

Copyright

by

Eleanor Marie Meeker

May, 1983

A STUDY OF FIVE ASPECTS OF JOB SATISFACTION
AMONG TEACHER RESIGNEES

By

ELEANOR MARIE MEEKER

Bachelor of Liberal Arts
Oklahoma University
Norman, Oklahoma
1967

Master of Education
Northeastern Oklahoma State University
Tahlequah, Oklahoma
1972

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 EDUCATION
May, 1983

Thesis
1983D
M494s
Cop. 2



A STUDY OF FIVE ASPECTS OF JOB SATISFACTION
AMONG TEACHER RESIGNEES

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Clark

Thesis Adviser

Phil K. Long

William E. Segall

Thomas Smith

Norman N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

1168769

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Kenneth St. Clair served as chairman of this dissertation. His willingness to meet and counsel with me is appreciated. I am grateful also to Dr. Patrick Forsyth for his time, advice, and counsel. I thank my committee members: Dr. Thomas Smith and Dr. William Segall for their valued opinion. I wish to express a special acknowledgment to Dr. Thomas Karman for his encouragement at the onset of this study.

I am indebted to the participating superintendents and to the individual responding teachers who made this study possible.

I owe recognition to my husband, Dr. Harry W. Meeker, for his confidence and his companionship. To our daughter Kristine, I offer thanks for her support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem.	3
Significance and Purpose of the Study	4
Limitations of the Study.	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Definitions of Job Satisfaction	5
Theories of Job Satisfaction.	6
Related Studies	7
Stress as a Factor.	9
Attitude as a Consideration	11
Feelings of Alienation.	12
Current Thoughts on Burnout	14
Summary	16
III. RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY.	17
Data Source	22
Population.	22
Instrumentation	22
Design of the Study	25
Method.	25
Scoring	27
IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	29
Summary	45
V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48
Summary	48
T-Test by Sex	50
T-Test by Districts	50
ANOVA - Years in the Teaching Profession.	52
ANOVA - Years Taught at the Last School	54
Discussion.	55
Recommendations for Personnel Administrators.	59
Recommendations for Further Research.	60

Chapter	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	61
APPENDIXES.	65
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE.	66
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE	68
APPENDIX C - DESCRIPTION OF SUBPOPULATIONS TABLE . . .	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Reliability Analysis by Variables	24
II. Coded Listing of Questionnaires by Districts.	26
III. T-Test for Differences in Means of Job Satisfaction Categories Between Male and Female Teacher Resignees	31
IV. T-Test for Differences in Means of Job Satisfaction Categories Between Teacher Resignees in 12 Subur- ban (Group 1) and One Large Urban (Group 2) School Districts	32
V. Analysis of Variance: Number of Years in Teaching by Groups, Category A: Physical and Mental Exertion.	35
VI. Analysis of Variance: Number of Years in Teaching by Groups, Category B: Relations With Associates .	36
VII. Analysis of Variance: Number of Years in Teaching by Groups, Category C: Relations With Employer . .	37
VIII. Analysis of Variance: Number of Years in Teaching by Groups, Category D: Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job.	38
IX. Analysis of Variance: Number of Years in Teaching by Groups, Category E: Job Information, Training, and Status.	40
X. Analysis of Variance: Years Taught at Last School, Category A: Physical and Mental Exertion	41
XI. Analysis of Variance: Years Taught at Last School, Category B: Relations With Associates.	42
XII. Analysis of Variance: Years Taught at Last School, Category C: Relations With Employer.	43
XIII. Analysis of Variance: Years Taught at Last School, Category D: Interest In, Liking For, and Emo- tional Involvement in the Job	44

Table	Page
XIV. Analysis of Variance: Years Taught at Last School, Category E: Job Information, Training, and Status.	46
XV. Summary of Findings	47
XVI. Description of Subpopulations	77

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

No one knows whether dissatisfaction with work is really more rampant today than in the past. It is possible that today's emphasis, especially among the educated, on finding intrinsic satisfaction in work, may sometimes operate to promote dissatisfaction, or at least expressions of dissatisfaction. It is the current common wisdom that today more people than ever are growing dissatisfied with their jobs and careers. Writers offer different reasons. Some say work is more highly structured today, more fragmented, and less personal (Klinger, 1977).

Ricken (1980, p. 22) feels that in the teaching profession, "the education process has become restrictive and painfully controlled." He reasons that "the teachers of today are turning off because they are not employed in an environment in which they may answer the district's questions, but they may not question the answers" (p. 23).

It is also true that teachers have had to adapt to different organizational structures. Wallen (1978) asserts that:

Teaching, particularly in our larger schools, can and for many teachers does, in a great many instances, take on certain characteristics not dissimilar from the assembly line of mass production firms. There is, for example, a similarity in the repetitiveness of the work itself, and the prospect of doing to same work on into the foreseeable future. There is also the timetable. It is the great regulator. Typically, the timetable is

created by persons not directly involved in teaching. This dictates--in an impersonal way--what the teacher is to teach (i.e., what subject), to whom, when, for how long, and in what place. Bells or buzzers--operated by an automatic, pre-set clock--control the length of each teaching period as well as the flow of groups of students from one room to the next (p. 11).

These features are typical of a bureaucratic organization. But most individuals function well in such situations. However, some individuals do not. Maslow (1954) recognized that:

The individual is an integrated, organized whole. This means the whole individual is motivated rather than just a part of him. Furthermore, satisfaction comes to the whole individual and not just to a part of him (p. 63).

This should be even more true of teachers, for as Sergiovanni (1967) notes:

It seems appropriate to assume that since students are the very crux of a teacher's work, they should account for many of the successes and good feelings that teachers have. . . . Establishing an appropriate relationship with students appears to be critical. Once established, the teacher can capitalize on this relationship in pursuit of work-centered or job-itself satisfaction. It appears that a happy relationship with students is not in itself potent enough to be a source of job satisfaction. A poor relationship with students, however, can be a source of considerable teacher dissatisfaction (p. 78).

Sergiovanni (1967) also found that factors which accounted for possible attitudes of teachers were related to the work itself, and factors which accounted for negative attitudes of teachers were related to the conditions or environment of work. Teachers appeared to derive the most satisfaction from work-centered activity. Sergiovanni (p. 81) states: "In summation, the satisfaction factors tended to focus on the work itself, and the dissatisfaction factors tended to focus on the conditions of the work."

Statement of the Problem

Teachers are voluntarily resigning from the teaching profession, even though they have spent a great deal of time, money, and effort to be trained in a specialized career. The question presents itself: Do various aspects of job satisfaction have a bearing on a teacher's decision to leave the teaching profession?

For James and Jones (1980), job satisfaction is described as:

. . . an affective/emotional evaluation of job/task events. Individuals rely on the psychologically significant and meaningful perception of job challenges, autonomy, and importance for direct information in the formulation of job satisfaction attitudes. In comparison to the job perceptions, job satisfaction is viewed as more personalistic and emotional and viewed as requiring additional stages of cognitive information processing (p. 126).

These emotions constitute a continuous stream of signals informing persons where their incentives are, how important they are, and what their relationship is to them. Because emotions are part of a larger behavioral complex, they are incipient behaviors with respect to incentive objects. Therefore, they prepare the person for a certain class of responses: to seize, fight, desist, or run (Klinger, 1977).

Many teachers are choosing to run; this results in a high turnover rate in public education. Peskin (1973) states that:

Turnover puts the organization into a state of flux as new behavior patterns and interpersonal expectations are introduced. While this can create a healthy challenge and rejuvenation, it can also produce disruption in the organization (p. 20).

The disruption in the organization due to teacher turnover suggests a great financial loss, for there are expenses involved in selecting and inducting new teachers. This teacher turnover would

encompass a great loss in human resources when the experienced teacher leaves the profession.

Significance and Purpose of the Study

The educational enterprise is considered a helping profession. It is composed of trained personnel whose services are in great demand in both private and public school. Their training is specialized enough to require certification, yet general enough to answer the basic psychological and academic needs of most of the students attending the schools.

But at a time when their knowledge and experience should benefit the schools, many teachers are resigning voluntarily. If they leave the profession permanently for another career, the loss can be great in terms of replacement with individuals of equal experience, training, and expertise. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine if one or more categories of job satisfaction have a bearing on the voluntary resignation of teachers.

Limitations of the Study

This study examines five job satisfaction categories among teachers in a large metropolitan area of northeastern Oklahoma who have voluntarily resigned during the two school years of 1980-1982. The size of the sample and the design of the study restrict the generalization of these findings to this area and time limit.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The first studies of job satisfaction were conducted in the industrial setting, but it was soon noted that the job satisfaction concept was useful in non-industrial settings as well. This is because of the universality of basic human characteristics. Yet, for all their basic similarity, persons react quite differently to seemingly identical situations. Some persons clearly thrive on challenge; others quit their jobs for apparently little or no reason. This is true not only of the industrial setting; it is also true of professional settings.

Definitions of Job Satisfaction

There is a dearth of literature on the subject of voluntary teacher resignation. A review of literature regarding job satisfaction, however, shows that there are many definitions of the term, as well as a multiplicity of viewpoints as to its cause.

Hoppock (1935) classified three major combinations or divisions of job satisfaction as psychological, physiological, and emotional. These have offered a base for subsequent studies. Hoppock (p. 47) also did the classic study of job satisfaction in which he defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological, and

emotional circumstances that cause a person to say 'I am satisfied with my job.'

Thirty-four years later, Locke (1969, p. 316) defined job satisfaction as "the pleasureable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job achieving or facilitating one's job values." Vroom (1964, p. 99) had defined job satisfaction as ". . . the affective orientations of individuals toward work roles that they presently occupy."

Although many definitions are proffered by researchers of job satisfaction, this study will define job satisfaction as an affective response to a work situation which results in a teacher's willingness to continue teaching (as indicated by the responses to the statements in the questionnaire). ✓

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Maslow's (1970) theory of the hierarchy of needs approached job satisfaction through the concept of individual self-esteem and self-fulfillment. If a person's inner needs were fulfilled, the worker would be satisfied with his job.

