction of job satisfaction for interrelated teachers. The relationship between the criterion variable (job satisfaction) and the eight independent variables (number of handicapping conditions served, number of students served, age range of the students, number of delivery systems implemented, number of areas of certification of the interrelated teacher, years of experience in regular education, size community in which the teacher works, and age level of the teacher) were obtained by performing multiple regression analysis for the total sample. Computations were done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) (Nie et al, 1983).

Test of the Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one stated that the number of handicapping conditions served, the number of students served, the age range of the students served, the number of delivery models implemented, the number of areas of standard certification held by the teacher, the number of years of regular teaching experience, the size of the community served, and the teachers' age level will not form a significant equation of predictors for job satisfaction of special education interrelated teachers. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive contributions of the various variables in combination.

A multiple correlation of .13693 ($p < .008$) was obtained between the criterion and predictive variables. [An examination of this analysis revealed that of the eight predictor variables, only delivery model contributed significantly to the explanation of job satisfaction ($F = 6.92, p < .05$). A square of r suggested that only two percent of the variance in job satisfaction is shared by delivery models. See Tables 14 and 15 for a description of these findings.] Since a significant linear combination was obtained, hypothesis one is rejected. Further, an examination of the bivariate correlation matrix for the analyses reveals the existence of significant relationships between delivery models and several other variables considered in the study (see Table 13).

Table 14

Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression
Analyses Between Job Satisfaction and
Main Effect Variables
N = 364

Variables	Multiple R	R ²	Standardized B	SE B	Beta	F
Total Delivery Models Implemented	.13693	.0188	-4.020	1.528	-.1369	6.917*
(Constant)			138.1936	2.921		

*p < .05

Table 15

Summary of Variables Not In the Equation
N = 364

Variable	Beta In	Partial	F*
Total Handicapping Categories	.022479	.022640	.18490
Total Number of Students Served	-.075409	-.076113	2.1025
Age Range of Students	-.057911	-.057969	1.2166
Total Areas of Standard Certification	-.023627	-.023544	.1998
Years of Regular Teaching Experience	.014355	.014480	.0756
Age Level of Teacher	.003091	.003110	.0035
Size Community Served	-.016611	-.016481	.0980

*p < .05

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two stated that the number of handicapping conditions served in an interrelated program will not be significantly related to job satisfaction. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis two. The correlation coefficient was not found to be significant at the .05 level ($r = .013$, $p > .05$); therefore, this research hypothesis was not rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three stated that the number of students served in an interrelated program will not be significantly related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis three. The correlation coefficient was not found to be not significant at the .05 level ($r = -.073$, $p > .05$); therefore, this research hypothesis was not rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis four stated that the age range of the students served in an interrelated program will not be significantly related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis four. The correlation coefficient was not found to be significant at the .05 level ($r = -.075$, $p > .05$); therefore, this research hypothesis was not rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Table 16

Simple Regression Between Job Satisfaction
and Each Main Effect Variable
(N = 364)

Variable	r	r ²	p*
Total number of Handicapping Categories	.01	.004	.402
Total Number of Students Served	-.073	.005	.083
Age Range of Students	-.075	.006	.078
Total Delivery Models Implemented	-.137	.020	.004*
Total Areas of Standard Certification	-.054	.003	.196
Years of Regular Teaching Experience	.020	.004	.353
Age Level of Teacher	.014	.014	.393
Size of Community Served	.009	.000	.430

*p < .05

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis five stated that the number of delivery models implemented by the teacher will not be significantly related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis five. The correlation coefficient was found to be significant at the .05 level ($r = -.137$, p

> .05); therefore, this research hypothesis was rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six stated that the number of areas in which a teacher holds standard certification certified will not be significantly related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis six. The correlation coefficient was not found to be significant at the .05 level ($r = -.045$, $p > .05$); therefore, this research hypothesis was not rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Hypothesis Seven

Hypothesis seven stated that the number of years teachers have taught in regular education will not be significantly related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis seven. The correlation coefficient was not found to be significant at the .05 level ($r = .020$, $p > .05$); therefore, this research hypothesis was not rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Hypothesis Eight

Hypothesis eight stated that the size of the community served will not be significantly related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis eight. The correlation coefficient was not found to be significant at the .05 level ($r = .009$, $p > .05$);

therefore, this research hypothesis was not rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Hypothesis Nine

Hypothesis nine stated that the age level of the teacher will not be significantly related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis nine. The correlation coefficient was not found to be significant at the .05 level ($r = .014$, $p > .05$); therefore, this research hypothesis was not rejected. Table 16 presents the summary table for this analysis.

Summary

Chapter four has presented a summary of the statistical analyses related to the nine hypotheses formulated for this study. Information summarizing the statistical results of the combined variable contribution to the variance in job satisfaction for interrelated teachers was presented. Results of the statistical analyses of the unique contributions of the independent variables in the prediction of job satisfaction for interrelated teachers was then presented.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter five presents an overview of the study and an interpretation of the statistical findings. Implications of the research findings are discussed along with clinical impressions from the open-ended section of the TQKIP.

Recommendations for future research are listed.

Summary of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate whether the job satisfaction of special education interrelated teachers can be predicted by measures of particular program and demographic variables. The interrelated program variables considered in the study were: the number of handicapping conditions served, number of students served, age range of the students served, and number of delivery models implemented. The interrelated teacher variables considered in the study were: the number of areas of standard certification held, the number of years of regular teaching experience, the community size in which teacher works, and the teacher's age level. In addition, the investigation

endeavored to determine if these variables, as a group, formed a predictive equation for the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers.

The subjects in this study were respondents from the total population of 587 Kansas interrelated teachers. The subjects were identified from rosters obtained from the Kansas State Department of Education, Special Education Division. Of the 402 interrelated teachers returning questionnaires, 364 usable sets of data were obtained (49 male, 315 female). This usable return represented 62 percent of the survey population.

Computational data from the surveys consisted of a single score obtained from the Job Descriptive Index (see Appendix C) and numerically coded responses from the Teacher Questionnaire for Kansas Interrelated Programs (see Appendix B) which was specifically designed for this study. One hypothesis was tested using a multiple regression analyses for combined variable hypotheses. Eight hypotheses were tested using simple regression analyses for the main effect hypotheses.

