


2003

An Assessment Of The Level Of Job Satisfaction Of Middle School Teachers From Selected Affluent Suburban Public School Districts In Essex County, New Jersey

Anthony V. Lanzo
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Other Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lanzo, Anthony V., "An Assessment Of The Level Of Job Satisfaction Of Middle School Teachers From Selected Affluent Suburban Public School Districts In Essex County, New Jersey" (2003). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 194.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/194>

**An Assessment of the Level of Job Satisfaction of Middle School Teachers from Selected
Affluent Suburban Public School Districts in Essex County, New Jersey**

By

Anthony V. Lanzo

Dissertation Committee

**Anthony J. Colella, Ph.D., Mentor
John Collins, Ed.D
Rita O'Kane, Ph.D.**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University
2003**

© Anthony V. Lanzo, 2003
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to all the members of my dissertation committee. To Dr. Anthony Colella, my mentor, I offer thanks for his guidance, kind words of encouragement, positive outlook, and tremendous professional support. To Dr. John Collins, I offer thanks for his advice, professional support, attention to detail, and patience. To Dr. Rita O'Kane, I offer her thanks for her nurturing, kind manner, and keen insight. She was my mentor during my first year teaching in public education and has graciously offered her time as a committee member with this project.

To the New Jersey public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey who participated in this study, I offer special thanks for their cooperation and time with the completion of the survey instruments.

To my colleagues, in the Livingston, Bernards, and Verona public school districts and Saint Rocco School in Newark, I offer deep appreciation for their professional support and sound advice with my career over the years.

To Anthony Decina, former principal of Saint Rocco School in Newark, I offer thanks in his memory, as he gave me the opportunity to be a teacher. He demonstrated the important qualities of a master teacher.

To Ralph Celebre, former principal of Riker Hill School in Livingston, I offer thanks for encouraging me to pursue school administration.

To Edward Berk, principal of H. B. Whitehorne Middle School in Verona, I offer sincere gratitude for his modeling of effective administrative techniques. I was very fortunate, personally and professionally, to work with him as his assistant principal.

To Dr. Robert Rosado, Superintendent of Verona Public Schools, I offer thanks for the opportunity as a building principal and for his support while I completed my dissertation.

To Valerie Goger, Superintendent of Bernards Township Public Schools, and Regina Rudolph, Assistant Superintendent of Bernards Township Public Schools, I offer sincere thanks for supporting me during my first year as an assistant principal. Their kind words and acts contributed to my level of job satisfaction as a first year administrator.

To my parents, Madeline and George Lanzo, my brothers, Michael and George Lanzo, and my sister-in-law, Mary, I offer heartfelt thanks for their faith in me as I ascertained my professional goals, which included the completion of the Degree of Doctor of Education and my professional growth in the field of education as a teacher and as a school administrator.

To my sister, Antoinette, I offer a special thank you for her loving support as she always had my best interest at heart. Her confidence, patience, encouragement, positive attitude, friendship, and advice have always been a driving force behind my professional and personal triumphs.

To my nieces, Dana, Gina, Kerry, Lisa, MaryKate, Shannon, and Susan and my nephew Michael, I offer thanks for their warm, respectful support over the years as I worked to achieve my goals.

To my family friend, Pete Parsels, I offer him thanks for his interest and concern for my professional success.

To my close friends, Jim Cunningham, Angelo Esposito, Bill Ippolito, Nancy Sisler LaVecchia, Barbara Lee, Chris Luciani, Sean Susani, and Marybeth Pugliese Troncone, I offer my sincere appreciation for their support, understanding, and encouragement.

To Sharon Smith, I offer her thanks for her loving support, patience, encouragement, understanding, and consideration. Her confidence in my abilities as I completed this important work was highly motivating.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my parents, Madeline and George Lanzo, and my sister,
Antoinette Lanzo, whose love and encouragement made this a reality.

ABSTRACT

An Assessment of the Level of Job Satisfaction of Middle School Teachers from Selected Affluent Suburban Public School Districts in Essex County, New Jersey.

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected affluent suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey in order to report and analyze the aspects of the job. Also, the purpose was to determine and support teachers' reported level of overall job satisfaction.

A written request was granted by each of the superintendents in preselected Essex County, New Jersey public school districts. After communicating the nature of the study with the principal through a letter of solicitation, the researcher personally visited each middle school in order to disseminate the surveys along with an informed consent form for each middle school teacher. The participants that received the survey packets were public middle school teachers that were currently employed with a participating district. It took approximately 10 to 15 minutes for the volunteers to read the informed consent form, complete the survey instruments and the demographic data questionnaire, and place all of the survey materials in an envelope.

The distributed instrument included the Job Descriptive Index Revised (JDI) including the Job in General (JIG) Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra, (1997) and the Stress in General (SIG) scales Stanton, Balzer, Smith, Parra, & Ironson (2001). A demographic data questionnaire, created by the researcher, was also

included in the packet. The instruments were self-administered by the individual participants.

This study found that although teachers were dissatisfied with the aspects of salary and opportunities for promotion and were experiencing high levels of stress, 97.05% were satisfied with their job in general. It was concluded that the role of the building administrator greatly impacted the level of satisfaction among teachers primarily through the school climate that the administrator created. Teachers that reported an ability to express their personal and professional needs to building administrators through open lines of communication, reported being satisfied with the teaching profession and also having a stronger commitment to the mission of the school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Goals of the Research.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Research Hypotheses.....	6
Null Hypothesis 1.....	6
Null Hypothesis 2.....	6
Null Hypothesis 3.....	6
Null Hypothesis 4.....	7
Null Hypothesis 5.....	7
Null Hypothesis 6.....	7
Null Hypothesis 7.....	7
Null Hypothesis 8.....	8
Null Hypothesis 9.....	8
Null Hypothesis 10.....	8
Null Hypothesis 11.....	8
Null Hypothesis 12.....	8
Null Hypothesis 13.....	9
Theoretical Rationale.....	9
Definition of Terms.....	11
Limitations of the Study.....	13
Significance of the Study.....	14
Organization of the Study.....	15
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	16
Research of Job Satisfaction Beyond the Arena of Education.....	17
Workplace Conditions.....	18
Highest Degree Held.....	19
Opportunities for Promotion.....	20
Salary.....	21
Age.....	21
Stress.....	22
Gender.....	23
Commitment.....	29

Part-time Versus Full-time Status.....	32
Years of Experience.....	32
School Climate.....	33
Administration.....	36
 III.METHODOLOGY.....	 42
Introduction.....	42
Purpose of the Study.....	42
Goals of the Research.....	42
Research Questions.....	43
Null Hypotheses.....	43
Null Hypothesis 1.....	43
Null Hypothesis 2.....	44
Null Hypothesis 3.....	44
Null Hypothesis 4.....	44
Null Hypothesis 5.....	44
Null Hypothesis 6.....	45
Null Hypothesis 7.....	45
Null Hypothesis 8.....	45
Null Hypothesis 9.....	45
Null Hypothesis 10.....	45
Null Hypothesis 11.....	46
Null Hypothesis 12.....	46
Null Hypothesis 13.....	46
Participants and Identification Process.....	46
Identification of a School in a Participating District.....	48
Contacting Building Principals.....	49
Distribution of Survey Packets.....	49
Participants.....	50
Parental Permission.....	50
Anonymous and Confidential Responses.....	51
Materials and Organization of Survey Packets.....	52
Completion Time of Survey Packets.....	52
Permission for Use of the Survey Instrument.....	52
Permission to Distribute Survey Materials to Human Subjects.....	53
Instruments.....	53
Job Descriptive Index Revised (JDI).....	53
Job in General Scale (JIG).....	54
JDI and JIG: Useful Measures of Job Satisfaction.....	54
Scoring the JDI including the JIG.....	55
Missing Responses.....	56
Improving the Accuracy of Scoring.....	57
Stress in General Scales SIG I –Pressure.....	57
Stress in General Scales SIG II – Threat.....	57
Reliability for the SIG I – Pressure Scale.....	58

Reliability for the SIG II – Threat Scale.....	58
Reliability Analysis for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI).....	59
Reliability Analysis for the Job in General (JIG).....	60
Data Analysis Plan.....	61
Summary.....	62
IV. DATA ANALYSIS.....	63
Purpose of the Study.....	63
Research Questions.....	63
Introduction.....	64
Background of Participating Districts.....	65
Demographic Analyses.....	67
Analysis of Research Questions.....	87
Null Hypothesis 1.....	88
Null Hypothesis 2.....	91
Null Hypothesis 3.....	94
Null Hypothesis 4.....	97
Null Hypothesis 5.....	100
Null Hypothesis 6.....	103
Null Hypothesis 7.....	106
Null Hypothesis 8.....	109
Null Hypothesis 9.....	111
Null Hypothesis 10.....	115
Null Hypothesis 11.....	118
Null Hypothesis 12.....	120
Null Hypothesis 13.....	123
Summary.....	126
V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	127
Summary of the Study.....	127
Research Question 1.....	129
Null Hypotheses 1-3.....	129
Null Hypotheses 4-5.....	130
Research Question 2.....	130
Null Hypothesis 6.....	130
Research Question 3.....	131
Null Hypotheses 7-8.....	131
Research Question 4.....	131
Null Hypotheses 9-13.....	132
Conclusions.....	133
Responding to Research Question 1.....	133
Responding to Null Hypothesis 1.....	133
JDI Work on Present Job.....	133

Responding to Null Hypothesis 2.....	134
JDI Pay	134
Responding to Null Hypothesis 3.....	136
JDI Opportunities for Promotion.....	136
Responding to Null Hypothesis 4.....	137
JDI Supervision.....	137
Responding to Null Hypothesis 5.....	138
JDI People on Present Job.....	138
Summary.....	140
Responding to Research Question 2.....	140
Responding to Null Hypothesis 6.....	141
Summary	141
Responding to Research Question 3.....	142
Responding to Null Hypothesis 7.....	142
SIG I-Pressure.....	142
Responding to Null Hypothesis 8.....	143
SIG II-Threat.....	143
Summary.....	144
Responding to Research Question 4.....	145
Responding to Null Hypothesis 9.....	146
Independent Variable Age.....	146
Responding to Null Hypothesis 10.....	147
Independent Variable Salary.....	147
Responding to Null Hypothesis 11.....	149
Independent Variable Years in Teaching.....	149
Responding to Null Hypothesis 12.....	150
Independent Variable Highest Degree Held.....	150
Responding to Null Hypothesis 13.....	152
Independent Variable Gender.....	152
Summary of the Hypotheses.....	153
Null Hypothesis 9.....	153
Null Hypothesis 10.....	154
Null Hypothesis 12.....	154
Null Hypothesis 13.....	154
Demographic Profile.....	154
Implications.....	155
Local Policy.....	156
National Policy.....	156
Practice.....	158
Recommendations for Future Research.....	160
Summary.....	160
REFERENCES.....	161
APPENDICES.....	167

A. Request for Approval Form.....	167
B. Approval for Dissertation Proposal.....	168
C. Informed Consent Form.....	169
D. Letter of Solicitation.....	173
E. JDI and JIG.....	176
F. SIG I Pressure and SIG II Threat.....	179
G. Demographic Data Questionnaire.....	180
H. NJ District Factor Groupings.....	181

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The purpose of education is to fulfill the obligation of providing our country with young adults that can demonstrate various levels of thinking and problem-solving skills along with various standards that have been set by each individual state in our union. According to Wood (1992) democracy requires citizens who participate in broad public decision-making with an eye toward the common good. Citizens must thus be literate, able not only to master the rudiments of reading, writing, and computing but able to use the tools as ways of understanding the world and making their voices heard. We must also know how to find and evaluate information, sift through the items that bombard us daily, sort the useful from the unnecessary, and the clearly propagandistic from the approximate truths.

According to Wood (1992) there seems to be little discussion about the democratic purpose of public education. Perhaps we should remind ourselves that this was the reason for establishing free public education.

“In 1782, Thomas Jefferson, the father of American public schooling, made it clear that democracy could not survive without those talents which nature has sown as liberally among the poor as well as the rich, but which perish without use, if not sought for and cultivated. Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, as its only safe depositories. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved” (Wood, 1992, xvi-xvii).

In order to obtain a job, an employee must, at the minimum, possess basic skills which are taught in our American schools. Education is the backbone of every profession in our country yet teachers do not make the salaries, receive the acknowledgment, or work in the conditions of their counterparts in other fields such as business, law or medicine to name a few. We hear numerous reports about how poorly our schools are doing, various reports about teachers that are not performing, scrutiny surrounding the workday of a teacher, and other public criticisms. An emphasis on how well our schools and teachers are performing needs to be highlighted more often.

People in the workforce, other than education, do not always realize the severe conditions of a classroom prior to a teacher decorating it to the point of comfort for the students. Many teachers spend hours in their classrooms prior to the beginning of school. They generally give their own time, spend money out of their own pocket, and work in a room that is usually not air-conditioned. According to Wood (1992) there are schools and classrooms in the United States today that are special the moment you step into them. The first clues are visual. It might be that the halls are full of student projects and artwork, covering what are usually drab, industrial-strength green cinder blocks. Or it might be the absence of posted rules carefully outlining what one can or cannot do. Then there are materials, not merely textbooks, that spill out of every corner of the building.

Many reform movements revolve around the public perception that teachers lack the motivation to teach. If this is true, what are the underlying reasons behind the lack of motivation? Is it dissatisfaction with the teaching profession? If so, what are the areas that we need to examine in order to develop an action plan for improvement? The supervisory procedures that are in place from state to state, although there are differences

with the format of the observation instrument, demonstrate that teachers need to be monitored closely. Standards for teachers regarding teaching certification have risen along with the suggestion of merit pay and career ladders by various state legislatures. Bacharach (1986) stated that the education reform plans adopted by many state legislatures advocate practices that the most successful private sector organizations have rejected for over 25 years. Indeed, many proposed education reform plans are inconsistent with the research on effective organizations and effective schools. Rather than creating an atmosphere of cooperation and productivity, these programs result in an atmosphere of conflict and competition.

In the business world companies are continually striving for improvement in order to generate higher revenue. Therefore, business gives the appearance of being proactive. Many times in education educators will wait until a problem is beyond a viable solution. Therefore, educators are found to be reactive. As a result, individual schools fail and consequently erode an entire district. Bacharach (1986) identified and shared the four basic principles of organizational effectiveness as the following:

1. In effective organizations, management defines goals, objectives and priorities to guide decision-making at all levels of the organization.
2. In effective organizations, management assures that organizational members have the resources they need to meet their responsibilities.
3. In effective organizations, management promotes communication and cooperation among organization members.
4. In effective organizations, management guarantees that organizational members are involved in decision-making.

(p. 2)

Statement of the Problem

Job satisfaction is critical to an employee's perception of his or her worth in relation to a particular job or career. Commitment by an individual is heightened if he or she finds a job or career satisfying. Lawler (1973) defined job satisfaction as an individual's reaction to his or her overall role at work and the quality of life he or she is feeling in connection to the job.

What happens to people during the work day has profound effects both on the individual employee's life and on society as a whole, and thus these events cannot be ignored if the quality of life in a society is to be high (Lawler, 1973, p. 63).

The conditions of work impact on both teacher satisfaction and their commitment to teaching as a career.

Recruitment of teachers is more critical now than ever since we will need more teachers than ever to fill positions since many of our current teaching staff is over the age of 55 years old. "Over the next fifteen years, the proportion of the nation's teaching force over 55 years of age is expected to increase by half" (Perie & Baker, 1997, p. 59).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey in order to report and analyze the aspects of the job that determine and support teachers' reported level of overall job satisfaction.

Goals of the Research

1. To assess the level of overall job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey.
2. To assess the level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey in order to report and analyze the aspects of the job that determine and support teachers' reported level of overall job satisfaction.
3. To collect demographic data in order to investigate possible relationships of the various indicators and overall job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions regarding job satisfaction and middle school teachers in selected public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey:

1. What is the level of overall job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey DFG I as measured by the Job in General (JIG) Scale?
2. What is the level of job satisfaction of public middle school teachers from selected suburban school districts in Essex County, New Jersey DFG I as measured by each of the indicated scales of the Job Descriptive Index Revised (JDI) and which of the indicators represent the major areas as the primary source(s) of job satisfaction?

3. What is the level of overall stress at work of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey DFG I as measured by the Stress in General Scales SIG I (Pressure) and SIG II (Threat)?

Research Hypotheses

The following research null hypotheses were developed and researched for this study:

Null Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) using Work on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Work on Present Job subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Pay subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Pay subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores as compared to the JDI

using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Supervision subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Supervision subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using People on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using People on Present Job of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the Job in General Scale (JIG) as compared to the Job in General Scale (JIG) of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the Stress in General I – Pressure (SIG I) as compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the Stress in General I – Pressure (SIG I).

Null Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the Stress in General II – Threat (SIG II) as compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the Stress in General II – Threat (SIG II) scale.

Null Hypothesis 9

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of age.

Null Hypothesis 10

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of salary.

Null Hypothesis 11

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of years in the teaching profession.

Null Hypothesis 12

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of highest degree held.

Null Hypothesis 13

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of gender.

Theoretical Rationale.

Prior to analyzing whether a particular employee is satisfied or not with his or her job, the concept of job satisfaction must be defined. Balzer, Smith, Irwin, Bochiochi, Robie, Sinar & Parra (1997) defined job satisfaction as “the feelings a worker has about his or her job experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectation, or available alternatives (p.10). Balzer et al. also reported that employees may have different feelings about different aspects of their job. Job satisfaction has been an area of interest for employers for many years since it is important to assess the level of satisfaction for employees.

Balzer et al. have also developed three principal reasons for this interest by practitioners and managers as the following:

1. Humanitarian concerns. Management strives for their employees to be satisfied with their jobs. Job satisfaction is lined to overall life satisfaction including mental and physical health.
2. Economic concerns. This area focuses in on the commitment of a particular employer or organization that is willing to invest resources to heighten job satisfaction. In the end, employers benefit from job satisfaction since employees tend to be absent less, employee retention is longer, and employee productivity is greater. Therefore, job satisfaction provides a savings for employers and

organizations in the end, since substitutes are needed less, less time and effort hiring new employees, and greater profit gained by productive employees.

Employers that are aware of the deficiency within the organization related to job satisfaction can utilize the data to develop an action plan to remedy the problem.