Herzberg et al. (1959) developed a Two-Factor Theory of Work Motivation that indicated that job satisfaction was based on the concept of intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of the job. The intrinsic factors included the work itself and a sense of achievement; the extrinsic factors included salary and working conditions. ✓

The results of a study by Abdel-Halim (1980) indicated that the relationship between job performance and certain extrinsic sources of job satisfaction should not be treated as uniformly positive for all

individuals, even if the overall general relationship seems positive. This is because "It has become apparent that individuals faced with a complex perceptual or conceptual task do not approach it in the same way" (Tyler, 1974, p. 115).

In 1966, an analysis of an industrial setting by Katz and Kann (1966) suggested that job satisfaction was not so much an index of direct gratification from the type of work as it was a reflection of satisfaction with all aspects of the job. This differed from the viewpoints of the early industrial psychologists whose central focus of interest was on the concepts of fatigue and monotony for the worker. Since the Hawthorne study (as cited in Burrell and Morgan, 1979), interest has been directed towards the identification of the determinants of job satisfaction and its relationship to work performance.

In the educational field, Sergiovanni (1967) believed that factors which account for job satisfaction of teachers are arranged on a conceptual continuum. Thus, a factor identified as a source of dissatisfaction for one teacher in a teaching situation may be a potential source for satisfaction for another teacher in a similar situation.

Related Studies

More recent studies add to the knowledge of the classic views of job satisfaction. A study by James and Jones (1980) showed that job satisfaction was influenced causally by job perception:

A job that was perceived as more challenging, autonomous, and important was also regarded as more satisfying. The generally accepted belief that individuals respond to perceptions of environments, and not the environment per se, received strong empirical support (pp. 126-127).

Research of an organization setting done by Cheloha and Farr (1980) measured for job satisfaction, job involvement, and absenteeism. These researchers found some sharp differences between the relationship of absenteeism and job involvement and the relationships of the various measures of satisfaction and the extrinsic job factors.

Absenteeism in an educational institution was investigated by Bridges (1980). He found the relationship between job satisfaction and employee absenteeism among elementary teachers to be influenced by the design of the job. In a low or moderately interdependent work situation, there was little or no relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism. However, in more highly interdependent work settings, the job satisfaction of teachers was negatively related to absenteeism.

Other concepts regarding work are: job perception, job involvement, and job design. They are all valid approaches to the study of job satisfaction in both the teaching profession and in the industrial setting. As Jahoda (1981) notes:

Both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with employment appear to be a function of the immediately experienced social contact. The vast majority derive five ties from employment as latent by-products. These are: time structure, social contacts, experiences of social purposes, status and identity, and regular activity. Time structure may also be too rigid; contact with supervisors may be unpleasant; purposes unclear or unacceptable; the status too low, and the activity may be too boring and exhausting (p. 189).

Weiner and Vardi (1980) agree. In their study, job satisfaction was found to be associated with both job and organizational commitment. Job commitment was related to satisfaction with the work itself and organizational commitment was related to pay, co-workers, and supervisors.

Gruskey (1970) determined that the internal processes in organizations include the processes of social interaction among members that find expression in the emergent group structures and the processes through which the interrelated elements in the total system become organized. The aid then, is to explain the system of interrelated characteristics that evolve in various organizations.

An attempt to explain a small portion of the interrelated characteristics of job satisfaction is the major focus of the present research.

Stress as a Factor

The first in-depth study of stress, now considered a classic, was done by Selye (1975). He recognized the confusion that occurred with the continued use of the word "stress" for a nonspecific response to any demand. Therefore, he set about to make a distinction between the different kinds of stress, as well as different kinds of stressors, or causes. His findings are too comprehensive to be of great interest in the current study, however, for he deals with a number of medical implications that offer little by the way of explanation of job satisfaction as it is addressed in this paper.

Other researchers addressed the issue more clearly with regard to job satisfaction. Anderson (1979, p. 400), for instance, states that: "Stress factors in large organizations are many, and they are likely to increase. In many cases it is not the job that worries people, but rather the people that they have to work with."

Cooper and Payne (1978) believe that how a person responds to a stressful situation is of crucial importance, for not all people will

experience a given job situation as stressful. Rather, stress occurs when the abilities of the person are incongruent with the demands of the job environment, or where clear obstacles exist to fulfill strong needs or values.

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1977) insist that the extent to which the demands made upon a teacher resulting in teacher stress depend on numerous factors. These factors include role conflict and working conditions, to name a few. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe also suggest that the relevance of stress cannot be underestimated in its effect on job satisfaction.

Maslach's (1976) research observes that professionals tend to cope with stress by a form of reaction known as distancing. But, "Stress is not just an individual's emotional state; it is a particular kind of reaction to environmental events" (McGrath, 1970, p. 14). Stress, then, not only involves a "state" of the focal organism (i.e., the actor) as a "state" of the environment, but it also involves a relationship between the two (McGrath, 1970). Teachers, as professionals, may be responding to situations in similar emotional states.

Because emotions are not a constant thing, shifts in intensity and quality over time can reflect perceived, evaluated, or appraised alternations in the person's relationship with the environment. This is based in part on feedback from the situation as well as from one's own reaction (Monat and Lazarus, 1977).

Gilbert and Mangeldorf (1977, p. 24) stated that in perceived stress, "It would appear that individuals typically respond to events in ways which serve to protect their self-esteem and sense of personal worth."

Other researchers who have studied stress factors that can offer insight with regard to educational problems are Appley and Trumbull (1975), as well as Mason (1975). Their studies indicate that stress is a factor to take into consideration in any study of job satisfaction; that would include those studies involving teachers.

Attitude as a Consideration

The attitude of a worker may have a decided bearing on job satisfaction.

Historically, attitudes have been defined in terms of a feeling of favorableness or unfavorableness toward an object which mediates overt behavior toward that object. And a subject's reported attitude toward an object is interpretable in terms of his judgment. To this extent, it is no different from a belief. The interpretation of beliefs and attitudes as subjective probabilities suggest a useful notation for referring to these cognitions (Wyer, 1974, pp. 24-25).

For Rokeach (1976), an attitude is defined simply as:

. . . an organization of interrelated beliefs around a common object, with certain aspects of the object being at the focus of attention for some persons, and other aspects for other persons. Attitudes have cognitive and affective properties by virtue of the fact that the beliefs comprising it have cognitive and affective properties that interact and reinforce one another (p. 116).

Essentially, these definitions accent the fact that workers are different. As Samuel and Lewin-Epstein (1979) note:

Work has a variety of meanings and serves a diversity of functions for workers everywhere. And meanings and functions which persons attach to their work activity affect their attitude and behavior patterns (p. 625).

Isherwood and Hoy (1973) concluded that:

Attitudes, values, and needs provide the individual with a standard from which judgments can be made. Teachers with organizational work values will probably conform to the explicit modes of operation, feel a

sense of organizational stability, and feel in control of the situation. In contrast, teachers with professional work values in an authoritarian bureaucracy are likely to experience a lack of control over issues central to their interests and expertise. However, teachers with social work values seem to require only a stable organization to achieve their goals of establishing and maintaining membership in their work group (pp. 128-129).

Fishbein's (1977) theory accepts the idea that a person's behavior is a function of the intention to perform that behavior, and the behavior is a function of two basic determinants: (1) attitude toward performing the behavior and (2) a subjective norm regarding the behavior.

An attitude can be either positive or negative, and it can be reflected in a teacher's behavior. Positive people see themselves as open, well-liked, and needed. Negative people may find communication with others extremely difficult. This may result in self-isolation, either voluntary or involuntary (Mitchell, 1979).

Feelings of Alienation

Sociologists owe a debt to Seeman (1959) for distinguishing five areas of alienation. The major emphasis with regard to work is identified as self-estrangement. This is the inability of the individual to find self-rewarding activities in employment. Seeman (1959, p. 273) states that ". . . the price we pay for alienated labor is not simply the denial of personal fulfillment, but the further trouble it generates in social life."

The term "alienation" is most frequently considered a general syndrome made up of a number of different objective conditions and subjective feeling-states which emerge from certain relationships

between workers and the socio-technical settings of employment (Blauner, 1964).

Studies of work alienation generally take into consideration the feelings of the subjects. This is important, for it acknowledges that physical alienation may not necessarily be a problem in work situations; however, feelings of alienation on the job may cause dissatisfaction.

Friedmann (1961), who made a study of the anatomy of work, stated that:

Work dissatisfaction, whether conscious or not, has a lasting and manifold influence. This is shown in the efforts to escape subsidiary activities. And all escapism, the psychologists say, is accompanied by repression, partial separation from reality; and when a person feels the need of escaping from his work, it is because it no longer plays a vital part in his life (pp. 112-113).

Alienation from work then, reflects a feeling of disappointment with the career and professional development as well as disappointment over the inability to fulfill professional norms (Aiken and Hage, 1966).

Moeller (1964) expresses the same idea with regard to the teaching profession:

Exhorted to be professional and, therefore, self-directed and autonomous in judgment, teachers may feel themselves surrounded by restrictions imposed by the policy structure of their school systems and by their superiors' idiosyncracies of leadership. If the teachers think they are unable to make an impact upon their occupational environment, they may divert their energy from teaching pupils to other activities, avocational or vocational, which are more meaningful to them (p. 138).

Tomeski and Dadek (1980) emphasize the fact that:

A professional evaluates himself continually. And, a professional knows when his work at an organization is

completed, i.e., when he realizes that he cannot contribute to the organization's welfare, or when the proposals that he recommends are not followed. By incidents such as this, he sees that he is wasting his time, and so he may move to another organization which needs his talents (p. 9).

Hom et al. (1979) say that:

Resignation is assumed to have evaluative implications for the organization or for the job. And leaving is assumed to mean that the leaver has a negative evaluation of the job. But resignation can also imply rejection of the organization, but not necessarily rejection of the job (p. 280).

The substantially alienated individual, then, may seek recourse in withdrawal. And a constructive type of withdrawal may involve quitting to seek more acceptable work.

In response to such a dilemma, Exton (1972) suggests that organizations provide opportunities that may enable individuals to achieve their personal goals. To the extent that such conditions do not exist, the organizations will suffer the loss of those individuals by alienation.

