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ABSTRACT

This study begins with an introduction to Kuhn's (1970) concept of paradigm change and how this can be applied to the field of education. An exploration continues into the emergence of a new paradigm in education called transformational leadership where administrators act as change agents. Factors influencing teacher satisfaction are discussed in the literature review including: supportive relationships, joint decision making, locus of control, motivation theories, stress on the job, and differences between elementary and secondary schools.

Research indicated that teacher satisfaction leads to increased teacher effectiveness. In this study, an instrument was designed to assess teacher satisfaction in eight categories: (1) self-esteem, (2) professional growth, (3) decision-making, (4) perception of principal, (5) teacher relations, (6) student relations, (7) parent relations, and (8) stress factors. Teachers responded to the survey on a scale of 0 to 3 where 0=strongly disagree, 1=disagree, 2=agree, and 3=strongly agree. Six schools participated in the study including two elementary schools, two middle schools, and two high schools. Data was analyzed from 223 surveys. The Teacher Satisfaction Survey was developed to provide transformational administrators with information to facilitate teacher empowerment and efficacy.
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SIGNIFICANCE OF THESIS

The goal of this thesis was to design a practical tool that elementary and secondary school administrators could use to assess teacher satisfaction. Specific aspects of teacher satisfaction were examined, including intrinsic motivators, relationship dynamics, and stress factors. With the information provided by the Teacher Satisfaction Survey, transformational leaders could then facilitate the necessary changes to increase teacher satisfaction, empowerment, and efficacy.

Once the job environment has been enhanced, teaching would become a more desirable career. This would lead to the attraction and retention of more quality teachers. Students would benefit from increased teacher effectiveness as teachers become willing to expend more energy toward achieving desired student outcomes (Blase & Greenfield, 1980). Parents, community, and society would also benefit from a higher quality of education that produces better citizens and future workers.

True reform requires a fundamental change in attitudes. "Fifty years of top-down reform has not done the trick" (Wallis, 1994, p. 54). If implemented on a national scale, the Teacher Satisfaction Survey has the potential to be a catalyst for bottom-up changes throughout education. This would generate more successful and dynamic schools.
LITERATURE REVIEW: Definitions and Assumptions

Paradigm Change

Kuhn (1970) explained the process by which a professional community develops, maintains, and changes a set of beliefs through his concept of paradigm change. He described paradigm change as a series of three stages where the last two stages form a continual cycle of repetition. First, there is chaos which only occurs at the beginning or discovery of a new field of knowledge. It is in this stage that new information is collected and assimilated into the first paradigm installed by the professional community.

Once this paradigm is in place, the second stage begins called normal science. A student, upon entering a particular profession, becomes familiar with the paradigm of that field by attending school and studying that body of knowledge. During normal science, problems are solved using the accepted paradigm. Problems that cannot be solved by the paradigm are called anomalies. In normal science, anomalies are ignored. However, when the anomalies reach crisis proportions, extraordinary science, the third stage, kicks in. Crisis is followed by revolution. The paradigmatic rules are manipulated and new theories spring forth in an effort to explain the anomalies.
Creativity and anxiety characterize extraordinary science. Professionals must be superhuman to succeed in the workplace. Finally, a new paradigm emerges along with the hero credited with its inception and the professional community returns to a period of normal science.

Thus, the cycle is perpetuated from normal science to extraordinary science and back to normal science. Professionals solve problems using paradigmatic rules until anomalies become overwhelming. Then crisis leads to revolution and the installation of a new paradigm. Although Kuhn’s concept of paradigm change was originally applied to the field of physics, its compatibility with the field of education can be readily observed.

**Education Paradigms**

The industrial revolution and two world wars propelled the United States from normal science into extraordinary science in many professional communities. The development of technology gave rise to more anomalies. As a result, Taylorism became the ruling paradigm within industry and education and the new hero was Frederick Winslow Taylor (1947). Under this paradigm, production was maximized and education was viewed as preparation for the job market. Just like factory products, students were assembly line processed.
This period in alternative education of the 1930s to 1950s has been described as: "...functional and mechanistic conceptions of education, which resulted in a refinement of school organization and operation for the purpose of sorting and processing young people for roles in the economy" (Neumann, 1994, p. 548).