3. Theoretical concerns. Many theorists have defined the concept of job satisfaction. Many theorists have defined it as a direct cause of attendance, high standards, carrying out the mission of the organization and cooperating with others. Other theorists have defined job satisfaction as a consequence of this behavior since it fosters rewards from the organization. Regardless of the definition that is followed, job satisfaction is an important tool if assessed accurately (p.10).

Job satisfaction is closely linked to on-the-job productivity. Therefore, an understanding of the concept of job satisfaction is beneficial for all organizations. Job satisfaction benefits the arena of education as well. Chittom and Sistrunk (1990) have reported in their research the strong link between teacher job satisfaction and student learning. Oves (2002) discussed what the factors are that obstruct teachers from doing their jobs. Oves' article was a response to a recent conference held by the New Jersey Education Commissioner. Oves shared that teachers are not in teaching for the salary. She concluded that teachers extend themselves beyond their job discretion by acting as instructors, parents, psychologists, cheerleaders, counselors, copy machine repairmen among many others as examples of the roles that are not compensated. Teachers that are reported by Oves go above and beyond their job description on a daily basis.

“Class coverages, low pay scales, 12-minute lunches, four or more prep periods, discipline problems, in-services, broken copy machines, lesson plans, grievances,

mentoring, contract negotiations, unfair observations, fire drills, state testing, weak discipline policies, personal improvement plans, faculty meetings, paperwork overload, inventory, budget restrictions, field trip forms – note this has nothing to do with actually teaching classes” (Oves, 2002, p. A9).

Listening to the statement made by Oves makes one think ‘are teachers satisfied and if so in what areas?’ ‘What are the contributors to their satisfaction?’

Definition of Terms.

Source: The New Oxford American Dictionary, University 2001.

*denotes the source: New Jersey Department of Education

**denotes the source: Lawler, E.E. (1973). Motivation in Work Organizations.

Boston: Wadsworth.

Attitude a settled way of thinking or feeling about someone or something, typically one that is reflected in a person’s behavior.

Autonomy freedom from external control or influence; independence.

Commitment the act of committing or the state of being committed; dedication; application.

Demographics statistical data relating to the population and particular groups within it.

District Factor Grouping	<p>The State of New Jersey presently categorizes its' school districts by assigning a letter to represent the district.</p> <p>The assigned DFG is based on various socioeconomic factors using the data for several indicators derived from the decennial Census of Population.</p>
Empowerment	<p>give someone the authority or power to do something.</p>
Job Satisfaction**	<p>as an individual's reaction to his or her overall role at work and the quality of life he or she is feeling in connection to the job.</p>
Middle School	<p>a school intermediate between an elementary school and a high school, typically for children in sixth, seventh, and eighth.</p>
Morale	<p>the confidence, enthusiasm, and discipline of a person or group at a particular time.</p>
Public School	<p>any of a class of grammar-schools founded or endowed for public use and subject to public management or control.</p>

Reform make changes in (something, typically a social, political, or economic institution or practice) in order to improve it.

SPSS Statistical Products Support Services

Teacher a person who teaches, especially in a school.

Limitations of the Study.

1. The study was limited to five of the six DFG I districts in Essex County, New Jersey since one district declined to participate in this study.
2. Participation was voluntary, therefore, there were teachers that did not participate in this study. Those that did not participate may have shared different responses for job satisfaction.
3. Job satisfaction was based on one's experience and perceptions.
4. Job satisfaction does not take into account outside personal factors.
5. The results of this study were limited to DFG I, therefore it did not account for the other DFG's in Essex County, New Jersey.
6. The results of this study were limited to one New Jersey county, therefore, it does not account for the other counties in New Jersey.
7. The results of this study were limited to a specific population in New Jersey, therefore, it does not account for the results of middle school teachers throughout the United States.
8. The collection of data took place during the beginning of winter in November 2002. Therefore, teachers were not experiencing the end of the marking period responsibilities such as report cards, conferences, etc. Hence, the responses may

have been different if disseminated at another time of the year, i.e., report card time, the first week of school, the last week of school.

9. Leadership styles for building and district administrators varied from district to district.

10. The professional expectations for teachers varied from district to district.

Significance of the Study.

Teachers both locally and nationally, enter the teaching profession with a spark of enthusiasm and a desire to make a difference in the future of a child. During one's teaching career, it is important to note the level of one's satisfaction with the teaching profession. The researcher pondered the following questions related to the teaching profession and job satisfaction resulting in the development of the significance for this study: Does the individual still possess that same enthusiasm and love for the profession? If so, what the areas that support the satisfaction for teachers. How can administrators throughout the nation capitalize on these aspects that support high levels of satisfaction? If not, what are the areas that need to be identified? How can we improve in these areas? The information garnered from this study will clearly implicate the areas that district administrators can focus on in order to improve that particular district. Employers, in this case, administrators, need to know 'what are the aspects of the teaching profession that retain teachers and heighten their satisfaction?' The findings of this study will provide district administrators and policymakers the key strategies for developing satisfaction among their teaching staff.

Organization of the Study.

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I included the introduction, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the goals of the research, the research questions, the research hypotheses, the theoretical rationale, the limitations of the study, the significance of the study, the definition of terms, and the organization of this study. Chapter II included a review of the literature in the area of job satisfaction and the various aspects that comprise teacher job satisfaction. The literature focused on job satisfaction outside of the arena of education, teacher job satisfaction, workplace conditions, gender, commitment, years of experience, school climate, administration, age, salary, teacher education, and stress. Chapter III included the methodology that the researcher used that supported the design of this study. This chapter also focused on the participants, the materials, the instruments, the reliability and validity of information, the procedures for collecting the data, the data analysis plan, and a summary. Chapter IV included the research questions, the research hypotheses, background of the participating districts, an analysis of the data using frequency distributions, one sample t-tests, independent t-tests, ANOVA (one way), a demographic profile of the participants, and a summary. Chapter V included a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from this study, a summary of the hypotheses, the demographic profile, the implications, practice, recommendations for future research, and a summary of the chapter.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Teaching in American schools is without a doubt a rewarding occupation for thousands of educators today. Special people make the commitment to become a teacher. Most teachers remain in the profession for many years while others leave the profession many years prior to retirement. Whether people continue to work as teachers or not is often a question of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a concept that is applicable to all occupations. Many researchers have been investigating job satisfaction for more than 50 years. Some of the studies have focused on settings outside of education while many have focused on the arena of education. The supply of qualified teachers has been decreasing as we have entered the new millennium. Many veterans are retiring each year and those that have decided to remain for a few more years despite the fact that they have completed 25 years of service are reporting that the teaching profession is far less satisfying than when they began their teaching career. Administrators and school boards need to know the factors that contribute to teacher job satisfaction as this information would assist with the increased retention of teachers in the profession.

Archer (1999) shared that nearly 50 percent of all teachers that left the teaching profession left because of dissatisfaction with the job. Halford (1998) reported 25 to 30 percent of teachers leave the teaching profession in most districts, and the number may be higher in other districts, during the first five years of his or her teaching career. Studies have shown teachers exiting the teaching profession in high numbers at the beginning of one's teaching career as well as the time frame surrounding retirement. According to Henke (1997) teachers reported being more satisfied with the teaching profession during

the 1993–1994 school year. The level of teacher satisfaction was significantly higher than the studies reported in the late 1980's. Henke also reported that although teachers were reporting to be more satisfied in the mid 1990's, less than fifty percent of the teachers surveyed indicated that they would become a teacher again. Studies have noted that when teachers are dissatisfied there is a strong possibility that many teachers will eventually leave the teaching profession.

“Only seven percent who were very satisfied with their career said they were likely to move to another profession within the next five years, whereas 38 percent who were somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied indicated they would switch careers in the near future” (Latham, 1997, p. 82).

Teachers in the field for more than 20 years have been found in several studies to be less satisfied with the teaching profession than those with less than 20 years of teaching experience. “Teachers with twenty years of experience or more are less likely to be categorized as highly satisfied than any other group of teachers” (Perie & Baker, p. 19). Perie and Baker (1997) also shared that less than 25 percent of teachers teaching 20 or more years had high levels of satisfaction.

Research of Job Satisfaction Beyond the Arena of Education.

Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman (1959) explored job satisfaction in work settings outside of education by studying several steel production companies in Pennsylvania. It was concluded that there were several factors that clearly illustrated the an individual's satisfaction with his or her job. Herzberg, et.al. described several factors and labeled these factors as 'hygiene factors'. Hygiene factors were described as factors that encircled the job such as the benefits package and relationships with co-workers.

Herzberg believed that hygiene factors made individuals more satisfied with their work but were not enough to create complete job satisfaction in an individual.

Herzberg, et.al. (1959) discovered that to have true job satisfaction, an individual must be satisfied with various motivational factors in conjunction with the hygiene factors. Motivational factors involve how connected to the job a person may or may not be along with the feeling of commitment towards the job. It was found that an individual might be dissatisfied with a coworker (hygiene factor) but be generally extremely satisfied with the rewards of a particular task or job (motivation factor). Therefore, although hygiene factors may play a major role in preventing job dissatisfaction it has been proven that motivational factors must exist in order to foster a high level of job satisfaction for an individual.

Maslow (1968) developed and explained seven basic levels of needs for individuals as: physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, self-actualization, knowing and understanding, and aesthetics.

Workplace Conditions.

The physiological, safety, belongingness and love, and esteem needs are parallel to the hygiene factors described by Herzberg, et.al. (1959). Individuals tend to fulfill their physiological, safety, belongingness and love, and esteem needs prior to fulfilling the needs of self-actualization, knowing and understanding, and aesthetics. Self-actualization, knowing and understanding, and aesthetics needs are a parallel concept to Herzberg's motivation factors.

Teachers tend to remain in school settings despite the fact that their counterparts are making more money and working with better fringe benefits such as the potential to ascertain a monetary bonus for a quality job performance or more paid vacations. Yet many educators remain in the field for more than 25 years of service and many universities throughout the United States have high numbers of students graduating with teaching degrees. What are the factors that retain individuals in the teaching field? Is it a combination of hygiene and motivation factors? Does one or several factors dominate the reason an individual continues in the field of education as a teacher?

Bogler (2000) found teachers that were more satisfied tended to refer to their vocation as a "profession" rather than a job. Bogler (1999) also shared that the opportunities for professional development, teacher autonomy, workplace conditions and gender have been related to teacher job satisfaction. MacMillan (1999) also discussed the influences of workplace conditions on a teacher's job satisfaction to be a negative or positive factor.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) workplace conditions had a positive relationship with a teacher's job satisfaction regardless of whether a teacher is in public or private school, or an elementary or secondary school, and regardless of the teacher's background characteristics or the school demographics.

Highest Degree Held.

A teaching staff generally has individuals that hold bachelor's, master's and doctorate degrees. Some teachers are consistently learning. They are involved in graduate courses and staff development seminars while other teachers only complete the 100 hours of staff development every five years required by the State of New Jersey. Teachers that

are acquiring advanced degrees in the field of education are on the rise nationwide. According to Alt and Choy (2001), the likelihood that a teacher will have attained a master degree or other advanced degree has increased since 1993. Another study conducted in the Douglas County school district in April 2002, found that more than half, 58 percent, of the teachers who reported their educational background had earned a master's degree, 40 percent had a bachelor's degree. It was also reported that there was one percent of the sample surveyed that held a doctorate.

Opportunities for Promotion.

There are many teachers that receive stellar performance reports year after year and remain in the classroom for their entire teaching career without even pondering the thought of leaping into administration while other teachers return to graduate school for a degree in administration in order to ascertain an administrative position. Contrary to this are teachers that receive mediocre performance reports year after year and choose to also acquire a position in administration. Teachers must make a choice to pursue a position in administration by taking the courses, completing the program, and applying for administrative positions. Teachers are not offered an administrative position based on good performance as a teacher. Many teachers describe administration as a new phase of one's career and one that is selected by choice. Others, although one must select this job description, view administration as a promotion since the average salary is higher than that of the average teaching salary. A study conducted at the Douglas County School District in April 2002, revealed that teachers report that they feel there are opportunities to work and grow.

Salary.

Throughout the nation it has been heard that teachers are well underpaid. Generally, teachers spend much of their own time, resources, and money on teaching supplies and materials for their students. The salary is lower as compared to the private business sector. Salaries vary from district to district throughout the nation as does the cost of living. Does the low salary impact on the level of satisfaction for teachers?

“Many factors have been examined in an attempt to find which ones promote teacher motivation. Pay incentives have been found to be unsuccessful in increasing motivation. Teacher motivation is based in the freedom to try new ideas, achievement of appropriate responsibility levels and intrinsic work elements. Based upon our findings, schedules such as merit pay were predicted to be counterproductive” (Bishay, 1996, p. 147).

In a study conducted by Bishay (1996) women agreed more strongly than men that pay incentives would improve teacher morale.

Age.

Teachers range in age from the early twenties through the sixties and beyond in the United States. Generally, teachers that are older are also the ones with more experience unless an individual has chosen teaching as a second career. The public generally perceives age with stereotypes; i.e. The younger teachers are more enthusiastic and the older teachers are suffering from teacher burn out. The younger teachers are not experienced, therefore cannot handle all of the responsibilities of teaching while the older

teachers are the seasoned experienced teachers that can handle tough situations. There has been research completed connecting age and satisfaction.

“Job satisfaction seems to increase with age and years of service. T-tests comparing responses of teachers below the age of 45 with those above the age of 45 showed that the responses to the statements ‘I have good relations with most of the faculty’ and I perform a vital function in society,’ yielded significantly lower means for those teachers over the age of 45, indicating greater levels of agreement by the older teachers” (Bishay, 1996, p. 150).

Teachers earn more money as they complete more years of service for a particular school district. Therefore, teachers teaching longer make more money than those first starting the profession.

“It can be inferred from the responses to the conventional survey that increased length of service correlated with greater satisfaction with salary, higher levels of self esteem, higher levels of respect for the teaching profession, and decreased levels of stress. These may be used as measures of job satisfaction and motivation. The findings regarding the high satisfaction levels of teachers may be related to higher salaries” (Bishay, 1996, p.153).

Stress.

Teaching requires much work in order to motivate teacher achieve the results that are desired. Teachers suffer from an enormous amount of stress on a daily basis. According to the UK National Union of Teachers (2000) stress is rooted in the way teaching and schools are organized. Jarvis (2002) has attributed teacher stress to the

following areas: classroom discipline, lack of parental support, long hours, political interference, role overload, and stringent evaluations procedures.

Gender.

Teachers are made up of both genders with females being the most predominant group in teaching. There are many aspects of teaching that compromise how satisfied a teacher may be. Bacharach and Mitchell (1983) explained that job satisfaction has been an important consideration in studies on work life because it was assumed that satisfied workers would produce more. Bacharach and Mitchell added that structures, which enhance task performance, lead to satisfaction while structures, which hinder task performance, lead to dissatisfaction.

Research findings were reported regarding the interaction between gender and years as a teacher. MacMillan (1999) reported that this interaction was not significant. MacMillan also exemplified that for the main effects, gender differences were statistically significant in favor of female teachers. That is, female teachers were significantly more satisfied than their male counterparts. Years as teachers, according to MacMillan showed a statistically significant but negative effect on teacher satisfaction. "Teachers who stayed in the teaching profession longer were less satisfied with their professional role. Moreover, the effect of gender was the same in absolute size as that of years as a teacher" (MacMillan, 1999, p. 42).

Teaching experience and the link to job satisfaction regarding gender is not as significant as it was thought to be. MacMillan (1999) pointed out that the nonsignificant interaction between gender and years has an important implication. MacMillan also stated that gender difference in teacher satisfaction are the same among teachers with similar

teaching experience, no matter how long they have stayed in the profession. MacMillan gave an example and explained that beginning female teachers are more satisfied with their professional role than their male counterparts. The same differences also apply to female and male teachers who have been teaching for a longer period of time.

Klecker and Loadman (1999) reported that the national statistics of teacher demographics have indicated that the national teaching population is 72% female and 28% male. Klecker and Loadman further indicated that the gender statistics are more disproportionate at the elementary level. Klecker and Loadman looked at how satisfied teachers were at the elementary school level in order to discover if there was a significant difference based on gender. The study included 2225 recent graduates from 12 teacher education programs who were employed as teachers. The purpose of the study was to extend the research on male elementary school teachers beyond the first years of teaching. Klecker and Loadman reported that when teachers were asked about plans for 'five years from now' male teachers were more likely than females to be planning a career move to school administration. The respondents were reported to be 14% male respondents and 3% female. (p. 504)

Klecker and Loadman (1999) conducted a descriptive research study using mailed survey questionnaires. The study used 'The Job Satisfaction Subscale of The National Survey of Teacher Education Graduates'. This instrument was designed to collect responses on common aspects of job satisfaction of graduates from different universities. The instrument used the following aspects of job satisfaction: salary/fringe benefits,

opportunities for professional advancement, level of personal/professional challenge, level of professional autonomy/decision making authority, general work conditions, interactions with colleagues and interactions with students. (p. 506)

Klecker and Loadman (1999) reported that these aspects of teaching are rated on a Likert-type seven-point scale. Klecker and Loadman went on to explain that the scale ranges from 1 (very negative) to 7 (very positive). The categories that were reported to measure years of teaching experience were the following: five years or fewer, six to ten years, eleven to fifteen years, sixteen to twenty years, twenty-one to twenty-five years and twenty-six years or more. (p. 506)

Klecker and Loadman (1999) reported that the Cronbach's coefficient alpha reliability for the job satisfaction subscale with the data from this study was .80 with each item contributing to the overall reliability. Klecker and Loadman further elaborated that the overall rating of job satisfaction by the total sample of elementary teachers was positive (5.09).

“All seven aspects of teaching received positive ratings, that is, they were all above the neutral 4.00 mid-point on the seven-point rating scale. The differences in job satisfaction were in degree rather than in kind. The elementary teachers rated ‘interaction with students’ as the most positive aspect of their job (6.01). The teachers rated their satisfaction with ‘general work conditions’ the least positively (4.47)” (Klecker & Loadman, 1999, p. 508).