Current Thoughts on Burnout

Burnout, a phenomenon once thought to be the province of assembly line employees whose repetitive tasks institutionalized boredom, is now a factor in every stratum of skilled and unskilled employment (Ricken, 1980). The amount of professional literature which focuses on job satisfaction and burnout is growing. Edelwich (1980) suggests that:

A study of burnout can be done in any profession. Burnout among professional and paraprofessionals in the human services is much easier to observe and describe than to define. But it can be said that the term 'burnout' refers to a progressive loss of idealism, energy, and purpose experienced by people in the helping

professions as a result of the conditions of their work. And the costs of burnout in staff turnover do not have to be documented statistically; any social services administrator knows them well. Every year fields such as nursing and teaching suffer the loss of hundreds of their most dedicated and sensitive practitioners. The costs of staff turnover are felt by clients, fellow staff members, the institutions, and by society (pp. 30-31).

Burnout involves the loss of concern for the people with whom one is working (Maslach and Pines, 1977). Three top causes of burnout have been suggested: (1) responsibility without the necessary authority to accomplish tasks; (2) responsibility without the necessary resources to get the job done; and (3) lack of meaningful recognition for one's efforts and accomplishments (Emener, 1979).

Freudenberger (1974, p. 159) refers to burnout as the verb "to fail, to wear out, or to become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resources." He suggests that:

There are several signs of burnout: a) The person who used to be the talker and contributor at staff meetings now remains silent, b) The person appears to be resentful, disenchanted, fatigued, bored, discouraged, and confused; c) The person appears edgy, quick to be angry and frustrated at what would ordinarily be something of mild relevance (p. 78).

Hendrickson's (1979) viewpoint is specifically for teachers:

Burnout is a response to circuit overload. It is the result of unchecked stress caused by the institution's impersonal and unyielding demands and by the immediate environment in which teaching is done. . . . Although burnout is an occupational hazard that all teachers, as well as members of other helping professions are exposed to, its effect varies with the individual. . . . Some teachers leave teaching altogether, others burnout but stay on the job, counting the days until Friday (p. 37).

Teachers are expected to be psychologists, sociologists, social workers, baby sitters, coaches, club advisers, and police. The best of them are leaving the profession or seeking a way out of it (Mace,

1979). As a result, the National Education Association is stepping up its programs to assist teachers and to bring about community understanding of stress-related problems (McGuire, 1979).

Summary

Although there is a dearth of literature on voluntary teacher resignation, there is a multiplicity of viewpoints regarding the subject of job satisfaction. The review of literature of job satisfaction emphasized aspects such as stress, attitudes, feelings of alienation and burnout as definite ideas to be considered in any future study of job satisfaction. ✓

This study has recognized the legitimacy of these considerations. It also acknowledges the suggestion by Szilagyi and Holland (1980, p. 43) that:

There is voluntary turnover for organizational reasons and voluntary turnover for personal reasons, and that the precursor of turnover is dissatisfaction with such organizational components as pay, promotion, supervision, and work (p. 43).

Szilagyi and Holland also suggest that the decision to leave an organization is typically not made on the spot, but rather is contemplated by the employee for a considerable period of time--sometimes months. They also think that close examination of employee behavior can alert managers to potential turnover.

Tiffin (1952, p. 475) even proposes that "An exit interview be provided to determine an employee's feeling or opinion for leaving." Other researchers concur with that idea (Cheloha and Farr, 1980; Murnane, 1981; Warner and Abegglen, 1955).

CHAPTER III

RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY

In this research, nine categories of job satisfaction are examined in order to identify those elements that may induce a teacher to voluntarily resign a teaching position. The nine categories are as follows:

1. Physical and Mental Exertion.✓
2. Relations With Associates.
3. Security, Advancement, and Finances.
4. Relations With Employer.
5. Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job.✓
6. Job Information, Training, and Status.✓
7. Physical Surroundings and Work Conditions.✓
8. Future Goals and Progress Toward Goals.✓
9. Evaluation and Retrospect.✓

The concept of job satisfaction has become important in the study of organizational behavior apart from its possible relationship to productivity (Miskel et al., 1980).

Hackman and Suttle (1977) believed that job satisfaction is based largely on the individual's personal, subjective evaluation of the job. For the individual worker, quality of work life and productivity are closely related, especially when productivity is defined in terms of the individual's internal work standards.

Now a "productive" worker in educational terms would be difficult to define specifically, but it would imply a teacher who was satisfied with his job enough to make a career in the teaching profession. However, this is not always the case. Some teachers are leaving their jobs not only to teach elsewhere, but also to seek employment in an entirely new field. The inference is that these teachers are not satisfied with their jobs. To address this issue of job satisfaction and voluntary teacher resignation, four questions were posed regarding each of the nine categories. They were as follows:

Category A: Physical and Mental Exertion. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to physical and mental exertion:

Question 1. Is it because physical and mental exertion differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because physical and mental exertion differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because physical and mental exertion differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because physical and mental exertion differ by the number of years at the last school?

Category B: Relations With Associates. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to relations with associates:

Question 1. Is it because relations with associates differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because relations with associates differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because relations with associates differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because relations with associates differ by the number of years at the last school?

Category C: Security, Advancement, and Finances. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to security, advancement, and finances:

Question 1. Is it because security, advancement, and finances differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because security, advancement, and finances differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because security, advancement, and finances differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because security, advancement, and finances differ by the number of years in the last school?

Category D: Relations With Employer. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to relations with the employer?

Question 1. Is it because relations with employer differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because relations with employer differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because relations with employer differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because relations with employer differ by the number of years at the last school?

Category E: Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job:

Question 1. Is it because interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job differ by the number of years at the last school?

Category F: Job Information, Training, and Status. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to job information, training, and status:

Question 1. Is it because job information, training, and status differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because job information, training, and status differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because job information, training, and status differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because job information, training, and status differ by the number of years at the last school?

Category G: Physical Surroundings and Work Conditions. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to physical surroundings and work conditions:

Question 1. Is it because physical surroundings and work conditions differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because physical surroundings and work conditions differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because physical surroundings and work conditions differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because physical surroundings and work conditions differ by the number of years at the last school?

Category H: Future Goals and Progress Toward Goals. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to future goals and progress toward goals:

Question 1. Is it because future goals and progress toward goals differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because future goals and progress toward goals differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because future goals and progress toward goals differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because future goals and progress toward goals differ by the number of years at the last school?

Category I: Evaluation and Retrospect. Assuming that leaving the teaching profession is due to evaluation and retrospect:

Question 1. Is it because evaluation and retrospect differ by sex?

Question 2. Is it because evaluation and retrospect differ by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because evaluation and retrospect differ by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because evaluation and retrospect differ by the number of years at the last school?

Data Source

The necessary data for locating the population for this study were obtained from the Oklahoma State Department of Education in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. This information is open to the public upon request. All school districts must submit a list each year of the teachers who have been terminated. The reasons for termination are coded by a number; each number signifies a particular reason. The individual teacher submits his/her own reason for resigning. This information is forwarded by the school districts to the State Department of Education.

Population

For this study, a list was compiled of the teachers who voluntarily resigned from a large metropolitan area in northeastern Oklahoma during the years 1980-1982. This large metropolitan area includes one large, urban school district, as well as 12 smaller school districts surrounding this urban school district. These smaller school districts include suburban areas within 25 miles of the large urban school district.

Instrumentation

The emphasis of this research was to find the answer to the four questions posed earlier in this chapter regarding the nine categories of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with an instrument developed by George H. Johnson of the American Institute for Research in 1951. This instrument utilized an inventory, or questionnaire approach. It was composed of 99 uncomplicated items which were

answered by the respondents with reference to themselves and to the job. The instrument has nine subtests. They are: (1) Physical and Mental Exertion; (2) Relations With Associates; (3) Relations With Employer; (4) Security, Advancement, and Finances; (5) Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job; (6) Job Information, Training, and Status; (7) Physical Surroundings and Work Conditions, (8) Future Goals and Progress Toward Goals, and (9) Evaluation in Retrospect.

The internal consistency of the original instrument had been established by a reliability coefficient of .90 for the entire instrument as a whole. The current study, however, did not use the instrument as a whole. Instead, the nine categories were evaluated as nine units for measurement of job satisfaction. The data received in this research established the fact that four of the categories had unreliable alpha coefficients of reliability (Table I). Only those factors which showed an alpha of 0.75 or above have been considered in subsequent analyses. They are: (1) Physical and Mental Exertion; (2) Relations With Associates; (3) Relations With Employer; (4) Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job; and (5) Job Information, Training, and Status.

The instrument was originally designed to measure the job satisfaction of teachers who were still in the teaching profession. Because this research addressed the issue of teachers who had already voluntarily resigned, the instrument had to be modified so that each item was made to read in the past tense (See Appendix B).

TABLE I
RELIABILITY ANALYSIS BY VARIABLES

Variable	Alpha	N of Items	Least Pos- sible Score	Highest Pos- sible Score
a. Physical and Mental Exertion	0.78	7	7	14
b. Relations With Associates	0.76	7	7	14
c. Relations With Employer	0.76	16	16	32
d. Security, Advancement, and Finances	0.53	11	11	22
e. Interest In, Liking For, and Emo- tional Involvement in the Job	0.98	26	26	52
f. Job Information, Training, and Status	0.83	12	12	24
g. Physical Surroundings and Work Conditions	0.59	10	10	21
h. Future Goals and Progress Toward Goals	0.27	7	7	14
i. Evaluation in Retrospect	0.40	3	3	6

Note: Items were counted as True = 1; False = 2. In variable a, no reversals; variable b, three reversals; variable c, five reversals; variable d, five reversals; variable e, two reversals; variable f, 4 reversals; variable g, four reversals; variable h, four reversals; and variable i, two reversals. (See Questionnaire in Appendix B for specific questions reversed.)

Design of the Study

The demographic questions included gender, total years in the teaching profession, years in the last school, the highest degree held, and the level of teaching--from elementary to senior high. The two latter questions were asked only for purposes of describing the subpopulations (see Appendix B). The actual design did not include questions regarding the school districts; that information was acquired by the use of a code.

The code did not identify any specific teacher. Only the return envelopes were coded by school district so that the data regarding any differences between the urban versus the suburban school districts might be determined. The gender, total years in the teaching profession, and the number of years in the last school were an integral part of the study also. The last two areas of study were trisected into identifiable groups for comparison (see Tables V through XIV in Chapter IV).

After receiving the questionnaires, each one was given a code number to identify the school district from which it has been sent. Since the questionnaire itself had no identifying marks, the code was transferred to the questionnaire for data gathering purposes. The codes are reported in Table II.

