A study of job satisfaction as perceived by the certified staff in Florida public elementary schools

George A. Taylor
University of Central Florida
A STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION AS PERCEIVED BY THE CERTIFIED STAFF IN FLORIDA PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

GEORGE A TAYLOR, III

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Department of Educational Services at the University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida

April 1986

Major Professor: Arthur Olson
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to survey the subject certified staff of Florida public elementary schools to determine how elements of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory were perceived as being met in their current school employment. The descriptive study utilized an instrument that listed each of the 16 job factors in Herzberg's theory. The instrument was designed to allow subjects to mark each job factor as contributing to their job satisfaction, neutral, or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The instrument also had areas to record various biographical data regarding the subjects. The survey was conducted on a randomly selected subject group that was stratified over the five regions of Florida public schools. A total of 586 usable surveys were returned, a return rate of 71%.

An estimation approach to inferential statistics was used to analyze the data. Interval estimation of the data was done through the construction of confidence intervals at the .95 level. Each job factor was analyzed with regard to the group as a whole and with regard to selected
biographical information including sex, years of teaching experience, job position, and degree held by subject.

The job factors of Advancement, Salary, and Personal Life were perceived by over half of the subjects as not contributing to their job satisfaction. The job factors of Achievement and Interpersonal Relationships with Students were perceived by over 90% of the subjects as contributing to their job satisfaction.

There was no significant difference between male and female subjects on all job factors with the exception of Responsibility. There was no significant difference between subjects with M.A. degrees and subjects with B.A. degrees with regard to any job factor. Subjects with the most years of teaching experience tended to have more members that perceived job factors as contributing to their job satisfaction than subjects with lesser years of teaching experience.

It is recommended that further research be undertaken to determine the perceptions of certified personnel in Florida's public secondary schools.
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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

The pendulum of educational history appears to have swung towards a time of reform. It is once more in vogue to criticize American public education. Many educators and business leaders have created a deluge of writing on this important topic. Phi Delta Kappa (1983) has highlighted the seriousness of this situation with the following quote: "In no prior era of our history have so many public and private bodies issued reports recommending reform in U.S. education."

A common theme in many of these reports seems to be the need for teacher improvement. In A Nation At Risk (1983), a seven-part recommendation is made designed to improve the quality of teachers in America. The suggestions include increasing teacher pay, lengthening the school year, developing a career ladder program for teachers, using nonschool personnel resources in the schools, and improving teacher preparation. This document has received the attention of educators and community bodies from Washington to Florida.

The report of the Education Commission of the States (1983), Action For Excellence, generally supports the
recommendations of *A Nation At Risk*. The EXC report contains the additional recommendation of establishing methods for honoring outstanding teachers such as merit pay programs.

A third major national education reform report, *Making The Grade* (1983), calls for a greater role for the federal government in improving the quality of teachers in the public schools. It suggests a "national master teacher program," which would include monetary rewards for master teachers.

Florida is considered to be one of the leading states in actually implementing educational reform (Pipho, 1983). The state legislature has passed several statutes designed to improve public education.

The District Quality Instruction Incentives Program (1984) was designed to financially reward "meritorious" schools within a school district. In order to be selected as a meritorious school, students at a school site had to score "in the upper quartile of district schools in terms of its relative or expected rate of student gain as measured by standardized tests of verbal and quantitative achievement." Teacher reception of this proposal has been, at best, mixed. Many Florida counties have chosen not to participate in the program.
Florida established the Inservice Training Institute (1984) program. This legislation was designed to provide inservice training for teachers and was implemented at times convenient for teacher attendance as they were frequently held during the summer. Teachers were paid to attend workshops and institutes and, hopefully, improve areas of critical need within school districts.

The Sunshine State has attempted to improve its ability to evaluate educational programs by establishing the Institute for Instructional Research and Practice and Student Educational Evaluation and Performance (1984). The statute directed the Florida Board of Regents to establish a program using different universities in the state led by directors at the different sites. The directors were responsible for different areas of research including subject area knowledge for instructional personnel, teacher effectiveness and practice, and student educational evaluation and performance. The true impact of this legislation may take several years to gain significance.

In 1984, Florida established the State Master Teacher Program (1984). The program was designed "to recognize superior ability among Florida's instructional personnel and to provide an economic incentive to such personnel to continue in public instruction." Teachers who qualified for entry into the program were to pass an observation of
their classroom teaching and a subject area examination. The program came under a great deal of criticism from teachers and many legislators when it was put into practice. As a result, several changes were made in the program for the 1985–86 school year including the removal of the requirement that applicants for the program hold a master's degree unless no test was available in their field. It remains to be seen if the changes will result in a program that satisfies the teachers and state legislators.

While the general public considers that Florida has taken action to address some of the problems facing education today, it is debatable as to whether these actions will solve the problems. The present uproar over the State Master Teacher Program may be doing more harm than good with its programs ("Spotlight on Issues," 1985).

Since any program designed to improve public education has an effect on the personnel of a school, insight into the possible success or failure of a reform program may be gained by analyzing the field of industrial psychology. Frederick Herzberg (1959) developed a theory of employee motivation known as the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The theory identifies certain employee needs that cause an employee to be satisfied or dissatisfied with his/her work. Briefly, the state of Florida has attempted to
address the employee needs with legislation. Evaluation of which needs are or are not being met at the work site may give valuable information as to what should be done to improve job performance.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to survey the subject certified staff of Florida public elementary schools to determine how elements of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory were perceived as being met in their current school employment.

Study Questions

1. What percentage of the certified staff of Florida public elementary schools perceive elements of Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory as being met in their current school employment?

2. What percentage of the certified staff of Florida public elementary schools perceive elements of Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory as not being met in their work?
3. Is there a significant difference between the sex of a subject and his/her response to the questionnaire used in the study?

4. Is there a significant difference between the number of years of teaching experience a subject has completed, grouped into five-year intervals, and his/her response to the questionnaire used in the study?

5. Is there a significant difference between the job position held by a subject and his/her response to the questionnaire used in the study?

6. Is there a significant difference between the degrees held by a subject and his/her response to the questionnaire used in the study?

**Definition of Terms**

**Achievement**—Successful completion of a job, to experience solutions to different problems, and seeing the results of one's work.

**Administrative Policy**—The rules, regulations, and organizational procedures under which a person works.

**Advancement**—The opportunity for promotion within the organization one works.
Certified Staff--Educational personnel certified to teach by the Florida Department of Education.

Colleagues--Co-workers within the organization a person works.

Elementary Classroom Teacher--Educational personnel whose primary assignment is classroom instruction of regular students in grades K-6.

Elementary Schools--Public schools in the state of Florida that enroll students in any combination of grades K-6.

Exceptional Teaching Position--Any teaching position where the majority of teaching duties includes work with students staff into exceptional educational programs.

Interpersonal Relations--Basic quality of the daily dealings with one's co-workers, superiors, or subordinates.

Job Security--Objective indicators of continuation of employment such as tenure.

Perceptions--Awareness of external objects, conditions, or relationships.

Personal Life--The activities of employees beyond the work site.

Professional Growth--The opportunity to advance in one's professional skills.

Responsibility--Control over a worker's job task.
Salary—Those elements that make up a workers' contract monetary payment.

Supervision—The overseeing of a worker's job task.

Support Teacher—Educational personnel whose primary assignment is instruction of art, music, physical education, media, or similar classes in grades K-6.

Status—The position that a worker holds within the organization and within the community.

Students—Individuals enrolled in public elementary schools in the state of Florida.

Work—Those activities an employee is subjected to within an organization.

Working Conditions—The physical conditions in which an employee works.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study was limited by the response rate of the subjects.

2. The study was limited by the quality of the survey instrument.

3. The study was limited by the mood of the subjects as they completed the questionnaire.

4. The findings of the study were limited by the reliability of Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory.
Assumptions

1. The subjects' responses to the items on the questionnaire were based on their true feelings.

2. The applicability of Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory has been demonstrated for educational employees.

3. The subjects in this study were representative of the certified staff of Florida's public elementary schools.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of related literature will examine some of the current concerns regarding the future supply of teachers. The review will highlight the significant research related to Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The review will examine the tenets of his controversial industrial psychology concept and survey the literature concerning the applicability of Herzberg's theory to the field of education.

The Possible Teacher Shortage

There is a growing concern among some educators that the public schools may soon be faced with a critical shortage of teachers in all teaching fields. This shortage could prevent the attainment of educational reforms called for in reports from the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), the Twentieth Century Fund (1983), the Education Commission of the States (1983), the Twentieth Century Fund (1983), and other groups (Darling-Hammond, 1984).
The projected teaching shortage is the result of several changing conditions in society and the teaching profession. Donald Empey (1984) reports that the school student population decline of recent years is about to end. The baby boom following World War II increased public school enrollment from 28.8 million students in 1950 to 51.3 million students in 1970. A decline in enrollment began in 1970 and was expected to bottom out at 44.3 million students in 1984 (Educational Research Services, 1983). The baby boom generation that accounted for the increase in school population in the 1960s will have entered their child-bearing years. Public school enrollment is expected to increase to 49.7 million students by the end of the century (Educational Research Services, 1983).

The projected increase in student population will require a corresponding increase in the teacher population. Changes in society give reason to believe that school systems will not be able to count on the traditional pool of possible teachers to meet their need for more employees.

Education was once one of the few professions open to large numbers of women. Changes in the role of women in American society now afford females a much wider range of professions than in past years. Women are taking advantage
of these opportunities. The number of women majoring in education has steadily declined between 1970 and 1981. In 1970, 36% of all women college graduates received their bachelor's degree in education. In 1981, the percentage of all women college graduates that received their bachelor's degree in education fell to 17% (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

The opening of new job markets for women not only affects the availability of new candidates for teaching, but also effects women already in the profession. Wangberg, Metzger, and Levitov (1982) conducted a survey of female elementary school teachers in school districts across the United States. One of the questions asked on their survey was whether or not the subjects would select teaching as a career if they had the chance to reconsider. Forty percent of the teachers in the study replied that they would not select education again. The reasons given for not selecting education again included poor current working conditions and the availability of careers for women outside of education.

Elementary school female teachers were not the only group of educators that regretted entering the teaching profession. A 1981 survey conducted by the National Education Association reported that 36% of all teachers in America would not select education as their
employment field if they could repeat their college years. The study found that only 22 percent of the subjects would definitely enter education if they could repeat their choice of career fields (Wangberg, 1984).

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) provided more data that indicates the possibility of a teacher shortage in the near future. In 1981, the NCES projected a need to increase the teacher pool by 900,000 new teachers to meet the demands of the public school system by the year 1990. The new teachers would increase the present teacher work force by 45 percent. During the same time period, the NCES predicts a 20 percent decline in the number of college students majoring in education (Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984).

One of the most widely cited reasons for teachers leaving the field of education is the low monetary rewards associated with it. Starting salaries for teachers are lower than almost every other profession requiring a bachelor's degree (NEA, 1983). Although teaching salaries have risen in face value over the last few years, average salaries for teachers have fallen by 15 percent in terms of real dollars between 1971 and 1981 (Darling-Hammond, 1984).

Educators concerned with avoiding a possible teacher shortage while attracting the best individuals to the
teaching profession have suggested a variety of methods to improve the profession. Merit pay is one technique that is often presented as a way to improve the field of education. Merit pay is not a new concept in education. Educational reformers of the 1920s and the 1950s presented it as a method of solving many of education's problems (Johnson, 1984). Today's debate on the pros and cons of merit pay raise many of the same questions that were pondered in past years. Advocates of the program, such as Myron Lieberman (1985), focus on ways to successfully organize and administer merit pay programs. Opponents of merit pay, such as Albert Shanker (1985), focus on the shortcomings of any merit pay program.

There are those in education that feel merit pay programs will not solve problems in American education because the program is not directed at the real cause of teacher dissatisfaction. John Goodlad's (1983) work revealed that teachers in his study entered the education profession because of the type of work it offered. Teachers were aware of the low salary structure of the profession, but the intrinsic rewards of the occupation were what attracted them to the profession. Goodlad found that teachers that left the field were dissatisfied in what they were able, or unable, to do in their classrooms. He
found that monetary concerns were secondary to teacher dissatisfaction with their classroom work in regard to reasons given by teachers for leaving the profession. Goodlad speculates that when teachers become disillusioned with the intrinsic rewards of teaching that they had expected when beginning their careers, they become much more aware of the lack of extrinsic rewards in their profession.