Interpretation of the Statistical Findings

The first hypothesis stated that measures of the number of categories of students, total number of students served, age range of students, number of delivery models implemented, number of areas in which the teacher has standard certification, number of years of regular teaching experience, community size, and teacher's age level will not form a significant equation for the prediction of job satisfaction among teachers who work in interrelated programs. A stepwise multiple regression analysis between job satisfaction and

the eight predictor variables was performed to test hypothesis one. Because of the stepwise procedure utilized, variables which did not significantly increase the magnitude of the regression coefficient were excluded from the analysis by the computer. The results of this analysis found that of the proposed main effect variables entered into the multiple regression equation at the .05 significance level, total delivery models implemented by the teacher remained in the equation when analysis was completed. Inclusion of total number of delivery models resulted in a significant equation for the prediction of job satisfaction. This null hypothesis was rejected.

The second hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of categories of students served by teachers who work in interrelated programs. A simple regression analysis found that measures of the number of categories of students served did not significantly predict the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. This null hypothesis was not rejected.

The third hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the total number of students served across the various categories of handicapping conditions by teachers who work in interrelated programs. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis three. The results of this analysis found that the total number of students served across the various categories of handicapping conditions did not significantly predict the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. This null hypothesis was not rejected.

The fourth hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the age range of students who are served by teachers in interrelated programs. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis four. The results of this analysis found that measures of the age range of students who are served did not significantly predict the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. This null hypothesis was not rejected.

The fifth hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of delivery models implemented by teachers who work in interrelated programs. A simple regression analysis was performed to test hypothesis five. The results of this analysis revealed that measures of the number of delivery models implemented did significantly predict the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers ($r = -.137, p < .05$). This null hypothesis was rejected.

The sixth hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of years taught in regular education by teachers who work in interrelated programs. A simple regression analysis was performed to test this relationship. Since the correlation coefficient for this relationship was not significant at the .05 level, this null hypothesis was not rejected.

The seventh hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the number of years taught in regular education by teachers who work in interrelated programs. A simple regression analysis was performed to test this hypothesis. The results of this analysis found

that measures of years taught in regular education by teachers who work in interrelated programs did not significantly predict the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. This null hypothesis was not rejected.

The eighth hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the size of the community in which teachers who work in interrelated programs work. A simple regression analysis was performed to test this hypothesis. The results of this analysis found that measures of the size community in which teachers work did not significantly predict the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. This null hypothesis was not rejected.

The ninth hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between measures of job satisfaction and the age levels of teachers who work in interrelated program. A simple regression analysis was performed to test this hypothesis. The results of this analysis did not reach significance at the .05 level. This null hypothesis was not rejected.

Conclusions

Within the parameters and limitations of this study, the following conclusions are proposed.

1. Based on the statistical findings, it is concluded that of the variables included in the study (number of handicapping categories served, total number of students served, age range of students, number of delivery models implemented, number of areas in which the teacher has standard certification, number of years of regular teaching experience, community size, and teachers' age level), only

the number of delivery models implemented was found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction among interrelated teachers. This variable was revealed to be a significant low-level predictor within both the analyses of combined variables and as an isolated predictor.

Discussion

Since only limited answers were given to the research questions posed at the beginning of this study, one might suppose that few insights were gained into the relationships existing between the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers and the various program and demographic variables studied. Aside from the significance of the total number of delivery models implemented the insight this study provided came primarily from the statistical findings verifying that certain variables are not significant predictors of the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers.

Prior literature did not directly address two of the exploratory variables which are peculiar to interrelated programs: number of handicapping categories served, and number of delivery models implemented; although Zabel and Zabel (1981) looked at type delivery model (self-contained vs. resource room). Three other exploratory variables which are peculiar to special education programs in general were not directly addressed by prior studies: age range of the students served, number of standard certifications held by the teacher, and years of regular teaching experience; although other investigators looked at similar variables such as education level of the teacher (Decker, 1981; Zabel and Zabel, 1981) and elementary vs. secondary teaching experience (Chase, 1951; Check,

1971; Federman, 1984; Zabel and Zabel, 1981). The age of the teacher has been shown to be a significant factor in a number of studies (Decker, 1980; Federman, 1984; Finger, 1984; Hoppock, 1935; Muncrief, 1979; Zabel & Zabel, 1981). Likewise, community size was found to be a factor in the job satisfaction of teachers by Boeck (1980) and by Hoppock (1935). Mixed findings have been reported in the literature concerning the consistency with which teaching load (number of students) is related to job satisfaction (Chase, 1951; Dunham, 1984; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979; Weiskopf, 1980), and these studies were all conducted within the regular education field with measures of class size. In this investigation, only the number of delivery models implemented by the teacher gained statistical significance when the data were analyzed.

The statistical significance of number of delivery models as a predictor of the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers must be tempered by the meaningfulness of this finding. Multiple R for the analysis was reported to be .13693 with a probability of .0089. This leaves a very small adjusted R square (.01604) indicating minor utility of the equation in the prediction of job satisfaction among interrelated teachers in situations other than the present study. This does not mean, however, that the present study did not reveal information of interest to those involved in the preliminary study of interrelated programs. Even the small magnitude of the influence of total delivery model implementation invites interest. Here, at least, is a small part of the puzzle of which factors influence job satisfaction in a profession with rapid turnover.

Examination of the partial correlations of the main effect variables yields other small clues into the existing relationships. The unique contributions shared

with the remaining variables that does not also contribute to variance in job satisfaction is found to be small (range: $-.076113$ to $.003110$). This information could be indicative of the independence of the variables included in the study or it could be indicative that the remaining variables are significantly related to delivery models, thus diminishing the role of the remaining variables.

Examination of the bivariate correlations with delivery models gives some support to the latter speculation, although the correlations are not strong. Upon inspection, we see total delivery models significantly related to: (1) age range of the students served ($r = .130$, $p < .05$), (2) number of areas of standard certification held by the teacher ($r = .160$, $p < .05$), and (3) size of community served ($r = -.185$, $p < .05$). Overall, the variables do not appear to be measuring the same factor. When this information is combined with the small size of the partial correlations, it would seem to indicate that, indeed, the variables considered for the study were independently related.

The nonsignificant statistical findings may alert one to several avenues of thought. Certainly, one must consider that there are other variables of interest related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers which have yet to be utilized.