Method

A letter describing the research was sent to the superintendents of each of the 13 school districts included in this study. A list of the teachers' names that had been obtained from the State Department of Education in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma was also included. (The

TABLE II
CODED LISTING OF QUESTIONNAIRES BY DISTRICTS

School Districts	Coded Nos.	No. Sent	No. Received	%
<u>Suburban District</u>				
a	001-	1	1	
b	011-012	4	2	
c	021-023	3	3	
d	031-034	6	4	
e	041-045	5	5	
f	051-056	11	6	
g	061-068	15	8	
h	071-080	13	10	
i	081-092	21	12	
j	110-125	21	14	
k	200-222	30	23	
l	300-329	61	30	
	Total Suburban	191	118	62
<u>Large Urban District</u>				
m	400-483	Total Urban	131	84
			84	64

Department of Education does not furnish the addresses of the teachers.) However, the information itself is public knowledge, so no permission is required of the school districts if the addresses are available.

The superintendent of the large urban district gave permission to examine the records and acquire the addresses needed for the research. Of the 12 smaller school districts, the superintendents of eight complied; five refused on the grounds that the right of privacy would be violated.

However, some of the teachers' names were found in the local telephone directory. By telephoning these teachers and some representatives of teachers' organizations in the districts, many addresses were obtained. The number sent in the urban area was 191; of these, 119 were returned, or 62 percent. The number sent in the surrounding 12 school districts was 131; of these, 84, or 64 percent, were returned.

The teachers were sent a questionnaire, along with a cover letter which explained the reason for the research (see Appendix A). Full instructions were given for filling out the questionnaire. A stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire was enclosed, as was a self-addressed, metered post card with the respondent's name. Each respondent was instructed to send these on different days to assure anonymity.

Scoring

Each item of the instrument was to be completed by the respondent. The directions to the respondents were as follows:

"The following statements concern your feeling and attitudes regarding your previous work and your plans. They are specific and require that you place a #1 for 'True' and a #2 for 'False'--whichever is appropriate for you. If you are doubtful, give the best answer you can, but answer with either a #1 or a #2. Answer with a #3 ONLY if the statement does not apply to you. Some of the statements are very similar, but they have somewhat different meanings, so answer every question, please, even though you may feel that it has already appeared on the list."

Some of the questions appeared to be asked in a positive way in one category and negatively in another. This was taken into consideration by a factor analysis of the 99 questions. As a result, some of the items were reversed. The reversed items are signed with an asterisk (see Appendix B).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter analyzes the data by the use of tables and by various statistical procedures. Explanations for the various statistical procedures used in this descriptive study are also included.

A descriptive study generally utilizes percentages in the analysis; however,

Relationship between variables can be investigated by comparing responses. Certain attitudes and behaviors can be explored by identifying factors which seem to be related to certain responses (Gay, 1976, p. 133).

The concept of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is that the total variation, or variance of scores can be attributed to two sources; the variance between groups (variance caused by the treatment), and the variance within groups (error variance) (Gay, 1981, p. 284).

Many research problems in education involve more than two means:

A single composite test to compare all sample means simultaneously and to tell whether or not a statistically significant difference exists somewhere in the data, overcomes these disadvantages. . . . It has the additional advantage of a more accurate estimate of the population variance since it could base this estimate on all the sample data taken together, rather than just two samples. Analysis of Variance answers the question: Is the variability between groups large enough in comparison with the variability within groups to justify the inference that the means of the populations from which the different groups were sampled are not all the same? In other words, if the variability between group means is large enough, we can conclude they probably come from different populations and that there is a statistically significant difference present in the data. The particular statistical test yielding the answer is the F-Ratio (Isaac, 1971, p. 140).

If a significant F-Ratio is obtained, the researcher only knows that somewhere in his data something other than chance is probably operating (Isaac, 1971, p. 50).

The t -test makes adjustments for the fact that the distribution of scores for small samples becomes increasingly different from a normal distribution as sample sizes become increasingly smaller. The strategy of the t -test is to compare the actual mean difference observed with the difference expected by chance (Gay, 1981, p. 319).

The t -test for independent samples, such as this study uses, assumes the members of one group are not related to members of the other group in any systematic way.

Contained in Table III are comparisons between male and female resignees on five separate factors of job satisfaction. The t -test is used to determine whether or not systematic differences between male and female resignees exist. The results indicate no appreciable difference by sex in the decision to leave the teaching profession as measured by the instrument used in this study.

Contained in Table IV are comparisons between urban and suburban resignees in five separate factors of job satisfaction. The t -test is used to determine whether or not systematic differences between suburban and urban resignees exist. The results of the t -test show that the large urban district resignees are strongest in attributing their resignations to physical and mental exertion (Category A).

The suburban district resignees are strongest in attributing their resignations to relations with associates (Category B). There appears to be no systematic difference between groups in relations with employees (Category C).

TABLE III

T-TEST FOR DIFFERENCES IN MEANS OF JOB SATISFACTION
CATEGORIES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE
TEACHER RESIGNEES

Variable	N	Mean	F Value	Two-Tailed Prob.	T Value (Pooled Variance)	Two-Tailed Prob.
<u>Category A</u>						
Physical and Mental Exertion *						
M	63	10.921	1.13	0.559	-0.53	0.597
F	137	11.102				
<u>Category B</u>						
Relations With Associates						
M	63	10.5127	1.06	0.762	0.88	0.382
F	137	10.1314				
<u>Category C</u>						
Relations With Employer						
M	63	21.7619	1.15	0.494	0.45	0.655
F	137	21.5109				
<u>Category D</u>						
Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job						
M	63	25.3492	1.27	0.246	-1.16	1.248
F	137	28.7883				
<u>Category E</u>						
Job Information, Training, and Status						
M	63	16.2857	1.08	0.689	0.64	0.523
F	137	15.9781				

Note: No appreciable difference is indicated.

TABLE IV

T-TEST FOR DIFFERENCES IN MEANS OF JOB SATISFACTION
 CATEGORIES BETWEEN TEACHER RESIGNEES IN
 12 SUBURBAN (GROUP 1) AND ONE LARGE
 URBAN (GROUP 2) SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Variable	N	Mean	F Value	Two-Tailed Prob.	T Value (Pooled Variance)	Two-Tailed Prob.
<u>Category A</u>						
Physical and Mental Exertion						
Group 1-Suburban Dist.	119	10.655				
Group 2-Urban Dist.	84	11.571*	1.07	0.749	-2.93	0.004
<u>Category B</u>						
Relations With Associates						
Group 1-Suburban Dist.	119	10.7563**				
Group 2-Urban Dist.	84	9.4762	1.89	0.002	4.67	0.001
<u>Category C</u>						
Relations With Employer						
Group 1-Suburban Dist.	119	21.4622				
Group 2-Urban Dist.	84	21.7381	2.19	0.001	-0.49	0.623
<u>Category D</u>						
Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job						
Group 1-Suburban Dist.	119	20.4370				
Group 2-Urban Dist.	84	37.3571*	4.94	0.001	-7.49	0.001

TABLE IV (Continued)

Variable	N	Mean	F Value	Two-Tailed Prob.	T Value (Pooled Variance)	Two-Tailed Prob.
<u>Category E</u>						
Job Information, Training, and Status						
Group 1-Suburban Dist.	119	17.000**	3.43	0.001	5.80	0.001
Group 2-Urban Dist.	84	14.7738				

*Resignees in Group 2 (Urban District) are strongest in attributing resignation to physical and mental exertion and to Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the job.

**Resignees in Group 1 (Suburban District) are strongest in attributing resignation to Relations With Associates and Job Information, Training, and Status.

Note: There appears to be no appreciable difference between resignees for Relations With Employer.

The large urban district resignees are strongest in attributing their resignations to interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job (Category D).

The suburban district resignees are strongest in attributing their resignations to job information, training, and status (Category E).

An Analysis of Variance was computed for the five categories and the number of years in the teaching profession. The number of years was trisected: Group 1 = 1-7 years; Group 2 = 8-14 years; Group 3 = 15+ years.

Reported in Table V are comparisons between the resignees by the groups just identified. The resignees in Group 1 (1-7 years) are strongest in attributing their resignations to physical and mental exertion (Category A).

Included in Table VI are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. The resignees in Group 3 (15+ years) are strongest in attributing their resignations to relations with associates (Category B).

Indicated in Table VII are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. There appears to be no significant differences in the groups of resignees in attributing their resignation to relations with employer (Category C).

Reported in Table VIII are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. The resignees in Group 1 (1-7 years) are strongest in attributing their resignation to interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job (Category D).

TABLE V
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING
 BY GROUPS, CATEGORY A: PHYSICAL AND
 MENTAL EXERTION

Variable A	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	102.4813	51.2406	11.283	0.001	1 = 1- 7 years	71	11.7606*	2.080
Within Groups	200	908.2737	4.5414			2 = 8-14 years	66	11.2273	2.210
						3 = 15+ years	66	10.060	2.104
Total	202	1010.7549					203	11.035	2.237

*Group 1 (1-7 years) is strongest in attributing resignation to Physical and Mental Exertion.

Note: $p < .001$.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING
BY GROUPS, CATEGORY B: RELATIONS
WITH ASSOCIATES

Variable B	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	203.7730	101.8865	28.871	0.001	1 = 1- 7 years	71	9.3521	1.5033
Within Groups	200	705.8010	3.5290			2 = 8-14 years	66	9.7424	2.0926
						3 = 15+ years	66	11.6515*	2.0114
Total	202	909.5740					203	10.2266	2.1220

*Group 3 (15+ years) is strongest in attributing resignation to Relations With Associates.

Note: $p < .001$.

TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING
 BY GROUPS, CATEGORY C: RELATIONS
 WITH EMPLOYER

Variable C	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	34.4008	17.2004	1.277	0.2810	1 = 1- 7 years	71	21.8310	4.0882
Within Groups	200	2693.1995	13.4660			2 = 8-14 years	66	20.9848	3.5539
						3 = 15+ years	66	21.8939	3.2889
Total	202	2727.6003					203	21.5764	3.6745

Note: No significant difference in the groups.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING
 BY GROUPS, CATEGORY D: INTEREST IN, LIKING
 FOR, AND EMOTIONAL INVOLVEMENT
 IN THE JOB

Variable D	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	27010.7526	13505.3750	52.903	0.001	1 = 1- 7 years	71	38.9859*	2.3814
Within Groups	200	51057.0879	256.2854			2 = 8-14 years	66	30.9394	18.1759
						3 = 15+ years	66	11.5192	21.1901
Total	202	78067.8125					203	27.4384	19.6589

*Group 1 is strongest in attributing resignation to Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job.