Elaine Wangberg (1984) supports the idea that simply increasing teacher pay will not cure the problems teachers have with education. She completed a review of the literature concerning teacher stress and dissatisfaction and found that disruptive and violent students, fear of violence, lack of public support and respect, lack of job security, lack of job mobility, poor working conditions, excessive paperwork, poor interpersonal relations with others at the work site, lack of personal recognition, loss of classroom curriculum control, and poor salary conditions were all factors that contributed to teacher burnout.

If educational specialists are to correct the problems faced by teachers in the classroom, it is important to identify what problems need to be addressed. Teacher stress and job dissatisfaction are very complex issues that defy simple solutions. Before reform programs can be put
into practice, it is important to analyze the current employment conditions that teachers face at the job site. Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory offers a method of completing this task.

**Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

Early in his career, Frederick Herzberg became interested in the factors that influence motivation. After completing an exhaustive review of more than 2,000 articles on the subject, he analyzed the data and tried to identify the trends (Herzberg, Mauser, Peterson, & Capell, 1957). The findings of the review led Herzberg to question the commonly held belief that the factors that promoted employee job satisfaction and job motivation were aligned on a conceptual continuum (Herzberg, Mauser, & Snyderman, 1959).

Herzberg and his associates conducted a study of 200 engineers and accountants in an attempt to identify the factors that contributed to employee job satisfaction and job motivation. The researchers utilized an open-end interview technique with each of their subjects. The results of their study suggested that the factors that promoted job satisfaction and job motivation were mutually exclusive of each other (Herzberg, et al. 1959).
Herzberg's findings indicated that there existed both maintenance and motivational factors associated with the job environment. He found that one group of job factors associated with work, when absent, served to make employees dissatisfied with their work. Herzberg labeled these job factors maintenance or hygiene elements. He took the term, "hygiene" from the medical field as he felt these factors were preventative and environmental in nature (Herzberg, 1966). Herzberg felt that his data suggested that the hygiene elements were the job factors that would cause an employee to remain on the job or seek employment elsewhere. These hygiene factors would determine whether an employee would complete the basic work demanded by the job.

Herzberg et al. (1959) identified ten hygiene job elements:

1. Relationships with subordinates. The quality of the relationship with those employees under the direct supervision of an employee.

2. Relationship with supervisors. The nature of the relationship with those individuals who supervise an employee.
3. Relationship with peers. Social interaction with other employees at the work site.


5. Company policy and administration. The affect of company personnel policy on employees.

6. Personal life. Employee concerns off the job site.

7. Security. Employee feelings regarding the certainty of future gainful employment.

8. Working conditions. The physical environment at the work site (i.e., heating, air conditioning, tools, etc.).

9. Status. The position, state, or rank of an employee with reference to other employees.


Herzberg found six job factors that he claimed led to an employee being motivated on the job to do work above and beyond the expected level of work required by the position. He called these job factors motivators. The motivators were identified by Herzberg et al. (1958) as being:
1. Achievement. Personal accomplishment in completing a difficult or challenging job task.

2. Recognition for Achievement. Acknowledgment from others for completion of superior work.

3. Work itself. Engaging in challenging or meaningful work as perceived by the employee.

4. Responsibility. A measure of independence in accomplishing a work task as well as input into the task itself.

5. Growth. The chance for growth, both personal and professional, on the job site.

6. Advancement. The opportunity for employee promotion within the organization's structure.

Herzberg et al. (1959) claimed that the six motivation job factors were completely independent from the hygiene job factors. Fulfillment of the hygiene needs of an employee would not result in the employee becoming motivated to do work above and beyond that required by the job. Fulfillment of the hygiene needs of an employee results in no employee dissatisfaction with the job. The converse position is also true. Failure to fulfill an employee's motivational needs would not result in employee
hygiene dissatisfaction, rather it results in no employee job motivation beyond the basic requirements of the job.

Herzberg's new position drew immediate attention from the academic community. Brayfield (1960) and Kahn (1961) reviewed Herzberg's initial work. While both felt the results of the research showed some promise, they voiced two concerns that would serve as the main criticism of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory over the years. They questioned the reliability of the critical-incident interview technique used in Herzberg's research. Both reviewers were concerned that the methodology was faulty with regard to the findings of Herzberg's study. The reviewers further questioned the generality of the findings. Brayfield and Roth both pointed out that Herzberg had used a very limited segment of the work force, 200 accountants and engineers, in his study. They questioned if a study of such a limited subject group could be projected onto the total employee population.

During the past 20 years, the question of the generality of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory to other occupational areas has been widely examined. McGowan's (1982) review of literature concerning studies investigating the Motivation-Hygiene Theory identified a wide range of research using registered nurses, hospital
engineering workers, civilian scientists, and civil service supervisors. In each research study, Herzberg's position was supported.

The main criticism of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory seems to be that it is methodologically bound as illustrated in McGowen (1982). He concluded that studies that investigated the Motivation-Hygiene Theory were most favorable in their findings towards Herzberg when the study used the same type of methodology.

Herzberg used a technique called "critical incident methodology" in conducting his research. The technique was developed by Flanagan (1954). It involved an interview process where subjects were asked about events they had experienced at the work site that resulted in a major change in their perceived feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their job. The interviewer began each session by asking the subject to describe an incident that made him/her feel good about his/her job. The interviewer probed the subject's response in an attempt to identify why the subject felt the way he/she indicated. The interviewer then probed to find out what happened to the average state of emotion concerning his/her job (Herzberg, 1966).

Following the conclusion of the questioning session of a good job experience, the interview sequence would begin
again. The subject would be asked to identify an incident that made him feel very negative towards the job. The pattern of positive and negative incidents would be continued by the interviewer.

The subject's responses were recorded provided the responses were in agreement with the following criteria (Herzberg, 1966):

1. The incident must be based on an event in the life of the subject. The incident could not be based on a purely psychological happening independent of a physical occurrence.

2. The incident had to be in a time frame. It must have had an identifiable beginning, middle, and end.

3. The incident must have occurred during a period when the subject had accompanying strong feelings, good or bad, regarding the incident.

4. The incident must have occurred while the subject was a member of the population of the study.

5. The incident must have been an occurrence directly related to the subject's job that caused strong feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction towards the job.
The critical incident methodology used by Herzberg has been a major target of criticism by those individuals who have rejected the concept of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Many critics have stated that the theory is methodologically bound to Flanagan's technique. It has been argued that when research methods other than critical incident methodology are used, the job factors for motivation and hygiene do not follow Herzberg's position. Herzberg (1982) responded to this line of criticism by claiming that all theories and experiments are methodologically bound. He alluded to the field of physical science when he stated, "You don't produce steel by the Haber process and say I can't produce it by a process that produces aluminum."

Whitsett and Winslow (1967) conducted a general review of the literature concerning the merits of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The review focused on those studies that had been critical to the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Their work noted that some of the most critical research conducted by Dunnette (1965), Ewen (1966), Malinovsky and Barry (1965), and Wernimont (1966) was conducted using some type of variant of the rating scale procedure for collecting data.

Herzberg's work has been championed by other reviewers of the research hostile to the Motivation-Hygiene Theory.
Bockman (1971) reviewed the studies critical to Herzberg's research. She concluded that many of the objections to the Motivation-Hygiene Theory or his methodology were based on semantic differences, misunderstanding of the basic implications of Herzberg's work, and unjustified extrapolation of the theory. She pointed out the use of an overall job satisfaction rating used by some critics as an example of a concept attributed to Herzberg that he has never postulated.

Grigalliunas and Wiener (1976) conducted a similar investigation into Motivation-Hygiene Theory research. They reviewed the charges that the critical incident methodology was biased in the reliability of the coding process and the consistency of the data. It was their conclusion that the literature did not support the charges. They found that almost all Motivation-Hygiene research studies that utilized the critical incident methodology reported a high degree of agreement between coders. They concluded that the design, rationale, and findings of those studies critical to Herzberg's work do not provide a strong case for refuting the Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

Grigalliunas and Wiener (1976) identified three problem areas of studies critical to Herzberg's position:
1. The use of scale scores in attempting to measure very complex motivational and emotional events.

2. The testing of hypotheses not postulated in the Motivation-Hygiene Theory but attributed to it.

3. The findings of several critical studies that were inconclusive and/or with results that can be interpreted in several different ways including explanations supportive of Herzberg's position.

Motivation-Hygiene Research in Education

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory has been examined in a wide range of different employee areas. The applicability of his work to the field of educational personnel is of particular importance to this study for obvious reasons.

Savage (1967) replicated Herzberg's original study using the critical incident technique. His subjects were Georgia public school teachers. Savage's results were generally supportive of Herzberg's position except in one area. He found that good interpersonal relationships with students, a hygiene job element in Herzberg's research, tended to be a motivator for public school teachers. This
concept seems to be consistent with the common reasons to stay in teaching.

One of the best known studies of Motivation-Hygiene Theory in the area of educational personnel was conducted by Thomas Sergiovanni (1967). Sergiovanni, acting under a contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, conducted his research in Monroe County, New York. In his review of literature, he pointed out the similarity of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory and Maslow's hierarchy of needs concept. Although this relationship would be discussed in many future reviews of Herzberg's work, Herzberg (1982) considered the comparison to be only superficial at best.

Sergiovanni selected at random 127 teachers from the 3,682 teachers of the school district's population. Of that group, only 71 members agreed to take part in the study. Sergiovanni interviewed each subject using the same critical incident technique used by Herzberg in his original research.

Sergiovanni's findings were very supportive of Herzberg's position with regards to there being two separate areas of job factors in the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of an employee. Sergiovanni found that among his subjects, achievement, recognition, and
responsibility were the most often listed job factors regarding job motivation. Some of the most interesting findings of his were the factors of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction applied to all teachers irrespective of the sex, teaching level, or tenure status.

McGreal (1968) conducted a personnel survey of Illinois public school teachers. The purpose of his study was to determine how school organization variables affected teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their jobs. McGreal's findings were generally supportive of Herzberg's position, but some overlap of job factors was found.

Morrill (1969) conducted a study using Minnesota public elementary school teachers and principals as subjects. Morrill used a satisfaction questionnaire and obtained findings supportive of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. He found some interesting results in that female teachers were more satisfied with various job elements in their work than male teachers. He also found that teachers and principals were more satisfied with their work in school districts that spent more money than other school districts.

A study that support Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory, but did not use the critical incident method of data gathering, was conducted by Passalacqua (1970). His study of Michigan public school teachers utilized the
Flanders Interaction Analysis Scale and a questionnaire from the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index. Again, Passalacqua's findings were supportive of Herzberg's thesis.

One of the first educational studies to produce contradicting results to the Motivation-Hygiene Theory was conducted by Hammer (1970). Hammer mailed questionnaires to 152 matched pairs of special education and regular public elementary school teachers in Iowa during the 1968-69 school year. Hammer had a response rate of 85.6 percent. The questionnaire used in the study contained a section for the subjects to record biographical information, a list of Herzberg's job factors, and an item designed to measure overall job satisfaction. A Likert scale was used to measure how each subject felt about Herzberg's job factors.

Hammer found that some of Herzberg's job factors performed as the Motivation-Hygiene Theory predicted the factors would perform. Growth and advancement were found to be motivation factors and supervision and job security were found to be the hygiene factors. Herzberg's other identified factors did not perform as exclusive motivators or hygiene job elements. Hammer raised the common criticism that Herzberg's findings cannot be generalized beyond his own critical incident methodology.
Wickstrom (1971) conducted a study of Saskatchewan teachers that generally supported Herzberg's concept. He used a questionnaire based on Herzberg's motivation and hygiene job elements to gather data from his subjects. Wickstrom's overall results were supportive of Herzberg. Wickstrom's results indicated that good interpersonal relationships with students served as a motivation factor rather than a hygiene factor for teachers. This finding was the same as Savage's (1967) earlier work. Wickstrom also found some indication that sex and job position were factors in determining what job elements were motivation or hygiene elements.

One of the more vocal critics in the field of education on the topic of Motivation-Hygiene Theory has been James Medved. Medved (1971) conducted a study in an attempt to evaluate the applicability of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory to public school educators. He developed two questionnaires designed to measure how teachers and administrators perceived the job factors listed by Herzberg in the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. His subjects were 24 principals and a total of 97 teachers who returned surveys. Medved's findings indicated that job factors could be motivators or hygiene factors. These findings were supportive of the traditional single linear relationship of job factors.
Morris (1972) conducted a study of 340 private liberal arts college faculty members from nine colleges. Morris used the same type of critical incident methodology used by Herzberg in his research. The purpose of his study was to examine his subject group to find out if the tenets of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory were applicable to their work environment. Morris reported findings highly supportive of Herzberg's concepts.