According to the research reported in this study there was a difference regarding the mean by gender in ratings of satisfaction with salary in the 11 to 15 years of experience category (M=5.00; F= 6.00). It was also reported to be about the same in the 16 to 20 year

category. The 21 to 25 and 26 years and more have the opposite results reported. "The mean ratings for degree of challenge for the job appear to be higher for female elementary teachers across the years of teaching experience except for the twenty-six years or more category" (Klecker & Loadman, 1999, p. 508). It was reported that there were no statistically significant differences between gender and years of teaching experience on any of the items on the instrument. In regards to salary, opportunities for advancement, degree of autonomy, general work conditions, or interaction with students there were not any significant differences by gender or years of teaching experience in elementary teachers' ratings of satisfaction.

A significant difference was noted regarding the challenge of the job by years with gender whereas female teachers rated in this category higher than males. Klecker and Loadman (1999) also reported interactions with colleagues to show statistically significant differences in teachers' ratings of satisfaction both by gender and by years of teaching experience.

"Teachers with twenty-six years and more teaching experience rated their satisfaction with interaction with colleagues lower than did teachers in the other five categories. Female teachers rated their satisfaction with interaction with colleagues higher (5.30) than did male teachers (5.11)" (Klecker and Loadman, 1999, p. 511).

There was a significant difference in professional satisfaction among teachers of different backgrounds regarding workplace conditions. MacMillan (1999) reported that gender differences in teachers' satisfaction were still significant in the presence of workplace conditions. MacMillan further explained that more importantly, the effect of

years as a teacher remained the same when the workplace condition was introduced.

Those findings indicate workplace conditions cannot adequately account for the difference in professional satisfaction among teachers. In other words, according to MacMillan, with control over the workplace conditions, teachers of different backgrounds still showed different levels of professional satisfaction.

The third and fourth models used in this study illustrated the link between gender and the background of workplace conditions. According to MacMillan (1999) the third model showed that gender interacted significantly with both teaching competence and organizational culture. MacMillan further explained that gender did not show significant interaction with administrative control. However, if one graphs two regression lines in terms of the relationships between teacher satisfaction and administrative control (one for male teachers and one for female teachers), then the two lines are parallel. That finding suggests that under similar administration control, female teachers reported more satisfaction about their professional role than male teachers did.

“Male teachers’ professional satisfaction is much more influenced by the organizational culture of a school than is the professional satisfaction of female teachers. As evidenced by the much steeper slope of the line indicating male teachers, those men who work in a more positive organizational culture have much more professional satisfaction than those working in a less positive organizational culture. On the other hand, female teachers’ professional satisfaction is relatively independent of the organizational culture of a school” (MacMillan 1999, p. 44).

The findings of the study done by MacMillan (1999) have shown significant gender differences in professional satisfaction.

“Female teachers appear to be more satisfied with their professional role than are their male colleagues. The gap between male and female teachers’ expressions of satisfaction increases as beliefs in teaching competence increase. That suggests that other factors beyond the classroom are at work. In this study, we found that male teachers’ professional satisfaction appears to be much more affected by the reorganization culture of a school than does that of female teachers. The finding may imply that a difference in focus exists between men and women throughout their teaching careers, and the difference may lie, in the underlying reasons for selecting teaching as career” (MacMillan, 1999, p. 45).

The study also reported the results of teachers selecting teaching as a career again in regards to gender.

“Women more than men, would select teaching again if given the opportunity; on the other hand men often saw teaching as an alternative rather than as the main focus of their career aspirations. If we extrapolate, female teachers may be gaining more satisfaction from teaching than male teachers may because they purposefully choose this career. Male teachers who have been unable to achieve their early career goals may be looking beyond the classroom for satisfaction in such area as school administration” (MacMillan, 1999, p. 45).

Women have been reported to be more satisfied than men in the classroom and this may offer some explanation as to why so many men enter the administrative arena rather than women.

“If women do achieve greater satisfaction in the classroom than do men, then they may be unwilling to leave that rewarding environment to assume the often

conflicted and difficult role of school administrators. That finding should be recognized if we are to encourage more female participation in school administration. Female teachers need more encouragement to assume the role of school administrators than do their male counterparts, and they also may have to alter their perception of the rewards gained by their colleagues through their leadership” (MacMillan, 1999, p. 45).

Commitment.

Commitment in schools has generally been linked to job satisfaction.

“One aspect of job satisfaction appears to be commitment. Indicators of that finding are the degree of individuals’ identification with the organization or school; an individual’s perceived ability to contribute positively, and the organizational conditions that allow an individual to feel valued. Because job satisfaction may be an indicator of whether individuals (a) will be affectively connected to an institution, (b) will merely comply with directives, or (c) will quit, principals ought to have some understanding of the factors that influence teachers’ satisfaction with their work loves and the impact this satisfaction has on teachers’ involvement in their schools, especially when changes are contemplated” (MacMillan, 1999, p. 39).

Many descriptors have been used in this study in order to assess how satisfied teachers were.

Teachers are consistently asking themselves if they are satisfied based on present and past experiences. Hoy and Miskel (1991) stated, “in educational settings, job satisfaction is a present- and past-oriented affective state of like and dislike that results when an

educator evaluates her or his work role" (p. 392). Teachers were asked in this study to reflect on how they feel about coming to work each day and dealing with students. Teachers were then asked to reflect if they had felt that their experience was successful or not. MacMillan (1999) pointed out that evidence of immediate success through clear indications of student learning was not usually possible. Hence, the perceptions of teachers are often based on affective or subjective judgments of the degree to which they have successfully taught instructional objectives. MacMillan (1999) further explained that the aspects of how teaching affects job satisfaction could be divided into three groups: (a) teachers' feelings of competence, (b) administrative control, and (c) organizational culture. MacMillan added that although this last section does not appear to be of significance in noneducation settings, recent studies in education examining the career of teachers suggests that is it significant.

MacMillan (1999) explained that professional competence is a key contributor to job satisfaction. For teachers, this can be expressed in three ways. MacMillan illustrated the first way as the belief by teachers that they have the prerequisite subject-content knowledge and skills in sufficient detail to be able to teach the particular course effectively and with confidence. The second is the teachers' belief that they have or have access to effective and current instructional strategies and skills. The third way teachers describe professional competence can be expressed as their ability to use their subject-content knowledge in conjunction with instructional techniques to enable students to meet standards for the course they are being taught. In order to foster professional growth for the teaching staff, there must be professional development. Professional development allows for the acquiring of new skills and the application of those same skills.

“Teachers who are satisfied with their jobs state that they feel positive about what they know and that how they teach does matter in the education of their students. Those teachers also recognize the importance of ongoing professional development. Without a sense of professional competence, let alone growth, some degree of professional unease may reel in feelings of dissatisfaction with teachers’ instructional success over the short term, and if such sentiments persist, with their jobs” (MacMillan, 1999, p. 40).

Studies have shown the impact on the level of teacher job satisfaction based on the relationship between the administration and the teaching staff. Teachers that perceived themselves as valued members of the staff felt more satisfied. Teachers also expressed more satisfaction when they were involved in the decision-making process regarding the school. The satisfaction of teachers has been closely linked to the culture of the school. Teachers that were always doing paperwork felt that their time was very limited in terms of focusing on their classroom and their students academic progress. This increase in administrative tasks had been reported to impact on the level of job satisfaction for teachers.

“The context provided by the administration influences interaction among staff, teachers’ feelings of being valued of their work, and the sense of substantive involvement in the operation of the school. Evidence also suggests that increased ‘administrivia’ such as paperwork and other tasks perceived by teachers to be non-substantive contributors to student academic achievement can result in withdrawal from participation, or in extreme cases, exit from the profession. Principals who are termed open and who try to reduce such frustrations as paperwork contribute to

the feelings of satisfaction, even though upon analysis, the paths of action have already been scripted. The key factor in maintaining teachers' commitment to the school appears to be their perception of meaningful, organizational involvement" (MacMillan, 1999, p. 40).

MacMillan (1999) further explained that the organizational culture that promotes collegiality and collaboration generally is the type that promotes satisfaction and feelings of professional involvement of teachers. MacMillan pointed out that other types of cultures that create, maintain, and reinforce isolation provide little help for teachers to resolve issues or to learn new techniques for teaching. The research findings of MacMillan also indicated that teacher dissatisfaction and loss of certainty about their professional competence has been significantly impacted by cultures that foster isolation.

Part-Time Versus Full-Time Status.

MacMillan (1999) concluded this part of his research by stating that there were no significant differences in professional satisfaction among teachers with different employment status except that part-time permanent teachers were significantly less satisfied with their professional role than part-time temporary teachers.

Years of Experience.

Teachers with more experience have been reported to have more satisfaction with their professional role than less experienced teachers. Huberman (1993) suggested that as teachers gain more teaching experience, they often follow one of two tracks. Either one is defined as proactive and professionally content, or one defined by self-doubts and conservatism. Huberman also pointed out that the teacher's roles change in its structure as they progress in their careers.

“Some measures need to be taken to maintain a certain degree of engagement and satisfaction for senior teachers. With some sort of renewal, either individually desired or externally created, the negative professional trajectory may be altered” (MacMillan, 1999, p.45).

School Climate.

Sutherland (1994) investigated teachers' perceptions of the characteristics of a good school climate. A questionnaire called the 'Teacher Perception Scale' was used. This survey was given to 150 teachers in a school district in a suburban area. Gender and years of teaching experience were used when analyzing the results of the study.

School climate has been reported to be an important factor in the overall effectiveness of a school. The more satisfied the teaching staff is, the higher the morale resulting in better quality educational programs.

“School climate has been identified as an important component of the schools. Though not easily defined, a favorable school climate is easily recognizable. In quality schools staff and students care for, respect and trust each other. Morale is high and social and academic growth is continuous. School climate may be defined as those qualities that affect the attitudes, behaviors and achievement of the people involved in its operation be they staff, parents or community members” (Sutherland, 1994, p. 3).

School climate is crucial in providing students with quality education. Quality education can be present in urban and suburban districts as long as the teachers are motivated and feel valued. Brookover (1980) reported that schools with a positive school climate have high achievement regardless of the type of community served by the school.

Brookover further pointed out that ineffective climates are associated with low levels of achievement.

Sutherland (1994) explained that a positive learning environment, good teacher morale, and high student achievement are essentials for a positive school climate.

Sutherland also explained that school climate referred to school health. Sutherland stated that a healthy school is one in which harmony pervades relationships among students, teachers, and administrators as the organization directs itself towards its mission. Healthy schools appear to be high achieving schools. Collegial relations, high academic expectations and teachers' beliefs in their ability to help students characterize these schools.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (1990) listed seven areas as the essential ingredients of an effective school climate:

1. A caring atmosphere permeates the school.
2. Feelings, concerns and conflicts receive fair and consistent attention.
3. Respect for individual differences among staff, students, parents, and administrators are demonstrated.
4. The trust level is high. The principal respects the teachers' judgment and includes them in school-based decisions. The teachers are given appropriate classroom autonomy.
5. The morale in the schools is high. The students are enthusiastic about learning, and the teachers are excited about teaching. Achievement and contributions by everyone in the school are acknowledged and celebrated.

6. Social development is emphasized. Good citizenship and a written code of behavior through collaborative efforts of parents, schools, and students.
7. Academic development is the primary concern to the students and staff. Learning is constantly celebrated.

Sutherland (1994) reported that a majority of the teachers agree that the characteristics of a favorable school climate, as described in the current research of favorable school climate, are present in their schools. Sutherland also noted that at the .05 level of significance, in the area of the teachers overall attitude toward the school, 82 percent agreed that they liked the school in which they work. In the area of trustworthiness of colleagues, Sutherland explained that 66 percent, at the .05 levels, agreed that they trust the people with whom they worked. Trustworthiness has been reported to be an important ingredient in a positive school climate resulting in effective schools. "Communication is an important aspect in creating an effective school climate. Communication is used to help people within the organization clarify their understanding of the organization's goals, objectives, procedures, and rules" (Sutherland, 1994, p. 7). At the .05 level of significance, Sutherland reported that 84 percent of the teachers agreed that they know a lot about the school in which they work. Sutherland also implicated that the majority of the teachers agreed that information about their school is shared and communication practices are acceptable to them. Sutherland also pointed out that 70 percent of the teachers agreed to the statement. 'I feel that I am a part of the school in which I work' at the .05 level of significance.

The data used indicated that there were an unbalanced number of males and females in the survey. Males were reported to be more satisfied than females with their perception of school climate.

“The implications of the data in table two may reflect the unbalanced gender makeup of the school district. Females outnumber males two to one. In some of the comment areas of the survey, teachers suggested that there are more males hired to perform duties in areas other than their own classrooms. Many teachers show their gratitude for this assistance by verbally expressing their appreciation to the males in their school. Perhaps such attention to the males might encourage their feeling more favorable toward their schools” (Sutherland, 1994, p. 9).

Administration.

Hartzell and Winger (1989) found that the role of the principal in addition to other variables attribute to teacher job satisfaction. Derlin and Schneider (1994) researched the job satisfaction of teachers working in suburban settings. The researchers found teacher job satisfaction to be strongly tied to teacher involvement and empowerment. Derlin and Schneider summarized their findings by indicating that teachers found themselves being more satisfied when principals fostered an environment where teachers had opportunities to identify, implement, and execute strategies and tactics as a means for achieving school goals.

Maehr (1990) found teachers to be more satisfied when they had more input with the development, process and delivery of school curriculum and policy. It was clear that the principal set the tone throughout the building when deciding the process in which

curriculum was developed along with by whom it would be created. Lortie (1975) shared that teachers were more satisfied when they viewed themselves as contributors to the whole school.

The decision making process at the building level has changed. Years ago building administrators would make decisions for the building with the mind set of 'what is the best for our students' with little or no consultation with the classroom teachers. Bredeson (1989) reported that although the term empowerment itself is a fairly recent addition to the contemporary educational lexicon, the concept of a process by which teachers would assume greater responsibility in their professional work life is rooted in literature on teacher job satisfaction, autonomy and efficacy, professional development, and in the large body of research in the area of shared and participatory decision making. It is more common today for building administrators to ask their staff for assistance through a variety of settings when making decisions for the building. Some of the settings may include, but are not limited to, faculty meetings, staff advisory boards, and staff surveys. The building administrators collect the data, analyze it and make decisions that are best for the students and the buildings. Of course, building administrators must keep in mind that a teacher, although his or her opinions and needs are important and valued. Also, teachers may perceive a situation by looking at it through tunnel vision. A good building administrator takes into account the needs and opinions of the staff but must keep a perspective as to what is best for the school as a whole. The entire picture must be looked at and considered. The principal is the key to how the staff feels about themselves and the building in which they work. Bredeson (1989) noted that the principal is responsible for creating, nurturing and shaping a school environment in which professional

responsibilities are accepted and shared collegially among the staff. There are many advantages and disadvantages to greater teacher empowerment and shared decision-making. Administrators can utilize many strategies that support and motivate shared decision-making.

Some teachers view empowerment and shared decision-making as an important key to any program working successfully. Some teachers feel that the administrators are the educational leaders and should make all of the decisions for the building. These teachers feel that the empowerment of teachers in schools affects the principal's role as a building leader. The considerable amount of research and informed opinion on shared decision-making in schools builds a strong case that a more professional, autonomous role for teachers could enhance the effectiveness of the public schools. (Erlandson and Bifano, 1987, p.33). The American Heritage Dictionary defines 'empower' in one of two ways: 1) To empower is to invest with legal power and/or to authorize and, 2) To empower is to enable or permit. The second definition clearly defines what is intended with shared decision-making and teacher empowerment. Lagana (1989) stated that empowerment gives people the opportunity and necessary resources so they can believe, understand and change their world. (p. 20)

Some educators feel that there is always a struggle for power in a building. The feeling of these educators is that there must be a winner and a loser with each issue presented. Bredeson (1989) stated that implicit in the notion of empowerment of teachers is power itself. Practitioners and researchers often skirt issues of power because of notions of 'win-lose' and understandings of power, as they become entangled in organizational hierarchy and structures of authority, both of which complicate and

threaten collegial and empowered professional work environments. Stinson and Appelbaum (1988) implied that such understandings of power within schools and other organizations are based on a competitive notion of power, that is, power as a finite and scarce resource. This competitive view of power has created a myth that tends to impede meaningful empowerment of teachers and principals. Empowering an individual gives the recipient the feeling of ownership and raises the level of commitment. Stinson and Appelbaum defined 'power' as "simply the real or imagined ability of one individual to influence the behavior of another. When power is viewed as an infinite resource with the possibility of unleashing untapped reserves of creativity and energy, the idea of shared power "encourages people at all levels of the organization to be involved in decision-making without feeling manipulated" (Stinson & Appelbaum, 1988, p. 314).

Shared decision making must be valued by the building principal in order for the process to be successfully implemented. "The success of participatory decision-making has much to do with the readiness of the principal to share power and his/her ability to provide processes, information and resources necessary to make shared decision making work" (Chapman, 1988, p. 55). If the leader feels empowered by his or her superiors then most likely he or she will find it easy to empower a staff. Duke, Showers, and Imber (1980) believed that the principal is of critical importance in determining the extent, nature and pattern of participation in their schools. Bredeson (1989) found that the positive effects of empowerment are most evident in the areas of teachers' attitudes about their professional work and workplace, in their work behaviors, in benefits to the schools themselves, and in benefits to the principal.

Bredeson (1989) further explained that empowered teachers are positive, energetic and have enthusiasm for school and for students. They have ownership in decisions and support those decisions and their implementation and they are prepared to deal with criticism of their decisions. It has been proven that empowered teachers are more willing to participate in committee work and assist with school projects, in addition to other building initiatives. Many educators feel that teacher empowerment makes the school environment a better place. Bredeson reported in his study that superior decisions and implementation of those decisions at the classroom level are better. Bredeson added that as the lines of authority become blurred, communications become more open and teachers are more willing to share professional knowledge, insights and concerns.

Some teachers expressed a lack of time to participate in the numerous committee work and projects. Some teachers indicated that they were uncomfortable with empowerment and increased levels of teacher decision-making since they were unclear what it meant in terms of their negotiated employment contract. Teachers also indicated that their time should not be wasted on trivial, mundane issues. Teachers need to know that their ideas and plans, even when questioned and challenged, are valued. Bredeson (1989) noted that despite the notion of freedom and autonomy, teachers expected the principal to be highly visible around the school. They expected the principal to be informed about concerns, issues, and programs and 'to be available to them' (p. 5). Teachers also expected the principal to provide an environment that is supportive, friendly, open, sharing and safe.