A further consideration must be given to the utilization of scores from the instrument employed to measure job satisfaction. A total score for the Job Descriptive Index was used to test the hypotheses for this study. Subtest scores varied greatly across the Index. The significance of the predictive variables might indeed be statistically different for the facets Work, Supervision, Salary, Advancement, and Co-Workers. Findings of this nature could shed new light on

the role the independent variables play in the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. This would best be done by utilizing a multivariate multiple regression analysis, rather than by the use of separate analyses, although both approaches could be used. Of particular interest would be the analysis between measures of job satisfaction with subtest scores for *Work*, since this subtest measures most directly the affective response of the individual with the job itself.

Perhaps foremost in value, the present study (which began the exploration of variables which might affect the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers) has resulted in the most complete descriptive information to date on the composition of these programs and of the teachers responsible for implementing them. This information was presented in detail in the description of the subjects given in Chapter III and may be used as baseline data for future studies.

It is appropriate at this point to examine the results of voluntary comments which were submitted. Any discussion of the findings of this research project would be incomplete without an inclusion of the clinical impressions gained from the respondents' hand written comments.

The instrument for gathering teacher/program information (TQKIP) included a section for additional information the respondent felt was important to relate about his/her interrelated position. Over half the respondents chose to include comments in this section. Many more made marginal comments throughout the completion of both questionnaires. These comments were categorized and are discussed here according to the number of respondents relating information/opinions on each topic.

Roughly one-third (N = 55) of the volunteer information involved comments on the mixing of the categories. Of these, the majority (N = 35) reported negative experiences and/or feelings toward interrelated groupings. Another eleven (11) subjects held mixed views toward interrelated groupings, wishing to explain their feelings about their program in terms of both its strengths and weaknesses. A third group of thirteen (13) subjects solidly agreed with the concept. An interesting aspect of examining the comments was a comparison of the remarks with individual JDI scores. For that reason, each respondent's JDI score is included in parenthesis after his or her comment. It should be noted that an adverse reaction toward interrelated programming does not necessarily affect the total job satisfaction of the person in that job. Of those who were unhappy with the interrelated concept, these comments were typical:

For the last two years I have had interrelated LD and EMH. I find it very hard to have the two types of kids in one class. They are too different types and don't mix well together. (126)

I do not feel that a person who specialized in one area of special education should be expected to teach all areas. I am terribly uncomfortable working with EMR and PSA students . . . I will stay with this job until my child finishes high school and then look for a school where I will only teach LD students. (45)

I strongly believe that PSA students should NOT be placed in an interrelated program with MR and LD. The PSA student is disruptive to the rest of the class, the MR pick up on the inappropriate behavior... (151)

I feel I am not meeting the needs of my students in an interrelated setting. (98)

I find it very difficult to be teaching MR children along with LD children as most LD children are much more advanced . . . to serve both at the same time in the same classroom seems unrealistic. (154)

These programs were set up to serve more student categories with fewer teachers. (151)

Our facilities are not set up to handle BD students . . . the BD students are continually disruptive and only tend to upset and disturb the LD students. (96)

If our Coop would follow the State Plan Guidelines to set up the Interrelated classrooms, we would be able to do our jobs better -- such as! Don't form one because of lack of a qualified teacher or to accommodate larger numbers of students. Do see to it that the students are mildly handicapped and similar. Teacher/pupil contact

time is a more realistic way to decide class loads. We are seeing more severely handicapped students because of the new regression formula. (153)

Interrelated programming is an administrative quick fix which is not in the best interests of special education students. This is especially true at the secondary level. The needs of the LD students are different from the needs of PSA or EMH students. Yet interrelated programming assumes that all special education students have the same needs. (92)

Some kids are placed in interrelated classrooms for disabilities that the teacher is not certified for. I thought I was well covered (reg. ed., MR, LD, PSA certification) until I got physically and visually impaired kids. Then I screamed, "Help!" (145)

I have seen great emotional and social damage done to LD students placed in an EMR program! (110)

The interrelated classroom model is less than ideal. (108)

Only one comment will be documented from the group reporting mixed feelings. This is because so many of the favorable and unfavorable comments listed here are combined in them. The remark listed below highlights the

ambivalence of special education teachers who must do the best they can with a huge variety of tasks.

I feel PSA and LD work very well together. It is much more difficult to have EMH in the same room. It changes the whole atmosphere and limits group activities. Twelve students are too many for the amount of help they need. We have 7 levels of reading, 4 levels of math, and spelling is completely individualized. The day is too short. I love this work, but do feel frustrated by the time bind.

The comments listed below are representative of those teachers who reported favorably concerning interrelated programming. Note that when the JDI scores are given, they tend to be higher than the scores of those who oppose the model, yet they also cover a wide range of satisfaction with the job.

Kids are kids -- labels don't change them. Teach to who you have (and) what they need. (158)

I like interrelated because you benefit from the strengths of the different exceptionalities . . . interrelated allows students to attend their home school which provides for good attitudes from the administration and mainstream teachers. (112)

It provides an excellent opportunity for good social interaction. It also gives the teacher a chance to work closely with a student for a period of years. (129)

I like having an interrelated class. Many times it is hard to determine which category they (students) fit. Often, the students are real assets in helping each other with academics or behavioral problems. (99)

I like what I do. I like the kids and the building and the people in it. My room is not much different as an interrelated room than it was as a LD resource room. I still have more LD kids than anything else. (116)

The size school I am in allows for 5 interrelated positions. For this reason, I do not have the variety of handicapping conditions I did when I was the only sp. ed. teacher in a smaller school. I have the support of many people here. (142)

I am very supportive of the interrelated program for it has made it possible for the students with learning problems to stay in the community and be part of their peer group. (150)

The second largest category of comments (N = 34) centered around the rubric "general frustration". Some of these frustrations are worth attention since the respondents were instructed that they might include anything additional they felt was important about their interrelated program. Additionally, one intent of this research was to determine some areas in which interrelated teachers were satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs. Most knowledgeable persons would agree that these are legitimate concerns of teachers. JDI scores are again listed after each comment.