Taylorism served organizational needs well for a long time until newer technologies were developed requiring a higher degree of specialization in many fields. Concerns for quality began to outweigh the old concerns for quantity. Research in psychology became significant as the basis for strategies attempting to address the overwhelming anomalies. Questions about human motivation did not make sense within the framework of Taylor’s paradigmatic rules. The stage was set for extraordinary science.

B. F. Skinner advanced theories of behavior modification, rewards and conditioning, which were used in business and education to motivate employees and students. Piaget won worldwide recognition for his contributions to developmental psychology. The focus shifted from product to process, from performance to person, from mechanistic to humanistic. The new hero, Douglas McGregor, brought it all together with his Theory X-Y paradigm explaining management, control and the integration of the individual with organizational goals.
McGregor's new paradigm described two different sets of assumptions (X and Y) about human nature that are behind all managerial decisions.

Theory X, associated with the traditional mechanistic view, assumed that people disliked work and would avoid it if possible. Therefore, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational goals. Furthermore, most people preferred being directed, avoided responsibility, had little ambition, and wanted security above all else. McGregor pointed out that, while there is a considerable body of evidence to support Theory X, "Nevertheless, there are many readily observable phenomena in industry and elsewhere which are not consistent with this view of human nature" (McGregor, 1960, p. 35). It was the anomalies that could not be solved under Taylorism, that inspired Theory Y.

The assumptions under Theory Y included: Work was as natural as play or rest; people would put forth more effort when they were committed; commitment was a function of rewards associated with their achievement; people could learn to accept and seek responsibility; most people could be imaginative, ingenious, and creative; and "under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized" (McGregor, 1960, p. 48).
Theory Y is consistent with the humanistic view which has dominated alternative education since 1960 emphasizing: "uniqueness of individuals and the dynamics of their intrinsic motivation for growth...education should be tailored to students' needs and interests as much as possible...ideas of openness and choice, which underlie another central theme of 'humanistic' education - democracy" (Neumann, 1994, p. 548). Traditional education came to embrace this paradigm as well and normal science reigned peacefully for a while.

But by the 1980s anomalies forced educators to face the fact that schools were in crisis. The first report to gain national attention was A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). In response to the questions raised by this report, numerous studies were conducted reflecting both the anxiety and creativity typical of extraordinary science. See: Accelerating Academic Achievement (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1990); Caught in the Middle (Report of the Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force, 1987); Consortium of Schools for the Future (Pilot Project by ACSA Region 18, 1990); Here They Come Ready or Not (Report of School Readiness Task Force, 1988); It's Elementary! (The Elementary Task Force Report, 1992); Second to None (Report of the California High School Task Force, 1992).
**Transformational Leadership**

While schools across the United States have been experiencing changes on many levels, a new paradigm is emerging called *transformational leadership* (Davis, 1993; Kirby et al., 1992; Leithwood, 1992; Walker, 1993). A transformational leader is a change agent who empowers others to be part of the change process.

Leadership is less a matter of aggressive action than a way of thinking and feeling about ourselves, about our jobs, and about the nature of the educational process,... Transformational leadership arises when leaders are more concerned about gaining overall cooperation and energetic participation from organization members than they are in getting particular tasks performed (Mitchell & Tucker, 1992, pp. 31,33).

This new paradigm, while consistent with the humanistic view, goes beyond the parameters of instructional and transactional leadership suggesting new attitudes and relationships between administrators and teachers (Leithwood, 1992; Poplin, 1992; Walker, 1993).

The idea of transformational leadership was first formalized by Burns who observed how political leaders behaved:

Great leaders do more than satisfy their followers' wants in exchange for support; they win allegiance by sensing and articulating followers' deeper needs. The relationship 'raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both' (Brandt, 1992, p. 7).
Leithwood (1992) compared Type A organizations to traditional schools in their use of centralized control, differences in status, top-down decision processes, and competitive power. Type Z organizations were compared to restructured or transformed schools which emphasized joint decision making, consensual and facilitative power.

Concept of Community and Supportive Relationships

One of the primary goals of transformational leadership is to create a community that promotes respect and growth such as Clark & Astuto (1994, p. 516) described:

The concept of community recognizes the value of shared efforts in an environment that is safe for experimentation. Cooperative work environments characterize high-producing organizations because they foster the sharing of ideas, allow idiosyncrasy to be a strength rather than a weakness, support innovation and change, and broaden the range of perspectives on work problems.