Charles Aebi (1972) conducted an interesting study designed to investigate the charge that Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory was method bound. Aebi used 132 faculty members and 21 administrators from 16 church-related liberal arts colleges across 11 states. Among Aebi's hypothesis was a test of the free choice interview, the critical incident type interview, and the forced choice structured item interview technique. Aebi wanted to study the results of giving the same group of subjects the two investigative techniques. Aebi found that the results of the critical incident research method provided data that were more consistent with Herzberg's position. The forced choice method was not as supportive of Herzberg, but the findings did not completely contradict the two levels of motivation and hygiene postulated by Herzberg.

Public school administrators from suburban Chicago were the subjects of a study by George Schmidt (1974). He
conducted a tape recorded critical incident interview with 74 public school administrators. He found support for Herzberg's position that the dual factors of motivation and hygiene job elements are applicable to all job situations. Schmidt found that subject information such as sex, age, school district size, type of community, educational background, and the age of the school building in which the subject worked had no bearing on the job factors.

Schmidt concluded that his research was supportive of Herzberg's position. He identified achievement, recognition, and advancement as motivation elements. Schmidt listed salary, good interpersonal relations, school policy and administration, and supervision as hygiene elements.

Schmidt included an interesting notation in the limitations of his study. He stated that the replies of the subjects in a critical incident interview were dependent on the memories of the subject. Schmidt questioned whether the possible subjective nature of people's memory might limit the reliability of critical incident methodology.

Bembry (1975) completed a study of 231 Iowa public secondary school business teachers. She investigated the Motivation-Hygiene Theory to see if biographical information supplied by the subjects would be a factor in their responses. Bembry found that business teachers who had more teaching experience were significantly more satisfied
with their work than teachers with less experience. Marital status, educational background, and the size of the school had no impact on the response of the subjects.

Handy (1975) conducted a study of 100 adult educators in the Washington D.C. area. The subjects were given questionnaires requesting them to describe incidents that contributed to their job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Handy's purpose was to examine whether or not the job factors identified by his subjects as motivation or hygiene elements in their work would correspond with Herzberg's position. Handy's findings supported Herzberg's work. Handy found the job factors of achievement, work itself, advancement, and recognition were identified by his subjects as job motivators. He identified the job factors of working conditions, company policy and administration, status, interpersonal relations, supervision, and job security as the primary hygiene elements in his subject group.

Schmitz (1977) conducted an investigation of 184 academic deans from eight state universities. The purpose of his investigation was to test the Motivation-Hygiene Theory with regard to his subject population. Schmitz used an interview technique similar to Herzberg's critical incident method for collecting data. After tabulating the data, Schmitz used a chi square test to determine if the
factors identified as motivation job factors were significantly different from those job factors identified as hygiene elements. Schmitz's results were supportive of the dual element position of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Schmitz found that the job factors listed most often as motivation elements by his subjects included achievement, work itself, recognition, and responsibility. The job factors listed by the deans as most often contributing to their job dissatisfaction, hygiene factors, were university policy and administration and poor working conditions.

Schmitz conducted a "chi square goodness of fit" test on the data to determine if all of the motivation job factors contributed more to job satisfaction of subjects than did the hygiene elements. The results showed that the motivation elements were significantly higher than the hygiene elements - a result highly supportive of Herzberg's work.

Schmitz completed the same procedure to examine whether hygiene factors contributed more to job dissatisfaction than did the motivation elements. The results were not significantly higher for the hygiene elements - a result that was not supportive of Herzberg's work.

Sister James Marie Donahue (1978) conducted a study of nursing and non-nursing faculty members in midwestern
private liberal arts colleges. She wanted to investigate the two matched groups to see if there would be any differences in how the subjects perceived job elements in the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Donahue used a survey questionnaire to gather data. The data were analyzed by using the Modified Friedlander Scale. Eighteen job factors were given ratings of one to four with the results tabulated to group the job factors as motivation or hygiene elements.

Donahue's research indicated that there was little difference between the two subject groups as to their identification of items as motivation or hygiene elements. The subjects listed achievement, work itself, and use of best abilities as motivational job factors. Management policies, technical supervision, salary, and the opportunity for advancement were listed as hygiene factors.

Another study that provided support for the Motivation-Hygiene Theory was conducted by Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979). The subjects of their investigation were 218 teachers randomly selected from 16 English schools. The purpose of the study was to research the relationship between teacher absenteeism, job stress, intention to leave teaching, and job satisfaction. The researchers concluded that the job factors that were most likely to cause
teachers to leave the profession were the job factors identified in Herzberg's work as hygiene factors.

Martha Lawrence (1979) conducted a study of elementary school supervisors. The purpose of her study was to examine the relevancy of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory to her subject group. She selected 40 elementary supervisors at random from the listing of such positions in the 1977-78 Virginia Educational Directory. Lawrence collected her data by taping personal interviews with each of her subjects. The interviews were conducted closely to the procedure used in critical incident methodology.

Lawrence concluded that the motivational job factors of achievement and recognition were the most significant for her subject group. She did not report any job factors other than those presented by Herzberg as being motivation or hygiene job factors.

Robert Sparks (1979) conducted a study of teacher job dissatisfaction. His subjects were 44 teachers attending a workshop on teacher stress. Although Sparks admitted that his subject group may be biased due to his selection method, he found some interesting results concerning Herzberg's hygiene job factors. Sparks found that feelings of powerlessness, poor relationships with other educators, poor relationships with supervisors, and a conflict with teacher role were the major reasons given by his subjects.
with an overall feeling of dissatisfaction with teaching and a desire to leave the field. These elements correspond with the hygiene factors Herzberg's work would predict for the subjects.

The National Education Association (1980) conducted a descriptive research study of American public school teachers. The organization surveyed 1,738 teachers using a self-administered questionnaire to gather data. A wide range of information was requested from subjects regarding their teaching situation and feelings towards their present job. The findings of the study included a list of job factors identified by the subjects as contributing most to their dissatisfaction with work. The items included relationships with other teachers, job security, relationships with parents of students, physical facilities or environment in which the subject worked, class size, opportunities for professional growth, and intangible rewards from teaching. All of the identified job factors, except intangible rewards from teaching, would be part of Herzberg's group of hygiene elements and functioned as his theory predicted hygiene elements would function, thus validating the concept.

Erlandson and Pastor (1981) conducted a study of 150 public high school teachers chosen from 10 high schools in different geographical areas across the nation. The
authors wanted to examine what they termed "higher order need strengths" of secondary school teachers. The higher order need strengths were those items in the work place that motivated employees to increase productivity and experience individual growth.

After identifying teachers with higher level need strengths and lower level need strengths, the researchers conducted open-ended interviews with each subject in an attempt to identify specific job elements that contributed to feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with regards to their job.

Erlandson and Pastor found results that were very supportive of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. The most commonly held need strength of their subjects were the job factors of responsibility and independence in completing work assignments. They found no relationship to their subject's age, sex, or job seniority and the job factors identified as higher level need strengths.

An interesting finding of the Erlandson and Pastor study concerned the dissatisfaction reported by subjects in the higher order needs group with the lack of opportunities in the school system for them to fulfill those needs.

Those subjects in the lower order needs group identified high pay, fringe benefits, job security, friendly co-workers, and considerate supervision as job
factors. These elements are very similar to Herzberg's hygiene job factors.

The tenets of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory were tested in a teacher reward system in an Arizona school district (Frase, Hertzel, & Grant, 1982). The local school board wanted to develop a program to reward excellent teaching, but was reluctant to implement a merit pay program. The following reasons cited for not using merit pay included those cited by Megel (1981):

1. Merit pay cannot fairly evaluate the true effectiveness of teachers.

2. Merit pay rewards conformity.

3. Merit pay places a premium on teachers who conduct their classroom activities with a minimum of problems for the administration.

4. Merit pay programs foster a competitive rather than a cooperative spirit between teachers.

5. Merit pay threatens the security of some teachers.

6. Merit pay ratings do not take into account the environment in which the teacher must teach.

7. Merit pay has not improved the quality of education.

The board of education of the school district wanted to develop a program that rewarded excellence in teaching, but avoided the pitfalls of traditional merit pay programs. Instead of offering cash awards, the board set up a reward program based on Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory.
Teachers were identified by building level administrators for their excellence in the classroom. It is interesting to note that teacher activity outside of the classroom such as service on local educational committees, work with community groups, professional attitude, and cooperation with administrators were considered only as minor factors for teacher nomination. Each school site administrator could nominate any members of the faculty without special observation procedures or any other mandated format. The district felt that their administrators knew who the outstanding teachers were at each school site.

Funds budgeted by the school board for use in the program were divided equally among the schools in the district based on school size. Awards to the teachers included items such as out-of-state attendance at professional education conferences, computers for the classroom, and instructional material for use in the classroom. Administrators and nominated teachers met to discuss possible rewards. It was important that a conference between the administrator and the teacher be used to identify an award that the teacher would view as a motivator along the lines of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

When the program ended, the teachers who received the awards were asked to complete a questionnaire to evaluate
the program. The questionnaire was designed with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The results indicated that the teachers were very satisfied with the program and highly valued the items selected to reward their classroom work.

Barbara Goodson (1984) conducted a study of public elementary school teachers in the state of Alabama. She surveyed 200 subjects to examine the applicability of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory to Alabama's elementary school teachers. Goodson examined how teachers grouped by various demographic factors including sex, race, educational training, tenure, type of school, age, years of teaching experience, and grade level taught, would respond to the job elements of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

Goodson used a chi-square analysis to examine her data. She reported that her subjects identified motivation and hygiene factors similar to Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Goodson reported that there was no significant relationship as to the subject's sex, race, educational degree, tenure, type of school, or grade taught and identification of motivation or hygiene job factors. She did note that the variable of number of years taught did have a significant effect on the motivators in the study.
Cates (1984) completed a study of the applicability of Herberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory to teachers in fundamental Christian schools in North and South Carolina. Cates developed a three-part questionnaire that consisted of a demographic section, a section designed to measure the overall job satisfaction of the subjects, and a section designed to measure the level of job satisfaction each of the subjects perceived regarding Herzberg's motivation and hygiene job factors. Cates had 327 responses to his survey, a 68% return rate. The findings of his study were supportive of the Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

Helm (1984) conducted a study of 240 public elementary school and middle school teachers. The data were gathered with the Job Episode Questionnaire, a 60-item instrument used to measure how the subjects perceived job factors associated with Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Along with identifying the level of satisfaction his subjects felt concerning each of Herzberg's job factors, Helm was interested in investigating how those feelings were associated with the achievement gains in student math scores. Although Helm found support for the two-factor concept of separate motivation and hygiene work factors, he did not find any significant relationship between student achievement gains and motivation job factors.
Summary

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory has been a subject of interest among those in the field of personnel psychology since its appearance in 1959. Its position on the duality of job factors that create motivation and hygiene has been examined by a wide range of researchers with findings both pro and con to Herzberg's position.

Early criticism of Herzberg's work centered on the applicability of the theory to employee areas beyond the engineers and accountants in his original research. Years of replication studies of Herzberg's work using different employee areas as subjects has greatly reduced this area of criticism.

A second area of concern regarding Herzberg's work that still surfaces is the charge that the Motivation-Hygiene Theory is methodology bound. Critics have claimed that the critical incident research method is the only technique where data can be collected that support Herzberg's position. The validity of this position has been argued by researchers on both sides of the debate.

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory has been widely examined in the field of education personnel. Many studies, especially those using the critical incident methodology, were very supportive of Herzberg's work.
A few studies have been completed that rejected the Motivation-Hygiene Theory as not being applicable to education personnel.

While some debate exists over the Motivation-Hygiene Theory, there is enough supportive research in the field of education personnel to conclude that Herzberg's work is applicable to the area.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Population

The population for this study consisted of the certified staff in Florida public schools. The schools in the population included only regular schools. Exceptional schools, vocational schools, adult schools, and alternative schools were not members of the population.

Selection of the Sample

The sample used in this study was a stratified random sample of the certified staff in Florida public elementary schools. A 2% sampling of the population was taken by the researcher. The sampling was stratified based on the distribution of the population in the five regions of Florida public school districts (see Table 1).