Note: $p < .001$.

Reported in Table IX are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. The resignees in Group 3 (15+ years) are strongest in attributing resignation to job information, training, and status (Category E).

An Analysis of Variance was also computed for the five categories and the number of years at the last school. The number of years was trisected: Group 1 = 1-3 years; Group 2 = 4-10 years; and Group 3 = 11+ years.

Noted in Table X are comparisons between the resignees by the groups just identified. The resignees in Group 2 (4-10 years) are strongest in attributing their resignations to physical and mental exertion (Category A). However, the resignees in Group 1 (1-3 years) are nearly as strong in attributing this as their reason for resigning.

Indicated in Table XI are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. The resignees in Group 3 (11+ years) are strongest in attributing their resignation to relations with associates (Category B).

Reported in Table XII are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. The resignees in Group 3 (11+ years) appear to be strongest in attributing their resignation to relation with employer (Category C). However, $p > .05$ level; therefore, no significant difference was found.

Reported in Table XIII are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. The resignees in Group 1 (1-7 years) are strongest in attributing resignation to interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job (Category D).

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING
 BY GROUPS, CATEGORY E: JOB INFORMATION,
 TRAINING, AND STATUS

Variable E	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	530.0450	265.0225	35.797	0.001	1 = 1- 7 years	71	14.5634	1.6965
Within Groups	200	1480.6989	7.4035			2 = 8-14 years	66	15.4394	2.7631
						3 = 15+ years	66	18.3485*	3.4707
Total	202	2010.7439					203	16.0788	3.1550

*Group 3 is strongest in attributing resignation to Job Information, Training, and Status.

Note: $p < .001$.

TABLE X
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: YEARS TAUGHT AT LAST SCHOOL,
 CATEGORY A: PHYSICAL AND MENTAL EXERTION

Variable A	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	226.4413	113.2206	28.871	0.001	1 = 1- 3 years	84	11.6548	2.0505
Within Groups	200	784.3133	3.9216			2 = 4-10 years	55	11.8909*	2.2334
						3 = 11+ years	64	9.4844	1.6232
Total	202	1010.7544					203	11.0345	2.2369

*Group 2 is strongest in attributing resignation to Physical and Mental Exertion.

Note: $p < .001$.

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: YEARS TAUGHT AT LAST SCHOOL,
CATEGORY B: RELATIONS WITH ASSOCIATES

Variable B	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	348.2341	174.1170	62.036	0.0001	1 = 1- 3 years	84	9.3690	1.5271
Within Groups	200	561.3411	2.8067			2 = 4-10 years	55	9.2909	1.7392
						3 = 11+ years	64	12.1563*	1.8014
Total	202	909.5750					203	10.2266	2.1220

*Group 3 is strongest in attributing resignation to Relations With Associates.

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: YEARS TAUGHT AT LAST SCHOOL,
 CATEGORY C: RELATIONS WITH EMPLOYER

Variable C	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	72.2858	36.1429	2.722	0.0682*	1 = 1- 3 years	84	21.7143	4.0644
Within Groups	200	2655.3160	13.2766			2 = 4-10 years	55	20.6545	4.3852
						3 = 11+ years	64	22.1875*	1.9750
Total	202	2727.6018					203	21.5764	3.6746

*Group 3 appears to be the strongest in attributing Relations with Employer as the reason for leaving. However, $p > .05$ level; therefore, there is no support for this.

TABLE XIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: YEARS TAUGHT AT LAST SCHOOL,
 CATEGORY D: INTEREST IN, LIKING FOR, AND
 EMOTIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE JOB

Variable D	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	59542.6780	29771.3359	321.413	.001	1 = 1- 3 years	84	39.3690	2.6832
Within Groups	200	18525.2722	92.6264			2 = 4-10 years	55	38.5818	5.8013
						3 = 11+ years	64	2.2031	15.9912
Total	202	78067.9375					203	27.4384	19.6590

*Group 1 is strongest in attributing resignation to Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job.

Note: $p < .001$.

Indicated in Table XIV are comparisons between the resignees of the three groups. The resignees in Group 3 (11+ years) are strongest in attributing their resignation to job information and status.

A summary of findings is reported in Table XV.

Summary

The major thrust of this chapter has been to present the results and analysis of the data of the descriptive study. Table XV lists the five categories with comparisons between the variables of sex, school districts, years in the teaching profession, and the number of years of teaching at the last school. Chapter V will present a summary, discussion, and recommendations.

TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: YEARS TAUGHT AT LAST SCHOOL,
 CATEGORY E: JOB INFORMATION, TRAINING,
 AND STATUS

Variable E	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.	Group	Count	Mean	Standard Dev.
Between Groups	2	1146.8320	573.4158	132.747	.001	1 = 1- 3 years	84	14.5714	1.5928
Within Groups	200	863.9244	4.3196			2 = 4-10 years	55	14.3091	1.6763
		2010.7561				3 = 11+ years	64	19.5781*	2.8217
Total	202						203	16.0788	3.1550

*Group 3 is strongest in attributing resignation to Job Information, Training, and Status.

Note: p < .001

TABLE XV
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Differences Studied	Category A: Physical and Mental Exertion	Category B: Relations With Associates	Category C: Relations With Employer	Category D: Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job	Category E: Job Information, Training, and Status
Sex					
M	--	--	--	--	--
F	--	--	--	--	--
Districts					
Suburban	0	X	--	X	X
Urban	X	0	--	0	0
Yrs. Teaching					
Grp. 1=1-7	X	0	--	X	0
Grp. 2=8-14	0	0	--	0	0
Grp. 3=15+	0	X	--	0	X
Yrs. at Last School					
Grp. 1=1-3	0	0	0	X	0
Grp. 2=4-10	X	0	0	0	0
Grp. 3=11+	0	X	X	0	X

Note: X indicates the higher (highest) mean when a significant difference was found.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This research was concerned with the voluntary resignation of teachers in a large metropolitan area in northeastern Oklahoma. These resignations of teachers after years of intensive career training seemed to require examination, since resignations are expensive to the school and have a negative impact on the profession. Therefore, the primary question which this research sought to address was: do various aspects of job satisfaction have a bearing on a teacher's decision to leave the teaching profession?

The names of those teachers who had voluntarily left the teaching profession were obtained from the State Department of Education. The addresses were most often provided by the school district itself. When these were not forthcoming, telephone calls to teacher organizations or to individual teachers helped in locating addresses that would otherwise have been missing.

The questionnaires were sent to those teachers who, for any number of reasons, had voluntarily resigned from the teaching profession. These resignees were placed into two groups: Group 1 included 12 independent suburban public school districts; Group 2 represented one large urban school district around which the other 12 were located. Of the total number of 191 teachers in Group 1, 118 (62

percent) responded. Of the total number of 131 teachers in Group 2, 84 (64 percent) responded.

No respondent could be identified. Only districts were coded. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed, as was a self-addressed post card. The latter had the respondent's name; however, the respondent was instructed to mail the post card a day or two after mailing the questionnaire so that anonymity was assured.

The instrument selected covered nine categories of job satisfaction. They were as follows:

1. Physical and Mental Exertion.
2. Relations With Associates.
3. Security, Advancement, and Finances.
4. Relations With Employer.
5. Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job.
6. Job Information, Training, and Status.
7. Physical Surrounding and Work Conditions.
8. Future Goals and Progress Toward Goals.
9. Evaluation and Retrospect.

These seemed quite appropriate for this study. However, the alpha coefficients of reliability showed only five of the job satisfaction subtests to be reliable. These were as follows: (1) Physical and Mental Exertion; (2) Relations With Associates; (3) Relations With Employer; (4) Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement In the Job; and (5) Information, Training, and Status.

This research gathered data that would answer the following questions for each of the above named categories:

Assuming that leaving the teaching profession was due to any or all of the categories mentioned:

Question 1. Is it because there is a difference by sex?

Question 2. Is it because there is a difference by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Is it because there is a difference by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Is it because there is a difference in the years at the last school?

T-Test by Sex

The results of the study shown in Table III (Chapter IV) indicate by the t-test that there was no appreciable difference in mean responses when resignees were categorized by sex.

T-Test by Districts

The results of the study shown in Table IV (Chapter IV) indicate that there are differences between urban and suburban districts. The resignees from the urban district (Group 2) attribute physical and mental exertion (Category A) as their reason for resigning. This may indicate that the pressures of teaching in an urban public school may be greater than that of the suburban school situation.

A comparison of school facilities would show some differences, i.e., the urban schools generally have better equipment in laboratories and in elective subjects such as art and computer sciences. The demands made upon the teacher to keep abreast of the latest trends in these and other areas of vocational/technical training would be greater.

Group 1, the resignees from the suburban districts, felt more strongly about the Relations With Associates (Category B). Perhaps this is due to the fact that many teachers commute to suburban areas from the larger districts because they cannot find employment in their area. The resignees may find that they prefer to resign rather than make the necessary adjustments in dealing with professional coworkers in a smaller school community. Frequently, the suburban areas are represented by relatively small school populations as well as by a small number of teachers.

With regard to Category C, Relations With Employer, there appears to be no appreciable difference between groups. This may be because the professional employer, whether urban or suburban, would have been exposed to the same recent trends in dealing with personnel.

The resignees from the large urban district attributed interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job as their reason for resigning (Category D). This may be due to the urban district's policy to randomly assign teachers to schools which may be far from their residence. These teachers would be less inclined to be a participating member of that school to which they are assigned than they would be if they were assigned to their neighborhood school. Because they are often patrons of their own neighborhood school, their interest and involvement is there. When a teacher feels that he or she is forced to travel to a school, resentment may be strong. This may be especially true when the teacher feels that there is no hope of transfer. If there would be a rotating system, a teacher would not feel "locked in" to a job.

The resignees in the suburban district (Group 1) are strongest in attributing their resignation to job information training and status (Category D). Any conclusion here would be based upon the comments that some of the resignees added to their questionnaires. They stated that many of them had to teach out of their field; therefore, they lacked information and training in their subjects. These teachers also felt a lack of recognition for their work. It may be that the teachers in the suburban areas seldom got the opportunities for recognition that may be more readily available to teachers in the urban districts. However, this may depend on the climate and/or the leadership of the school.