Administrative control, teaching competence and organizational culture had positive effects on teacher satisfaction in another model presented by MacMillan (1999).

“All three effects were positive, indicating that teachers with more positive perception of their relationship with school administration reported higher satisfaction with their professional role; teachers with better teaching competence showed higher satisfaction; teachers working within a positive school culture indicated higher satisfaction” (MacMillan, 1999, p. 43).

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the survey instruments, the process, and the population in detail. Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) developed the survey instrument used. The survey instruments that were used are called the JDI, the JIG, and the SIG. The survey instruments were obtained from the Department of Psychology at Bowling Green State University.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey in order to report and analyze the aspects of the job that determine and support teachers' reported level of overall job satisfaction.

Goals of the Research

1. To assess the level of overall job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey.
2. To assess the level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey in order to report and analyze the aspects of the job that determine and support teachers' reported level of overall job satisfaction.
3. To collect demographic data in order to investigate possible relationships of the various indicators and overall job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions regarding job satisfaction of middle school teachers in selected public school districts in the State of New Jersey with a DFG of I.

1. What is the level of overall job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban school districts in the State of New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JIG Scale?
2. What is the level of job satisfaction of public middle school teachers from selected suburban school districts in the State of New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by each of the indicated scales of the JDI and which of the indicators represent the major areas as the primary source(s) of job satisfaction?
3. What is the level of overall stress at work of middle school teachers from selected suburban school districts in the State of New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG Scale?

Null Hypotheses.

Thirteen null hypotheses were formulated regarding overall job satisfaction as measured by the JIG Scale, aspects of job satisfaction as measured by the various scales of the JDI and possible relationships to selected demographic variables. The following research null hypotheses were developed and researched for this study:

Null Hypothesis 1.

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured

by the JDI using Work on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Work on Present Job subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 2.

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Pay subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Pay subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 3.

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 4.

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Supervision subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Supervision subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 5.

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using People on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using People on Present Job of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 6.

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by JIG as compared to the JIG of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 7.

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG I as compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG I.

Null Hypothesis 8.

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG II as compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG II scale.

Null Hypothesis 9.

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of age.

Null Hypothesis 10.

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of salary.

Null Hypothesis 11.

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of years in teaching profession.

Null Hypothesis 12.

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of highest degree held.

Null Hypothesis 13.

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of gender.

Participants and Identification Process.

The study was proposed in order to foster a self-selected sample of public middle school teachers presently teaching in public schools in Essex County, New Jersey with a district factor grouping of I. The State of New Jersey presently categorizes its' school districts by assigning a letter to represent the district. This categorization is known in New Jersey as DFG. The information is based on the latest data shared by the U.S Census and is also available on the New Jersey Department of Education Web Site.

The DFG was created and introduced by the New Jersey Department of Education in 1975. Districts throughout New Jersey are ranked by their socioeconomic status (SES) through this system. The data from the 1970 Census was utilized for the first district

factor grouping compilation. The State of New Jersey is presently utilizing data from the third DFG based on the data from the 1990 Census. The assigned DFG is based on various socioeconomic factors using the data for several indicators derived from the decennial Census of Population.

The seven indices that were formulated based on the census data include the following:

1. Household income
2. Percent of population with no high school diploma
3. Percent with some college
4. Occupation
5. Poverty
6. Unemployment
7. Population density

In the late 1960's and early 1970's research proved that there was a significant correlation between socioeconomic status and educational performance. The DFG provided a frame of reference to policymakers and school officials since the socioeconomic background of the students was shared. The research pointed out that socialization was a key contributor to the success of a student. Therefore, the skills and experiences that a child brings to school impact on his or her performance in the classroom.

School districts can make performance comparisons with other districts that are categorized with the same DFG. For example, if students in a district with a DFG of I completed the GEPA test, the school administrators can attain the test results from other

districts with the same DFG of I in order to formulate comparisons. The comparisons are made between districts with similar socioeconomic status rather than on geographic factors. As a result, the DFG assists school officials in making comparisons when results are based on factors out of their control. The DFG has also been used as the source for districts having equitable financing.

As of today, the following DFG categories are presently utilized: A, B, CD, DE, FG, GH, I, and J. New Jersey is defined as a very diverse state particularly in socioeconomic status as evidenced by the DFG categories. Districts that are denoted as A or B represent those districts with a lower socioeconomic status than those with a FG or GH classification. I and J districts are known as the wealthy districts since these districts hold a high socioeconomic status.

Identification of a School in a Participating District.

A written request was faxed to each of the superintendents in preselected Essex County, New Jersey public school districts with a DFG of I.

The written request asked for permission to survey the given school district at the middle school level only. The Superintendent responded by fax. The fax also requested the superintendent to fill-in the name of the principal and the name, address, and telephone number of the middle school. The fax requested the superintendent to indicate the number of teaching staff (all classroom teachers, special area teachers, and special education teachers). This assisted the researcher with preparing an accurate number of surveys.

Contacting Building Principals.

After receiving written confirmation from the individual district superintendent, a letter of solicitation was sent to the building principal. The purpose of the letter of solicitation was to share the following information:

1. Written documentation of permission from district superintendent to survey district middle school
2. The researcher's affiliation with Seton Hall University
3. The purpose of the research and the expected duration of subject's participation
4. A detailed account of the procedures involved with survey instrument.
5. Samples of the JDI, JIG, SIG-I Pressure and SIG-II Threat
6. Completion of the survey is of a volunteer nature
7. Assurance of anonymity
8. Assurance of safe storage and confidentiality of data
9. Proof of review and approval by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The researcher addressed all questions and concerns regarding the process in order to send the surveys out in early December 2002. The data was collected by mid- December 2002.

Distribution of Survey Packets.

After communicating the nature of the study with the principal, the researcher personally visited each middle school in order to disseminate the surveys along with an informed consent form for each middle school teacher. The subjects that received the

survey packets were public middle school teachers that were currently employed with a participating district at the time.

Once the surveys and the informed consent form were placed in each mailbox, the researcher set up a collection box in the main office of the respective middle school. Upon voluntary completion of the survey, the participants placed their completed surveys in an envelope supplied by the researcher and forwarded the survey to the collection box. Two weeks later, the researcher returned to all participating middle schools in order to pick up the collection box with the completed surveys.

Participants.

The participants that were chosen were any teachers that voluntarily filled-out the survey in the public middle school in the participating district. The participants were asked to complete the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and II instruments along with a demographic questionnaire. The participants were public middle school teachers that worked in the following capacity: classroom teachers of all content areas, special area teachers, and special education teachers. The public middle school teachers had to be employed in a participating public middle school (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey during the month of December 2002. Other school personnel such as child study members, teacher assistants, school counselors, school nurses, student teachers, and school administrators were not included.

Parental Permission.

Parental permission was not required since all of the subjects were legal adults over the age of eighteen employed with the participating school district with the job

description of teacher. The subjects were college graduates with a teaching license or licenses for the State of New Jersey.

Anonymous and Confidential Responses.

The informed consent form stated that the teachers' participation in the completion of the survey instruments was strictly on a voluntary basis. Middle school teachers did not have to volunteer if he or she did not wish to and may have discontinued his or her participation at any time without penalty or loss of which the volunteer is otherwise entitled. In order to foster a high return rate of the surveys the subjects were assured in writing through the informed consent form that all surveys would be completed anonymously and the data from the individual participant or individual district would not be revealed. Therefore, the teacher participants were not asked to indicate their first and/or last name on any of the survey instruments, as this information is not necessary or requested. The participants were also assured that all surveys would be securely stored in a locked cabinet in order to maintain confidentiality. The researcher would be the only individual that has access to the locked cabinet. The dissertation committee members may also peruse the data upon request to the researcher.

The researcher did not gather information in order to study a particular district or group of teachers in a particular middle school building. Instead the researcher collected the data and analyzed it with the purpose of finding data related to overall job satisfaction and the relationships garnered. The demographic data questionnaire was typed with a different font than that used on the survey instruments. It was also printed on goldenrod paper. The survey instruments were provided by the publisher at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. It was on standard white paper.

Materials and Organization of Survey Packets.

Subjects were given a packet of materials that included the following sequenced in this order:

1. An informed consent form (approved by the IRB) will be included from the researcher.
2. A demographic data questionnaire created by the researcher will be attached.
3. The JDI Revised including the Job in General (JIG) Scale along with the Stress in General Scales (SIG-I and SIG-II) will be included.
4. An envelope will be supplied for the return of the completed materials.
5. A reminder note will be included in the packet indicating the date the surveys should be returned to the collection box and where the collection box will be set up. The date selected will be December 11, 2002.

Completion Time of Survey Packets.

It had taken approximately ten to fifteen minutes for the volunteers to read the informed consent form, complete the survey instruments, and the demographic data questionnaire and place all of the survey materials in an envelope.

Permission for Use of the Survey Instrument.

The researcher communicated clearly and often with the dissertation committee regarding the purpose of this research project. The research design for this study along with the dissertation process had been shared with the Department of Psychology at Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio. Written permission to utilize the survey had been granted by the authors and publishers of the instrument.

Permission to Distribute Survey Materials to Human Subjects.

The survey materials and information regarding the study and its subjects was submitted and reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey in October 2002.

Instruments.

The instruments included in the survey packets were the JDI including the JIG and the SIG I and SIG II scales. A demographic data questionnaire was created by the researcher and was also included in the packet. The survey instruments were easily self-administered by the individual subjects.

Job Descriptive Index Revised (JDI)

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin created the JDI in 1969. Since 1969, the JDI has been revised several times including copyright dates in 1975, 1985, and most recently in 1997. The JDI has been utilized by many organizations to Assess employee job satisfaction.

“Supervisors and managers have long attempted to assess job satisfaction by one means or another. Informal sources such as directly questioning employees (e.g., ‘How’s it going?’) and chatting with people ‘in the know’ such as the plant nurse, the night watchperson, and the bartender at the nearby bar where paychecks are cashed many indeed provide useful clues, but decisions regarding intervention programs should not be made on the basis of this information alone. Many firms, therefore, rely on employee attitude surveys to measure job satisfaction”

(Balzer & Smith 1997, p. 7).

The JDI measures five major aspects of job satisfaction that have been recognized as important by various organizations. The five aspects include: work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and people at work.

Job in General (JIG) Scale

The research on the JDI has been shown to not measure overall job satisfaction accurately despite the fact that there is a substantial general satisfaction component to the five JDI scales. The JIG was created for the purpose of being administered with the JDI as a means for identifying overall job satisfaction. Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) suggested “measures of job satisfaction should possess certain characteristics in order to be widely useful to diverse organizations and employee groups. The JDI and the JIG scales were carefully designed to meet these needs” (p. 9). The JIG covers all aspects of job satisfaction that reflect general feelings towards an employee’s job. The JIG scale was formulated to reflect the overall evaluation of a job. The JIG accurately measures interactions and contributions of factors occurring over time that impact on a person’s level of satisfaction on a job in addition to reflecting the five aspects of job satisfaction for the individual similar to the JDI, the JIG is easy to complete and requests an individual to ‘think of your job in general’ using adjectives such as ‘good’, ‘undesirable’, and ‘makes me content’.

The JDI and JIG: Useful Measures of Job Satisfaction

The authors of the JDI and JIG stressed the importance of measuring satisfaction as an easy process to administer and complete. The JDI and the JIG are considered short in length. There are 72 items in the JDI and 18 items in the JIG. Each aspect contains words at lower reading levels using adjectives as simple as boring or slow. The response

includes participants circling a Y (yes), N (NO), or ? (Not sure) for each item. Very little time is needed to administer the JDI and JIG and it has been reported that most employees complete both scales in less than 10 minutes. The authors of the scales reported that a person who is reading on the third grade level could easily complete the surveys.

Scoring the JDI including the JIG

Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) explained that the coding and scoring process for each of the five JDI facet scales and the JIG scale is scored separately. The facet scale scores are not added together in any way. The scales are scored by assigning numerical values to the Y, N, and ? responses. About half are worded favorably using such words as creative, so that a Y response indicated satisfaction. For these items, a Y receives 3 points, N receives 0 points, and a ? receives 1 point. The remaining items are worded unfavorably using words such as boring meaning that a Y responses would indicate dissatisfaction. These unfavorable items are reverse scored with an N receiving 3 points, a Y receiving 0 points, and a ? receiving 1 point. A ? response always receives a score of 1 point, both before and after reverse scoring. It has been shown that the ? response tends to be closer to an unfavorable response such as a score of 0 than to a favorable response with a score of 3. A Yes that is initially scored as 3 would be reverse-scored to 0 because Yes for this item indicates an unfavorable attitude. The ? will retain its score of 1 as it has been shown to be more closely aligned with an unfavorable attitude.

Scores on the JDI Work, Supervision, Co-Workers, and JIG Scales, are computed by summing the points obtained from an individual's responses to the items in each scale.

Scores on the JDI Pay and Promotion facets are also computed by summing up the total points, but these totals should be doubled to create the scale score because the Y includes only half as many items as the other scales. Thus, the possible range of scores on each of the JDI facet scales and the JIG is from 0 to 54. (Balzer, et.al. 1997, p. 21) The demographic data questionnaire asked for the following information:

1. age
2. grade (s) currently teaching
3. job classification (regular education, special education, special area)
4. department (i.e. math, social studies, science, etc;)
5. years in teaching professions
6. years at current school
7. present salary
8. gender
9. tenure status
10. highest degree held

The data was entered into an excel spreadsheet prior to the data being migrated into an SPSS program.

Missing Responses.

According to Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) they stated in the User's Manual for the JDI and the JIG, "occasionally, a respondent will fail to mark a response to an item on a scale. In situations where three or fewer responses are left unmarked for the eighteen item scales (JDI Work, Supervision, Coworker, or JIG) or two or fewer for the nine item scales (JDI Pay and Promotion), omitted responses

should be treated as ? and scored a one. It was also recommended not scoring that particular scale, if a greater number of items than these are left unmarked. (Balzer, et. al. p. 17)

Improving the Accuracy of Scoring.

Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) have recommended double-checking and triple-checking the scoring and tabulation of questionnaire responses (p. 17). Other pitfalls noted by Balzer and Smith included the following:

1. Failing to edit questionnaires for marking errors or omissions before with hand or computer scoring
2. Assigning incorrect point values to JDI and JIG items
3. Incorrectly summing item responses to obtain separate scores
4. Failing to double scores on the JDI Pay and Promotion scales (p . 22)

Stress in General Scales (SIG I-Pressure and SIG II-Threat)

The Stress in General Scales were developed in response to the high rate of workplace stress. According to Stanton, Balzer, Smith, Parra, & Ironson, (2001) workplace stress has been related to a number of individual problems such as headaches, depression, and hypertension and organization outcomes such as job dissatisfaction, burnout, and absenteeism. The SIG scales were developed to have the same format and the same respondent instructions as the JIG. Each item is scored as No = 0, ? = 1.5, and Yes = 3. There are 15 items listed on the scale. The words that are used for the items are adjectives. Reverse coding is used for the following words: calm, relaxed, under control, comfortable, and smooth running. SIG I (items 1-7) correlated with time pressure and

contained such words as hectic and pressured. SIG II (items 8–15) correlated with a more serious level of stress. According to Stanton, et.al. the item content also supported this because words such as overwhelming and nerve-wracking suggest a threatening and negative quality to the work experience. Thus it was labeled as the Threat subscale. The reported mean scores for the SIG I–Pressure was 12.00 and the reported mean scores for SIG II–Threat was 9.00.

Reliability Analysis for the SIG I–Pressure Scale.

A reliability analysis was conducted using SPSS for this study. The reliability coefficients were reported to include 132 participants, seven items to respond to on the SIG I - Pressure, and the alpha score of .7826 (average internal consistency).

The reported alpha for this study (.7826) is almost the same as the alpha available (.88) by publisher of the SIG I–Pressure.

Reliability Analysis for the SIG II–Threat Scale.

A reliability analysis was conducted using SPSS for this study. The reliability coefficients were reported to include 132 participants, 8 items to respond to on the SIG II-Threat , and the alpha score of .7794(average internal consistency). The reliability coefficients were reported to include 132.0 participants, 7 items to respond to on the SIG I-Pressure, and the alpha score of .7794 (average internal consistency).

The reported alpha for this study (.7794) is almost exact to the alpha available (.82) by publisher of the SIG II–Threat. “We formed two summative subscales from the SIG items using the configurations of items ascertained from Study 1. The resulting two subscales yielded scores of Alpha reliabilities of .83 and .81.” (Stanton, et.al., p. 878)

Reliability Analysis – Scale (Alpha) for the JDI.

A reliability analysis was conducted using SPSS for this study. The reliability coefficients were reported to include 136 participants, 72 items to respond to on the JDI, and the alpha score of .8760 (average internal consistency).

The reported alpha for this study (.8760) is almost the same as the alpha available (.88) by the publisher of the JDI.

“A sequential research strategy was followed to validate the JDI, using evidence for both discriminate and convergent validity within and across samples. Regarding discriminate validity, it was expected that the JDI facets should distinguish satisfaction with pay from satisfaction from work and in turn, distinguish these from satisfaction with other aspects of the job. Convergent validity evidence requires that the JDI facet measures and other measures using maximally different methods to assess the same satisfaction facet (e.g., ratings of interviews focused on critical incidents of satisfaction, different rating techniques, other measures of satisfaction, etc. should be significantly similar in their evaluations” (Balzer, et.al., 1997, p. 50).

According to Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) the norms were developed for the JDI to permit direct comparison of similar groups of employees across different organizations. The JDI has been revised over the years and 1997 has the latest revisions made to the JDI. “Based on the above analyses and revisions, and after careful examination of additional data sets collected subsequently to the inclusion of the new items, the JDI Revised was formally announced. The number and areas of the facets of satisfaction, as well as the number of items included on each

facet subscale, remained the same. Factor analyses indicate that five moderately correlated factors account for most of the common variance. Scale reliabilities remain impressively high, with an average internal consistency (alpha) of .88 across six samples” (Balzer, et.al., 1997, p. 54).

Reliability Analysis – Scale (Alpha) for the Job in General (JIG) Scale.

A reliability analysis was conducted using SPSS for this study. The reliability coefficients were reported to include 136.0 participants, 18 items to respond to on the JIG, and the alpha score of .8224 (average internal consistency) was reported.