The schools in the sample were selected by using a table of random numbers assigned to a list of all schools included in the population. When a school was selected for inclusion in the sample, all certified staff personnel at the school site became members of the sample. Numbers were chosen until all five sections of stratified sample groups were filled.
The study population was divided into five strata. The groups were composed of the certified staff in Florida public elementary schools in the Panhandle, Crown, East Central, West Central, and South regions of Florida.

The process of random selection for membership in each sample group occurred in the following manner. Each Florida public school in the population has been assigned a four digit, Department of Education number. A number was selected from a table of random numbers and the school with the corresponding Department of Education number was selected for inclusion in the appropriate stratified sample group. The process of random number selection continued until all groups within the stratified samples were filled.
A list was compiled of all schools selected for a sample group. The principal of each school was identified using The Florida Education Directory 1983-84. The principal of each school was mailed a letter introducing the study, requesting his/her assistance, and alerting him/her to the impending arrival of a package containing the survey material (see Appendix A).

A week after the first class mailing of the letter to the principals, a study package was mailed to each of the subject school sites. The package included the following:

1. A second letter to the principal (see Appendix B).
2. Cover letters (see Appendix C). and questionnaires for each certified personnel at the school site.
3. Extra sets of cover letters and questionnaires equal to 10% of the school site's certified personnel to be used to replace any lost forms after the initial school site distribution.
4. A stamped, addressed return envelope for collecting and returning the completed questionnaires to the researcher.

Three weeks after the mailing of the study package, a list of all schools that had not returned the material was compiled. A follow-up letter was mailed to the principal in an attempt to increase the return rate of the questionnaires (see Appendix D).
Research Instrument

The instrument used in the study was a modification of an instrument used by McGowen (1982). The instrument was in the form of a questionnaire (see Appendix E). The instrument was field-tested on subjects in several University of Central Florida graduate education classes. The results of the field tests and suggestions from Dr. Art Olson and Dr. Linda Malone were used to develop the instrument into its final form.

Analysis of Data

The descriptive research design of the study required data analysis that would yield the most useful information concerning the population sampled in the survey. The inferential statistical procedure that was deemed most appropriate for the design of the study was the estimation approach. Due to the unknown number of subjects that would fall into each of the biographically related questions addressed in the study, interval estimation of the sample mean to the population were considered to be the statistical methodology that would produce the most useful knowledge from the study. Confidence intervals, calculated the .95 level, were selected to be the primary statistical method of conducting the interval estimations.
The responses of the subjects were coded into two categories for analysis. One category consisted of all subject responses for each job factor that recorded the job factor as contributing to their job satisfaction, column one of the survey instrument. The second category consisted of all subject responses that indicated the job factor did not contribute to their job satisfaction, columns two and three on the survey instrument.

The data obtained from the surveys were coded and programmed into an IBM 4381 computer at the University of Central Florida. The data were analyzed with the assistance of the Institute of Statistics. Selected programs of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were utilized in tabulating means, frequencies, and confidence intervals at the .95 level.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

On October 8, 1984, 827 surveys were mailed to the schools selected for the study. A total of 586 usable forms were returned, a return rate of 71% (see Table 2).

TABLE 2

SURVEY RETURNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>#Schools</th>
<th>#Population</th>
<th>#Returns</th>
<th>%Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panhandle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data obtained from the returned surveys were analyzed at the University of Central Florida with the assistance of the Institute of Statistics. The data in this chapter are
reported with regard to each of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene job factors. The six job factors regarded as motivators are presented in alphabetical order. The 10 job factors that are regarded as hygiene elements, presented in alphabetical order, follow the motivators.

The data in each job factor section are presented in the order the study questions are presented in Chapter I. Data regarding the group as a whole are followed by data based on sex, number of years of teaching experience, job position held, and degree. A summary of the data is presented in Chapter V.

**Motivators**

**Achievement**

In the sample group as a whole, 560 subjects (95.6%) marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 26 subjects (4.4%) marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.2% and a lower limit of 93.9%.

As a subgroup, 500 female subjects (95.9%) marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 21 female subjects (4.1%) marked Achievement as
neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.7% and a lower limit of 94.3%.

The male subgroup had 60 subjects (92.3%) who marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.8% and a lower limit of 85.8%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 96 members (92.3%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of eight subjects (7.7%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.4% and a lower limit of 87.2%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 153 members (96.2%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (3.8%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10
years of teaching experience who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 99.2% and a lower limit of 93.3%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 139 members (93.9%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of nine subjects (6.1%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.8% and a lower limit of 90.1%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 87 members (97.7%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (2.3%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 93.9%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 38 members (100.0%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all
subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 23 members (100.0%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held an administrative position who marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 397 members (94.5%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 23 subjects (5.5%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 96.7% and a lower limit of 92.3%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 13 members (100.0%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held a
counselor position who marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 45 members (97.8%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (2.1%) who held a support unit position marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to her dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support unit position and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 93.6%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 54 members (96.4%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (3.6%) who held an exceptional education position marked Achievement as contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 91.6%.
Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 28 members (100.0%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held a position classified as other who marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 334 members (95.1%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 17 subjects (4.9%) who held a B.A. degree marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.4% and a lower limit of 93.2%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 208 members (95.8%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of nine subjects (4.2%) who held an M.A. degree marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.5% and a lower limit of 93.2%.
Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 10 members (100.0%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held an Ed.S. degree who marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had eight members (100.0%) who marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held an Ed.D. degree who marked Achievement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Achievement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Advancement

In the sample group as a whole, 182 members (31.1%) marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 404 subjects (67.9%) marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Advancement as
contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 34.8% and a lower limit of 27.3%.

As a subgroup, 165 female subjects (31.7%) marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 356 female subjects (68.3%) marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 35.7% and a lower limit of 27.7%.

The male subgroup had 17 subjects (26.2%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 48 male subjects (73.8%) marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 36.8% and a lower limit of 15.5%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 37 members (35.6%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 67 subjects (64.4%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Advancement as contributing
to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 44.8% and a lower limit of 26.4%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 44 members (27.7%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 115 subjects (72.3%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who had 6-10 years of teaching experience and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 34.6% and a lower limit of 20.7%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 34 members (23.0%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 114 subjects (77.0%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 29.8% and a lower limit of 16.2%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 29 members (32.6%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 60 subjects (67.4%) marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all
subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 42.3% and a lower limit of 22.8%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 17 members (35.4%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 31 subjects (64.6%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 48.9% and a lower limit of 21.9%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 21 members (55.3%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 17 subjects (44.7%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.1% and a lower limit of 39.5%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 13 members (56.5%) who marked Advancement as contributing to
their job satisfaction. A total of 10 subjects (43.5%) who held an administrative position marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 76.8% and a lower limit of 36.3%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 120 members (28.6%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 300 subjects (71.4%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 32.9% and a lower limit of 24.3%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had three members (23.1%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 10 subjects (76.9%) who held a counselor position marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 46.0% and a lower limit of 00.2%.
Subjects who held a support unit position had 18 members (39.1%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 28 subjects (60.9%) who held a support teacher position marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 53.2% and a lower limit of 25.0%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 15 members (26.8%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 41 subjects (73.2%) who held an exceptional education position marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 38.4% and a lower limit of 15.2%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 13 members (46.4%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 15 subjects (53.6%) who held a position classified as other marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a
position classified as other and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 64.9% and a lower limit of 28.0%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 102 members (29.1%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 249 subjects (70.9%) who held a B.A. degree marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 33.8% and a lower limit of 24.3%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 71 members (32.7%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 146 subjects (67.3%) who held an M.A. degree marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 39.0% and a lower limit of 26.5%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 6 members (60.0%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (40.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Advancement as neutral or contributing
to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.4% and a lower limit of 29.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 3 members (37.5%) who marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 5 members (62.5%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Advancement as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Advancement as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.0% and a lower limit of 04.0%.

Recognition

In the sample group as a whole, 409 members (69.8%) marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 177 subjects (30.2%) marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 73.5% and a lower limit of 65.1%.

As a subgroup, 365 female subjects (70.1%) marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A
total of 156 female subjects (29.9%) marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 74.0% and a lower limit of 66.1%.

The male subgroup had 44 subjects (67.7%) who marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 21 male subjects (32.3%) marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 79.1% and a lower limit of 56.3%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 74 members (71.2%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 30 subjects (28.8%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 79.9% and a lower limit of 62.4%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 112 members (78.6%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 47 subjects (21.4%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction.
The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 77.5% and a lower limit of 63.3%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 94 members (63.5%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 54 subjects (36.5%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.3% and a lower limit of 55.8%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 70 members (78.7%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 19 subjects (21.3%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 87.2% and a lower limit of 70.1%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 32 members (66.7%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 16 subjects (33.3%)
with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 80.0% and a lower limit of 53.3%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 27 members (71.1%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 11 subjects (28.9%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 85.5% and a lower limit of 56.6%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 18 members (78.3%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (21.7%) who held an administrative position marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.1% and a lower limit of 61.4%.
Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 284 members (67.6%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 136 subjects (32.4%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 72.1% and a lower limit of 63.1%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 12 members (92.3%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (7.7%) who held a counselor position marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 77.8%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 37 members (80.4%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of nine subjects (19.6%) who held a support teacher position marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Recognition as contributing to
their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 91.1% and a lower limit of 69.0%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 36 members (64.3%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 20 subjects (35.7%) who held an exceptional education position marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 76.8% and a lower limit of 51.7%.

Subjects who held a position that was classified as "other" had 22 members (78.6%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (21.4%) who held a position classified as other marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position that was classified as other and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.8% and a lower limit of 63.4%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 238 members (67.8%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 113 subjects (32.2%) who held a
B.A. degree marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 72.7% and a lower limit of 62.9%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 157 members (72.4%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 60 subjects (27.6%) who held an M.A. degree marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.3% and a lower limit of 66.4%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 8 members (80.0%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (20.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 55.2%. 
Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 6 members (75.0%) who marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (25.0%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked Recognition as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Recognition as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 45.0%.

Responsibility

In the sample group as a whole, 486 subjects (82.9%) marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 100 subjects (17.1%) marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects marking Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 85.9% and a lower limit of 79.9%.

As a subgroup, 425 female subjects (81.6%) marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 96 female subjects who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.9% and a lower limit of 78.2%.
The male subgroup had 61 subjects (93.8%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four male subjects (6.2%) marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 99.7% and a lower limit of 88.0%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 83 members (79.8%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 21 subjects (20.2%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 87.5% and a lower limit of 72.0%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 135 members (84.9%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 24 subjects (15.1%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.5% and a lower limit of 79.3%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 120 members (81.1%) who marked Responsibility as
contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 28 subjects (18.9%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 87.4% and a lower limit of 74.8%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 79 members (88.8%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 10 subjects (11.2%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.3% and a lower limit of 82.2%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 36 members (75.0%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 12 subjects (25.0%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.3% and a lower limit of 82.2%.
Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 87.3% and a lower limit of 62.8%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 33 members (86.8%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (13.6%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.6% and a lower limit of 76.1%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 20 members (87.0%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (13.0%) who held an administrative position marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 73.2%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 335 members (79.8%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 85 subjects (20.2%)
who held a classroom teaching position marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 83.6% and a lower limit of 75.9%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 13 members (100.0%) mark Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held a counselor position who marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 45 members (97.8%) mark Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (2.2%) who held a support teacher position marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 93.6%.
Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 47 members (83.9%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of nine subjects (6.1%) who held an exceptional education position marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.5% and a lower limit of 73.3%.

Subjects who held a position that was classified as "other" had 26 members (92.9%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (7.1%) who held a position that was classified as other marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.7% and a lower limit of 83.3%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 283 members (80.6%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 68 subjects (19.4%) who held a B.A. degree marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95
confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.7% and a lower limit of 76.5%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 187 members (86.2%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 30 subjects (13.8%) who held an M.A. degree marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.8% and a lower limit of 81.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 8 members (80.0%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (20.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.4% and a lower limit of 41.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 7 members (87.5%) who marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (12.5%) who held an
Ed.D. degree marked Responsibility as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Responsibility as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 64.6%.

Professional Growth

In the sample group as a whole, 377 members (64.3%) marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 209 subjects (35.7%) marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 68.2% and a lower limit of 60.5%.

As a subgroup, 343 female subjects (65.8%) marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 178 female subjects (34.2%) marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 70.0% and a lower limit of 30.0%.