I follow up with students all over Harvey County. My total amount of students I follow up with and work with one/one (once a week) is 44.
(154)

I teach in an over-sized walk-in closet. If I ever get a severely acting-out PSA student, I will be in trouble. There is no way I could carry out the type program I was taught during my PSA training. I will become the token special education teacher. (113)

I am generally satisfied with being an interrelated teacher because I love working with my students. However, there are things I'm not satisfied with such as lack of time to actually instruct because the students are in and out so much. (148)

I think there is too much to do with too little time and help. The government has totally forgotten the child and put paper work in the lime light . . . I'm getting out of special ed. for that reason and I'm a d___ good teacher for these kids. Thanks for your concern. (108)

I have students from 4 school districts including the one in which we are located. I also have to deal with 2 time zones (mountain for 2 districts and central for 2 districts). Bussing is not always easily arranged. (127)

My college education didn't prepare me for my teaching job in special education. I was not familiar enough with the writing of I.E.P.s or with the variety of testing materials available. The paper work involved in teaching special ed. is massive. (110)

The type of program I have seems to take much more time in planning programs than in teaching. (134)

The present requirement to be certified in the area where most students fall is a continuing source of irritation. As class composition changes, so must certification. (138)

My major difficulties on the job relate to: (1) Principal does not want us here and does not know that much about Sp. Ed. (2) Some teachers have the same attitude. (106)

I was asked to take 2 schools 2 weeks before school started as they couldn't find teachers. It's too much! Two different districts and serving both every day. And they are 30 miles apart. I drive 100 miles a day on top of all the preparations and constant adjusting to the other school every half day. (161)

I feel pulled in all directions. Sometimes it is humanly impossible to get all the things done I am supposed to do unless I'm willing to put in

20 hours a day. Scheduling and planning are very difficult and sometimes you feel very ineffective because of these problems. (138)

Itinerant teaching is a joke. It is a very rare case that can be helped by two twenty-minute sessions a week. (107)

The third largest grouping of comments centered around problems with administrative arrangements (N = 22). Comments from this category highlight issues which were not addressed by the survey, but which are of great concern to teachers in interrelated programs. JDI scores are given after each comment.

I teach through a special ed coop which has its main office in another town. This has been our major problem because communication is very poor. (111)

Sorry if I messed up your (JDI) chart. However, I have 3 distinctive administrative bodies I am responsible to on a daily basis. (136)

I feel we are respected by our fellow teachers, but not by the administrators. (93)

I have too many bosses: 2 principals, a director and assistant director of special education, 2 local superintendents and a vocational counselor, 2 school psychologists and 2 regular education counselors who all think they are my boss. No one ever agrees on what should

be done and a consensus is seldom reached. I'm always in the middle. (83)

The overall impressions gained from perusal of the comments and the corresponding JDI scores were: (1) That job satisfaction may or may not be connected with what one thinks is best for students. (2) That teachers in the field are questioning the propriety of interrelated groupings for valid reasons. (3) That some administrators are perceived as lacking in knowledge and acceptance of special education and special education programs. (4) That some interrelated teachers are feeling less effective because of conflicting obligations to more than one administrator.

Recommendations

1. It would be useful to continue the search for other sets of variables related to the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers. Job satisfaction, though elusive, has long been considered important to the teaching profession. The possibility remains that job satisfaction influences other job outcomes; and it is, at least in the context of present employment standards, considered a worthy goal in and of itself.

Several suggestions for future variables that might possibly bear fruit in the search for influences upon the job satisfaction of interrelated teachers can be made. The range in achievement level among students in interrelated programs could be a useful variable of interest. Achievement level might prove to be of more predictive value than the age range of students since achievement level addresses real differences in the amount and type of instruction necessarily

offered by a teacher. The expectancy level of students might also prove to be a variable of interest. Expectancy levels could indicate program complexity in ways that the age range does not address: namely, what long range goals might reasonable be expected. This could be a confounding factor in the teacher's selection of program emphases. Student contact time could also be an appropriate variable. Several respondents addressed the frustration of too much to do and not enough time in which to do it.

2. It would be useful to study the attrition of special education interrelated teachers. Attrition in the field has not been directly studied and the current figures indicate a larger turnover than can be expected in categorical special education programs. Job satisfaction can indirectly hint at relationships, but causal relationships cannot be assumed.

3. Administrative perceptions of the interrelated special education option and/or of their role in facilitating interrelated programming is another area in need of exploration. The open-ended responses made clear the need for research to address the existing confusion related to administrative roles. Whether or not the inadequate direction given to interrelated teachers is independent of administrative attitude or a result of it will be an area of increasing concern to teachers if the interrelated program option continues to grow.

A General Recommendation

In this study it was noted that interrelated (generic/noncategorical) special education programs are growing at a rapid rate. This fact was documented for the State of Kansas within this study. With increasing pressure for the education

community to be accountable for its actions, such drastic program changes should not be made without study. An exhaustive search of the literature regarding studies of noncategorical programs revealed that almost the entire volume of published work on the subject is related to opinion positions. Teachers who are struggling in the field and children placed in those programs are the appropriate object of meaningful research efforts. Much work is needed to determine program efficacy and implementation success. Whether the education community and the larger society believe strongly enough in appropriate services for all students will be reflected in the care with which program decisions are made. The results of this study, particularly those associated with the descriptive function of correlational research, reflect the complexities of existing programs and the frustrations of teachers now employed as interrelated teachers in Kansas. Programs which are designed to optimally develop student abilities and which encourage the retention of the qualified teaching personnel are those which must be implemented and researched.

REFERENCES

- Arvey, R. D. & Dewhirst, H. D. (1976). Goal-setting attributes, personality variables, and job satisfaction. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 9(2), 179-189.
- Baehr, M.E. (1954). A factorial study of the SRA employee inventory. Personnel Psychology. 7, 319-336.
- Beck, C. L., & Gargiulo, R. M. (1983). Burnout in teachers of retarded and nonretarded children. Journal of Educational Research. 76 (3), 169-173.
- Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. Personnel Psychology. 31(4), 665-699.
- Belch, P. J. (1979). Toward noncategorical teacher certification in special education--Myth or reality? Exceptional Children. 46 (2), 129-131.
- Bentzen, M. M., Williams, R. C., & Heckman, P. (1980). A study of schooling. Phi Delta Kappan. 61 (6), 394-397.
- Blackhurst, A. E. (1981). Noncategorical teacher preparation: Problems and promises. Exceptional Children. 48 (3), 197-203.
- Blai, B. (1979). Predicting Job Satisfaction in Career Education. Journal of Studies in Technical Careers. 1 (4), 365-369.
- Blum, M. (1952). Employee Morale--Its Meaning and Measurement. Chicago: University of Chicago.