“In each of the samples from the Bowling Green data pool with $N > 100$, coefficient alpha reliability estimates exceeded .90 (Total $N = 3566$). The information function (calculated using latent trait theory), which gives the standard error of measurement at different levels of the latent trait, showed success in obtaining accurate measurements throughout the range” (Balzer, et. al., 1997, p. 58).

In addition to the reliability information that is available from Bowling Green University, there is proven validity elsewhere. “Several methods of validation are possible for a general satisfaction scale. Convergent validity was demonstrated by correlation with other global measures of satisfaction: the Brayfield and Rothe (1951) is a classic; we also used a rating scale with pre-scaled adjectives as anchors (Ironson & Smith, 1981), the ‘Faces’ scale (Kunin, 1955) and a simple numerical rating scale (-100 to +100). Correlations with the JIG ranged from .66 to .80” (Balzer, et. al., 1997, p. 58).

Data Analysis Plan

The information was migrated into SPSS program. Frequency distributions for the independent variables age, years in teaching professions, present salary, gender, and highest degree held was completed. Additionally, there were frequency distributions for the five aspects (Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People on Present Job) of the JDI. Descriptive statistics was used to compare the mean scores for each one of the five aspects of the JDI and the mean scores of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled for each one of the five aspects that comprise the JDI. Frequency distributions were also completed for JIG, the SIG I, and the SIG II .

A one sample statistic was completed to compute the mean score for each of the five aspects of the JDI and for the JIG for the public middle school teachers in this study. A one sample test was also completed in order to compare the mean score for the middle school teachers in this study and for the scores for the norm group between the 25th and 75th percentiles for nonprofit organizations outlined in the JDI and JIG manual (Balzer, et. al., 1997, p. 257).

A one-sample t-test was also completed for the SIG I-Pressure and the SIG II-Threat. A one-sample test will also be completed in order to compare the mean score for the middle school teachers in this study and for the scores for the norm group between the 25th and 75th percentiles for nonprofit organizations outlined in SIG manual.

Group statistics and an independent t test was also computed as a means for comparing the relationship between the independent variable of age and the JDI, JIG, SIG I, and SIG II. An ANOVA (one way) was completed as a means to compare the

relationship between the independent variable of salary and the JDI, JIG, SIG I, and SIG II. An ANOVA (one way) was also completed in order to compare the relationship between the independent variable of years in the teaching profession and the JDI, JIG, SIG I and the SIG II. Group statistics and an independent t-test was also completed to compare the relationship between the independent variable of highest degree held and the JDI, JIG, SIG I and the SIG II.

Group statistics and an independent t-test was also completed to compare the relationship between the independent variable of gender and the JDI, JIG, SIG I, and the SIG II. Reliability coefficients were analyzed for the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II as a means for reporting the alpha score. The alpha score was compared to the alpha scores available in the respective manuals.

Summary

Chapter III presented the methodology for this study. Included in this chapter is an introduction, the purpose of the study, the goals of the research, the research questions, and the research hypotheses. This is followed by the identification process, contacting procedures between the researcher and the building principals, the distribution of survey packets, a description of the subjects, information on parental permission, and assurance of anonymous and confidential responses. The next section focused on the materials, the organization of the survey packets, the completion time of the survey packets, the permission for use of the survey instrument, the permission to distribute survey materials to human subjects, and the background and scoring information for the instruments: JDI, JIG, SIG I and SIG II. The last section of chapter III shared the data analysis plan for this study and the summary of the chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Data Analysis

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey in order to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and selected demographic variables.

The Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions regarding job satisfaction and middle school teachers in selected public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey.

1. What is the level of overall job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey as measured by the Job in General (JIG) Scale?
2. What is the level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey as measured by each of the indicated scales of the Job Descriptive Index Revised (JDI) and which of the indicators represent the major areas as the primary source(s) of job satisfaction?
3. What is the level of overall stress at work of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey as measured by the Stress in General Scales SIG I-Pressure and SIG II -Threat?

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses (SPSS) conducted utilizing the data collected to support the purpose of this study. The chapter begins with a description of the participants and the schools in which the study was conducted. Tables 1–5 represent the results of frequency distributions for the independent variables age, years in teaching professions, present salary, gender, and highest degree held. Tables 6–10 indicate frequency distributions for the five aspects (Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People on Present Job) of the JDI. Descriptive statistics are used to compare the mean scores for each one of the five aspects of the JDI and the mean scores of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled for each one of the five aspects that comprise the JDI.

Tables 11-13 present the results of the frequency distributions for the Job in General Scale (JIG), the Stress in General Scale I (SIG I–Pressure), and the Stress in General Scale II (SIG II–Threat). Tables 14-29 present the mean scores for the various aspects of the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I-Pressure, and the SIG II–Threat. The tables also offer the mean scores for nonprofit organizations based on national norms compiled by the publishers of the JDI, the JIG, and the SIG I–Pressure, and the SIG II–Threat. Comparisons of the mean scores have been presented. Tables 30–38 present an analysis of mean scores as measured by the JDI, JIG, SIG I–Pressure, SIG–II Threat and the independent variables of age, salary, highest degree held, gender, and years in the teaching profession. Group statistics are also included.

Background of the Participating Districts

The study was proposed in order to foster a self-selected sample of public middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey. The State of New Jersey presently categorizes its' school districts by assigning a letter to represent the district. This categorization is known in New Jersey as District Factor Grouping (DFG). The information is based on the latest data shared by the United States Census Bureau and is also included in the appendix of this study.

A request was made to each of the Superintendents in (DFG I) Essex County, New Jersey public school districts. There were a total of six school districts in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. Of the six school districts contacted, five school districts (83.3%) agreed to participate in the study. Each superintendent indicated the number of teachers for each middle school. Each participating district superintendent also provided the name and telephone number of the building principal for each participating middle school respectively.

A letter of solicitation was given to each building principal. The letter of solicitation adhered to the guidelines set forth by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The middle school principals were given information indicating the researcher's affiliation with Seton Hall University along with written proof supporting the review and approval by the IRB to conduct the research.

Upon receipt of the hand delivered letter for the building principals in the participating districts, the researcher placed the surveys in the teachers' mailboxes in each of the respective main offices along with the set up of a clearly marked collection box placed in the main office of each middle school building. An informed consent form

was attached to the survey instruments for the participating volunteers. The informed consent form adhered to the guidelines set forth by the IRB. The volunteers were given information indicating the researcher's affiliation with Seton Hall University along with written proof supporting the review and approval by the IRB to conduct the research.

Upon voluntary completion of the survey instruments, the participants placed their completed surveys in an envelope supplied by the researcher and forwarded the survey to the collection box. The researcher returned to each respective middle school two weeks after the distribution of the surveys in order to pick up the collection box with the completed surveys.

District number one indicated that there was one middle school with a total of 15 teachers. Out of the 15 teachers, 13 teachers (86.6%) participated in the study. District number two indicated that there was one middle school with a total of 45 teachers. Out of the 45 teachers, 38 (84.4%) participated in the study. District three indicated that there were two middle schools with a total of 70 teachers present in one middle school and a total of 50 teachers present in the other middle school resulting in a combined total of 120 teachers. Out of the 70 teachers in the first of the two middle schools in district number three, 21 teachers (30.0%) participated in the study. Out of the 50 teachers in the other middle school in district number three, 12 teachers (24.0%) participated in the study. Therefore, out of the 120 teachers, 33 teachers (27.5%) participated in the study. District number four indicated that there was one middle school with a total of 72 teachers. Out of the 72 teachers, 26 teachers (36.1%) participated in the study. District number five indicated that there were a total of 65 teachers. Out of the 65 teachers, 28 teachers (43.0%) participated in the study. Therefore, there were a total of 317 surveys distributed

to participating (DFG I) Essex County, New Jersey public middle schools. Out of the 317 surveys that were distributed, 138 surveys (43.5%) were completed and returned.

Demographic Analyses of Participants

The researcher attached a demographic questionnaire to each of the survey instruments for the voluntary participants to complete and return. The requested information on the survey instrument included demographic data about the participant's age, grades(s) currently teaching, job classification (regular education, special education, or special area), department, years in teaching profession, years at current school, present salary, gender, tenure status, and highest degree held.

Tables 1–5 indicated frequency distributions for the demographic independent variables age, years in teaching profession, present salary, gender, and highest degree held.

Table 1 indicated the frequency distribution for the independent variable of age. The researcher developed age categories initially as 20's, 30's, 40's, 50's, 60's. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the researcher collapsed the age categories into two groups. One group represented the 20-39 years old range for the independent variable of age. This group made up 49.3% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their age on the demographic survey. The other group represented the 40 years old and above range for the independent variable for age. This group made up 47.8% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their age on the demographic survey. Out of the 138 teachers that completed the surveys, there were 134 teachers (96.3%) that indicated their age. Therefore, there were only four teachers (3.7%) that did not indicate their age.

Table 2 indicated the frequency distribution for the independent variable of years in the teaching profession. The researcher developed categories initially as 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the researcher collapsed the categories for years in the teaching profession into three groups. One group represented the 0-10 years range, the second group represented the 11-20 years range, and the third group represented the 21 years and above range. The first group, 0-10 years, made up 42.8% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their years in the teaching profession on the demographic survey. The second group, 11-20 years, made up 26.8% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their years in the teaching profession on the demographic survey. The third group, 21 years and above represented 30.4% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their years in the teaching profession on the demographic surveys. Out of the 138 teachers that completed the surveys, there were 138 teachers (100%) that indicated their years in the teaching profession.

Table 3 illustrated a frequency distribution that was completed for the independent variable of salary. The researcher developed seven categories initially as \$25,000-\$35,000, \$36,000-\$45,000, \$46,000-\$55,000, \$56,000-\$65,000, \$66,000-\$75,000, \$76,000 - \$85,000, and \$86,000-\$95,000. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the researcher collapsed the age categories into three groups \$25,000-\$45,000, \$46,000 - \$65,000, \$66,000-and above. Once the categories were collapsed, there were 39 teachers (28.3%) reported to be earning a salary between \$25,000-\$45,000, 55 teachers (39.9%) were reported to be earning a salary between \$46,000-\$65,000, and 39 teachers (28.3%) reported to be earning a salary between \$66,000 and above. Out of

the 138 teachers that completed the surveys, there were five (3.6%) teachers that did not indicate their present salary, therefore, there were 133 (96.4%) teachers that indicated their salary on the demographic survey.

Table 4 illustrated a frequency distribution that was completed for the independent variable of gender. The researcher developed two categories for gender (male, female). There were 32 males (23.2%) and 105 females (76.1%) that made up the number of teachers that completed the survey. Out of the 138 teachers that completed the surveys, there was one (.7%) teacher that did not indicate their present gender, therefore, there were 137 (99.3%) teachers that indicated their gender on the demographic survey.

Table 5 illustrated a frequency distribution for the independent variable of highest degree held. The researcher initially developed five groups: BA/BS, BA/BS+, MA/MS, MA/MS+, Ph.D/Ed.D. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the researcher collapsed the five groups into the following two groups: Undergraduate degrees and Graduate degrees. Using the new groupings there were 57 teachers (41.3%) with undergraduate degrees reported and 81 teachers (58.7%) reported with graduate degrees. Out of the 138 teachers surveyed, 138 teachers (100%) indicated their level of degree on the demographic survey.

Table 1: *Frequency Distribution for the Independent Variable Age*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 20-39 years old	68	49.3	50.7	50.7
Valid 40 years old and above	66	47.8	49.3	100.0
Total	134	97.1	100.0	
Missing System	4	2.9		
Total	138	100.0		

Table 2: *Frequency Distribution for the Independent Variable Years in Teaching Profession*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0 - 10 years	59	42.8	42.8	42.8
Valid 11 - 20 years	37	26.8	26.8	69.6
Valid 21 years and above	42	30.4	30.4	100.0
Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: *Frequency Distribution for the Independent Variable Present Salary*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	\$25,000 - \$45,000	39	28.3	29.3	29.3
Valid	\$46,000 - \$65,000	55	39.9	41.4	70.7
	\$66,000 and above	39	28.3	29.3	100.0
	Total	133	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	5	3.6		
Total		138	100.0		

Table 4: *Frequency Distribution for the Independent Variable Gender*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	32	23.2	23.4	23.4
	Female	105	76.1	76.6	100.0
	Total	137	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.7		
Total		138	100.0		

Table 5: *Frequency Distribution for the Independent Variable Highest Degree Held*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Undergraduate degree(s)	57	41.3	41.3	41.3
Valid Graduate degree(s)	81	58.7	58.7	100.0
Total	138	100.0	100.0	

Tables 6-10 indicated frequency distributions utilizing the five aspects of the JDI. The five aspects include the following: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision. Table 6 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 137 were completed for Work on Present Job. The researcher discovered the scores of the JDI Work on Present Job ranged from a low of 9 to a high of 54. There were three teachers that scored below the middle range score of 27, resulting in 2.19% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with Work on Present Job. There were 134 teachers that scored at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, 97.81% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Work on Present Job.

Table 7 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 137 were completed for JDI Pay. The researcher discovered the scores of the JDI Pay ranged from a low score of 8 to a high of 24. There were 137 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 27, resulting in 100% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with the JDI Pay. There was a reported percentage of 0% of the teachers scoring at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, 0.00% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Pay.

Table 8 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 137 were completed for the JDI Opportunities for Promotion. The researcher discovered the scores of the JDI Opportunities for Promotion ranged from a low of 0 to a high of 27. There were 130 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 27, showing that 94.89% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with the JDI of Opportunities for Promotion. Seven of the teachers scored at the middle range score of 27 and above,

therefore, 5.11% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Opportunities for Promotion.

Table 9 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 137 were completed for JDI Supervision. The researcher discovered the scores of the JDI Supervision ranged from a low of 6 to a high of 54. There were 20 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 27, indicating that 14.60% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with JDI Supervision. One hundred seventeen of the teachers were reported at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, 85.40% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Supervision.

Table 10 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 137 were completed for JDI People on Your Present Job. The researcher discovered the scores of the JDI People on Your Present Job ranged from a low of 9 to a high of 54. There were 16 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 27, showing that 11.68% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with JDI People on Your Present Job. There were 121 of the teachers that were reported at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, 88.32% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of People on Your Present Job.

Table 6: *Frequency Distribution for JDI Work on Present Job*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
9	1	.7	.7	.7
19	1	.7	.7	1.5
25	1	.7	.7	2.2
27	2	1.4	1.5	3.6
30	1	.7	.7	4.4
31	2	1.4	1.5	5.8
32	1	.7	.7	6.6
33	2	1.4	1.5	8.0
34	3	2.2	2.2	10.2
36	1	.7	.7	10.9
37	6	4.3	4.4	15.3
38	2	1.4	1.5	16.8
39	8	5.8	5.8	22.6
Valid 40	2	1.4	1.5	24.1
42	12	8.7	8.8	32.8
43	2	1.4	1.5	34.3
44	3	2.2	2.2	36.5
45	26	18.8	19.0	55.5
46	5	3.6	3.6	59.1
47	4	2.9	2.9	62.0
48	11	8.0	8.0	70.1
49	4	2.9	2.9	73.0
50	2	1.4	1.5	74.5
51	12	8.7	8.8	83.2
52	6	4.3	4.4	87.6
54	17	12.3	12.4	100.0
Total	137	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	1	.7		
Total	138	100.0		

Table 7: Frequency Distribution for JDI Pay

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
8	1	.7	.7	.7
9	3	2.2	2.2	2.9
10	2	1.4	1.5	4.4
11	2	1.4	1.5	5.8
12	14	10.1	10.2	16.1
13	9	6.5	6.6	22.6
14	4	2.9	2.9	25.5
15	37	26.8	27.0	52.6
Valid 16	8	5.8	5.8	58.4
17	3	2.2	2.2	60.6
18	26	18.8	19.0	79.6
19	4	2.9	2.9	82.5
20	2	1.4	1.5	83.9
21	20	14.5	14.6	98.5
22	1	.7	.7	99.3
24	1	.7	.7	100.0
Total	137	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	1	.7		
Total	138	100.0		

Table 8: *Frequency Distribution for JDI Opportunities for Promotion*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0	7	5.1	5.1	5.1
1	4	2.9	2.9	8.0
3	11	8.0	8.0	16.1
4	6	4.3	4.4	20.4
5	3	2.2	2.2	22.6
6	20	14.5	14.6	37.2
7	10	7.2	7.3	44.5
8	3	2.2	2.2	46.7
9	17	12.3	12.4	59.1
10	8	5.8	5.8	65.0
11	6	4.3	4.4	69.3
12	17	12.3	12.4	81.8
Valid 13	2	1.4	1.5	83.2
14	1	.7	.7	83.9
15	4	2.9	2.9	86.9
16	1	.7	.7	87.6
18	1	.7	.7	88.3
19	2	1.4	1.5	89.8
20	1	.7	.7	90.5
21	3	2.2	2.2	92.7
22	1	.7	.7	93.4
24	1	.7	.7	94.2
25	1	.7	.7	94.9
27	7	5.1	5.1	100.0
Total	137	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	1	.7		
Total	138	100.0		

Table 9: *Frequency Distribution for JDI Supervision*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
6	1	.7	.7	.7
9	1	.7	.7	1.5
10	1	.7	.7	2.2
11	1	.7	.7	2.9
13	1	.7	.7	3.6
14	1	.7	.7	4.4
15	2	1.4	1.5	5.8
18	1	.7	.7	6.6
20	4	2.9	2.9	9.5
21	3	2.2	2.2	11.7
22	1	.7	.7	12.4
24	2	1.4	1.5	13.9
26	1	.7	.7	14.6
27	4	2.9	2.9	17.5
29	2	1.4	1.5	19.0
30	3	2.2	2.2	21.2
31	2	1.4	1.5	22.6
33	3	2.2	2.2	24.8
Valid 34	1	.7	.7	25.5
35	1	.7	.7	26.3
36	2	1.4	1.5	27.7
37	2	1.4	1.5	29.2
39	6	4.3	4.4	33.6
40	4	2.9	2.9	36.5
41	1	.7	.7	37.2
42	9	6.5	6.6	43.8
43	9	6.5	6.6	50.4
44	2	1.4	1.5	51.8
45	7	5.1	5.1	56.9
47	1	.7	.7	57.7
48	14	10.1	10.2	67.9
49	3	2.2	2.2	70.1
50	6	4.3	4.4	74.5
51	11	8.0	8.0	82.5
52	6	4.3	4.4	86.9
54	18	13.0	13.1	100.0
Total	137	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	1	.7		
Total	138	100.0		

Table 10: *Frequency Distribution for JDI People on Your Present Job*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
9	1	.7	.7	.7
13	1	.7	.7	1.5
15	1	.7	.7	2.2
17	1	.7	.7	2.9
18	2	1.4	1.5	4.4
19	1	.7	.7	5.1
21	1	.7	.7	5.9
22	1	.7	.7	6.6
24	5	3.6	3.7	10.3
25	2	1.4	1.5	11.8
27	1	.7	.7	12.5
28	1	.7	.7	13.2
30	2	1.4	1.5	14.7
32	2	1.4	1.5	16.2
33	3	2.2	2.2	18.4
34	1	.7	.7	19.1
35	1	.7	.7	19.9
36	5	3.6	3.7	23.5
37	1	.7	.7	24.3
38	5	3.6	3.7	27.9
39	10	7.2	7.4	35.3
40	5	3.6	3.7	39.0
41	3	2.2	2.2	41.2
42	8	5.8	5.9	47.1
43	3	2.2	2.2	49.3
44	1	.7	.7	50.0
45	13	9.4	9.6	59.6
46	7	5.1	5.1	64.7
47	2	1.4	1.5	66.2
48	9	6.5	6.6	72.8
49	2	1.4	1.5	74.3
50	2	1.4	1.5	75.7
51	11	8.0	8.1	83.8
52	8	5.8	5.9	89.7
54	14	10.1	10.3	100.0
Total	136	98.6	100.0	
Missing System	2	1.4		
Total	138	100.0		

Tables 11–13 indicated frequency distribution utilizing the JIG, the SIG I-Pressure, and the SIG II Threat.