Within a caring environment principals build teachers' self-esteem by letting them know they are appreciated and recognizing their achievements. Transformational principals make teachers' welfare a top priority by instilling pride and confidence through growth and leadership opportunities. Principals "need to be sensitive to the talents and skills of their employees and be free from the conventional bureaucracy" (Stine, 1992, p. 40). After all, teachers are "a school district's most fundamental asset in creating positive change" (Leslie, 1989, p.19).
Interpersonal relationships form bonds of support among and between administrators, teachers, parents and students. These relationships are especially important to teachers and contribute to their overall job satisfaction (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992; Frase & Sorenson, 1992; Grafft, 1993; Schlechty & Cole, 1991). "To ensure their schools continue to improve, principals must build confidence and trust, improve social interactions, encourage collegiality and foster communication" (Grafft, 1993, p. 18).

**Teacher Empowerment and Joint Decision Making**

Another important characteristic of transformational leadership is the empowerment of teachers through joint decision making. The assumption here is that teachers have the capacity to solve problems and make decisions in areas that have traditionally been reserved for district or site level administrators. This includes curriculum development, financial planning, student assessment, and interviewing prospective staff, among other things. Research indicated that teachers were more satisfied when given opportunities to participate in the decision making process (Bein et al, 1990; Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Frase & Sorenson, 1992; Kessler, 1992; Sweeney, 1993). When staff had input, they tended to show more commitment and responsibility for the program (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Sarason, 1990). One California superintendent reported:
"After having an adversarial environment for many years, the district now has open communication and an atmosphere of developing trust" (Kessler, 1992 p. 37). Sweeney (1993, p. 98) advocates more respect and support for teachers by providing a school culture that not only encourages teacher participation in decision making, but "energizes them and promotes their satisfaction."

**Locus of Control**

Many studies have attempted to explain what motivates and/or satisfies teachers. Bein et al. (1990) examined how locus of control beliefs related to teacher satisfaction. *Internal* individuals are those who believe they are in control of their lives. *External* individuals view outside factors, such as chance and others, as being more potent. This study revealed that teachers having a more internal locus of control were better adjusted, less stressed and more satisfied with their jobs and decision making. These results were consistent with research relating locus of control to job satisfaction in the general population.

**Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

In 1966 Herzberg advanced the motivation-hygiene theory which asserted that there were two separate categories of factors: One that contributed to job satisfaction called *motivators*; the other contributed to job dissatisfaction called *hygiene factors* (Frase, 1989).
Motivators contributed to satisfaction if present, but did not distract if not present. Examples of motivators were intrinsic rewards such as: recognition, responsibility, advancement, achievement, and work itself. Hygiene factors led to dissatisfaction if not present but did not satisfy if present. These factors were related to extrinsic rewards derived from working conditions such as: salary, company policies, supervision and interpersonal relations. Herzberg's research has been replicated internationally within industry. More recently his motivation-hygiene theory has been validated in education (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992; Frase, 1989; Heller et al. 1992).

High Growth Need Teachers

This difference between teachers could also be observed in high growth need teachers. These teachers thrived on change and challenge as a part of their growth and satisfaction in their work (Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992). Therefore, they responded better than their peers to reforms such as decision making, collegial peer relations, learning new instructional techniques, and leadership opportunities (Frase & Sorenson, 1992). “Contingent reward is related to effectiveness, but extraordinary leaders place less emphasis on extrinsic reward and more prominence on raising the followers’ needs to higher levels” (Kirby et al., 1992, p. 310).
Job Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers

Greathouse, Moyer, and Rhodes-Offutt (1992) conducted a study involving K-3 teachers who responded to an open-ended questionnaire that determined what factors contributed most to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Here is a list of their findings in order of importance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfiers</th>
<th>Dissatisfiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relationships with peers</td>
<td>1. Problems with administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Observing the growth and development of children</td>
<td>2. Too much paperwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relationship with administration</td>
<td>3. Low pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Love of children</td>
<td>4. Problems with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sharing young children’s eagerness &amp; joy of learning</td>
<td>5. Large class size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Freedom to create their own curriculum</td>
<td>7. Problems with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Having a small class</td>
<td>8. Too many meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Good working atmosphere</td>
<td>9. Philosophical differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Good rapport with children</td>
<td>10. Standardized tests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers from other grade levels and job conditions may differ with above items or their rank order. It is essential that all administrators become aware of those satisfiers and dissatisfiers impacting their teachers (Leslie, 1989).
The Interactive/Cyclical Theory