ANOVA - Years in the Teaching Profession

The Analysis of Variance findings for years in the teaching profession are depicted in Tables V through XI in Chapter IV. The number of years of teaching has been trisected as follows: Group 1 = 1-7 years; Group 2 = 8-14 years; Group 3 = 15+ years in the teaching profession. The resignees in Group 1, those newest to the teaching field, expressed a concern over physical and mental exertion (Category A). Comments on the questionnaires by the teachers gave no indication why this is occurring. Perhaps there is a need at the leadership level to prepare the potential teacher at an earlier time in career goals. It appears that the teaching profession falls short of the young teachers' expectations. Certainly, the level of pay is not commensurate with the training or the work involved.

The resignees in Group 3, those in the last school the longest time, are strongest in reporting relations with associates (Category

B) as having an impact on job satisfaction. This may be due to the influx of new teachers coming into the profession who have different ideas and methods of teaching that are inconsistent with the point of view of those who have been in the profession much longer. Possibly, the older teachers are generally less rebellious or less inclined to disrupt the status quo.

There appears to be no significant difference between the resignees in the three groups in reporting that relations with employer (Category C) had any impact on job satisfaction. If the leadership is satisfactory, perhaps the likelihood of leaving the profession is not strong.

The resignees in Group 1 (1-7 years) are strongest in reporting interest in, liking for, and involvement in the job (Category D) as having an impact on job satisfaction. It seems reasonable to assume that opportunities afforded to the younger teachers--especially those in an urban setting--would be great. Being a certified teacher is an asset to a graduate, for teachers have always had a reputation for being intelligent, and professional in behavior. Therefore, these persons would have better opportunities for jobs that pay more than a career in education.

The resignees in Group 3, those in the profession the longest, are strongest in reporting job information, training, and status (Category E) as having an impact on job satisfaction. Perhaps this is due to the fact that teachers in the past have had the honor of being the most educated; they were the dispensers of the knowledge in the community. However, this is no longer true. Students may have a certain field of expertise that is not a part of the school curriculum;

therefore, a student may be more skilled than the teachers in some areas of knowledge. Teachers are also required to constantly return to college for more credit hours, and at their own expense. Perhaps these courses are not perceived as being related to classroom situations and thus are felt to be unnecessary.

ANOVA - Years Taught at the Last School

The results of the Analysis of Variance for the years taught at the last school are depicted in Tables X to XIV (Chapter IV). Respondents were grouped as follows: Group 1 = 1-3 years; Group 2 = 4-10 years; Group 3 = 11 years.

The resignees in Group 2 (4-10 years) are strongest in reporting physical and mental exertion (Category A) as having an impact on job satisfaction. However, Group 1 (1-3 years) are nearly as strong in their decision. It seems that as the years progress, especially toward the tenth year, a teacher makes the decision to stay or leave.

The resignees in Group 3 (11+ years) are strongest in reporting relations with associates (Category B) as having an impact on job satisfaction. Perhaps these persons find it difficult to adjust to the new ideas that the younger teachers bring to the school.

The resignees in Group 3 also are strongest in reporting relations with employer (Category C) as having an impact on job satisfaction. However, the probability for this category did not support this finding.

The resignees in Group 1 (1-3 years) are strongest in reporting interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job (Category D) as having an impact on job satisfaction. Those in Group 2

(those at the last school 4-10 years) were also strong in their response for this category. Those in Group 3 (11+ years) gave no strong indication in this category. Perhaps this indicates again that teachers are making a decision to stay or leave--in this instance, in the years at the last school.

The resignees in Group 3 (11+ years) are strongest in reporting job information, training, and status (Category E) as having an impact on job satisfaction. It appears that those teachers who have remained in the teaching profession a long time are simply more than ready to leave. Some comments on the questionnaire indicated a few teachers intended to go into another field of business altogether.

Discussion

This descriptive research was initiated in the hope that some answers could be found regarding job satisfaction and the current trend of voluntary teacher resignation from the public school in selected school districts in northeastern Oklahoma.

The instrument selected for this study offered such a promise, and with modifications, it has fulfilled that promise. It had nine categories of job satisfaction which seemed apropos to any possible school situation: (1) Physical and Mental Exertion; (2) Relations With Associates; (3) Relations With Employer; (4) Security, Advancement, and Finances; (5) Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job; (6) Job Information, Training, and Status; (7) Physical Surroundings and Work Conditions; (8) Future Goals and Progress Toward Goals; and (9) Evaluation in Retrospect. No hypothesis was stated, only questions. These questions addressed the issue of

job satisfaction and teacher resignation, but with limitations to the categories just mentioned.

It was assumed that voluntary resignation was due to the nine categories. The questions asked were as follows:

Assuming that leaving the teaching profession was due to any one or all of the nine categories:

Question 1. Was it because each category differed by sex?

Question 2. Was it because each category differed by districts (urban versus suburban)?

Question 3. Was it because each category differed by the number of years in the teaching profession?

Question 4. Was it because each category differed by the number of years at the last school?

The data collected showed that of the nine categories, four had unacceptable alpha coefficients of reliability. Therefore, only five categories were considered in subsequent analysis (Table X, Chapter IV).

In the classifications of the five identified as Category A, Physical and Mental Exertion; Category B, Relations With Associates; Category C, Relations With Employer; Category D, Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement In the Job; and Category E, Job Information, Training, and Status, no difference by sex was found for resignation. This seems to indicate that the efforts to minimize the issue of sex in intelligence and in the work situation have had a positive effect.

The only response to the sex issue came from written responses on the questionnaires. In these cases, the indication was that some resignations were due to the female teachers wishing to stay home in

order to begin a family. Others stated that they were resigning because their husbands were being transferred to another state. No comments indicated that a male teacher was leaving due to his wife's transfer.

In the responses regarding the school districts, urban versus suburban districts, Category C, Relations With Employer, seems not to be a strong factor in resigning. However, the teachers in the large urban district appear to find teaching to be physically and mentally exhausting, as indicated by the responses to questions in this category. Respondents from the suburban districts referred to Category D, Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job; and Category E, Job Information, Training, and Status, as the areas which were different for them.

Some of the districts polled are very small; this would be a factor to consider in analyzing the results of this study. Any suburban district that might be somewhat comparable to an urban district might be viewed as having some of the same problems as the urban district. Superintendents would have to make their own evaluation of any unique situations.

Among the responses regarding the number of years in the teaching profession, no appreciable difference was shown between the groups with regard to relations with employer (Category C). The groups were trisected as follows: Group 1 = 1-7 years; Group 2 = 8-14 years; and Group 3 = 15+ years in the teaching profession.

Group 1, those resignees in the teaching profession 1-7 years, were strongest in attributing Category A, Physical and Mental Exertion; and Category D, Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in

the Job. These teachers seem to show a reaction to the modern psychological view that good mental health can come as a result of enjoying one's occupation. Those teachers in Group 3 who have been teaching for 15 years or more indicated that Category B, Relations with Associates; and Category E, Job Information, Training, and Status, are different for them. This could be interpreted as a conflict with new teachers entering the teaching career and with the feeling that there is some lack in the training that older teachers possess.

The responses regarding the number of years at the last school were trisected as follows: Group 1 = 1-3 years; Group 2 = 4-10 years; and Group 3 = 11+ years. The resignees at the last school the longest number of years were strongest in attributing Category B, Relations With Associates; Category C, Relations With Employer; and Category E, Job Information, Training, and Status, as being the reason for their resigning. However, Category C, Relations With Employer, is questionable here because the difference noted is not significant.

In Category A, Physical and Mental Exertion, resignees in Group 2, those who had taught at the last school 4-10 years, appear to have the most significantly different mean score. However, those resignees in Group 1 (1-3 years) have very nearly the same mean score. This seems to indicate that the decision to resign would come in the first 10 years. The situation is very nearly the same for Category D, Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job. The resignees in Group 1 (1-3 years) are strongest in attributing interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job as having an impact on satisfaction, but the mean score for Group 2 (4-10 years) is very close. This seems to indicate again that the decision to leave

the teaching profession comes in the first 10 years. In this case, it is the 10 years at the last school.

This seems to be supported by the results of the data with regard to Category D, Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job, for here the numbers of those left in Group 3 (11+ years) are very small. This would seem to indicate that the majority of those in Group 3 had already left; therefore, responses from them would have to be made over a greater period of time than the two years covered by this research. Another possibility is that these teachers had moved up in their careers and had become counselors or administrators. This factor would not appear in this study because only teachers were polled.

Recommendations for Personnel Administrators

This research attempted to find answers to the perplexing problems of teacher resignation. The instrument used seems to be adequate for the subject under study. Although it is not recommended for any in-depth study--for it may prove too limiting--it is quite satisfactory for an initial investigation of teacher resignation. The problem is too grave to be dismissed lightly; therefore, any beginning will be of some value to future studies.

Because the instrument used in this study is addressed to issues after the fact; i.e., a year or two after a teacher has left, it may be a bit late to find the answers to an existing problem. To find immediate answers, a more direct approach might be more appropriate. The method recommended for gathering more accurate data is the exit interview.

The proposal that an exit interview be provided to determine an employee's feeling or opinion for leaving was recommended by Tiffen (1952). This interview would be made at the time of the employee's decision to leave; the reasons for leaving would be uppermost in the mind of the resignee at that time and, hopefully, the reasons would be stated more accurately and more honestly then.

To protect teachers who might feel it ill advised to be honest about their decision to leave, a committee could be appointed to do the interviewing. (A teacher in a small community might feel more intimidated than in a larger urban area.) This committee would have no set number of persons. Each district would name a small group of employees it felt were qualified for such a study. No special field of expertise is recommended for these committee members. The data that this committee would record could possibly provide some insights to the problems of job satisfaction and voluntary teacher resignees.