Table 11 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 136 were completed for the JIG. The researcher discovered the scores of the JIG ranged from a low of 13 to a high of 54. There were four teachers that scored below the middle range score of 27, 2.95% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with the JIG. One hundred thirty two of the teachers were reported at the middle range score of 27 and above and therefore, 97.05% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JIG.

Table 12 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 132 were completed for the SIG I-Pressure. The researcher discovered the scores of the SIG I-Pressure ranged from a low of .0 to a high of 21.0. There were 108 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 12.0, resulting in 81.81% of the teachers surveyed reporting to experience less pressure on the job under the aspect of stress. Twenty-four of the teachers were reported at the middle range score of 12.0 and above, therefore, 18.18% of the teachers surveyed had experienced more pressure on the job with the SIG I-Pressure.

Table 13 indicated that there were 138 surveys returned. Of the 138 returned, 132 were completed for the SIG II-Threat. The researcher discovered the scores of the SIG II-Threat ranged from a low of .0 to a high of 24. There were 62 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 9.00, resulting in 46.97% of the teachers surveyed reporting to experience less of threat on the job under the aspect of stress. Seventy of the teachers were reported at the middle range score of 9.00 and above, therefore, 53.03% of

the teachers surveyed had been experiencing more of a threat on the job with the SIG II-
Threat.

Table 11: *Frequency Distribution Job in General Scale (JIG)*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	13	1	.7	.7
	15	1	.7	1.5
	20	1	.7	2.2
	22	1	.7	2.9
	27	2	1.4	4.4
	29	1	.7	5.1
	30	1	.7	5.9
	31	2	1.4	7.4
	32	1	.7	8.1
	33	5	3.6	11.8
	34	2	1.4	13.2
	35	2	1.4	14.7
	36	4	2.9	17.6
	37	2	1.4	19.1
Valid	38	1	.7	19.9
	39	2	1.4	21.3
	40	3	2.2	23.5
	42	10	7.2	30.9
	43	6	4.3	35.3
	45	17	12.3	47.8
	46	2	1.4	49.3
	47	2	1.4	50.7
	48	16	11.6	62.5
	49	2	1.4	64.0
	50	3	2.2	66.2
	51	18	13.0	79.4
	52	6	4.3	83.8
	54	22	15.9	100.0
Total	136	98.6	100.0	
Missing System	2	1.4		
Total	138	100.0		

Table 12: *Frequency Distribution: Stress in General Scale I-Pressure (SIG I-Pressure)*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
.0	2	1.4	1.5	1.5
3.0	5	3.6	3.8	5.3
4.5	2	1.4	1.5	6.8
6.0	6	4.3	4.5	11.4
7.5	3	2.2	2.3	13.6
9.0	3	2.2	2.3	15.9
10.5	3	2.2	2.3	18.2
Valid 12.0	21	15.2	15.9	34.1
13.5	4	2.9	3.0	37.1
15.0	12	8.7	9.1	46.2
16.5	5	3.6	3.8	50.0
18.0	21	15.2	15.9	65.9
19.5	14	10.1	10.6	76.5
21.0	31	22.5	23.5	100.0
Total	132	95.7	100.0	
Missing System	6	4.3		
Total	138	100.0		

Table 13: *Frequency Distribution Stress in General Scale II –Threat (SIG II –Threat)*

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
.0	14	10.1	10.6	10.6
1.5	7	5.1	5.3	15.9
3.0	13	9.4	9.8	25.8
4.5	4	2.9	3.0	28.8
6.0	19	13.8	14.4	43.2
7.5	5	3.6	3.8	47.0
9.0	16	11.6	12.1	59.1
10.5	4	2.9	3.0	62.1
12.0	6	4.3	4.5	66.7
Valid 13.5	11	8.0	8.3	75.0
15.0	13	9.4	9.8	84.8
16.5	4	2.9	3.0	87.9
18.0	6	4.3	4.5	92.4
19.0	1	.7	.8	93.2
19.5	4	2.9	3.0	96.2
21.0	1	.7	.8	97.0
22.5	1	.7	.8	97.7
24.0	3	2.2	2.3	100.0
Total	132	95.7	100.0	
Missing System	6	4.3		
Total	138	100.0		

Analysis of Research Questions

District administrators from selected suburban public school districts (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey may often want to know how satisfied their teachers are. Questions that are pondered could include “How satisfied are public middle school teachers (DFG I) in Essex County, New Jersey?” and “How does this group compare to national norms that are available for other nonprofit organizations?”. The JDI and JIG are instruments that assess the overall satisfaction of a group and also have the capability to compare the results of one group to the national norms for similar or different organizations.

Tables 14-25 offered a comparison of the mean scores for the various aspects of the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I-Pressure, and the SIG II-Threat. The tables also offer the mean scores for nonprofit organizations utilizing national norms reported by the JDI, the JIG, and the SIG I-Pressure, and the SIG II-Threat.

The JDI and JIG have developed a range that supports the satisfaction or dissatisfaction on one’s job. The range of possible scores is from a low of 0 to a high of 54. The numbers that are at the midpoint of the range, 27, or higher indicate satisfaction on the job.

“In practice, however, there is a limited range on each scale that would characterize persons who feel neither good nor bad about particular aspects of their jobs. Thus, without attempting to pinpoint an exact neutral point, we have found it to be reasonably close to the middle range of possible scale scores (0 – 54), or around a score of 27. Scores well above 27 (i.e., 32 or above) indicate

satisfaction, while those well below 27 (i.e., 22 or below) indicate dissatisfaction” (Balzer, et. al., 1997, p. 26).

Null Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Work on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Work on Present Job subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Table 14: *JDI Work on Present Job*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Work on Present Job	137	44.53	7.565	.646

Table 14 indicated that a one sample t-test was completed to compute the mean score for the aspect Work on Present Job of the JDI for 137 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 44.53.

Table 15: *JDI National Norms Work on Present Job*

	Test Value = 44					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Work on Present Job	.824	136	.411	.53	-.75	1.81

Table 15 indicated that the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of Work on Present Job is 44. The mean difference between the two groups is .53. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the Work on Present Job subscale scores and the national norms for nonprofit organizations of the JDI. Public middle school teachers in this study were as satisfied as those employees employed in nonprofit work settings. Therefore, null hypothesis number one has been retained in this study. The researcher found the average score of the aspect Work on Present Job for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I to be satisfied with this aspect of their job since it is 17.53 points above the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Null Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Pay subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Pay subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Table 16: *JDI Pay*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pay	137	16.07	3.282	.280

Table 16 indicated that a one sample t-test was completed to compute the mean score for the aspect Pay of the JDI for 137 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 16.07.

Table 17: *JDI National Norms Pay*

	Test Value = 26					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Pay	-35.399	136	.000	-9.93	-10.48	-9.37

Table 17 indicated that the mean score of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of Pay is 26. The mean difference between the two groups is 9.93. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the Pay subscale scores and the national norms for nonprofit organization for the JDI. Public middle school teachers in this study were significantly more dissatisfied than those employees employed in nonprofit work settings. Therefore, null hypothesis number two has been rejected in this study. The researcher found the average score of the Pay for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I to be more dissatisfied with this aspect of their job since it is 10.93 points below the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Null Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Table 18: *JDI Opportunities for Promotion*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Opportunities for Promotion	137	9.55	6.523	.557

Table 18 indicated that a one sample t-test was completed to compute the mean score for the aspect Opportunities for Promotion of the JDI for 137 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 9.55.

Table 19: *JDI National Norms Opportunities for Promotion*

	Test Value = 12					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Opportunities for Promotion	-4.401	136	.000	-2.45	-3.55	-1.35

Table 19 indicated that the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of Opportunities for Promotion is 12. The mean difference between the two groups is 2.45. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the JDI. Therefore, null hypothesis number three has been retained in this study. The researcher found the average score of the Opportunities for Promotion for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I not to be satisfied with this aspect of their job since it is 17.45 points below the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Null Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Supervision subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Supervision subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Table 20: *JDI Supervision*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Supervision	137	40.85	12.155	1.038

Table 20 indicated a one sample t-test was completed to compare the mean score for the aspect Supervision of the JDI for 137 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 40.85.

Table 21: *JDI National Norms Supervision*

	Test Value = 39					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Supervision	1.778	136	.078	1.85	-.21	3.90

Table 21 indicated that the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of Supervision is 39. The mean difference between the two groups is .15. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the Supervision subscale scores and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the JDI. Therefore, null hypothesis four has been retained by this study.

The researcher found the average score of the aspect Supervision for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I to be satisfied with this aspect of their job since it is 13.85 points above the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Null Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using People on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using People on Present Job of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Table 22: *JDI People on Your Present Job*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
People on Your Present Job	136	41.63	10.253	.879

Table 22 indicated that a one sample t-test was completed to compute the mean score for the aspect People on Your Present Job of the JDI for 136 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 41.63.

Table 23: JDI National Norms People on Your Present Job

	Test Value = 41					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
People on Your Present Job	.719	135	.473	.63	-1.11	2.37

Table 23 indicated that the national norms of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of People on Your Present Job is 41. The mean difference between the two groups is .63. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the People on Your Present Job subscale scores as compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the JDI. Therefore, null hypothesis number five has been retained in this study. The researcher found the average score of the People on Your Present Job for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I to be satisfied with this aspect of their job since it is 14.63 points above the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Null Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the Job in General Scale (JIG) as compared to the Job in General Scale (JIG) of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Table 24: *Job in General Scale (JIG)*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Job in General	136	44.83	8.465	.726

Table 24 indicated that a one sample t-test was completed to compute the mean score for the Job in General Scale (JIG) for 136 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 44.83.

Table 25: *Job in General Scale (JIG) National Norms*

	Test Value = 43					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Job in General	2.522	135	.013	1.83	.40	3.27

Table 25 indicated that the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled for the JIG is 43. The mean difference between the two groups is 1.83. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JIG and the JIG of national norms for nonprofit organizations. Public middle school teachers in this study were as satisfied with their job in general as those employees employed in nonprofit work settings. Therefore, null hypothesis number six has been retained in this study. The researcher found the average score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I to be satisfied with this aspect of their job since the average score is 17.83 points above the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Null Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG I and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG I.

Table 26: *Stress in General I – Pressure Scale (SIG I – Pressure)*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Stress in General I - Pressure	132	15.239	5.5287	.4812

Table 26 indicated that a one sample t-test was completed to compare the mean score for the Stress in General Scale I – Pressure (SIG – I) for 132 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 15.23.

Table 27: *Stress in General I – Pressure Scale (SIG I – Pressure) National Norms*

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 12					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Stress in General I - Pressure	6.730	131	.000	3.239	2.287	4.191

Table 27 indicated that the mean for nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the publishers of the SIG – I Pressure is 12.00. The mean difference between the two groups is 3.23. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG – I Pressure and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG - I Pressure scale. Public middle school teachers in this study reported experiencing more pressure with their job in general than those employees employed in nonprofit work settings. Therefore, null hypothesis number seven has been rejected in this study.

Null Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG II and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG II scale.

Table 28: *Stress in General II – Threat Scale (SIG II – Threat)*

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Stress in General II - Threat	132	9.144	6.3386	.5517

Table 28 indicated that a one sample t-test was completed to compute the mean score for the SIG – II for 132 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 9.144.

Table 29: *Stress in General II-Threat Scale (SIG II-Threat) National Norms*

	Test Value = 9					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Stress in General II - Threat	.261	131	.795	.144	-.947	1.235

Table 29 indicated that the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled for the SIG-II Threat is 9.00. The mean difference between the two groups is .144. Although the mean scores for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I is slightly higher by .144, there is not a significant difference between this group as measured by the SIG-II Threat and national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG-II Threat scale. Public middle school teachers in this study reported feeling slightly more threatened with their job in general than those employees employed in nonprofit work settings. Null hypothesis number eight has been retained in this study since the difference in mean scores is insignificant.

Null Hypothesis 9

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of age.

Table 30 illustrated the group statistics for the independent variable of age. Although the mean scores are very close for all of the tests, there is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI aspects of Work on Present Job, Pay, Supervision, People on Your Present Job, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of age with the exception of JDI Opportunities for Promotion. JDI Opportunities for Promotion reported the mean for the group 20–39 years old as 10.37 and the mean score for the other group, 40 years old and above, as 8.92. In addition to the 1.45 point difference in mean scores, the standard deviation for the 20–39 years old group is 6.592 and the standard deviation for the other group, 40 years old and above is 6.517.

Table 31 also indicated that an independent t-test was completed to compare the relationship between the independent variable of age and overall teacher job satisfaction. These tables also reported that there were not any significant differences in any of the job aspects of the JDI with the exception of the aspect Opportunities for Promotion. The reported mean for the group 20-39 years old was reported as 10.37 and the mean score for the other group, 40 years old and above, was reported as 8.92. Therefore, there is a difference of 1.45 points between the two groups. The difference in mean scores

indicated that group one 20–39 years old is more satisfied with the aspect of Opportunities for Promotion than group two, 40 years old and above.

Tables 30 and 31 also reported a difference in mean scores for the Stress in General II–Threat. The group 20–39 years old was reported to have a mean score of 9.447 and the group 40 years old and above had a mean score of 8.323. There is a reported difference of 1.124 points between the two mean scores. Therefore, the group 20–39 years old reported feeling more threatened in the teaching profession than the group 40 years old and above.

The null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the JDI Opportunities for Promotion and the independent variable age. The null hypothesis was also rejected specifically with the SIG II–Threat and the independent variable age. All other areas JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Supervision, People on Present Job, the JIG, and the SIG I–Pressure, were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Table 30: *Group Statistics Age*

			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Work on Present Job	Age	20-39 years old	67	44.91	7.583	.926
		40 years old and above	66	44.56	7.347	.904
Pay	Age	20-39 years old	67	16.03	3.266	.399
		40 years old and above	66	16.23	3.290	.405
Opportunities for Promotion	Age	20-39 years old	67	10.37	6.592	.805
		40 years old and above	66	8.92	6.517	.802
Supervision	Age	20-39 years old	67	41.42	11.063	1.352
		40 years old and above	66	40.71	13.007	1.601
People on Your Present Job	Age	20-39 years old	66	41.08	9.842	1.212
		40 years old and above	66	41.79	10.800	1.329
Job in General	Age	20-39 years old	66	45.35	7.343	.904
		40 years old and above	66	44.76	8.677	1.068
Stress in General I	Age	20-39 years old	66	15.477	5.4317	.6686
		40 years old and above	62	14.831	5.6915	.7228
Stress in General II	Age	20-39 years old	66	9.447	6.0276	.7419
		40 years old and above	62	8.323	6.2036	.7879

Table 31: *Independent t test Age*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Work on Present Job	Equal variances assumed	2.705	.102	.270	131	.787	.35	1.295
	Equal variances not assumed			.270	130.964	.787	.35	1.295
Pay	Equal variances assumed	.001	.969	-.347	131	.729	-.20	.568
	Equal variances not assumed			-.347	130.933	.729	-.20	.569
Opportunities for Promotion	Equal variances assumed	.035	.851	1.275	131	.205	1.45	1.137
	Equal variances not assumed			1.275	130.998	.205	1.45	1.137
Supervision	Equal variances assumed	1.234	.269	.337	131	.736	.71	2.093
	Equal variances not assumed			.337	127.089	.737	.71	2.095
People on Your Present Job	Equal variances assumed	.809	.370	-.396	130	.693	-.71	1.799
	Equal variances not assumed			-.396	128.896	.693	-.71	1.799
Job in General	Equal variances assumed	2.915	.090	.422	130	.673	.59	1.399
	Equal variances not assumed			.422	126.539	.674	.59	1.399
Stress in General I	Equal variances assumed	.144	.705	.658	126	.512	.647	.9832
	Equal variances not assumed			.657	124.504	.513	.647	.9846
Stress in General II	Equal variances assumed	.329	.568	1.040	126	.300	1.124	1.0812
	Equal variances not assumed			1.039	124.948	.301	1.124	1.0822

Null Hypothesis 10

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of salary.

Table 32 indicated that a One Way ANOVA was completed to compare the relationship between the independent variable of salary and overall teacher job satisfaction. Table 32 also shows that the degrees of freedom were reported as two and there were 127 teachers surveyed for SIG II–Threat. The resulting One Way ANOVA calculation was $F(2, 125) = 3.946, p = .022$. There was a significant difference between groups for the SIG–II. The One Way ANOVA indicated the level of significance to be .022.

Table 33 indicated that the following means were reported through use of a One Way ANOVA: \$25,000–\$45,000 was 7.382, \$46,000–\$65,000 was 10.868, and \$66,000–and above was 8.5. The \$66,000 and above group feels more threatened than the \$25,000–\$45,000 group and the \$46,000–\$65,000. The \$46,000–\$65,000 group feels more threatened than the \$25,000–\$45,000 group.