Blase and Greenfield (1980) conducted a study based on data collected directly from teachers regarding their interactions with students and how these interactions influenced their perception of personal effectiveness in the classroom. They found that teachers perceived themselves as effective when their effort to achieve student outcomes brought desired results. With this perception of self-efficacy came a feeling of satisfaction which motivated teachers to expend more effort to achieve student outcomes. This cycle not only perpetuated itself, but could lead to higher student outcomes and increased effectiveness. On the other hand, when there was a perceived discrepancy between teacher effort and student outcomes teachers did not feel effective and became dissatisfied, eventually expending less effort.

Low levels of motivation are associated with low effectiveness, satisfaction, and involvement.... frustration...boredom, irritability, anger, and sometimes depression....the most difficult external first-order stressors to overcome were student apathy, paperwork, preparation work, student discipline, student attendance, irresponsible teachers, obtrusive supervisors, and non-supportive parents (Blase & Greenfield, 1980, pp. 2,3).

Smiley (1988, p. 6) reported: “Teachers are more likely to adopt and implement new classroom strategies if they have confidence in their own ability to control their classrooms and effect student learning.”
Stress Factors

Some studies have focused on stress as an important aspect of job dissatisfaction. These items were the top ten sources of Teacher Stress in EDCAL (1993, p. 1):

1. Motivating students who don't want to learn.
2. Dealing with indifferent parents.
3. Handling excessive paperwork.
4. Planning learning activities for a wide range of student abilities.
5. Insufficient financial security.
6. Insufficient clerical help.
7. Frequent class disruptions
8. Overcrowded classes.
9. Poor communication with other teachers.
10. Poor communication between teachers and administrators.

Suggestions to help diminish teacher stress included:

* Support teachers in the presence of students and parents.
* Use specific praise, rather than general praise for a whole group.
* Let teachers know you care about them personally.
* Promote cooperative staff relationships.

Pajak et al. (1988, p. 95) suggested principals help teachers by "...encouraging daily contact among them, sharing suggestions for simplifying work, recommending time-savers, assisting them with especially difficult students, and arranging for mentors who share responsibility and provide support, perspective, and understanding."
**Elementary and Secondary School Differences**

Research indicated that elementary and secondary schools obtain different results due to underlying structural differences between the two systems (Conley et al, 1989; McLaughlin, 1992). For example, secondary school teachers working next door to one another, but in different departments, were found to have widely varying perceptions of their work environment. “Principals’ leadership was felt primarily in how they supported the role of the department chair” (McLaughlin, 1992, p. 33). For elementary teachers, contact with the principal was a greater influence than peer relations in job dissatisfaction (Conley et al, 1989).

Results from another study indicated that teachers at the junior or senior high school levels “...may perform less effectively than those at elementary levels, may be more reluctant to change, and may suffer more from ‘burnout’ than their elementary level counterparts because of a lower sense of efficacy” (Taylor, 1992, p. 66). However, these findings might be attributable in some degree to the two different student populations. For example, certain stressors such as student apathy, student discipline, student attendance, and non-supportive parents that hinder teacher effectiveness (Blase & Greenfield, 1980), also tend to be more prevalent at the secondary level.
To summarize the literature review: (1) There is a growing concern over attracting and retaining quality teachers (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992); (2) Studies report that teachers are dissatisfied with teaching (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Conley et al, 1989; Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992; Heller, 1993; Quaglia et al, 1991); (3) Teacher effectiveness has been strongly linked to teacher satisfaction (Frase, 1989; Heller et al, 1992; Pelsma et al, 1989) which is (4) dependent upon a variety of internal and external factors (Bein et al, 1990; Blase & Greenfield, 1980; Frase & Sorenson, 1992; Pelsma et al., 1988; Taylor, 1992); (5) Transformational leaders can facilitate teacher satisfaction, empowerment and efficacy.