The male subgroup had 34 subjects (52.3%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job
satisfaction. A total of 31 male subjects (47.7%) marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 64.5% and a lower limit of 40.2%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 65 members (62.5%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 39 subjects (37.5%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.8% and a lower limit of 53.2%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 90 members (56.6%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 69 subjects (43.4%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 64.3% and a lower limit of 48.9%.
Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 86 members (58.1%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 62 subjects (41.9%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 66.1% and a lower limit of 50.2%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 65 members (73.0%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 24 subjects (27.0%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 82.3% and a lower limit of 63.8%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 37 members (77.1%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 11 subjects (22.9%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to
their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 89.0% and a lower limit of 65.2%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 34 members (89.5%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (10.5%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 99.2% and lower limit of 79.2%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 19 members (82.6%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (17.4%) who held an administrative position marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.1% and a lower limit of 67.1%. 
Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 260 members (61.9%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 160 subjects (38.1%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 66.5% and a lower limit of 57.2%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 12 members (92.3%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (7.7%) who held a counselor position marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to her job satisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 77.8%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 31 members (67.4%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 15 subjects (32.6%) who held a support teacher position marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all
subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 80.9% and a lower limit of 53.8%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 33 members (58.9%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 23 subjects (41.1%) who held an exceptional education position marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.8% and a lower limit of 46.0%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 22 members (78.6%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (21.4%) who held a position classified as other marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.8% and a lower limit of 63.4%. 
Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 218 members (62.1%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 133 subjects (37.9%) who held a B.A. degree marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 67.2% and a lower limit of 57.0%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 148 members (68.2%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 69 subjects (31.8%) who held an M.A. degree marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 74.4% and a lower limit of 62.0%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 6 members (60.0%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (40.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Professional Growth as contributing to
their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.4% and a lower limit of 29.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 5 members (62.5%) who marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (37.5%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked Professional Growth as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Professional Growth as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 96.0% and a lower limit of 29.0%.

Work Itself

In the sample group as a whole, 439 subjects (84.1%) marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 93 subjects (15.9%) marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 87.1% and lower limit of 81.2%.

As a subgroup, 433 female subjects (83.1%) marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 88 female subjects (16.9%) marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95
confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.3% and a lower limit of 79.9%.

The male subgroup had 60 members (92.3%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 5 male subjects (7.7%) marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.8% and a lower limit of 85.8%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 87 members (83.7%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 17 subjects (16.3%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.8% and a lower limit of 76.5%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 136 members (85.5%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 23 subjects (14.5%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10
years of teaching experience who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 91.0% and a lower limit of 80.1%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 118 members (79.7%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 30 subjects (20.3%) with 11-15 years of teaching marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.2% and a lower limit of 73.3%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 72 members (80.9%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job dissatisfaction. A total of 17 subjects (19.1%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 89.1% and a lower limit of 72.7%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 44 members (91.7%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (8.3%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Work Itself
as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 99.5% and a lower limit of 83.8%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 36 members (94.7%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (5.3%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 87.6%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 20 members (87.0%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (13.0%) who held an administrative position marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 73.2%.
Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 349 members (83.1%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 71 subjects (16.9%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.7% and a lower limit of 79.5%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 12 members (92.3%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (7.7%) who held a counselor position marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 77.8%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 34 members (73.9%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 12 subjects (26.1%) who held a support teacher position marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Work Itself as contributing to
their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.6% and a lower limit of 61.2%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 52 members (92.9%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (7.1%) who held an exceptional education position marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 99.6% and a lower limit of 86.1%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 26 members (92.9%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (7.1%) who held a position classified as other marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 83.3%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 288 members (82.1%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 63 subjects (17.9%) who held a B.A. degree marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval
for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.1% and a lower limit of 78.0%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 190 members (87.6%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 27 subjects (12.4%) who held an M.A. degree marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 91.9% and a lower limit of 83.2%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 7 members (70.0%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (30.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.4% and a lower limit of 41.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 8 members (100.0%) who marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held an Ed.D.
degree who marked Work Itself as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Work Itself as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

**Hygiene Elements**

**Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues**

In the sample group as a whole, 492 members (84.0%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues (IRC) as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 94 subjects (16.0%) marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.9% and a lower limit of 81.0%.

As a subgroup, 440 female subjects (84.5%) marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 81 female subjects (15.5%) marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.6% and a lower limit of 81.3%.

The male subgroup had 52 members (80.0%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 13
male subjects (20.0%) marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 89.7% and a lower limit of 70.3%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 92 members (88.5%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 12 subjects (11.5%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 94.6% and a lower limit of 82.3%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 125 members (78.6%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 34 members (21.4%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 85.0% and a lower limit of 72.2%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 119 members (80.4%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 29 subjects (19.6%) with
11-15 years of teaching experience marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.8% and a lower limit of 74.0%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 79 members (88.8%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 10 subjects (11.2%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.3% and a lower limit of 82.2%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 45 members (93.8%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (6.2%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 86.9%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 32 members (84.2%) who marked IRC as contributing to
their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (15.8%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.8% and a lower limit of 72.6%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 21 members (91.3%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (8.7%) who held an administrative position marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 79.8%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 349 members (83.1%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 71 subjects (16.9%) who held a classroom teacher position marked as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.7% and a lower limit of 79.5%.
Subjects who held a counselor position had 13 members (100.0%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held a counselor position that marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 39 members (84.8%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of seven subjects (15.2%) who held a support teacher position marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.2% and a lower limit of 74.4%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 46 members (82.1%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 10 subjects (17.9%) who held an exceptional education position marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 92.2% and a lower limit of 72.1%.
Subjects who held a position that was classified as "other" had 24 members (85.7%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (14.3%) who held a position classified as other marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.7% and a lower limit of 72.8%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 287 members (81.8%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 64 subjects (18.2%) marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 85.85% and a lower limit of 77.7%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 187 members (68.2%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 30 subjects (13.8%) who held an M.A. degree marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.8% and a lower limit of 81.6%.
Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 10 members (100.0%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held an Ed.S. degree who marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 8 members (100.0%) who marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held an Ed.D. degree who marked IRC as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked IRC as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Interpersonal Relationships With Students

In the sample group as a whole, 533 subjects (90.9%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 53 subjects (9.1%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Interpersonal
Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.3% and a lower limit of 93.9%.

As a subgroup, 474 female subjects (90.9%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 47 female subjects (9.1%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.4% and a lower limit of 88.5%.

The male subgroup had 59 subjects (90.7%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 6 male subjects marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.8% and a lower limit of 83.7%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 96 members (92.3%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of eight subjects (7.7%) with 0-5 years of teaching
experience marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.4% and a lower limit of 87.2%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 144 members who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 15 subjects (9.4%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.1% and a lower limit of 86.0%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 131 members (88.5%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 17 subjects (11.5%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15
years of teaching experience who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.7% and a lower limit of 83.4%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 81 members (91.0%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of eight subjects (9.0%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.0% and a lower limit of 85.1%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 46 members (95.8%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (4.2%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 90.2%.
Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 35 members (92.1%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (7.9%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 83.5%.

Subjects who held administrative job positions had 21 members (91.3%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (8.7%) who held an administrative position marked Interpersonal Relationships with students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 80.0%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 379 members (90.2%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 21 subjects (9.8%) who held a classroom teacher
position marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects that held a classroom teacher position and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.1% and a lower limit of 87.4%.

Subjects that held a counselor position had 12 members (92.3%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (7.7%) who held a counselor position marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects that held a counselor position and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 77.9%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 42 members (91.3%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (8.7%) who held support teacher positions marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support unit position and marked Interpersonal
Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 99.4% and a lower limit of 83.2%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 54 members (96.4%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were two subjects who held an exceptional education position who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 91.6%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 25 members (89.2%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (10.8%) who held a position classified as other marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects that held a position classified as other and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 77.8%. 
Subjects that held a B.A. degree had 334 members (90.5%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 33 subjects (9.5%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects that held a B.A. degree and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.7% and a lower limit of 87.5%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 199 members (91.7%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 18 subjects (8.3%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects that held an M.A. degree and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.4% and a lower limit of 88.0%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 9 members (90.0%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (10.0%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all
subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job dissatisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 71.4%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 7 members (87.5%) who marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (12.5%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The.95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Interpersonal Relationships with Students as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 64.6%.

Interpersonal Relationships with Supervisors

In the sample group as a whole, 421 subjects (71.8%) marked Interpersonal Relationships with Supervisors (IPRS) as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 165 subjects (28.2%) marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects that marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 75.5% and a lower limit of 68.2%.

As a subgroup, 374 female subjects (71.8%) marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 147
female subjects (28.2%) marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 75.6% and a lower limit of 67.9%.

The male subgroup had 47 members (72.3%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 18 male subjects (27.7%) marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 83.2% and a lower limit of 61.4%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 69 members (66.3%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 35 subjects (33.7%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 75.4% and a lower limit of 57.3%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 113 members (71.1%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 46 subjects (28.9%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked IPRS as neutral or
contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.1% and a lower limit of 64.0%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 103 members (69.6%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 45 subjects (30.4%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 77.0% and a lower limit of 62.2%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 67 members (75.3%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 22 subjects (24.7%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.2% and a lower limit of 66.3%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 36 members (75.0%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their
job satisfaction. A total of 12 subjects (25.0%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 87.3% and a lower limit of 62.8%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 33 members (86.85) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (13.2%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.6% and a lower limit of 76.1%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 20 members (87.0%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (13.0%) who held an administrative position marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 73.2%.
Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 297 members (70.7%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 123 subjects (29.3%) who held a classroom teaching position marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teaching position and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 75.1% and a lower limit of 66.4%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 13 members (100.0%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held a counselor position who marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 36 subjects (78.3%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 10 subjects (21.7%) who held a support teacher position marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job satisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.2% and a lower limit of 66.3%.
Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 33 members (58.9%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 23 subjects (41.1%) who held an exceptional education position marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.8% and a lower limit of 46.0%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 22 members (78.6%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (21.4%) who held a position classified as other marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.8% and a lower limit of 63.4%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 244 members (69.5%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 107 subjects (30.5%) who held a B.A. degree marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked IPRS as
contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 74.3% and a lower limit of 64.7%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 162 members (74.7%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 55 subjects (25.3%) who held an M.A. degree marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 80.4% and a lower limit of 68.9%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 9 members (90.0%) who marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (10.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 71.4%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 6 members (75.0%) marked IPRS as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (25.0%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked IPRS as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked IPRS as
contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 45.0%.

Job Security

In the sample group as a whole, 399 subjects (68.1%) marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 187 subjects (31.9%) marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.8% and a lower limit of 64.3%.

As a subgroup, 353 female subjects (67.8%) marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 168 female subjects (32.2%) marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.8% and a lower limit of 63.7%.

The male subgroup had 46 members (70.8%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 19 male subjects (29.2%) marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked
Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 81.8% and a lower limit of 59.7%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 56 members (53.8%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 48 subjects (46.2%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 63.4% and a lower limit of 44.3%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 108 members (67.9%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 51 subjects (32.1%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 75.2% and a lower limit of 60.7%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 101 members (68.2%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 47 subjects (31.8%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction.
The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 75.7% and a lower limit of 60.7%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 61 members (68.5%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 28 subjects (31.5%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.2% and a lower limit of 58.9%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 40 members (83.3%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of eight subjects (16.7%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.9% and a lower limit of 72.8%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 40 members (83.3%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of eight
subjects (16.7%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.9% and a lower limit of 72.8%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 11 members (47.8%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 12 subjects (52.2%) who held an administrative position marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 68.2% and a lower limit of 27.4%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 286 members (68.1%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 134 subjects (31.9%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 72.6% and a lower limit of 63.6%.
Subjects who held a counselor position had 9 members (69.2%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (30.8%) who held a counselor position marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 94.3% and a lower limit of 44.1%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 26 members (56.5%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 20 subjects (43.5%) who held a support teacher position marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 70.8% and a lower limit of 42.2%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 45 members (80.4%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 11 subjects (19.6%) who held an exceptional education position marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and
marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.8% and a lower limit of 70.0%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 22 members (78.6%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (21.4%) who held a position classified as other marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.8% and a lower limit of 63.4%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 244 members (69.5%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 107 subjects (30.5%) who held a B.A. degree marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 74.3% and a lower limit of 64.7%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 143 members (65.9%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 74 subjects (34.1%) who held an M.A. degree marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95
confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 72.2% and a lower limit of 59.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 8 members (80.0%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (20.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 55.2%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 4 members (50.0%) who marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (50.0%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked Job Security as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Job Security as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.6% and a lower limit of 15.4%.