The null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the SIG II–Threat and the independent variable salary. All other areas, JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, People on Present Job, the JIG, and the SIG I–Pressure were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Table 32: *One Way ANOVA Present Salary*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work on Present Job	Between Groups	69.072	2	34.536	.602	.549
	Within Groups	7456.026	130	57.354		
	Total	7525.098	132			
Pay	Between Groups	4.717	2	2.358	.211	.810
	Within Groups	1450.802	130	11.160		
	Total	1455.519	132			
Opportunities for Promotion	Between Groups	205.478	2	102.739	2.452	.090
	Within Groups	5445.966	130	41.892		
	Total	5651.444	132			
Supervision	Between Groups	746.714	2	373.357	2.532	.083
	Within Groups	19167.391	130	147.441		
	Total	19914.105	132			
People on Your Present Job	Between Groups	241.505	2	120.752	1.138	.324
	Within Groups	13693.124	129	106.148		
	Total	13934.629	131			
Job in General	Between Groups	136.274	2	68.137	.950	.390
	Within Groups	9256.635	129	71.757		
	Total	9392.909	131			
Stress in General I	Between Groups	27.424	2	13.712	.445	.642
	Within Groups	3852.630	125	30.821		
	Total	3880.055	127			
Stress in General II	Between Groups	290.887	2	145.444	3.946	.022
	Within Groups	4607.793	125	36.862		
	Total	4898.680	127			

Table 33: *The Tukey Test: Stress in General II-Threat (SIG II-Threat)*

	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
\$25,000 - \$45,000	38	7.382	
Present \$66,000 and above	37	8.500	8.500
Salary \$46,000 - \$65,000	53		10.868
Sig.		.679	.181

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 41.545.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Null Hypothesis 11

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of Years in the teaching profession.

Table 34 indicated a One Way ANOVA was completed for the independent variable of years in the teaching profession. The researcher developed categories initially as 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the researcher collapsed the categories for Years in teaching profession into three groups. There were no significant differences in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of years in the teaching profession as proven with levels above the .05 level of significance. An One Way ANOVA was completed for the independent variable years in teaching profession. The resulting One Way ANOVA calculation was $F(2, 134) = 1.696$, $p = .187$ for Work on Present Job, $F(2,134) = .576$, $p = .564$ for Pay, $F(2,134) = 1.430$, $p = .243$ for Opportunities for Promotion, $F(2,134) = .746$, $p = .476$ for Supervision, $F(2,133) = 1.109$, $p = .333$ for People on Your Present Job, $F(2,133) = 1.132$, $p = .326$ for Job in General, $F(2,129) = .006$, $p = .994$ for Stress in General I-Pressure, and $F(2,129) = .318$, $p = .728$ for Stress in General II-Threat. The researcher also concluded that since there is not a significant difference between the two groups regarding the JDI, JIG, SIG I-Pressure, and SIG II-Threat and the independent variable of years in the teaching profession, that there is evidence that supports null hypothesis number eleven.

Table 34: *One Way ANOVA Years in Teaching Profession*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work on Present Job	Between Groups	192.181	2	96.091	1.696	.187
	Within Groups	7591.921	134	56.656		
	Total	7784.102	136			
Pay	Between Groups	12.482	2	6.241	.576	.564
	Within Groups	1452.788	134	10.842		
	Total	1465.270	136			
Opportunities for Promotion	Between Groups	120.887	2	60.444	1.430	.243
	Within Groups	5665.055	134	42.277		
	Total	5785.942	136			
Supervision	Between Groups	221.134	2	110.567	.746	.476
	Within Groups	19872.647	134	148.303		
	Total	20093.781	136			
People on Your Present Job	Between Groups	232.798	2	116.399	1.109	.333
	Within Groups	13958.820	133	104.954		
	Total	14191.618	135			
Job in General	Between Groups	161.838	2	80.919	1.132	.326
	Within Groups	9511.272	133	71.513		
	Total	9673.110	135			
Stress in General I	Between Groups	.366	2	.183	.006	.994
	Within Groups	4003.867	129	31.038		
	Total	4004.233	131			
Stress in General II	Between Groups	25.837	2	12.918	.318	.728
	Within Groups	5237.428	129	40.600		
	Total	5263.265	131			

Null Hypothesis 12

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of highest degree held.

Table 35 indicated the group statistics for the independent variable highest degree held. This table reported that the only significant difference between the two groups was noted with the JIG scale. Teachers with an undergraduate degree have a reported mean score of 42.79 and a standard deviation of 9.386 and the teachers with graduate degrees have a reported mean score of 46.26 and a standard deviation of 7.488. Therefore, there is 3.48 point difference between the mean scores for the two groups.

Table 36 indicated that an independent t-test was completed in order to compare the relationship between the independent variable of highest degree held and overall teacher job satisfaction. This table also supports the fact that the only significant difference between the two groups was noted with the JIG scale. Teachers with an undergraduate degree have a reported mean score of 42.79 and teachers with graduate degrees have a reported mean score of 46.26. Therefore, there is 3.48 point difference between the two groups. The researcher concluded that teachers with graduate degrees appeared to be more satisfied than those without graduate degrees.

The null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the JIG and the independent variable highest degree earned. All other areas JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, People on Present Job, the SIG I-Pressure and the SIG II-Threat were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Table 35: *Group Statistics Highest Degree Held*

			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Work on Present Job	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	57	43.39	9.063	1.200
		Graduate degree(s)	80	45.35	6.220	.695
Pay	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	57	15.74	3.436	.455
		Graduate degree(s)	80	16.31	3.169	.354
Opportunities for Promotion	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	57	9.56	6.601	.874
		Graduate degree(s)	80	9.54	6.508	.728
Supervision	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	57	40.63	12.312	1.631
		Graduate degree(s)	80	41.00	12.118	1.355
People on Your Present Job	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	56	42.59	9.316	1.245
		Graduate degree(s)	80	40.96	10.868	1.215
Job in General	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	56	42.79	9.386	1.254
		Graduate degree(s)	80	46.26	7.488	.837
Stress in General I	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	54	15.278	5.1227	.6971
		Graduate degree(s)	78	15.212	5.8257	.6596
Stress in General II	Highest Degree Held	Undergraduate degree(s)	54	9.639	5.9331	.8074
		Graduate degree(s)	78	8.801	6.6207	.7496

Table 36: *Independent Samples Test Highest Degree Held*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Work on Present Job	Equal variances assumed	3.354	.069	-1.5	135	.135	-1.96	1.305
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.4	92.51	.160	-1.96	1.387
Pay	Equal variances assumed	.528	.469	-1.0	135	.313	-.58	.569
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.0	114.6	.320	-.58	.577
Opportunities for Promotion	Equal variances assumed	.001	.973	.021	135	.983	.02	1.135
	Equal variances not assumed			.021	119.7	.983	.02	1.137
Supervision	Equal variances assumed	.053	.818	-.17	135	.862	-.37	2.114
	Equal variances not assumed			-.17	119.6	.862	-.37	2.120
People on Your Present Job	Equal variances assumed	1.369	.244	.910	134	.364	1.63	1.788
	Equal variances not assumed			.935	128.5	.351	1.63	1.740
Job in General	Equal variances assumed	2.283	.133	-2.4	134	.018	-3.48	1.450
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.3	101.0	.023	-3.48	1.508
Stress in General I	Equal variances assumed	.249	.619	.067	130	.946	.066	.9825
	Equal variances not assumed			.069	122.7	.945	.066	.9597
Stress in General II	Equal variances assumed	1.070	.303	.745	130	.458	.838	1.1240
	Equal variances not assumed			.760	121.6	.449	.838	1.1018

Null Hypothesis 13

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of gender.

Table 37 illustrated the group statistics for the independent variable of gender. It also indicated a comparison of the relationship between the independent variable of gender status and overall teacher job satisfaction. The researcher developed two groups: male and female. There was only a significant difference between the males and females on the SIG I – Pressure Scale. The male group had a reported mean score of 13.241 and a standard deviation of 5.3796 and the female group had a reported mean score of 15.750 and a standard deviation of 5.4667.

Table 38 also supported that there was only one area, SIG I–Pressure, that had shown a significant difference between the two groups. The lower mean score indicated that men reported to experience less pressure on the job as reported by the SIG–I Pressure Scale than their female counterparts. There was a mean difference of 2.509 points between the two groups. The researcher concluded that since there is a significant difference among the two groups regarding the SIG–I Pressure and the independent variable of gender. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the SIG I Pressure and the independent variable of gender. All other areas JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, People on Present Job, the JIG, and the SIG–II Threat were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Table 37: *Group Statistics Gender*

			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Work on Present Job	Gender	Male	32	43.38	6.036	1.067
		Female	104	45.06	7.806	.765
Pay	Gender	Male	32	16.44	2.951	.522
		Female	104	15.97	3.397	.333
Opportunities for Promotion	Gender	Male	32	9.47	5.897	1.042
		Female	104	9.60	6.756	.662
Supervision	Gender	Male	32	41.44	10.308	1.822
		Female	104	40.95	12.423	1.218
People on Your Present Job	Gender	Male	31	40.48	10.178	1.828
		Female	104	41.99	10.347	1.015
Job in General	Gender	Male	31	44.29	7.039	1.264
		Female	104	45.30	8.327	.817
Stress in General I	Gender	Male	29	13.241	5.3796	.9990
		Female	102	15.750	5.4667	.5413
Stress in General II	Gender	Male	29	7.845	5.5567	1.0319
		Female	102	9.397	6.4506	.6387

Table 38: Independent Samples Test Gender

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Work on Present Job	Equal variances assumed	1.066	.304	-1.120	134	.265	-1.68	1.503
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.281	65.860	.205	-1.68	1.313
Pay	Equal variances assumed	.966	.328	.699	134	.486	.47	.667
	Equal variances not assumed			.754	58.522	.454	.47	.619
Opportunities for Promotion	Equal variances assumed	1.047	.308	-.096	134	.924	-.13	1.328
	Equal variances not assumed			-.103	58.237	.918	-.13	1.235
Supervision	Equal variances assumed	2.208	.140	.201	134	.841	.49	2.419
	Equal variances not assumed			.222	61.222	.825	.49	2.192
People on Your Present Job	Equal variances assumed	.315	.576	-.714	133	.476	-1.51	2.110
	Equal variances not assumed			-.721	49.949	.475	-1.51	2.091
Job in General	Equal variances assumed	.768	.382	-.611	133	.542	-1.01	1.648
	Equal variances not assumed			-.670	57.343	.506	-1.01	1.505
Stress in General I	Equal variances assumed	.191	.663	-2.188	129	.030	-2.509	1.1465
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.208	45.762	.032	-2.509	1.1362
Stress in General II	Equal variances assumed	1.311	.254	-1.177	129	.241	-1.552	1.3189
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.279	51.472	.207	-1.552	1.2135

Summary

The data and information included in chapter IV is the final analysis of the data using an SPSS program that utilized descriptive and inferential statistics. The data supports the research questions developed through this study and outlined in chapter III. Chapter V utilized the results of the data presented in chapter IV in order to offer conclusions related to policy and practice along with the recommendations for further research in the area of teacher job satisfaction.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Discussion of Analysis, Conclusions, Implications of Research, and Recommendations

This chapter includes a summary of the study, discussion of the data analysis, a summary of the conclusions drawn, and recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the level of job satisfaction for middle school teachers from selected public school districts in the State of New Jersey, specifically in the County of Essex with an I district factor grouping in order to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and selected demographic variables.

In the terms of this study, the conditions of work affect both teacher satisfaction and their commitment to teaching as a career. According to Lawler (1973), job satisfaction is defined as an individual's reaction to his or her overall role at work and the quality of life he or she is feeling in connection to the job. The recruitment and retention of teachers is more important now than ever before. We have a high number of teachers that will be retiring and therefore, a high number of vacancies to fill. According to Hunt (2003), we should be focusing on improving working conditions in the school, having greater career opportunities for teachers, providing fair pay for them, and showing the right kind of appreciation.

The public middle school teachers in this study that participated on a voluntary basis are known as the participants. The participants were requested to fill out the JDI, the JIG and the SIG I-Pressure and the SIG II-Threat Scales. The JDI measured job satisfaction in five areas. The five areas included Work on Present Job, Pay,

Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People on Present Job. The JIG measured the participants' feelings toward their job in general. Participants were asked to think about their experiences on their job while evaluating and responding to 18 adjectives that described their job in general most of the time. The Stress in General I–Pressure measured the amount of pressure a participant felt on the job and the Stress in General II –Threat measured the amount of a threat the participant experienced regarding his or her job. The goal of the Stress in General Scales was to measure an individual's stress at the workplace.

The sample was proposed in order to foster a self-selected sample of public middle school teachers from selected public school districts DFG I in Essex County, New Jersey. There were 317 surveys distributed to participating Essex County, New Jersey public middle schools with a DFG of I. Out of the 317 surveys that were distributed, 138 surveys (43.5%) were completed and returned. The researcher also attached a demographic questionnaire to each of the survey instruments for the voluntary participants to complete and return. The requested information on the survey instrument included demographic data about the participant's age, grades(s) currently teaching, job classification (regular education, special education, or special area), department, years in teaching profession, years at current school, present salary, gender, tenure status, and highest degree held.

The data was collected through the distribution of individual survey packets. The surveys were easily self-administered. The five Essex County, New Jersey public middle schools with a DFG of I that volunteered to participate received the surveys. The data collection process took place during the month of December 2002.

The study was guided by the following research questions and hypotheses regarding job satisfaction and middle school teachers in selected public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I:

Research Question 1

What is the level of job satisfaction of public middle school teachers from selected suburban school districts in Essex County, New Jersey, with a DFG of I as measured by each of the indicated scales of the Job Descriptive Index Revised (JDI) and which of the indicators represent the major areas as the primary source (s) of job satisfaction?

Null Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Work on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Work on Present Job subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Pay subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Pay subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores as compared to the JDI

using Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using Supervision subscale scores as compared to the JDI using Supervision subscale scores of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Null Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using People on Present Job subscale scores as compared to the JDI using People on Present Job of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

Research Question 2

What is the level of overall job satisfaction of public middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey, with a DFG I as measured by the Job in General (JIG) Scale?

Null Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JIG as compared to the JIG of national norms for nonprofit organizations.

The study was also guided by the following research question regarding stress and middle school teachers in selected public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I:

Research Question 3

What is the level of overall stress at work of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG I as measured by the SIG I-Pressure and SIG II-Threat ?

Null Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG I-Pressure as compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG I-Pressure.

Null Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG II-Threat as compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG II-Threat scale.

Research Question 4

Is there a difference between and/or among predetermined groups for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG) the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variables of age, present salary, years in the teaching profession, gender and highest degree held?

Null Hypothesis 9

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of age.

Null Hypothesis 10

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of salary.

Null Hypothesis 11

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of years in the teaching profession.

Null Hypothesis 12

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of highest degree held.

Null Hypothesis 13

There is no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of gender.

Conclusions

Responding to Research Question 1

What is the level of job satisfaction of public middle school teachers from selected suburban school districts in Essex County, New Jersey, with a DFG I as measured by each of the indicated scales of the Job Descriptive Index Revised (JDI) and which of the indicators represent the major areas as the primary source (s) of job satisfaction?

The researcher distributed the JDI and utilized the User's Manual for the Job Descriptive Index by Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) as a means for assessing the data collected for all five aspects (Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and People on Your Present Job). The JDI has developed a range that supports the satisfaction or dissatisfaction levels. The range of possible scores is from a low of 0 to a high of 54. The numbers that are at the midpoint of the range of 27 or higher indicated satisfaction.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 1

JDI Work on Present Job.

The first aspect measured was the JDI Work on Present Job. Of the 138 surveys that were returned, 137 were completed for Work on Present Job. The researcher discovered through a frequency distribution that the scores of the JDI Work on Present Job ranged from a low of 9 to a high of 54. Three teachers scored below the middle range score of 27, therefore, 2.19% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with Work on Present Job. One hundred thirty four teachers scored at the middle range score of 27

and above, therefore, 97.81% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Work on Present Job.

The researcher examined the mean difference between the public middle school teachers in this study and employees in nonprofit organizations utilizing an independent t-test. This data analysis reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of 1 as 44.53. It also reported the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of Work on Present Job as 44.00. The mean difference between the two groups is .53. Therefore, public middle school teachers in this study were as satisfied as those employed in nonprofit work settings. The mean score for public middle school teachers in this study was 17.53 points above the middle range score of 27 for the JDI. Hence, more data is provided to support the conclusions of the researcher that public middle school teachers in this study are satisfied with the JDI Work on Present Job.

Bishay (1996) noted that teachers describe their workday activities as 'happy', 'involved', and 'excited'. These adjectives are similar to those of the JDI Work on Present Job. Parkes and Stevens (2000) also indicated in their study related to teacher satisfaction that schools with high levels of teacher efficacy tended to be more satisfied. Hence, this study also supports the similar findings of Bishay, Parkes and Stevens.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 2

JDI Pay.

Of the 138 surveys returned, 137 were completed for JDI Pay. The researcher discovered, using a frequency distribution, that the scores of the JDI Pay ranged from a low score of 8 to a high of 24. One hundred thirty seven teachers scored below the

middle range score of 27, resulting in 100% of the teachers surveyed being dissatisfied with the JDI Pay. Zero percent of the teachers scored at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, the results showed that 0.00% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Pay. The researcher also discovered, using an independent t-test, that the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I is 16.07 for the JDI Pay. The data analysis also reported that the mean score of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI Pay was 26.00. The mean difference between the two groups is 9.93. Therefore, there was a significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the Pay subscale scores and to the national norms for nonprofit organization for the JDI. The researcher found the average score of the Pay for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I showed that teacher's were more dissatisfied with this aspect of their job since it is 10.93 points below the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Hunt (2003) indicated that the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future has proposed approximately more than 30 solutions to keep teachers in the profession. One of the proposals included upgrading the appeal of teaching in many areas, particularly pay. Potter and Swenk (2001) surveyed 2007 teachers related to teacher job satisfaction. It was reported in this survey that 40.56% of the 2007 teachers that responded to this section were satisfied with their salary.