METHODOLOGY

Instrument Design

While many instruments have been developed to measure teacher satisfaction (Bein et al, 1990; Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Ellis & Bernhardt, 1992; Frase & Sorenson, 1992; Greathouse et al, 1992; Heller et al, 1992; Pelsma et al, 1989; Quaglia et al, 1991; Sweeney, 1993), the Teacher Satisfaction Survey is the only assessment tool designed as a practical aid to principals for the empowerment of teachers. Research has identified a number of key satisfiers/dissatisfiers in teachers' lives which have been incorporated into the Teacher Satisfaction Survey.
All survey statements were designed to avoid ambiguity and for ease of understanding and response. They only reflected those variables of teacher satisfaction that were directly or indirectly under the principal's control, and relevant to all elementary and secondary teachers. As a result of three pilot studies, the survey has undergone four modifications.

The first survey was designed in May 1993 with 20 statements and four categories. Responses ranged from 1 to 6 where 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. Survey scores had a possible range from 20 to 100 which resulted in deceptively high scores.

For the second pilot study in August 1993, the scoring was corrected with a survey using 25 statements and a response scale of 0 to 4 reflecting the same five responses. This yielded a range of possible scores from 0 to 100. There were now eight categories of satisfiers/dissatisfiers.

The third pilot study, which is the subject of this thesis, took place in May 1994. The five point scale was changed to a four point scale to eliminate a neutral response and force a choice to agree or disagree. The scale ranged from 0 to 3 where 0=strongly disagree, 1=disagree, 2=agree, and 3=strongly agree. The survey contained 33 statements yielding a range of possible scores from 0 to 99.
The eight categories were: (1) self-esteem; (2) professional growth; (3) decision-making; (4) perception of principal; (5) teacher relations; (6) student relations; (7) parent relations; (8) stress factors. Participants identified their schools as K-6, 6-9, or 9-12 at the bottom of each survey (see Appendix A pp. 25, 26).

**Procedure**

The best time to administer the Teacher Satisfaction Survey is in May, or near the end of the school year. The survey would ideally be given to all teachers at the same time (eg. at the beginning or end of a staff meeting or in-service), filled out individually and confidentially with no names, then collected immediately upon completion (approximately 10-15 minutes). It is recommended that administrators not be in the room during this time so that teachers feel comfortable in the knowledge that their answers are truly confidential. A teacher or secretary could distribute and collect surveys.

Since the ideal procedure is not always feasible, especially with larger staffs or multiple-track schools, an alternative would be to place surveys in teacher mail boxes requesting they be filled out and put in a designated box or envelope within a specified period of time (not more than one week later or teachers may forget). It is important to obtain a good response rate (80% is desirable) for results to
accurately represent the feelings of the entire staff. If staff participation is a problem, a principal should employ a motivational technique that works for that staff.

In this study, surveys were given to principals who decided which procedure to use. Elementary principals chose the first procedure, secondary principals chose the second procedure. After the surveys were completed, they were given to the researcher for statistical analysis and interpretation. Principals were later provided reports.

Results

Six schools located in southern California participated in this May 1994 study: two elementary schools (25, 18 teachers); two middle schools (50, 58 teachers); and two high schools (120, 161 teachers). The elementary schools had the highest response rates of 84% and 89%. The middle schools had response rates of 48% and 36%. The high schools had response rates of 31% and 69%. Out of 432 teachers, 53% responded and data was analyzed from 223 surveys.

Same level schools tended to have similar mean scores within the eight categories (see Appendix B p. 28). The two elementary schools had similar mean scores in self-esteem (2.3, 2.5), professional growth (2.0, 2.1), teacher relations (2.3, 2.3), student relations (2.4, 2.3), parent relations (2, 2.1), and stress factors (1.2, 1.3). Mean scores differed in perception of principal (2.0, 2.3) and
decision making (1.6, 2.2) indicating teachers were less satisfied in elementary school A in both areas.