Personal Life

In the sample group as a whole, 254 subjects (43.3%) marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 332 subjects (56.7%) marked
Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects marking Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 47.4% and a lower limit of 39.3%.

As a subgroup, 226 female subjects (43.3%) marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 295 female subjects (56.7%) marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 47.6% and a lower limit of 39.1%.

The male subgroup had 28 subjects (43.0%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 37 male subjects (57.0%) marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 55.1% and a lower limit of 31.0%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 41 members (39.4%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 63 subjects (60.6%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction.
The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 48.8% and a lower limit of 30.0%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 62 members (38.9%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 97 subjects (61.1%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 46.6% and a lower limit of 31.4%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 63 members (42.5%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 85 subjects (57.5%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 50.5% and a lower limit of 34.6%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 45 members (50.5%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 44 subjects (49.5%)
with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 60.9% and a lower limit of 40.2%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 17 members (35.4%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 31 subjects (64.6%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 48.9% and a lower limit of 21.9%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 26 members (68.4%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 12 subjects (31.6%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 83.2% and a lower limit of 53.6%.
Subjects who held an administrative position had 16 members (69.5%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 7 members (30.5%) who held an administrative position marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 88.4% and a lower limit of 50.8%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 179 members (42.6%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 241 subjects (57.4%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 47.3% and a lower limit of 37.9%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 6 members (46.1%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of seven subjects (53.9%) who held a counselor position marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 88.4% and a lower limit of 50.8%.
position and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 73.3% and a lower limit of 19.1%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 20 members (43.4%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 26 subjects (56.6%) who held a support unit position marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 57.8% and a lower limit of 29.2%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 20 members (35.7%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 36 subjects (64.3%) who held an exceptional education position marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 48.3% and a lower limit of 23.2%.

Subjects who held a position that was classified as "other" had 13 members (46.4%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 15
subjects (53.6%) who held positions classified as other marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 44.1% and a lower limit of 33.9%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 106 members (48.8%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 111 subjects (51.2%) who held an M.A. degree marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 55.5% and a lower limit of 42.2%

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 7 members (70.0%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (30.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.4% and a lower limit of 41.5%. 
Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 4 members (50.0%) who marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (50.0%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked Personal Life as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Personal Life as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.6% and a lower limit of 15.4%.

Salary

In the sample group as a whole, 299 members (34.0%) marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 387 subjects (66.0%) marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 37.8% and a lower limit of 30.1%.

As a subgroup, 181 female subjects (34.7%) marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 405 female subjects (65.3%) marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 38.9% and a lower limit of 30.7%.
The male subgroup had 18 subjects (27.7%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 47 male subjects (72.3%) marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 38.6% and a lower limit of 16.8%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 34 members (32.7%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 70 subjects (32.7%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 41.7% and a lower limit of 23.7%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 53 members (33.3%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total 106 subjects (66.7%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 40.7% and a lower limit of 26.0%.
Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 43 members (29.1%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 105 subjects (70.9%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 36.4% and a lower limit of 21.7%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 35 members (39.3%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 54 members (60.7%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 49.5% and a lower limit of 29.2%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 23 members (27.1%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 35 members (72.9%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Salary as contributing to
their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 39.7% and a lower limit of 14.5%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 21 members who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 17 members (44.7%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.1% and a lower limit of 39.4%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 12 members (52.2%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 11 subjects (47.8%) who held an administrative position marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 72.6% and a lower limit of 31.8%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 131 members (31.2%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 289 subjects (68.8%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95
confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 35.6% and a lower limit of 26.8%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 3 members (23.1%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 10 subjects (76.9%) who held a counselor position marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 46.0% and a lower limit of 00.2%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 18 members (39.1%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 28 subjects (60.9%) who held a support teacher position marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 53.2% and a lower limit of 25.0%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 25 members (44.6%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 31 members (55.4%) who held an exceptional education position marked Salary as
neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 57.7% and a lower limit of 31.6%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 10 members (35.7%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 18 subjects (64.3%) who held a position classified as other marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 53.5% and a lower limit of 00.2%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 106 members (30.2%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 245 subjects (30.2%) who held a B.A. degree marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 35.0% and a lower limit of 25.4%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 85 members (39.2%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 132 subjects (60.8%) who held an
M.A. degree marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 45.7% and a lower limit of 32.7%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 5 members (50.0%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (50.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 81.0% and a lower limit of 19.0%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 3 members (37.5%) who marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (62.5%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked Salary as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Salary as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 71.0% and a lower limit of 04.0%.

School Policy and Administration

In the sample group as a whole, 355 subjects (57.1%) marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to
their job satisfaction. A total of 251 subjects (42.9%) marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects marking School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 61.2% and a lower limit of 53.2%.

As a subgroup, 297 female subjects (57.0%) marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 224 female subjects (43.0%) marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 61.3% and a lower limit of 52.8%.

The male subgroup had 38 subjects (58.4%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 27 male subjects (41.6%) marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 70.4% and a lower limit of 46.5%.
Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 63 members (60.5%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 41 subjects (39.5%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 70.0% and a lower limit of 51.2%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 84 members (52.8%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 75 subjects (47.2%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 60.6% and a lower limit of 45.1%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 74 members (50.0%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 74 subjects (50.0%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or
contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 58.1% and a lower limit of 41.9%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 53 members (59.5%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 35 subjects (40.5%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 69.7% and a lower limit of 49.4%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 29 members (60.4%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 19 subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing
to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 74.3% and a lower limit of 46.6%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 32 members (84.2%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (15.8%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 95.8% and a lower limit of 72.6%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 17 members (73.9%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of six subjects (26.1%) who held an administrative position marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 91.9% and a lower limit of 56.0%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 232 members (55.2%) who marked School Policy and Administration
as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 188 subjects (44.8%) who held a classroom teacher position marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked School Policy as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 60.0% and a lower limit of 50.5%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had eight members (61.5%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (38.5%) who held a counselor position marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 88.0% and a lower limit of 35.1%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 33 members (71.3%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 13 subjects (28.7%) who held a support teacher position marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and
marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.8% and a lower limit of 58.7%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 28 members (50.0%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 28 subjects (50.0%) who held an exceptional education position marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 63.1% and a lower limit of 37.0%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 17 members (60.7%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 11 subjects (39.3%) who held a position classified as other marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.8% and a lower limit of 42.6%.
Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 196 members (55.8%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 155 subjects (44.2%) who held a B.A. degree marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 61.0% and a lower limit of 50.6%.

Subjects who held an M.A. had 124 members (57.1%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 93 subjects (42.9%) who held an M.A. degree marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 63.7% and a lower limit of 50.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 9 members (90.0%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (10.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to her job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all
subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 71.4%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had six members (75.0%) who marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (25.0%) who held an Ed.D. degree who marked School Policy and Administration as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked School Policy and Administration as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 45.0%.

Status

In the sample group as a whole, 447 subjects (76.3%) marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 139 subjects (23.7%) marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 79.7% and a lower limit of 72.8%.

As a subgroup, 393 females (75.4%) marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 128
female subjects (24.6%) marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 79.1% and a lower limit of 71.1%.

The male subgroup had 54 members (83.1%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 11 male subjects (16.9%) marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 92.2% and a lower limit of 74.0%.

Subjects with 0–5 years of teaching experience had 85 members (81.7%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 19 subjects (18.3%) with 0–5 years of teaching experience marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0–5 years of teaching experience who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 89.2% and a lower limit of 74.3%.

Subjects with 6–10 years of teaching experience had 116 members (73.0%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 43 subjects (27.0%) with 6–20
years of teaching experience marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 79.9% and a lower limit of 66.1%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 106 members (71.6%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 42 subjects (28.4%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.9% and a lower limit of 64.4%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 61 members (68.5%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 28 subjects (31.5%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.2% and a lower limit of 58.9%.
Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 43 members (89.6%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (10.4%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.2% and a lower limit of 80.9%.

Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 36 members (94.7%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (5.3%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 87.6%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 19 members (82.6%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (17.4%) who held an administrative position marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Status as contributing
to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.1% and a lower limit of 67.1%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 314 members (74.8%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 106 subjects (25.2%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.9% and a lower limit of 70.6%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 12 members (92.3%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (7.7%) who held a counselor position marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 77.8%.

Subjects who held a support unit position had 38 members (82.6%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of eight subjects (17.4%) who held a support teacher position marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95
confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 93.6% and a lower limit of 71.7%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 40 members (71.4%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 16 subjects (28.6%) who held an exceptional education position marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 83.3% and a lower limit of 59.6%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 24 members (85.7%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (14.3%) who held a position classified as other marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.7% and a lower limit of 72.8%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 275 members (78.3%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 76 subjects (21.7%) who held a
B.A. degree marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 82.7% and a lower limit of 74.0%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 158 members (72.8%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 59 subjects (27.2%) who held an M.A. degree marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.7% and a lower limit of 66.9%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 8 members (80.0%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (20%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Status as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 55.2%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 6 members (75.0%) who marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (25.0%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked Status as neutral or contributing to
their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Status as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 45.0%.

**Supervision**

In the sample group as a whole, 468 subjects (79.9%) marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 118 subjects (20.1%) marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 83.1% and a lower limit of 76.6%.

As a subgroup, 419 female subjects (80.4%) marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 102 female subjects (19.6%) marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 83.8% and a lower limit of 77.0%.

The male subgroup had 49 subjects (75.4%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 16 male subjects (24.6%) marked Supervision as
neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 85.9% and a lower limit of 64.9%.

Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 86 members (87.7%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 18 subjects (17.3%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.0% and a lower limit of 75.4%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 129 members (81.1%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 30 subjects (15.1%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 87.2% and a lower limit of 75.1%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 115 members (77.7%) who marked Supervision as contributing
to their job satisfaction. A total of 33 subjects (22.3%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.4% and a lower limit of 71.0%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 68 members (76.4%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 21 subjects (23.6%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 85.2% and a lower limit of 67.6%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 37 members (77.1%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 11 subjects (22.9%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 89.0% and a lower limit of 65.2%.
Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 33 members (86.8%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of five subjects (13.2%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 97.6% and a lower limit of 76.1%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 19 members (82.6%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (17.4%) who held an administrative position marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.1% and a lower limit of 68.1%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 335 members (79.8%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 85 subjects who held a classroom teacher position marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom
teacher position and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 83.6% and a lower limit of 75.9%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 13 members (100.0%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. There were no subjects who held a counselor position who marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 100.0%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 45 members (87.0%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (13.0%) who held a support teacher position marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 96.7% and a lower limit of 77.2%.

Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 37 members (65.1%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 19 subjects (34.9%) who held an exceptional education position marked
Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 78.5% and a lower limit of 53.7%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 24 members (85.7%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 4 members (14.3%) who held a position classified as other marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.7% and a lower limit of 72.8%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 232 members (80.3%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 69 subjects (19.7%) who held a B.A. degree marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.5% and a lower limit of 76.2%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 172 members (79.3%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction.
satisfaction. A total of 45 subjects (20.7%) who held an M.A. degree marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 84.7% and a lower limit of 73.9%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 7 members (70.0%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of three subjects (30.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 55.2%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 7 members (87.5%) who marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (12.5%) who held an Ed.D. degree marked Supervision as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Supervision as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 64.6%.
Working Conditions

In the sample group as a whole, 427 subjects (72.9%) marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 159 subjects (27.1%) marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The confidence interval, calculated at the .95 level, for all subjects who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 76.5% and a lower limit of 69.2%.

As a subgroup, 385 female subjects (73.9%) marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 236 female subjects (26.1%) marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all female subjects who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 77.7% and a lower limit of 70.1%.

The male subgroup had 42 members (64.6%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 23 male subjects (35.4%) marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all male subjects who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 76.2% and a lower limit of 53.0%.
Subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience had 74 members (71.2%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 30 subjects (28.8%) with 0-5 years of teaching experience marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 79.9% and a lower limit of 62.4%.

Subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience had 121 members (76.1%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 38 subjects (23.9%) with 6-10 years of teaching experience marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 6-10 years of teaching experience who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 82.7% and a lower limit of 69.5%.

Subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience had 99 members (66.9%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 49 subjects (33.1%) with 11-15 years of teaching experience marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to
their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 11-15 years of teaching experience who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 74.5% and a lower limit of 59.3%.

Subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience had 62 members (69.7%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 27 subjects (30.3%) with 16-20 years of teaching experience marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 16-20 years of teaching experience who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 79.2% and a lower limit of 60.1%.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had 35 members (72.9%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 13 subjects (27.1%) with 21-25 years of teaching experience marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 85.5% and a lower limit of 60.3%.
Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had 36 members (94.7%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of two subjects (5.3%) with 26 or more years of teaching experience marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 87.6%.

Subjects who held an administrative position had 19 members (82.6%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (27.4%) who held an administrative position marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an administrative position and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 98.1% and a lower limit of 67.1%.

Subjects who held a classroom teacher position had 303 members (72.1%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 117 subjects (27.9%) who held a classroom teacher position marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to
their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a classroom teacher position and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 76.4% and a lower limit of 67.9%.

Subjects who held a counselor position had 9 members (69.2%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (30.8%) who held a counselor position marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a counselor position and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 94.3% and a lower limit of 44.1%.

Subjects who held a support teacher position had 34 subjects (73.9%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 12 subjects (26.1%) who held a support teacher position marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a support teacher position and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.6% and a lower limit of 61.2%.
Subjects who held an exceptional education position had 42 members (75.0%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 14 subjects (25.0%) who held an exceptional education position marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an exceptional education position and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 86.3% and a lower limit of 63.7%.

Subjects who held a position classified as "other" had 20 members (71.4%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of eight subjects (28.6%) who held a position classified as other marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held a position classified as other and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 88.2% and a lower limit of 54.7%.

Subjects who held a B.A. degree had 258 members (73.5%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 93 subjects (26.5%) marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all
Subjects who held a B.A. degree and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 73.1% and a lower limit of 68.9%.

Subjects who held an M.A. degree had 156 members (71.9%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of 61 subjects (28.1%) who held an M.A. degree marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an M.A. degree and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 77.9% and a lower limit of 65.9%.

Subjects who held an Ed.S. degree had 6 members (60.0%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of four subjects (40.0%) who held an Ed.S. degree marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.S. degree and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 90.4% and a lower limit of 29.6%.

Subjects who held an Ed.D. degree had 7 members (87.5%) who marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction. A total of one subject (12.5%) who held an
Ed.D. degree marked Working Conditions as neutral or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The .95 confidence interval for all subjects who held an Ed.D. degree and marked Working Conditions as contributing to their job satisfaction had an upper limit of 100.0% and a lower limit of 64.6%.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the study, the conclusions drawn, and interpretations of the findings to the field of education. Recommendations for further research are also listed.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to survey the subject certified staff of Florida public elementary schools to determine how elements of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory were perceived as being met in their current school employment. The descriptive study utilized an instrument that listed each of the 16 job factors in Herzberg's theory. The instrument was designed to allow subjects to mark each job factor as contributing to their job satisfaction, neutral, or contributing to their job dissatisfaction. The instrument also had areas to record various biographical data regarding the subjects. The survey was conducted on a randomly selected subject group that was stratified over the five regions of Florida public
schools. A total of 586 usable surveys were returned, a return rate of 71%.

An estimation approach to inferential statistics was used to analyze the data. Interval estimation of the data was done through the construction of confidence intervals at the .95 level. Each job factor was analyzed with regard to the group as a whole and with regard to selected biographical information including sex, years of teaching experience, job position, and degree held by the subject.

**Conclusions**

**Study Question 1**—What percentage of the certified staff of Florida public elementary schools perceive elements of Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory as being met in their current school employment?

The job factors that were perceived by most subjects as contributing to their job satisfaction were Achievement (95.6%) and Interpersonal Relationships with Students (90.9%). The .95 confidence intervals for both job factors were statistically superior to all 14 of the other job factors (Appendix F). Achievement and Interpersonal Relationships with Students were followed by Work Itself (84.1%), Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues (84.0%), Responsibility (82.9%), Supervision (79.9%), Status (76.3%), Working Conditions (72.9%), Interpersonal
Relationships with Supervisors (71.8%), Recognition (69.8%), Job Security (68.1%), Professional Growth (64.3%), School Policy and Administration (57.1%), Personal Life (43.3%), Salary (34.0%), and Advancement (31.1%).

Study Question Number 2--What percentage of the certified staff of Florida public elementary schools perceive elements of Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory as not being met in their current school employment?

The job factors that were perceived by most subjects as not contributing to their job satisfaction were Advancement (68.9%) and Salary (66.0%). The .95 confidence intervals for both job factors were statistically superior to 14 of the other job factors (Appendix F). Advancement and Salary were followed by Personal Life (56.7%), School Policy and Administration (42.9%), Professional Growth (35.7%), Job Security (31.9%), Recognition (30.2%), Interpersonal Relationship with Supervisors (28.2%), Working Conditions (27.1%), Status (23.7%), Supervision (20.1%), Responsibility (17.1%), Interpersonal Relationships with Students (09.1%), and Achievement (04.4%). Relationships with Students (09.1%), and Achievement (04.4%).

Study Question Number 3--Is there a significant difference between the sex of a subject and his/her response to the questionnaire used in the study?
The .95 confidence intervals for male and female subjects overlapped for all job factors with the exception of Responsibility (Appendix G). The confidence interval for males, 99.7% to 88.0%, was significantly different to the confidence interval for females, 84.9% to 78.2%, for the job factor of responsibility.

Study Question Number 4—Is there a significant difference between the number of years of teaching experience a subject has compiled, grouped into five-year intervals, and his/her response to the questionnaire used in the study?

There were no significant differences between subjects with 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16-20 years of teaching experience.

Subjects with 21-25 years of teaching experience had significantly higher scores than subjects with 6-10 and 11-15 years of teaching experience with regard to the job factor of Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues. This group had significantly higher scores to subjects with 0-5 years of teaching experience with regard to Job Security. They also had significantly higher scores to subjects with 6-10, 11-15, and 16-20 years of teaching experience with regard to the job factor of Status.
Subjects with 26 or more years of teaching experience had significantly higher scores than subjects in several other groupings (see Appendix H). The job factors included Achievement (0-5, 6-10, and 11-15), Work Itself (11-15), Interpersonal Relationships with Supervisors (0-5), Job Security (0-5), Personal Life (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 21-25), Salary (11-15), School Policy and Administration (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20), Status (6-10, 11-15, 16-20), and Working Conditions (0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, and 21-25).

Study Question Number 5--Is there a significant difference between the job position held by a subject and his/her responses to the questionnaire used in the study?

Subjects who held an administrative position had confidence intervals higher than subjects who held a classroom teacher position with regards to the job factors of Achievement, Advancement, Professional Growth, and Personal Life. Classroom teachers did not perceive any job factor as contributing to their job satisfaction higher than administrative subjects (see Appendix I).

Study Question Number 6--Is there a significant difference between the degrees held by a subject and his/her response to the questionnaire used in the study?

The .95 confidence intervals for subjects with a B.A. degree and M.A. degree overlapped for all job factors. The low number of subjects who held an Ed.S. degree (10) or an
Ed.D. degree (8) made any comparisons to other groups highly suspect (see Appendix J).

**Interpretations**

The perceptions of the certified staff in Florida public elementary schools may give some insight as to the apparent failure of Florida's State Master Teacher Program and the need for its probable replacement, a career ladder program. The perceptions of the subjects regarding several of the job factors may be interpreted as supportive for changing Florida's current approach to educational reform.

The certified staff in Florida public elementary schools identified two hygiene elements, Salary and Personal Life, as not contributing to their job satisfaction. Salary was perceived to be the lowest hygiene factor, a study conclusion that has been often cited as a problem within the profession. Personal Life was perceived by over half of the study participants as not contributing to their job satisfaction.

The certified staff in Florida public elementary schools identified one motivational job factor, Advancement, as not contributing to their job satisfaction of a large number of their population. The large gap between Advancement and the next higher scored motivator, Professional Growth, seems to indicate that it is in an
area that needs to be addressed by Florida's educational community.

The apparent failure of Florida's main thrust at recognizing and rewarding teachers, the State Master Teacher Program, may be due in part to a design error. The program was never intended to provide monetary rewards and advancement for teachers on a large scale. Yet data from this study indicates that a need for just such a program is perceived to exist by over half of the certified staff members in Florida public elementary schools. It is unfortunate that a good idea was allowed to become a major source of dissatisfaction.

A career ladder program for teachers seems to obtain support in the findings of this study. The career ladder program offers employment steps that are obtainable by large numbers of the teaching population. Salary increases could be tied to the career ladder steps. The certified staff might welcome this program as it could give them the advancement opportunities and salary improvement that they perceive to be lacking in their employment. The Florida legislature is considering a "career ladder" approach for the 1986-87 academic year.

Some positive interpretations can be made from the data produced in this study. Certified staff members in Florida public elementary schools appear to be very pleased with
their relationships with students. Despite continuing news reports of discipline concerns in the schools, almost 90% of the study members perceived "Interpersonal Relationships with Students" as contributing to their job satisfaction. It is obviously a major reason for teachers to remain in the profession.

Certified staff members in Florida public elementary schools seem to be pleased with what they personally achieve in their work. Achievement was perceived by over 90% of the study members as contributing to their job satisfaction. It is important to have the professional staff feeling positive toward their chosen career. Therefore, our school systems must be careful not to overload our teachers with paperwork and create potentially negative situations.

Certified staff members in Florida public elementary schools also seem to be united in their perceptions regarding Herzberg's job factors. Only the job factor of Responsibility was perceived significantly different by male and female subjects. The degree held by a subject, B.A. or M.A., made no significant difference in any job factor perception; yet the perception of the public is the opposite and must be considered. It is common knowledge that our public school system is a vital part of this nation's future. During the past few years, individuals
and/or commissions have questioned the viability of our schools and the potential for allowing individuals to reach excellence. However, the work of Herzberg and this study, give our instructional leaders direction if, indeed, we are "in search of excellence."

**Recommendations**

This study should be replicated using the certified staff members in Florida public secondary schools as the study population. It is a distinct possibility that secondary school personnel will not perceive Herzberg's job factors in the same way that the elementary school personnel perceived them. This analysis will give our state better direction for the future.

Another recommendation is to replicate this study focusing on specific subgroups within the certified staff in Florida public elementary schools' population. Administrators, counselors, support teachers, and exceptional education teachers should be studied to obtain detailed information concerning their unique groups.

It is further recommended that this study be replicated in other states to ascertain the perceptions of certified staff in public elementary schools in other areas of the country with regard to Herzberg's work. Individual states, geographical regions, and national studies should be
considered. The data from such studies could be used to identify problems that could best be addressed by national, regional, or individual state action.

The scope of this study did not include any investigation into the specific nature of the dissatisfaction with job factors. Studies should be undertaken to investigate what elements in job factors, such as Personal Life, are causing the certified staff in Florida public elementary schools to mark them low. Follow-up studies of this nature would provide data on which remedial programs could be designed.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

COPY OF INITIAL LETTER SENT TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
Dear 

I am conducting a statewide survey of the certified staff in Florida public elementary schools. The purpose of this study is to examine how these employees perceive the degree to which their job needs are met. The theoretical framework for this study is Frederick Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

The study is being conducted as part of my doctoral dissertation in Educational Administration and Supervision. The work is being undertaken at the University of Central Florida under the chairmanship of Dr. Art Olson.

Your school has been randomly selected to be part of a stratified sample in this study. In a few days a package will arrive containing survey forms and a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope for returning them. I am requesting your help in conducting this study. Please distribute a copy of the survey instrument to each certified staff member at your school site. Please collect the completed forms by November 16, 1984.

I want to assure you of the complete confidentiality of these questionnaires. The results of this study will not be reported by individual school. The responses of your faculty will never be tabulated as an individual school.

The findings of this study will be used to help identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in the area of employee motivation. As with any descriptive study, the validity of the findings are directly related to the percentage of the questionnaires returned. I would greatly appreciate your help in maximizing the return rate.

I have enclosed a copy of the questionnaire and its cover sheet. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. My work phone number is 305-423-1023. My home phone is 305-574-8115.