- Boeck, D. G. (1980). The relationship of special education teacher job satisfaction and the implementation of Public Law 94-142 (Doctoral dissertation, Seattle University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 40 (8), 4521A.
- Bowman, H. L. (1984). Kindergarten, mathematics, and science teachers: Comparisons on selected variables for current and resigned personnel from an urban school district. Paper presented at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association in New Orleans, Louisiana, Nov. 14-16.
- Brayfield, A. H., and Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 35, 307-311. #1
- Brayfield, A. H., Wells, R. J., & Strate, M. W. (1957). Interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 41, 201-205.
- Chase, F. S. (1951). Factors for satisfaction in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan. 33, 127-32. #2
- Check, J. G. (1971). Dissatisfaction in teaching. Education Forum. 35, 173-175.
- Crane, C. (1974). Attitudes toward acceptance of self and others and adjustment to teaching. British Journal of Educational Psychology. 44, 31-36.
- Dabas, Z. S. (1958). The dimensions of morale: An item factorization of the SRA employee inventory. Personnel Psychology. 11, 217-234.
- Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1964). A Theory of Work Adjustment: Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.

- Decker, R. W. (1981). Job satisfaction factors of special education teachers employed in residential institutions for the mentally retarded in New Mexico (Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41 (8), 3342A.
- Dunham, J. (1984). Stress in Teaching. New York: Nichols Publishing Company.
- Dunn, L. M. (1968). Special Education for the mildly retarded--Is much of it justified? Exceptional Children. 35 (2), 5-22.
- Dunnette, M., Campbell, J., & Hakel, M. (1967). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction on six occupational groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 2(2), 143-174.
- Ewen, R. B. (1964). Some determinants of job satisfaction: A study of the generality of Herzberg's theory. Journal of Applied Psychology. 48, 161-163.
- Federal Register (August 23, 1977). Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Office of Education. Education of Handicapped Children.
- Federman, D. G. (1984). An exploratory study into the phenomenon of teacher burnout (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University). Dissertation Abstracts International. 45 (1), 122A.
- Finger, S. G. (1985). Leadership style of the quasi-administrator and teacher job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University). Dissertation Abstracts International. 45 (12), 3494A.
- Fraser, T. M. (1983). Human Stress, Work and Job Satisfaction: A Critical Approach. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization.

- Gay, L. R. (1981). Educational Research. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Gearheart, B. R. & Weishahn, M. W. (1980). The Handicapped Student in the Regular Classroom. St. Louis, MO: The C.V. Mosby Company.
- Graen, G. B., & Hulin, C. L. (1968). Addendum to "an empirical investigation of two implications of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction". Journal of Applied Psychology. 52 (4), 341-342.
- Gottfried, B. W. & Jones, R. L. (1970). Noncognitive correlates of satisfaction in teaching educable mentally retarded children. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded. 5 (1), 37-43.
- Hallahan, D. P. & Kauffman, J. M. (1977). Labels, categories, behaviors: ED, LD, and EMR reconsidered. The Journal of Special Education. 11 (2), 139-147.
- Halpern, G. (1966). Relative contributions of motivator and hygiene factors to overall job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 50 (3), 198-200.
- Harris, L. & Associates (1984). Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher. #3
- Harrison, R. (1961). Cumulative communality cluster analysis of workers' job attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology. 41, 123-125.
- Haughey, M. L., & Murphy, P. J. (1983). Are rural teachers satisfied with the quality of their work life? Education. 104 (1), 56-66.
- Hauser, P. (1982). The self-esteem of regular and special education elementary teachers are related to job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43 (6), 1926A.

- Helge, D. (1984). Models for serving rural students with low-incidence handicapping conditions. Exceptional Children. 50 (4), 313-324.
- Hertzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion. Pittsburg: Psychological Service of Pittsburg.
- Hertzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The Motivation to Work (2nd edition). New York: Wiley.
- Heward, W. L., Cooper, J. O., Heron, T. E., Hill, D. S., McCormick, S., Porter, J. T., Stephens, T. M., & Sutherland, H. A. (1981). Noncategorical teacher training in a state with categorical certification requirements. Exceptional Children. 48 (3), 206-212.
- Holdaway, E. A. (1978). Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly. 14 (1), 30-47.
- Hopkins, A. H. (1983). Work and Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Hulin, C. L. (1966). Effects of community characteristics on measures of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 50, 280-285.
- Hulin, C. L. (1968). Effects of changes in job satisfaction levels on employee turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology. 52, 122-126.
- Huntze, S. L. & Grosenick, J. K. (1980). National needs analysis in behavior disorders: Human resource issues in behavior disorders. Columbia: University of Missouri-Columbia. Department of Special Education.

- Idol-Maestas, L., Lloyd, S., & Lilly, M. S. (1981). A noncategorical approach to direct service and teacher education. Exceptional Children. 48 (3), 213-220.
- Iris, B. & Barrett, G. V. (1972). Some relations between job and life satisfaction and job importance. Journal of Applied Psychology. 56 (4), 301-304.
- Jorde, P. (1984). Teacher job satisfaction: A framework for analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for The Education of Young Children (Los Angeles, CA, November 8-11, 1984).
- Kahn, R. L. (1981). Work and Health. Wiley Series on Organizational Assessment and Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kansas Guidelines for Identifying Children and Youth with Learning Disabilities (1983). Special Education Section, Kansas State Department of Education.
- Kansas State Department of Education (1983). Special Education State Plan for Fiscal Year 1983. Topeka, KS; author.
- Kansas State Department of Education (1985). Special Education State Plan for Fiscal Year 1985. Topeka, KS; author.
- Kaplan, L. (1952). The annoyances of elementary school teachers. Journal of Educational Research. 45, 649-665.
- Keller, R. (1975). Role conflict and ambiguity: Correlates with job satisfaction and values. Personnel Psychology. 28, 57-64.
- Kells, P. P., Banman, R. D., & Daub, C. (1983). Kansas survey regarding attrition of special education personnel. Special Project: Summary Report. Kansas State Board of Regents, Topeka, KS.