It is certainly hoped that this study has offered some new insight into the current teacher resignation problem. It is also believed that further studies will be able to solve some of these problems by addressing issues raised by this research.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further research is suggested that would compare the job satisfaction of those teachers who remain in the employ of a school district with that of teachers who voluntarily resign. A longitudinal study is recommended to determine if teachers' job satisfaction remains constant over a period of five years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdel-Halim, A. "Effects of Higher Order Need Strength on the Job Performance-Job Satisfaction Relationship." Personnel Psychology, 33(2) (1980), 335-345.
- Aiken, M. and Hage, J. "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis." American Sociological Review, 31 (August, 1966), 497-507.
- Anderson, W. A. "Recognizing Stress." Occupational Health (September, 1979), 396-402.
- Appley, M. H. and Trumbell, R., Eds. Psychological Stress. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1967.
- Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. "Attitude-Behavior Relations." Psychological Bulletin, 84 (1977), 886-918.
- Berger, P. The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1966.
- Blauner, R. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1964.
- Bridges, E. M. "Job Satisfaction and Teacher Absenteeism." Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (Spring, 1980), 41-56.
- Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. New Hampshire: Heinemann Co., 1979.
- Cheloha, R. and Farr, J. L. "Absenteeism, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction in an Organizational Setting." Journal of Applied Psychology, 65(4) (August, 1980), 467-473.
- Cooper, C. L. and Payne, R. Stress at Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Edelwich, J. Burnout: Stages of Disillusionment. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1980.
- Emener, W. G., Jr. "Professional Burnout: Rehabilitation's Hidden Handicap." Journal of Rehabilitation 2 (Jan.-Feb., 1979), 57-58.
- Exton, W., Jr. The Age of Systems: The Human Dilemma. New York: American Management Association, 1972, 1975.

- Freudenberger, J. J. "Staff Burn-Out." Journal of Social Issues, 30(1) (1974), 159-165.
- Freudenberger, J. J. "The Staff Burn-Out Syndrome." Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 12(1) (1975), 73-82.
- Friedmann, G. The Anatomy of Work. New York: The Free Press, 1961.
- Gay, L. R. Educational Research. Columbus: Charles Merrill Pub. Co., 1981.
- Gilberg, L. A. and Mangelsdorff, D. A. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychology Association, San Francisco, California, August, 1977.
- Grusky, O., Ed. The Sociology of Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1970.
- Hackman, J. R. and Suttle, J. L. Improving Life at Work: Behavioral Science Approaches to Organizational Change. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Pub. Co., 1977.
- Henrickson, B. "Editorial." Learning: The Magazine for Creative Teachers (January, 1979), 37.
- Herzberg, F. and Mausner, B. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- Herzberg, F. and Mausner, B. Work and the Nature of Man. New York: Thomas Crowder Co., 1966.
- Hom, P. W. et al. "Comparative Examinations of Three Approaches to the Prediction of Turnover." Journal of Applied Psychology, 64(3) (1979), 280-289.
- Hoppock, R. Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and Row, 1935.
- Isaac, S. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. Columbus: Knapp Pub. Co., 1971.
- Isherwood, G. B. and Hoy, W. "Bureaucracy, Powerlessness, and Teacher Work Values." Journal of Educational Administration, 11(1) (May, 1971), 125-137.
- Jahoda, M. "Work, Employment, and Unemployment." American Psychologist, 36(2) (February, 1981), 184-191.
- James, L. and Jones, A. "Perceived Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction: An Examination of Reciprocal Causation." Personnel Psychology, 33(1) (Spring, 1980), 97-131.
- Katz, D. and Kahn, R. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

- Klinger, E. Meaning and Void: Inner Experience and the Incentives in People's Lives. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.
- Kyriacou, C. and Sutcliffe, J. "Teacher Stress: A Review." Educational Review, 29(4) (1977), 299-305.
- Locke, E. A. "What is Job Satisfaction?" Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4 (November, 1969), 316.
- Mace, J. "Teaching May be Hazardous to Your Health." Phi Delta Kappan, 60(7) (1979), 512-513.
- March, J. C. and Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- Maslach, C. and Pines, A. "The Burnout Syndrome in the Day Care Setting." Child Care Quarterly, 6(2) (1977), 100.
- Maslach, C. and Pines, A. "Burned-Out." Human Behavior (September, 1976), 16-22.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper Brothers Pub., 1954.
- Mason, J. "A Historical View of the Stress Field." Journal of Human Stress, 1(2) (June, 1975), 22-35.
- McGrath, J. E., Ed. Social and Psychological Factors in Stress. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- McGuire, W. "Teacher Burnout." Today's Education, 68 (November/December, 1979), 5.
- Miskel, C. et al. "A Test of Expectancy Work Motivation Theory in Educational Organizations." Educational Administration Quarterly, 16(1) (Winter, 1980), 38-53.
- Mitchell, L. "Thank God, It's Friday - That's Not Being Positive." Thrust for Educational Leadership, Association of California School Administrators, 9(1) (October, 1979), 21-22.
- Moeller, G. H. "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power." The School Review, 72(2) (Summer, 1964), 137-157.
- Monat, A. and Lazarus, R. Eds. Stress and Coping. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
- Murnane, R. J. "Teacher Mobility Revisited." Journal of Human Resources, 16 (Winter, 1981), 3-19.
- Peskin, D. B. The Doomsday Job: The Behavioral Anatomy of Turnover. New York: AMACOM, Inc., 1973.

- Ricken, R. "Teacher Burnout - A Failure of the Supervisory Process." NASSP Bulletin, 432 (March, 1980), 21-23.
- Rokeach, M. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1976.
- Samuel, Y. and Lewis-Epstein, N. "The Occupational Status as a Predictor of Work Values." American Journal of Sociology, 85(3) (1979), 625-639.
- Seeman, M. "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review, 24(6) (December, 1959), 783-791.
- Seeman, M. "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work." American Sociological Review, 32 (April, 1967), 273-285.
- Sergiovanni, T. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." Journal of Educational Administration, 5 (1) (May, 1969), 66-81.
- Selye, H. "Confusion and Controversy in the Stress Field." Journal of Human Stress, 1(2) (June, 1975), 37-44.
- Szilagyi, A. D. and Holland, W. E. "Changes in Social Density: Relationship With Functional Interaction and Perceptions of Job Characteristics, Role Stress, and Work Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 65(1) (1980), 28-33.
- Tiffin, J. Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.
- Tomeski, E. A. and Dadek, K. E. "Job Satisfaction and the System Professional." Journal of Systems Management, 31(6) (June, 1980), 9-10.
- Tyler, L. E. Individual Differences. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1974.
- Vroom, V. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Wallin, J. A. H. "Research Agenda for the 80's: Some Urgent Problems in the Administration of Schools in Canada's Province." Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, March 27, 1978.
- Wiener, Y. and Vardi, Y. "Relationships Between Job, Organization, and Career Commitments and Work Outcomes: An Integrative Approach." Organization Behavior and Human Performance, 26 (1980), 81-96.
- Wyer, R. S., Jr. Cognitive Organizations and Change. Potomac, Maryland: Lawrence Erlbaum Pub., 1974.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Fellow Teacher:

The issue of teacher job satisfaction is not new, but looking for definitive answers IS new. There are those of us who have voluntarily resigned our teaching position to transfer to another school district because we were not satisfied with our work. Others of us have voluntarily resigned to get into an entirely new business, giving up years of schooling, as well as a profession that we thought would be our lifetime career.

This survey is to home in on the relationship between the nine categories of job satisfaction and the voluntary resignation of a teacher. I hasten to add that there is nothing wrong with resigning.

Names of those who have voluntarily resigned are a matter of public record. Because it is public information, this research can be done directly with each teacher, NOT through any school system.

There are absolutely NO identifying marks on the questionnaire. You are free to answer the statements honestly and openly. The results will only be as valid as the honesty of the participants of this study. Please answer ALL statements.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for returning the questionnaire. A post card with your name is enclosed. It is to be mailed at the same time, or a day later; this lets me know that you have returned the questionnaire and NO followup letter will be necessary. This also assures anonymity.

This study is being made in Oklahoma by Oklahomans. Please help solve some possible problems that are related to teacher job satisfaction.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Kenneth St. Clair
Professor

E. M. Meeker
Research Associate

Encl.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Fellow Teacher:

This questionnaire will take only 15 minutes of your time. It is easy to understand and easy to answer.

Please be sure to answer EVERY question. Questionnaires that have not been completed are invalidated and cannot be a part of this important study.

Again, I assure you that there is nothing to identify a respondent; therefore, anonymity is assured.

We wish to thank you in advance for your participation in this research.

Kenneth St. Clair
Professor

E. M. Meeker
Graduate Researcher

PLEASE NOTE:

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

These consist of pages:

P. 70-75 Questionnaire

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

The following statements concern your feelings and attitudes regarding your previous work and your plans. They are specific and require that you place a #1 for "True" and a #2 for "False," whichever is appropriate for you. If you are doubtful, make the best answer you can, but answer either with a #1 or a #2. You should answer with a #3 ONLY if the statement does not apply to you. Some of the statements are very similar but have somewhat different meanings, so answer every question please, even though you may feel that it has already appeared in the list.

Category A. Physical and Mental Exertion.

- ___ 1. My job tired me too much physically.
- ___ 2. My job forced me to maintain too fast a pace.
- ___ 3. My work had a bad effect on my health.
- ___ 4. My job required me to work too long hours.
- ___ 5. I became restless during working hours and felt that the day was dragging endlessly.
- ___ 6. I felt that my job was getting more difficult for me each year.
- ___ 7. I felt that my work suffered because I had too much to do.

Category B. Relations With Associates.

- ___ 8. In general, I got along well with the persons with whom I worked.
- ___ 9. My job forced me to work with certain individuals whom I disliked.*
- ___ 10. I made real and lasting friends among my working associates.
- ___ 11. I felt that my general interests and attitudes were about the same as those of my fellow workers who had similar jobs.
- ___ 12. I felt that others could have made my work easier if they cared to do so.*
- ___ 13. Those with whom I worked sometimes seemed unreasonable in their dealings with me.*
- ___ 14. I felt that my associates stimulated me to do better work.

Category C. Relations With Employer.

- ___ 15. I felt that my employer unfairly took the credit for work that I had done.*

- ___ 16. I felt that I knew where I stood with my employer.
- ___ 17. There were too many people telling me what to do.*
- ___ 18. I felt at ease in the presence of the people under whom I worked.
- ___ 19. It was necessary for me to do things that I disliked in order to get promotions.*
- ___ 20. I sometimes wondered whether the people under whom I worked approved of my work.
- ___ 21. I felt that there should be more people to help with the work I was doing.
- ___ 22. I felt that other people advanced ahead of me by unfair means such as special influence and politics.
- ___ 23. I felt that I had been required to take more responsibilities in my work than I wanted.*
- ___ 24. The people under whom I worked made available the materials, information, and assistance I needed to do my best work.
- ___ 25. The people under whom I worked were willing to make improvements in my working conditions.
- ___ 26. The policies and problems of the people under whom I worked were adequately explained to me.
- ___ 27. I got along satisfactorily with the people under whom I worked.
- ___ 28. I felt respect and regard for the people under whom I worked.
- ___ 29. I felt that the people under whom I worked made unfair demands on my free time.*
- ___ 30. I felt that I could trust the people under whom I worked.