Sincerely,

George A. Taylor, III
enclosure
APPENDIX B

COPY OF MATERIALS PACKAGE LETTER
SENT TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
Dear

This package contains material for conducting my research study that I contacted you about in a previous letter. In it you will find:

1. Cover sheets and questionnaires for each certified staff member at your school site. Extra sets have been provided to replace any lost forms after initial distribution.

2. A self-addressed, postage-paid envelope for collecting and returning the completed questionnaires.

3. Please distribute the questionnaires to all certified staff personnel at your school site. For the purpose of this study, all full-time administrative and instructional personnel, including yourself, are to be given questionnaires.

Please collect and return all the questionnaires by November 16, 1984. Your cooperation and help in conducting this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

George A. Taylor, III

enclosure
APPENDIX C

COPY OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT COVER
LETTER TO SUBJECTS
Dear Fellow Educator,

I am an elementary school teacher working in Orange County. As part of my doctoral dissertation, I am conducting a statewide survey of certified staff members in Florida public elementary schools regarding their perceived degree of job satisfaction.

Your school has been randomly selected to take part in this study. Attached to this letter you will find a questionnaire. Please take a few minutes of your time to read the instructions and complete the forms.

Let me assure you that the information that you provide will be kept completely confidential. Do not sign your name to the questionnaire. The data that you provide will be tabulated only in terms of statewide information and not by individual teacher, administrator, or school site.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it to your school's office. As with any descriptive study, the validity of the findings are directly related to the percentage of questionnaires returned. I greatly appreciate you sacrificing a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

George A. Taylor, III

Attachment
APPENDIX D

COPY OF FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
COPY OF FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT
TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

1065 Treadway Drive
Deltona, Florida 32725

Dear

Several weeks ago, I mailed a survey package to your school. The package contained the material to be used in conducting my research study. As of the date of this letter, I have not received a response from your school.

If you have returned the material in the last few days, please excuse this letter and accept my thanks for your help. If you never received the material or need additional material to finish the survey, please call me collect at 305-574-8115.

The validity of the findings of this study is directly related to the percentage of returned questionnaires. I greatly appreciate your help in maximizing the return rate.

Sincerely,

George A. Taylor, III
APPENDIX E

COPY OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT
QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA. Please provide the following information.

1. AGE __________
2. SEX __________
3. DEGREES HELD  B.A. ______ M.A. ______  ED.S. ______  ED.D. ______
4. Years of teaching experience counting present year ______
5. Years of teaching experience outside of Florida ______
6. Job position presently held at your school site:
   Administrative ______ Classroom Teacher ______ Counselor ______
   Support Teacher ______ Exceptional Teacher ______ Other ______

PART II. JOB FACTORS. The second page of this questionnaire lists a series of 15 job factors for you to evaluate. A brief description of each factor is provided so that you may know its meaning as used in this study. Indicate whether each job factor contributes to your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your work in your present teaching position for this school year. Please check the column that best indicates your belief. Below you will find an example of one job factor and the rationale that may be reflected for each column choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT: Successful completion of a job, to experience solutions to different problems, and seeing the results of one's work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to my job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An "X" in the first column would indicate that you feel that this particular job factor was contributing to feelings of satisfaction with your present teaching position.

An "X" in the second column would indicate that you feel that this particular job factor did not contribute to feelings of satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with your present teaching position.

An "X" in the third column would indicate that you feel that this particular job factor was contributing to feelings of dissatisfaction with your present teaching position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT: Successful completion of a job, to experience solutions to different problems, and seeing the results of one's work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS WITH STUDENTS: Basic quality of daily dealings with one's students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION: The rules, regulations and organizational procedures under which you work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL LIFE: Aspects of the job which influence or affects your personal life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY: Control over one's own educational methods and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION: The competence and fairness of your supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOGNITION: To be singled out for praise or accomplishment for work well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH COLLEAGUES: Basic quality of daily dealings with one's co-workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSIBILITY FOR GROWTH: The opportunity to advance in one's own professional skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCEMENT: The opportunity for promotion with the school organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY: Satisfaction with one's contract salary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS WITH SUPERVISORS: Basic quality of daily dealings with one's supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING CONDITIONS: The physical conditions in which you work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ITSELF: Satisfaction with the actual tasks involved in performing the teaching job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS: Your satisfaction with your position as a teacher within your school and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SECURITY: Objective indications of security, such as teacher tenure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR THE TOTAL GROUP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor</th>
<th>Upper Limit</th>
<th>Lower Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationship</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policy and Administration</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BY SEX
## CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor</th>
<th>Female Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>Male Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>97.7%-94.3%</td>
<td>98.8%-85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships With Students</td>
<td>93.4%-88.5%</td>
<td>97.8%-83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>86.3%-79.9%</td>
<td>98.8%-85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships With Colleagues</td>
<td>87.6%-81.3%</td>
<td>89.7%-70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>84.9%-78.2%</td>
<td>99.7%-88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>83.8%-77.0%</td>
<td>85.9%-64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>79.1%-71.1%</td>
<td>92.2%-74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>77.7%-70.1%</td>
<td>76.2%-53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships With Supervisors</td>
<td>75.6%-67.9%</td>
<td>83.2%-61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>74.0%-66.1%</td>
<td>79.1%-56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>71.8%-63.7%</td>
<td>81.8%-59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>69.9%-61.7%</td>
<td>64.5%-40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policy and Administration</td>
<td>61.3%-52.8%</td>
<td>70.4%-46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>47.6%-39.1%</td>
<td>55.1%-31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>38.9%-30.7%</td>
<td>38.6%-16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>35.7%-27.7%</td>
<td>36.8%-15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
## CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor</th>
<th>0-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11-15 Years</th>
<th>16-20 Years</th>
<th>21-25 Years</th>
<th>26+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>97.4-87.2</td>
<td>99.2-93.3</td>
<td>97.8-90.1</td>
<td>100.0-94.7</td>
<td>100.0-93.9</td>
<td>100.0-100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS*</td>
<td>97.4-87.2</td>
<td>95.1-86.0</td>
<td>93.7-83.4</td>
<td>97.0-85.1</td>
<td>100.0-90.2</td>
<td>100.0-83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>90.8-76.5</td>
<td>91.0-80.1</td>
<td>86.2-73.3</td>
<td>89.1-72.7</td>
<td>99.5-83.5</td>
<td>100.0-87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC**</td>
<td>94.6-82.3</td>
<td>85.0-72.2</td>
<td>86.8-74.0</td>
<td>95.3-82.2</td>
<td>87.3-62.8</td>
<td>97.6-76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>87.5-72.0</td>
<td>90.5-79.3</td>
<td>87.4-74.8</td>
<td>95.3-82.2</td>
<td>87.3-62.8</td>
<td>97.6-76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>89.2-74.3</td>
<td>79.9-66.1</td>
<td>78.9-64.4</td>
<td>78.2-58.9</td>
<td>98.2-80.0</td>
<td>100.0-82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>79.9-62.4</td>
<td>82.7-69.5</td>
<td>74.5-59.3</td>
<td>79.2-60.1</td>
<td>85.5-60.3</td>
<td>100.0-87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPRS***</td>
<td>75.4-57.3</td>
<td>78.1-64.0</td>
<td>77.0-62.2</td>
<td>84.2-66.3</td>
<td>87.3-62.8</td>
<td>97.6-76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>79.9-62.4</td>
<td>77.5-63.3</td>
<td>71.3-55.8</td>
<td>87.2-70.1</td>
<td>80.0-53.3</td>
<td>85.5-56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>63.4-44.3</td>
<td>75.2-60.7</td>
<td>75.7-60.7</td>
<td>78.2-58.9</td>
<td>93.9-72.8</td>
<td>93.9-72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>71.8-53.2</td>
<td>64.3-48.9</td>
<td>66.1-50.2</td>
<td>82.3-63.8</td>
<td>89.0-65.2</td>
<td>99.2-79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policy and Administration</td>
<td>70.5-51.2</td>
<td>60.6-45.1</td>
<td>58.1-41.9</td>
<td>69.7-49.4</td>
<td>74.3-46.6</td>
<td>95.8-72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>48.8-30.0</td>
<td>46.6-31.4</td>
<td>50.5-34.6</td>
<td>60.9-40.2</td>
<td>48.9-21.9</td>
<td>83.2-53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>41.7-23.7</td>
<td>40.7-26.0</td>
<td>36.4-21.7</td>
<td>49.5-29.2</td>
<td>39.7-14.5</td>
<td>71.1-39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>44.8-26.4</td>
<td>34.6-20.7</td>
<td>29.8-16.2</td>
<td>42.3-22.8</td>
<td>48.9-21.9</td>
<td>71.1-39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interpersonal Relationships with Students  
**Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues  
***Interpersonal Relationships with Supervisors
APPENDIX I

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS BY JOB POSITION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factor</th>
<th>Administ.</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Counselor Support</th>
<th>Except. Bl.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>100.0-100.0</td>
<td>96.7-92.3</td>
<td>100.0-100.0</td>
<td>100.0-93.6</td>
<td>100.0-91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS *</td>
<td>100.0-80.0</td>
<td>93.1-87.4</td>
<td>100.0-77.9</td>
<td>99.4-83.2</td>
<td>100.0-91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>100.0-73.2</td>
<td>86.7-79.5</td>
<td>100.0-77.8</td>
<td>86.6-61.2</td>
<td>99.6-86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR +</td>
<td>100.0-76.8</td>
<td>86.7-79.5</td>
<td>100.0-100.0</td>
<td>95.2-74.4</td>
<td>92.2-72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>100.0-73.2</td>
<td>83.6-75.9</td>
<td>100.0-100.0</td>
<td>100.0-93.6</td>
<td>93.5-73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>98.1-67.1</td>
<td>83.6-75.9</td>
<td>100.0-100.0</td>
<td>96.7-77.2</td>
<td>78.5-53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>98.1-67.1</td>
<td>78.9-70.6</td>
<td>100.0-77.8</td>
<td>93.6-71.7</td>
<td>83.3-59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>98.1-67.1</td>
<td>76.4-67.9</td>
<td>94.3-44.1</td>
<td>86.6-61.2</td>
<td>86.3-63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPRS *</td>
<td>100.0-73.2</td>
<td>75.1-66.4</td>
<td>100.0-100.0</td>
<td>90.2-66.3</td>
<td>71.8-46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>95.1-61.4</td>
<td>72.1-63.1</td>
<td>100.0-77.8</td>
<td>91.9-69.0</td>
<td>76.8-51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>68.2-27.4</td>
<td>72.6-63.6</td>
<td>94.3-44.1</td>
<td>70.8-42.2</td>
<td>90.8-70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>98.1-67.1</td>
<td>66.5-57.2</td>
<td>100.0-77.8</td>
<td>80.9-33.8</td>
<td>71.8-46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policy and Administration</td>
<td>91.9-56.0</td>
<td>60.0-50.5</td>
<td>88.0-35.1</td>
<td>84.8-58.7</td>
<td>63.1-37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>88.4-50.8</td>
<td>47.3-37.9</td>
<td>73.3-19.1</td>
<td>57.8-29.2</td>
<td>48.3-23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>72.6-31.8</td>
<td>35.6-26.8</td>
<td>46.0-00.2</td>
<td>53.2-25.0</td>
<td>57.7-31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>76.8-36.3</td>
<td>32.9-24.3</td>
<td>46.0-00.2</td>
<td>53.2-25.0</td>
<td>38.4-15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Interpersonal Relationships with Students
+ Interpersonal Relationships with Colleagues
° Interpersonal Relationships with Supervisors
APPENDIX J

CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR B.A. AND M.A. DEGREES
CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR B.A. AND M.A. DEGREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Factors</th>
<th>B.A. Degree</th>
<th>M.A. Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>97.4-93.2</td>
<td>98.5-93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>93.7-87.5</td>
<td>95.4-88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>86.1-78.0</td>
<td>91.9-83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>85.8-77.7</td>
<td>90.8-81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>84.7-76.5</td>
<td>90.8-81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>84.5-76.2</td>
<td>84.7-73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>82.7-74.0</td>
<td>78.7-66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>78.1-68.9</td>
<td>77.9-65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>74.3-64.7</td>
<td>80.4-68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>72.7-62.9</td>
<td>78.3-66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>74.3-64.7</td>
<td>72.2-59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>67.2-57.0</td>
<td>74.4-62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policy and Administration</td>
<td>61.0-50.6</td>
<td>63.7-50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>44.1-33.9</td>
<td>55.5-42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>35.0-25.4</td>
<td>45.7-32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>33.8-24.3</td>
<td>39.0-26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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