- Kendall, L. M. (1963). Canonical analysis of job satisfaction and behavioral, personal background, and situational data. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.
- Kerr, S. T. (1983). Teacher specialization and the growth of a bureaucratic profession. Teachers College Record. 84 (3), 629-651.
- Knox, S. C. (1968). Turnover among teachers of the mentally retarded. Exceptional Children. 35, 231-235.
- Kottkamp, R. B., Provenzo, E. F., Jr., & Cohn, M. M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964-1984. Phi Delta Kappan. 67 (8), 559-567.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1979). Teacher stress and satisfaction. Educational Research, 21, 89-96. (b) 45
- LaGarde, R. N. (1983). A study of consumer satisfaction with interrelated special education services in a rural cooperative (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International. 44 (1), 1983, 137-A.
- Learning Magazine. (1979). Readers report on the tragedy of burnout. 27(4), 76-77.
- Lieberman, L. M. (1980). The implications of noncategorical special education. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 13 (2), 14-17.
- Lieberman, L. M. (1985). Special education and regular education: A merger made in heaven? Exceptional Children. 51 (6), 513-516.
- Lilly, M. S. (1977). A merger of categories: Are we finally ready? Journal of Learning Disabilities. 10 (2), 56-62.

Lingo, C. L. (1985). Teacher Questionnaire for Kansas Interrelated Programs.

Unpublished instrument.

Locke, E. A. (1976). What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 4, 316.

Lofquist, L. H., & Dawis, R. V. (1969). Adjustment to work: A Psychological View of Man's Problems in a Work-Oriented Society. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Educational Division.

Marozas, D. S. & May, D. C. (1980). Factors which motivate job acceptance among teachers of severely and profoundly mentally retarded children. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded. 15(4), 293-297.

Maslow, A. (1968). Toward a psychology of being. (2nd ed.) New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

McGuire, W. H. (1979). Teacher burnout. Today's Education. 68 (4), 5.

Meadow, K. P. (1981). Burnout in professionals working with deaf children. American Annals of the Deaf 13-22.

Mesinger, J. F. (1985). Commentary on "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education" or, is it time for the lamb to lie down with the lion? Exceptional Children. 51(6), 510-512.

Mitchell, J. V. , Jr. (ed.) (1985). The Ninth Mental Measurement Yearbook. Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska Press.

Morse, N. D. (1953). Satisfaction in the White Collar Job. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Morris, W. (ed.) (1969). The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., "needs", "values".
- Muncrief, M. (1979). Work adjustment of vocational education teachers. The Journal of Vocational Education Research. 4 (4), 35-48.
- Newhouse, J. (1981). A cross-disciplinary special education preparation program: An undergraduate experimental model. Journal of Teacher Education. 32 (4), 38-41.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. H. (1983). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Phipps, P. M. (1982). The merging categories: Appropriate education or administrative convenience? Journal of Learning Disabilities. 15 (3), 153-154.
- Polloway, E. A., & Smith, J. D. (1983). Changes in mild mental retardation: Populations, Programs, and perspectives. Exceptional Children. 50 (2), 149-158.
- Porter, L. W. (1961). A study of perceived job satisfaction in bottom and middle management jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology. 45, 1-10.
- Porter, L. W. & Lawler, E. E. (1968). Managerial Attitudes and Performance. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwine.
- Proctor, R. (1979). How to survive in today's stressful jobs. Parade Magazine, June 17, 4-5.

- Reynolds, M. C. (1979). Categorical vs. noncategorical teacher training. Teacher Education and Special Education. 2 (3), 5-11.
- Reynolds, M. C., & Balow, B. (1972). Categories and variables in special education. Exceptional Children. 38 (38), 357-366.
- Saleh, S. D., & Grygier, F. G. (1969). Psychodynamics of intrinsic and extrinsic job orientation. Journal of Applied Psychology. 53 (6), 446-450.
- Schaffer, R. H. (1953). Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work. Psychological Monographs. 67 (14), 1-29.
- Schrieschier, C. A. and Kinicki, A. J. (1984). The Measurement of Satisfaction By the Job Descriptive Index (JDI): A Review. Unpublished paper, Management Department, College of Business Administration, University of Florida.
- Schrieschier, C. A. and Tsui, A. S. (1981). Development and validation of a short satisfactory measure for use in survey feedback intervention. Unpublished manuscript.
- Seashore, S. E., & Tabor, T. D. (1975). Job satisfaction indicators and their correlates. American Behavioral Scientist. 18 (3), 333-368.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. The Journal of Educational Administration. 1, 66-82.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally and Company.

- Sparks, R. & Richardson, S. O. (1981). Multicategorical/cross-categorical classrooms for learning disabled students. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 14 (2), 60-61.
- Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1985). The merger of special and regular education: Can it be done? A response to Lieberman and Mesinger. Exceptional Children. 51 (6), 517-521.
- Stunkard, S. L. (1982). Job satisfaction and teacher attitudes of regular classroom and special education teachers (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, Urbana, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International. 43 (9), 2966-A.
- Twery, R., Schmid, Jr., Jr., & Wrigley, C. (1958). Some factors in job satisfaction: A comparison of three methods of analysis. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 18, 189-202.
- Vallecorsa, A. L. (1983). Cross-categorical resource programs: An emerging trend in special education. Education. 104 (2), 131-136.
- Vroom, J. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Wanous, J. P., & Lawler, E. E. (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology. 56 (2), 95-105. ✓ 4 9
- Weiskopf, P. E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children. 47 (1), 18-23.
- Weiss, D. M., Dawis, R.V., England, G. W., and Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for ✓ #8
the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: 22: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center.

- Wernimont, P. F. (1966). Intrinsic and extrinsic factors in job satisfaction. Journal # 7
of Applied Psychology. 59 (1), 41-50.
- Wickstrom, R. A. (1973). Sources of teacher job satisfaction. Canadian
Administrator. 31 (1), 1-5.
- Youngs, B. (1978). Anxiety and stress--How they affect teachers, teaching.
NASSP Bulletin. 62, 78-83.
- Zabel, R. H., Smith, M. L., & White, W. J. (1984). Relationships between selected
personal characteristics of special education teacher educators and their
job satisfaction. Teacher Education and Special Education. 7 (3), 132-141. NA
036
- Zabel, R. H., & Zabel, M. K. (1980). Burnout: A critical issue for educators.
Education Unlimited. 2(2), 23-25.
- Zigler, E., Balla, D., & Hodapp, R. (1984). On the definition and classification of
mental retardation. American Journal of Mental Deficiency. 89 (3),
215-230.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

509 "I" N.E.
Miami, OK 74354
October 1, 1986

Dear Special Education Teacher,

I am asking your help in a research project concerning the job satisfaction of teachers working in interrelated special education programs in Kansas. An earlier study that I conducted led me to believe that Kansas interrelated teachers vary greatly in their job responsibilities and in their personal feelings toward their jobs.