Category D. Security, Advancement, and Finances.

- ___ 31. I felt that I was paid a fair salary for the work I did.*
- ___ 32. I felt that I was able to get the promotions and pay increases which I felt I deserved.
- ___ 33. My income was sufficient to meet my financial obligations and support my family.*

- ___ 34. I was kept from dressing as I would like because of insufficient income.
- ___ 35. I was kept from living as I would like because of insufficient income.
- ___ 36. Adequate and fair arrangements were made for absences due to illness.*
- ___ 37. The method of payment of my earnings frequently caused me inconvenience.
- ___ 38. I was afraid of losing my job.*
- ___ 39. I felt as efficient as the average person with whom I work.
- ___ 40. I felt that there was prejudice toward my age group in my occupation (e.g., too young or old).*
- ___ 41. I did not have a retirement security in my job.

Category E. Interest In, Liking For, and Emotional Involvement in the Job.

- ___ 42. My job gave me more real satisfaction than the things I did in my spare time.*
- ___ 43. I felt that I had to look outside my work for those things that made life worthwhile and interesting.*
- ___ 44. I found that my work was so interesting that it was on my mind a lot when I was not at work.
- ___ 45. I found that my work was so interesting that I talked about it a great deal, even after working hours.
- ___ 46. My life would seem empty without this type of work to occupy me.
- ___ 47. I would continue to work even if it were not a financial necessity.
- ___ 48. I felt that I was really interested in my job.
- ___ 49. I felt that my work was monotonous and boring.
- ___ 50. I felt that I wanted a different job, either in the same or another occupation.
- ___ 51. I felt that I had selected the wrong occupation.
- ___ 52. I liked the job I had better than any other I had ever had.

- ___ 53. I did not want to remain in the area of work I was in permanently.
- 54. I declined an opportunity to change that job for one of equal pay, security, and status.
- ___ 55. If I had a choice, I would choose a job in the same occupation over any other line of work.
- ___ 56. I really wanted to enter the teaching profession when I first started.
- ___ 57. I was sorry that I had taken the particular job that I had.
- ___ 58. I actively looked for another job.
- ___ 59. I felt that I was "in a rut" vocationally.
- ___ 60. The job sometimes made me badly flustered and jittery.
- ___ 61. I frequently went home upset, angry, or irritable because of something that happened at work.
- ___ 62. I frequently came home at night with a feeling of satisfaction over work that was well done.
- ___ 63. I frequently got discouraged at the job.
- ___ 64. I was generally happy and cheerful at work.
- ___ 65. I worried a lot about my daily work.
- ___ 66. I felt glad to get back to my job after a vacation.
- ___ 67. I felt that the job had smothered my personality.

Category F. Information, Training, and Status.

- ___ 68. I felt that I had had adequate preparation for the job I held.
- ___ 69. I felt that I had adequate understanding of what was expected of me in the job.
- ___ 70. I felt that my work was worthwhile and important.
- ___ 71. I felt that my work utilized my full abilities.
- ___ 72. I felt proud of the job and the work that I did.
- ___ 73. I felt ashamed of my job.*
- ___ 74. I felt that my family and friends respected my vocation.

- ___ 75. I felt that people in general respected my job.*
- ___ 76. I felt that my working associates regarded me as an equal.
- ___ 77. I felt that my job detracted from my status in the community where I live.*
- ___ 78. I was embarrassed when people asked me what work I do.*
- ___ 79. I felt competent and fully able to handle my job.

Category G. Physical Surrounding and Work Conditions.

- ___ 80. I was satisfied with the degree to which my job gave me the opportunity to express my own ideas.*
- ___ 81. My work was too confining to suit me.
- ___ 82. I felt that my place of work was too far from my home.
- ___ 83. I felt that my work surroundings were not as pleasant as they should have been.*
- ___ 84. My occupation forced me to live in home surroundings which were uncomfortable or inadequate according to my standards.
- ___ 85. I felt that my work was too dirty and too noisy.
- ___ 86. I had adequate transportation available to me in going to and from work.*
- ___ 87. My job gave me enough varied experiences.*
- ___ 88. I felt that my job requirements changed too often for me to keep up adequately.
- ___ 89. I felt that my job tied me down or restricted my freedom too much.

Category H. Future Goals and Progress Toward Goals.

- ___ 90. My job helped me toward the financial goals that I had set for myself.
- ___ 91. My job helped me toward the occupational goals that I had set for myself.*
- ___ 92. I feel that it is possible to attain my vocational goals in that portion of my life that is still ahead of me.
- ___ 93. I felt that my job was a lifetime career.*
- ___ 94. My vocational future did not look promising to me.

___ 95. I expected my job to give me more satisfaction the longer I had it.*

___ 96. I felt that I would become more proficient at my work the longer I had my job.*

Category I. Evaluation and Retrospect.

___ 97. I felt that I had made a success of my job thus far in my career.

___ 98. If I could start over again at 18, I would choose a different line of work.*

___ 99. I felt less satisfied with my work as time went by.*

Background Information

This survey is made in a very large area of Oklahoma; therefore, this background information cannot be traced to any one area. Please answer the questions freely. Please place the correct number to the left on the line.

___ 1. Male 2. Female

___ Highest degree held: 1. Bachelor 2. Master's
3. Specialists 4. Doctorate

___ Level of teaching: 1. Elementary 2. Middle School
3. Junior High 4. Senior High

___ Please give total years in teaching.

___ Please give number of years at last school.

Please feel free to add comments that might help in this study.
Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF SUBPOPULATIONS TABLE

TABLE XVI
DESCRIPTION OF SUBPOPULATIONS

Criterion Variable	Variable	Sum	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
A-Phys. & Men.	<u>Degree</u>				
	Bachelors	1151.000	10.8585	2.2971	106
	Masters	955.000	11.2353	2.2972	85
	Specialist	88.000	11.0000	1.6903	8
	Doctorate	46.000	11.5000	3.3166	4
	Entire Popula.	2240.000	11.0345	2.2369	203
	<u>Teaching Level</u>				
	Elementary	1104.000	10.5143	2.1173	105
	Middle	143.000	11.0000	2.5820	13
	Junior High	352.000	11.3548	2.2590	31
Senior High	632.000	11.9245	2.1200	53	
1 missing	Entire Popula.	2231.000	11.0446	2.2378	202
B-Rel. w/ Assoc.	<u>Degree</u>				
	Bachelors	1057.000	9.9717	2.0211	106
	Masters	893.000	10.5059	2.2763	83
	Specialist	83.000	10.3790	1.8468	8
	Doctorate	43.000	10.7500	1.5000	4
	Entire Popula.	2076.000	10.2266	2.1220	203
	<u>Teaching Level</u>				
	Elementary	1141.000	10.8667	2.2061	105
	Middle	123.000	9.4615	1.8980	13
	Junior High	277.000	8.9355	2.0155	31
Senior High	524.000	9.8868	1.5770	53	
1 missing	Entire Popula.	2065.000	10.2228	2.1266	202

TABLE XVI (Continued)

Criterion Variable	Variable	Sum	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	
C- Rel. w/Employer	<u>Degree</u>					
	Bachelors	2310.000	21.7925	3.7154	106	
	Masters	1802.000	21.2000	3.4496	85	
	Specialist	175.000	21.8750	4.0861	8	
	Doctorate	93.000	23.2500	6.6521	4	
	Entire Popula.	4380.000	23.5764	3.6746	293	
		<u>Teaching Level</u>				
		Elementary	2267.000	21.5905	3.2335	105
		Middle	263.000	20.2308	3.6091	13
	1 missing	Junior High	653.000	21.0645	4.0901	8
	Senior High	1174.000	22.1509	4.2308	4	
	Entire Popula.	4357.000	21.5693	3.6824	202	
D-Int. Job	<u>Degree</u>					
	Bachelors	3131.000	29.5377	17.9184	106	
	Masters	2007.000	23.6118	21.6839	85	
	Specialist	269.000	33.6250	17.4023	8	
	Doctorate	163.000	40.7500	2.0616	4	
	Entire Popula.	5570.000	27.4384	19.6590	293	
		<u>Teaching Level</u>				
		Elementary	2103.000	20.0286	22.0212	105
		Middle	348.000	26.7692	21.0363	13
		Junior High	1085.000	35.0000	12.7958	31
	Senior High	2045.000	38.5849	5.8947	53	
1 missing	Entire Popula.	5581.000	27.6287	19.5195	202	

TABLE XVI (Continued)

Criterion Variable	Variable	Sum	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
E-Inf. & Stat.	<u>Degree</u>				
	Bachelors	1670.000	15.7547	2.7837	106
	Masters	1411.000	16.6000	3.5295	85
	Specialist	117.000	14.6250	2.6693	8
	Doctorate	66.000	16.5000	4.0415	4
	Entire Popula.	3264.000	16.0788	3.1550	203
	<u>Teaching Level</u>				
	Elementary	1811.000	17.2476	3.4188	105
	Middle	198.000	15.2308	2.7735	13
	Junior High	471.000	15.1935	2.7859	31
Senior High	764.000	14.4151	1.5864	53	
1 missing	Entire Popula.	3244.000	16.0594	3.1507	202

Note: Missing cases by sex = 3, 1.5%; missing by level of teaching = 1, 0.5%.

VITA ²

Eleanor Marie Meeker

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF FIVE ASPECTS OF JOB SATISFACTION AMONG TEACHER RESIGNEES

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lafayette, Indiana, June 13, 1925, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Otto and Georgina Westphal/Rumpf.

Education: Received Bachelor of Liberal Arts from the University of Oklahoma in 1967; received teacher certification through Tulsa University in 1970; received the Master of Education degree from Northeastern Oklahoma State University in 1972; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Taught Senior English at McLain High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1969-79; taught English at Webster High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1975-83.

Professional Organizations: Kappa Delta Pi, National Educational Association, Oklahoma Educational Association, Tulsa Classroom Teachers Association.