The two middle schools had similar mean scores in self-esteem (2.3, 2.3), professional growth (2.2, 2.3), decision making (2.2, 2.1), perception of principal (2.1, 1.9), teacher relations (2.3, 2.2), and parent relations (1.9, 1.7). Mean scores differed in student relations (2.3, 1.8) and stress factors (1.7, 1.4) indicating teachers were less satisfied in middle school B in both areas.

The two high schools had similar mean scores in self-esteem (2.2, 2.2), professional growth (2.0, 2.0), decision making (1.8, 2.0), perception of principal (2.2, 2.2), teacher relations (1.9, 2.0), parent relations (1.8, 2.0) and stress factors (1.5, 1.6). Mean scores differed in student relations (1.9, 2.3) indicating teachers were less satisfied in high school A in this category.

Scores ranged from 0 to 3 with a median of 1.5. Scores above 1.5 were considered indicative of teacher satisfaction, scores below 1.5 indicated dissatisfaction. Mean scores for all six schools indicated teachers were satisfied in self-esteem (2.25), professional growth (2.05), decision making (1.98), perception of principal (2.14), teacher relations (2.08), student relations (2.19), and parent relations (1.94). Teachers from all schools (1.49), except middle school A (1.70), were dissatisfied with stress factors (see Appendix B p. 29).
The six stress factors examined at elementary (E), middle (M), and high (H) school levels were: (1) teaching interruptions; (2) insufficient time to do work; (3) too much paperwork; (4) extracurricular duties; (5) available supplies; (6) changes in work environment. Low scores indicated all teachers were dissatisfied with teaching interruptions (E=1.2, M=1.0, H=1.0), insufficient time to do work (E=1.2, M=0.8, H=1.4), and paperwork (E=1.2, M=1.2, H=1.2). Teachers tended to be satisfied with available supplies (E=2.2, M=1.5, H=1.8) and changes (E=1.9, M=2.0, H=1.8). Middle school teachers were dissatisfied (1.0), while elementary and high school teachers were satisfied (1.8, 1.7) with duties (see Appendix B p. 30).

The Analysis of Variance was used as a parametric measure to calculate the average mean scores and standard deviations from those means for schools in each category. Dr. Sweeney (second reader, professor at California State University of San Bernardino) recommended the Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons as a regression coefficient to indicate where those differences were significant. These tests revealed differences in mean averages between the school levels in five out of the eight categories at the .05 level of significance (see Appendix B pp. 31-33). Elementary school teachers reported significantly more self-esteem than their high school counterparts. Teacher relations were significantly more
satisfying for both elementary and middle school teachers than high school teachers (see p.15 for related discussion). Stress factors were significantly more of a problem for teachers in elementary schools than middle and high schools. Professional growth was significantly more satisfying for middle school teachers than high school teachers. Student relations were significantly more satisfying for elementary than middle school teachers.

**Discussion and Limitations**

Survey data indicated that stress factors were the predominant cause of teacher dissatisfaction at all schools with the main causes of teacher stress being classroom interruptions, insufficient time to do what needs to be done, and too much paperwork. Teachers at the same level (elementary, middle, or high school) reported similar satisfaction scores 75% to 88% of the time. However, teachers at different levels reported significantly different satisfaction scores 63% of the time. These results suggest that while similar dynamics are in operation within each school level, the levels differ greatly from one another.

This study revealed teachers were satisfied in their jobs in seven out of the eight categories. This was a higher degree of satisfaction than expected in view of the research indicating teachers are not satisfied in their jobs. One
possible explanation for this is that teachers in this study chose response “2”, the most frequent choice, as a substitute for a neutral response not available on the 0-3 scale. The new Teacher Satisfaction Survey will use a response scale of 0-4. Another possible explanation for high scores in teacher satisfaction could be that underlying causes of teacher dissatisfaction, such as salary and class size, were not addressed in this study. The scope of variables was limited to those that come under a principal’s control, so that a principal could implement the necessary changes to increase teacher satisfaction, empowerment and efficacy.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future researchers might consider the following:
1. Qualitative and longitudinal studies in schools where changes have been implemented based on survey data.
2. Site-specific survey modifications reflecting issues or programs of concern to the administrator.
3. School comparisons with matched populations examining the effects of different leadership styles.
4. Data analysis by gender, experience, and/or education.
5. An examination of variables controlled by district and/or state policies such as salary, benefits, class size, state frameworks, and legislation.
APPENDIX A

Teacher Satisfaction Survey Statements in Categories
**TEACHER SATISFACTION SURVEY 1994**

Please respond to the following statements by circling the number that best corresponds to your feelings about your current job. When you have mixed feelings about an item, choose the response that applies *most* of the time. Thank you for participating in this survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark X for the school where you teach: K-6, 6-9, 9-12

Total: [Blank]
### SURVEY STATEMENTS IN CATEGORIES

#### SELF ESTEEM

6. I feel proud to be a teacher.
12. I feel appreciated on the job.
21. I feel confident in my teaching skills.
27. I feel respected at work.

#### PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

1. I feel challenged in my work.
11. Growth/leadership opportunities are available.
16. Staff development/in-services benefit me.

#### DECISION MAKING

10. Staff participate in decision making.
18. Decisions made reflect the concerns of everyone.
23. I have input on issues relevant to me.
31. I make decisions regarding my students/classroom.

#### PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL

3. The principal is available when needed.
9. The principal is supportive and helpful.
13. The principal handles problems well.
22. My rapport with the principal is good.
29. The principal communicates well with staff.

#### TEACHER RELATIONS

2. Staff communicate well with one another.
17. Teachers here support one another.
28. My peers are supportive towards me.
32. Staff interactions are positive.

#### STUDENT RELATIONS

7. My students learn what I want them to learn.
19. I enjoy interacting with my students.
24. Student discipline is not a problem for me.

#### PARENT RELATIONS

4. Parents respond well to my requests.
14. Parents are supportive towards me.
30. Parent complaints are not a problem for me.

#### STRESS FACTORS

5. There is not too much paperwork on this job.
8. I am able to teach without interruptions.
15. Supplies are available when needed.
20. There is sufficient time to do what I need to do.
25. Changes that take place here are desirable.
33. Extracurricular responsibilities are not a burden.
APPENDIX B

GRAPHS

Individual Schools: Mean Scores Within Categories  28
Eight Categories: Mean Scores for Each School  29
Three School Levels: Mean Scores for Stress Factors  30
Three School Levels: Mean Scores Within Categories  31

TABLES

Analysis of Variance and Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons

Table 1: Self-Esteem
Table 2: Professional Growth
Table 3: Decision Making
Table 4: Perception of Principal ...................  32
Table 5: Teacher Relations
Table 6: Student Relations
Table 7: Parent Relations
Table 8: Stress Factors  .........................  33
INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS:
MEAN SCORES WITHIN CATEGORIES

Elementary School A

Elementary School B

Middle School A

Middle School B

High School A

High School B

SE=Self Esteem, PG=Professional Growth, DM=Decision Making, PP=Perception of Principal, TR=Teacher Relations, SR=Student Relations, PR=Parent Relations, SF=Stress Factors
EIGHT CATEGORIES:
MEAN SCORES FOR EACH SCHOOL

ES=Elenientary School, MS=Middle School, HS=High School
THREE SCHOOL LEVELS:
MEAN SCORES FOR STRESS FACTORS

Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THREE SCHOOL LEVELS:
MEAN SCORES WITHIN CATEGORIES

Elementary Schools

Middle Schools

High Schools

SE=Self Esteem, PG=Professional Growth, DM=Decision Making, PP=Perception of Principal, TR=Teacher Relations, SR=Student Relations, PR=Parent Relations, SF=Stress Factors
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>SELF-ESTEEM</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F = 3.4778)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(DF = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL GROWTH</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2.238</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F = 3.4794)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(DF = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>DECISION MAKING</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F = 2.2063)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(DF = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F = 1.1569)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(DF = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>TEACHER RELATIONS</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>2.278</td>
<td>0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.970</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(F = 7.5670 \text{ DF} = 2 \text{ P} = .007)\]

### TABLE 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>STUDENT RELATIONS</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(F = 3.7182 \text{ DF} = 2 \text{ P} = .026)\]

### TABLE 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>PARENT RELATIONS</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>0.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(F = 1.3653 \text{ DF} = 2 \text{ P} = .258)\]

### TABLE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>STRESS FACTORS</th>
<th>TUKEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem.</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(F = 4.9523 \text{ DF} = 2 \text{ P} = .007)\]
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