The results of the survey will be reported in a doctoral research study at Oklahoma State University. No state agency, school district, or other group is connected with this study. All information will be reported as group information; no personal identification will be presented in reporting the results.

Enclosed are two brief questionnaires totaling 6 pages. One, The Teacher Questionnaire for Kansas Interrelated Programs is designed to gather information about your program and yourself. The second, the Job Descriptive Index, is designed to measure your opinions concerning certain aspects of your job. It should not take over 10 minutes to complete both forms.

Please answer all the questions on both questionnaires.

Your help is very important and is greatly appreciated. A stamped, addressed envelope has been included for the return of your completed questionnaires. The back of this return envelope has been number coded on the lower left corner. The coding allows unanswered questionnaires to be located so that a follow-up mailing can be sent. Again, under no circumstances is any information to be used to identify the sender.

Once again, your cooperation is essential and a special thanks is yours.

Sincerely,

Charlene Lingo

APPENDIX B

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KANSAS

INTERRELATED TEACHERS

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KANSAS
INTERRELATED PROGRAMS

DIRECTIONS

This survey is divided into 6 parts (A thru E). It is designed to gather information about you, your students and your job assignment.

Part A asks questions relating to the make-up of your program: the types of categorical disabilities served, the number of students identified in each category, the age range of the students you serve, the average amount of time each child is served daily, and the type of program in which you work.

Part B asks questions about your certification. The information given should reflect all certification areas in which you are qualified. It is also important that you show the type certification you hold (standard or provisional) for each area of certification.

Part C gathers information about your teaching experience. Questions relate to your years of service in regular education, special education, and specifically, in interrelated special education programs.

Part D is a coded question which attempts to determine your overall satisfaction with your current job in an interrelated program.

Part E asks for personal information. These questions are asked only to help provide an overall profile of the respondents as a group, as opposed to compiling individual information.

Part F is an optional section which allows you to volunteer any additional information about your interrelated special education program which you feel might more fully explain your answers.

Answer each question as accurately as possible. Directions have been provided for completion of each section. Please complete the questionnaire in its entirety as it relates to your program. Feel free to add comments to clarify your responses if you feel it is needed.

A. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Directions: In the first column, check with an "X" each category of students you serve; and for each category checked, indicate in the second column the number of students served in that category. Please total each column in the appropriate blank.

1. In my interrelated program I serve students identified in the following disability areas.

HANDICAPPING CATEGORY	NOW BEING SERVED IN MY CLASS ("X")	NUMBER IN THIS CATEGORY
a. early childhood handicapped	_____	_____
b. speech/language/hearing impaired	_____	_____
c. mentally retarded	_____	_____
d. personal/social adjustment	_____	_____
e. physically and other health impaired	_____	_____
f. severely/multiply handicapped	_____	_____
g. specific learning disabilities	_____	_____
h. visually impaired	_____	_____
* TOTAL NUMBER OF CATEGORIES SERVED	_____	XXXXX
* TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED	XXXXX	_____

Directions: Give the ages of the youngest and oldest student in your program. Please give the ages in years and months.

2. The youngest student in my program is _____ yrs. and _____ mos. old.
3. The oldest student in my program is _____ yrs, and _____ mos. old.

Directions: Check the model that fits your program. If you serve in more than one model, please indicate all that fit your job description by placing an X by each appropriate response.

4. My interrelated program is based on the following delivery model(s):
- a. hospital or home-bound instruction: (teacher travels to the student's home or to the hospital to deliver service)
 - b. special instructional materials and/or equipment only: (teacher is responsible only to supply materials and/or equipment for a given student)
 - c. consulting teacher plan: (teacher is to supply advisement to the regular classroom teacher, but does not teach the student)
 - d. itinerant teacher plan: (teacher is not based in one building, but travels from building to building to teach students)
 - e. resource room plan: (teacher has a single room location where students come for instruction on a half-day basis or less)
 - f. self-contained special class: (students are essentially in the class all day)
- TOTAL NUMBER OF PROGRAM MODELS YOU IMPLEMENT
-

B. CERTIFICATION

Directions: Check EACH that applies.

1. I have provisional or standard certification to teach in the following area(s):
- | | PROVISIONAL | STANDARD |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| a. learning disabilities | _____ | _____ |
| b. mental retardation | _____ | _____ |
| c. emotional disturbance | _____ | _____ |
| d. severely multiply handicapped | _____ | _____ |
| e. early childhood handicapped | _____ | _____ |

- f. deaf education _____
- g. visually impaired _____
- h. regular elementary education _____
- i. regular secondary education _____
- j. other (list) _____
-

C. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Directions: Check only one choice for each question.

1. What is the total number of years you have taught in interrelated programs?

_____ 0 years _____ 1-2 yrs. _____ 3-5 yrs. _____ 6-9 yrs. _____ 10+ yrs.

2. What is the total number of years you have taught in special education, excluding your interrelated experience?

_____ 0 years _____ 1-2 yrs. _____ 3-5 yrs. _____ 6-9 yrs. _____ 10+ yrs.

3. What is the total number of years you have taught in regular education?

_____ 0 years _____ 1-2 yrs. _____ 3-5 yrs. _____ 6-9 yrs. _____ 10+ yrs.

D. JOB ORIENTATION

Directions: Using the code below, place an "X" next to the description that corresponds to the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:

In general, I am satisfied with my job as an interrelated program teacher.

- | | |
|-------|------------------------|
| _____ | A = very much agree |
| _____ | B = mostly agree |
| _____ | C = barely agree |
| _____ | D = barely disagree |
| _____ | E = mostly disagree |
| _____ | F = very much disagree |

APPENDIX C

JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX

JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX*

The Job Descriptive Index measures satisfactions with five areas of a job: the type of work, the pay, the opportunities for promotion, the supervision, and the co-workers on the job. For each area there is a list of adjectives or short phrases. You will indicate whether each work or phrase applies to your present job. Complete directions are given for each part of the survey.

A. WORK

Directions: Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below write:

Y for "YES" if it describes your work.

N for "NO" if it does not describe it.

? if you cannot decide.

- _____ Fascinating
- _____ Routine
- _____ Satisfying
- _____ Boring
- _____ Good
- _____ Creative
- _____ Respected
- _____ Hot
- _____ Pleasant
- _____ Useful
- _____ Tiresome
- _____ Healthful
- _____ Challenging
- _____ On your feet
- _____ Frustrating
- _____ Simple
- _____ Endless
- _____ Gives a sense of accomplishment

*Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969

B. ADMINISTRATION

Directions: Think of those in your institution who in any way direct, coordinate, or supervise your activity. What is the most usual relationship? In the blank beside each word given below, write:

Y for "YES" if it describes the administration.

N for "NO" if it does not describe it.

? if you cannot decide.

- _____ Asks my advice
- _____ Hard to please
- _____ Impolite
- _____ Praises good work
- _____ Tactful
- _____ Influential
- _____ Up-to-date
- _____ Doesn't supervise enough
- _____ Quick tempered
- _____ Tells me where I stand
- _____ Annoying
- _____ Stubborn
- _____ Knows job well
- _____ Bad
- _____ Intelligent
- _____ Leaves me on my own
- _____ Lazy
- _____ Around when needed

C. SALARY

Directions: Think of your present salary. Try to describe it as accurately as possible. In the blank beside each word below write:

Y for "YES" if it describes your salary.

N for "NO" if it does not describe it.

? if you cannot decide.

_____ Income adequate for normal expenses

_____ Satisfactory fringe benefits

_____ Barely live on income

_____ Bad

_____ Income provides luxuries

_____ Insecure

_____ Less than I deserve

_____ Highly paid

_____ Underpaid

D. PROMOTION

Directions: Think about the promotion practices in your institution. In the blank beside each word given below, write:

Y for "YES" if it describes promotion practices in your institution.

N for "NO" if it does not describe them.

? if you cannot decide.

_____ Good opportunity for advancement

_____ Opportunity somewhat limited

_____ Promotion on ability

_____ Dead-end job

_____ Good chances for promotion

_____ Unfair promotion policy

_____ Infrequent promotion

_____ Regular promotion

_____ Fairly good chance for promotion

E. COLLEAGUES

Directions: Think of your colleagues. What are they like most of the time?
In the blank beside each word given below, write:

Y for "YES" if it describes your colleagues.

N for "NO" if it does not describe them.

? if you cannot decide.

- _____ Stimulating
- _____ Boring
- _____ Slow
- _____ Ambitious
- _____ Stupid
- _____ Responsible
- _____ Fast
- _____ Intelligent
- _____ Easy to make enemies
- _____ Talk too much
- _____ Smart
- _____ Lazy
- _____ Unpleasant
- _____ No privacy
- _____ Active
- _____ Narrow interests
- _____ Loyal
- _____ Hard to meet

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

Dear Fellow Special Educator,

About two weeks ago I sent you two questionnaires concerning your interrelated special education program. If you haven't yet completed them and put them in the mail, it's not too late! I'd like very much to have your input. As far as I know, this is the only survey done on all of the State's interrelated programs.

Sincerely,

Charlene Lingo
Sp. Ed. teacher (ED/PSA)
Miami, OK Public Schools

APPENDIX E

PILOT COVER LETTER

February 6, 1986
509 "I" N.E.
Miami, OK 74354

Dear Fellow Oklahoma Special Educator,

I am asking your help in developing a questionnaire. The questionnaire will be used in the state of Kansas to study certain aspects of their generic special education programs, which they call interrelated programs. Interrelated classes combine several exceptionalities in one program and require that the teacher be certified in the exceptionality representing the majority of students in the program.

Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire that should take no longer than 10 minutes to complete. Please answer the questions as though you were teaching in a generic (modified) program. If you feel that any question is unclear or poorly worded, make a note of it on the questionnaire itself. The purpose of the pilot is to clarify any part or parts of the survey.

When the questionnaire has been piloted and revised (with your input), it will be sent to the 500+ teachers of interrelated programs in Kansas. The information gained will be used as part of a doctoral program at Oklahoma State University.

Your help is very important and is greatly appreciated. A stamped, addressed, envelope has been included for the return of your completed questionnaire. The back of this return envelope has been number-coded on the lower left corner. The coding allows unanswered questionnaires to be located so that a follow-up mailing can be sent. Under no circumstances is any information to be used to identify the sender.

Once again, your cooperation is essential and a special thanks is yours.

Sincerely,

Charlene Lingo

VITA²

Charlene Littleton Lingo

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION AND VARIABLES OF KANSAS INTERRELATED PROGRAMS

Major Field: Applied Behavioral Studies

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Shawnee, Oklahoma, November 27, 1939.

Education: Graduated from Miami High School, Miami, Oklahoma in May, 1957; received Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Tulsa in Tulsa, Oklahoma in June, 1961; received a Master of Science degree from Pittsburg State University in Pittsburg, Kansas in May, 1980; received an Educational Specialist degree from Pittsburg State University in December, 1983; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1987.

Professional Experience: Kindergarten teacher, Miami Public Schools, Miami, Oklahoma, August 1968 - May 1975; Primary grade teacher, Miami Public Schools, Miami, Oklahoma, August 1975 - May 1981; Elementary gifted facilitator, Miami Public Schools, Miami, Oklahoma, August 1981 - May 1982; Chapter I reading specialist, Miami Public Schools, Miami, Oklahoma, August 1982 - May 1984; Teacher of the emotionally disturbed, Miami Public Schools, Miami, Oklahoma, August 1985 - January 1987; Remedial reading practicum assistant, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas, summers of 1982, 1983, 1984; Lecturer in special education, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas, 1983 - 1986; Teaching assistant, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, August 1984 - December 1984.

Professional Organizations: Oklahoma Education Association, National Education Association, Miami Association of Classroom Teachers, Council for Exceptional Children, Phi Delta Kappa, Kappa Delta Pi.