"We find that, contrary to frequent reports, salary was not a factor with which our respondents were most dissatisfied. This is not to say that salary was unimportant. It was

the second highest negative factor, with 54.36% of the sample saying they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with salary” (Potter and Swenk, 2001, p. 16). Therefore, this study supports those findings.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 3

JDI Opportunities for Promotion.

Of the 138 surveys returned, 137 were completed for the JDI Opportunities for Promotion. The researcher discovered, using a frequency distribution, that the scores of the JDI Opportunities for Promotion ranged from a low of 0 to a high of 27. One hundred thirty teachers scored below the middle range score of 27, 94.89% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with the JDI of Opportunities for Promotion. Seven of the teachers scored at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, the scores report that 5.11% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Opportunities for Promotion.

The data analysis reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 9.55. It also indicated that the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of Opportunities for Promotion was 12.00. The mean difference between the two groups is 2.45. Therefore, there was no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the Opportunities for Promotion subscale scores and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the JDI. An executive summary was posted by the Douglas County School District in Colorado regarding teacher job satisfaction. One thousand four hundred thirty eight teachers were surveyed in this

report. Ninety eight percent of the teachers expressed that there were opportunities to work and grow. It was clear that this pertained to the parameters of the classroom working in the capacity as a teacher. 73% of the teachers also reported that there were excellent opportunities for career development and continual learning. The researcher concluded that teachers perceive their opportunities for promotion as those that are intrinsically motivating to oneself. The opportunities for promotion were reported as professional growth in the profession in his or her current position as a teacher. Teachers do not perceive themselves as having as many opportunities for promotion as those that work in other sectors since an excellent teacher is not rewarded with an opportunity to leave the classroom and move into administration or provided the opportunity for a raise in salary based on merit.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 4

JDI Supervision.

Of the 138 surveys returned, 137 were completed for JDI Supervision. The researcher discovered, using a frequency distribution, that the scores of the JDI Supervision ranged from a low of 6 to a high of 54. Twenty teachers scored below the middle range score of 27, resulting in 14.60% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with JDI Supervision. One hundred seventeen of the teachers were reported at the middle range score of 27 and above therefore, the results showed that 85.40% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Supervision. An independent t-test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 40.85. This data analysis also indicated the mean of nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the JDI for the aspect of Supervision as 39.00. The mean

difference between the two groups was .15. Therefore, there was no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI using the Supervision subscale scores and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the JDI. The researcher found the average score of supervision for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I to be reported as satisfied with this aspect of their job. It was 13.85 points above the middle range score of 27 for the JDI. It was concluded that teachers are satisfied with their supervisors, in this case, building administrators. The Statistical Analysis Report that was published by the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) reported that administrative support and leadership were working conditions associated with teacher satisfaction. It was also reported that the more favorable the working conditions, the higher the satisfaction scores. The aspect of supervision has been consistently linked to teacher job satisfaction. Hartzell & Winger (1989) also found that the role of the principal contributes to teacher job satisfaction. This study supports the work of Hartzell, et. al., regarding the relationship of teacher job satisfaction and supervision.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 5

JDI People on Your Present Job.

Of the 138 surveys returned, 137 were completed for JDI People on Your Present Job. The researcher discovered, using a frequency distribution, that the scores of the JDI People on Your Present Job ranged from a low of 9 to a high of 54. Sixteen teachers scored below the middle range score of 27, resulting in 11.68% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with JDI People on Your Present Job. One hundred twenty one of the

teachers were reported at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, the results showed that 88.32% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI People on Your Present Job.

A one sample t-test was completed to compute the mean score for the aspect People on Your Present Job of the JDI for 136 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 41.63. The mean score for nonprofit organizations using national norms for the JDI People on your Present Job was reported as 41.00. The mean difference between the two groups was .63. Therefore, there was no significant difference between the overall job satisfaction scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI People on Your Present Job subscale scores and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the JDI People on Your Present Job. The researcher found the average score for the aspect People on Your Present Job for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I to be satisfied. This is due to the results being reported at 14.63 points above the middle range score of 27 for the JDI.

Bishay (1996) found in his study that the teachers surveyed requested to have more time to interact with their coworkers, thus contributing to their overall job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) explained in his study that an individual may be dissatisfied with a coworker (hygiene factor) but be extremely satisfied with the rewards of a particular task or the job in general (motivation factor). Therefore, although hygiene factors may play a major role in preventing job dissatisfaction, it has been proven that motivational factors must exist in order to foster a high level of job

satisfaction for an individual. Therefore, this study supports the findings of Bishay and Herzberg.

Summary

Out of the 138 teachers that were surveyed for this study, the following areas denote the major areas as the primary source of job satisfaction: Work on Present Job was reported at 97.81%, Supervision was reported at 85.40%, and People On Your Present Job was reported at 88.32%.

Responding to Research Question 2

What is the level of overall job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in the State of New Jersey, specifically in the County of Essex, with an I district factor grouping as measured by the Job in General (JIG) Scale?

In order to measure the overall level of job satisfaction of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I, the researcher distributed the Job in General Scale (JIG) and utilized the User's Manual for the Job in General Scales (JIG) by Balzer, Kim, Smith, Irwin, Bachiochi, Robie, Sinar, & Parra (1997) (1997) as a means for assessing the data collected for this scale. The JDI and JIG have developed a range that supports the satisfaction or dissatisfaction levels. The range of possible scores is from a low of 0 to a high of 54. The numbers that are at the midpoint of the range, 27 or higher, indicate satisfaction.

“In practice, however, there is a limited range on each scale that would characterize persons who feel neither good nor bad about particular aspects of their jobs. Thus, without attempting to pinpoint an exact neutral point, we have

found it to be reasonably close to the middle range of possible scale scores (0 – 54), or around a score of 27. Scores well above 27 (i.e., 32 or above) indicate satisfaction, while those well below 27 (i.e., 22 or below) indicate dissatisfaction” (Balzer, et. al., 1997, p. 26).

Responding to Null Hypothesis 6

The researcher discovered that the scores of the JIG ranged from a low of 13 to a high of 54. Out of 138 teachers returned, 136 were completed for the Job in General Scale (JIG). There were only four teachers that scored below the middle range of 27, resulting in 2.95% of the teachers surveyed indicating that they were dissatisfied with their job in general. Therefore, 132 teachers, 97.05%, of public middle school teachers employed in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I reported to be satisfied with their job in general. Similarly, Bishay (1996) found overall job satisfaction level(s) were high. It was also reported by Bishay that it appeared that gratification of higher-order needs is most important for job satisfaction. This study supports Bishay’s findings.

The researcher also discovered that there was no significant difference between the mean scores for the teachers in this study, 44.83, and the mean scores of nonprofit organizations, 43.00, using national norms compiled for the JIG. Hence, public middle school teachers in this study were as satisfied with their job in general as those employees employed in nonprofit work settings.

Summary

Out of the 132 teachers in this study, 97.05% reported being satisfied with their job in general as measured by the Job in General Scale (JIG).

Responding to Research Question 3

What is the level of overall stress at work of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG I as measured by the SIG-I Pressure and SIG II-Threat ?

In order to measure the overall level of stress of middle school teachers from selected suburban public school districts in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I, the researcher distributed the Stress in General I-Pressure and the Stress in General II – Threat Scales. The researcher also utilized the User’s Manual for the Stress in General I and Stress in General II by Balzer, et.al., (2001) as a means for assessing the data collected for these scales.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 7

SIG-I Pressure.

Out of the 138 surveys returned, 132 were completed for the SIG I-Pressure. The researcher discovered that the scores of the SIG I-Pressure ranged from a low of .0 to a high of 21.0. There were 108 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 12.0, resulting in 81.81% of the teachers surveyed reported to be experiencing less pressure on the job under the aspect of stress. Twenty-four teachers were reported at the middle range score of 12.0 and above, therefore, 18.18% of the teachers surveyed had experienced more pressure on the job with the SIG I-Pressure. A one sample t-test was completed to compare the mean score for the SIG-I for 132 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I and national norms for this survey. This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 15.23. It was also reported that the mean for

nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled by the publishers of the SIG-I Pressure was 12.00. The mean difference between the two groups was 3.23. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the overall stress level scores of public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the SIG-I Pressure and the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG - I Pressure scale. Public middle school teachers in this study reported experiencing more pressure with their job in general than those employees employed in nonprofit work settings.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 8

SIG II-Threat.

Out of the 138 surveys returned, 132 were completed for the SIG II-Threat. The researcher discovered that the scores of the SIG II-Threat ranged from a low of .0 to a high of 24.0. Sixty-two teachers scored below the middle range score of 9.00, resulting in 46.97% of the teachers surveyed reported to be experiencing less of threat on the job under the aspect of stress. Seventy teachers were reported at the middle range score of 9.00 and above, therefore, 53.03% of the teachers surveyed had been experiencing more of a threat on the job with the SIG II-Threat. A one sample t-test was also completed to compute the mean score for the SIG-II for 132 public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of "I." This test reported the mean score for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG of I as 9.144. It was reported that the mean score was 9.00 for nonprofit organizations using national norms compiled for the SIG -II Threat. The mean difference between the two groups was .144. Although the mean scores for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey DFG I is slightly higher by .144, there is not a significant difference between this group

as measured by the SIG-II Threat when compared to the national norms for nonprofit organizations for the SIG-II Threat scale. Public middle school teachers in this study reported being slightly more threatened on their job in general leading to higher levels of stress than those employees employed in nonprofit work settings. Black's (2001) report found in terms of organization factors, U.S. teachers and others worldwide feel especially burdened by time constraints, which translate into emotional exhaustion and low job satisfaction. She also noted that there were two categories of school factors: organizational characteristics and individual characteristics that affect stress. Black also reported that individuals feel stressed when they perceive the demands on them exceed their capacity to cope. She also noted that job insecurity, long work hours, role conflict, and interpersonal conflicts with administrators and other teachers create stress on the job. This study supports the research done by Black as the teachers in this study have been reported to experience more pressure as indicated by the SIG I and SIG II than the national norms for nonprofit employees. Although the teachers in this study may have a higher level of pressure, the overall level of job satisfaction as reported by the JIG Scale was reported to be very high. This study supports the work of Stanton, et.al., (2001) as it was reported that high levels of stress do not directly influence teacher job satisfaction.

Summary

One hundred thirty two surveys were completed for the SIG I-Pressure. There were 108 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 12.0, resulting in 81.81% of the teachers surveyed reported to be experience less pressure on the job under the aspect of stress. Twenty-four teachers were reported at the middle range score of 12.0 and above, therefore, 18.18% of the teachers surveyed had experienced more pressure on

the job with the SIG I-Pressure. One hundred thirty two surveys were completed for the Stress in General Scale (SIG II-Threat). Sixty-two teachers scored below the middle range score of 9.00, resulting in 46.97% of the teachers surveyed reported to be experiencing less of threat on the job under the aspect of stress. Seventy teachers were reported at the middle range score of 9.00 and above, therefore, 53.03% of the teachers surveyed had been experiencing more of a threat on the job as determined by the SIG II-Threat.

Responding to Research Question 4

The researcher compared mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variables of age, years in the teaching profession, years at current school, present salary, gender, and highest degree held.

The researcher attached a demographic questionnaire to each of the survey instruments for the voluntary participants to complete and return. The requested information on the survey instrument included demographic data about the participant's age, grades(s) currently teaching, job classification (regular education, special education, or special area), department, years in teaching profession, years at current school, present salary, gender, tenure status, and highest degree held.

The researcher conducted frequency distributions for the following demographic independent variables: age, present salary, years in teaching profession, gender, and highest degree held.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 9

Independent Variable Age:

The following conclusions are presented for the independent variable of age utilizing an independent t-test. Although the mean scores were close for all of the tests, there was not a significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI aspects of Work on Present Job, Pay, Supervision, People on Your Present Job, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of age with the exception of JDI Opportunities for Promotion. JDI Opportunities for Promotion reported the mean for the group 20–39 years old as 10.37 and the mean score for the other group, 40 years old and above, as 8.92. In addition to the 1.45 point difference in mean scores, the standard deviation for the 20–39 years old was 6.592 and the standard deviation for the other group, 40 years old and above, was reported as 6.517. Again, teachers were reported, despite age, to be dissatisfied with their opportunities for promotion. Teachers do not perceive their profession as affording as many opportunities for promotion as in other sectors. Teachers feel this way since an excellent teacher is not rewarded with an opportunity to leave the classroom in order to become an administrator or the opportunity to acquire a raise in salary based on merit. Teachers ranging from mediocre to excellent have the same opportunity to become an administrator. This change of career is by choice. The registration and completion of administrative preparation courses and program, and the completion of state tests for licensure are the requirements necessary to obtain an administrative position. In any Essex County, New Jersey teachers' contract, it is easily inferred that although teachers receive a salary increase each year, it is based on

years of service and adequate performance at a minimum and not on merit. Teachers' contracts do not offer teachers the choice of leaving the classroom and moving into administration, department head, or any other supervisory role as a result of satisfactory performance.

The data analysis also reported a difference in mean scores for the SIG II-Threat. The group 20-39 years old was reported to have a mean score of 9.447 and the group 40 years old and above had a mean score of 8.323. There is a reported difference of 1.124 points between the two mean scores. Therefore, the group 20-39 years old reported feeling more threatened in the teaching profession than the group 40 years old and above. Black (2001) found in her research that the teachers that reported to feel more powerless and estranged were younger and less experienced teachers. This study supports the conclusions reported by Black.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 10

Independent Variable Present Salary.

The researcher developed seven categories initially as \$25,000-\$35,000, \$36,000-\$45,000, \$46,000-\$55,000, \$56,000-\$65,000, \$66,000-\$75,000, \$76,000-\$85,000, and \$86,000-\$95,000. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the researcher collapsed the age categories into three groups: \$25,000-\$45,000, \$46,000-\$65,000, \$66,000-and above). Once the categories were collapsed, there were 39 teachers (28.3%) reported to be earning a salary between \$25,000-\$45,000, 55 teachers (39.9%) were reported to be earning a salary of \$46,000-\$65,000, and 39 teachers (28.3%) reported to be earning a salary between \$66,000 and above. Out of the 138 teachers that completed the surveys, there were five (3.6%) teachers that did not indicate

their present salary, therefore, there were 133 (96.4%) teachers that indicated their salary on the demographic survey. Of the 138 returned, 137 were completed for JDI Pay. The researcher discovered that the scores of the JDI Pay ranged from a low score of 8 to a high of 24. There were 137 teachers that scored below the middle range score of 27, resulting in 100% of the teachers surveyed were dissatisfied with the JDI Pay. There were not any teachers that scored at the middle range score of 27 and above, therefore, 0.00% of the teachers surveyed were satisfied with the JDI of Pay.

The following conclusions are presented for the independent variable of salary utilizing a One Way ANOVA as a means for comparing the relationship between the independent variable of salary and overall teacher job satisfaction. The One Way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference between the three groups for the SIG-II Threat. The \$66,000 and above group felt more threatened than the \$25,000-\$45,000 group and the \$46,000-\$65,000. The \$46,000-\$65,000 group felt more threatened than the \$25,000-\$45,000 group. "Increased length of service is correlated with greater satisfaction with salary, higher levels of self-esteem, higher levels of respect for the teaching profession, and decreased levels of stress" (Bishay, 1996, p. 153). The findings of this study show that all teachers, regardless of salary level, were dissatisfied with their pay as reported by the data analysis for the JDI Pay. This study also reports the results of the SIG II-Threat for the sample in this study utilizing a One Way ANOVA, hence, refuting the findings of Bishay. Black (2001) also found that the younger teachers experienced more pressure on the job, resulting in higher levels of stress than older teachers. It can be correlated that the teachers earning \$66,000 and above are the older teachers, therefore, the researcher's findings do not support the work of Black. Although

100% of the teachers in this study were dissatisfied with their present salary as reported by the JDI Pay, teachers have reported a very high rate of job satisfaction as reported on the JIG. Therefore, the researcher concluded that salary is an important factor that contributes to the overall job satisfaction for teachers. This supports the work of Bishay as he noted that gratification of higher-order needs is most important.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 11

Independent Variable of Years in Teaching Profession.

The researcher initially developed eight categories for the independent variable of years in the teaching profession as 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the researcher collapsed the categories for years in the teaching profession into three groups. One group represented the 0-10 years range, the second group represented the 11-20 years range, and the third group represented the 21 years and above range. The first group, 0-10 years, made up 42.8% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their years in the teaching profession on the demographic survey. The second group, 11-20 years, made up 26.8% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their years in the teaching profession on the demographic survey. The third group, 21 years and above, represented 30.4% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their years in the teaching profession on the demographic surveys. Out of the 138 teachers that completed the surveys, there were 138 teachers (100%) that indicated their years in the teaching profession.

A One Way ANOVA was completed for the independent variable of years in the teaching profession. There was no significant difference in mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured

by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of years in the teaching profession as proven with levels above the .05 level of significance. A One Way ANOVA was completed for the independent variable years in teaching profession. The resulting One Way ANOVA calculation was $F(2, 134) = 1.696, p = .187$ for Work on Present Job, $F(2,134) = .576, p = .564$ for Pay, $F(2,134) = 1.430, p = .243$ for Opportunities for Promotion, $F(2,134) = .746, p = .476$ for Supervision, $F(2,133) = 1.109, p = .333$ for People on Your Present Job, $F(2,133) = 1.132, p = .326$ for Job in General, $F(2,129) = .006, p = .994$ for Stress in General I-Pressure, and $F(2,129) = .318, p = .728$ for Stress in General II-Threat. Therefore, the researcher concluded that since there is not a significant difference between the two groups regarding the JDI, JIG, SIG I-Pressure, and SIG II-Threat and the independent variable of years in teaching profession, that null hypothesis number eleven has been retained.

According to the Statistical Analysis Report written by the National Center for Education Statistics it was found that "In public schools, younger and less experienced teachers have higher levels of satisfaction than older and more experienced teachers. In private schools, the relationship is bipolar—the very youngest and very oldest teachers had the highest levels of satisfaction as did the least and most experienced teachers" (p.1, 1997). This study does not support the findings regarding public schools reported by the National Center for Education Statistics.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 12

Independent Variable Highest Degree Held.

The researcher initially developed five groups: BA/BS, BA/BS+, MA/MS, MA/MS+, Ph.D/Ed.D. Due to an unbalanced representation of these categories, the

researcher collapsed the five groups into the following two groups: undergraduate degrees and Graduate degrees. The researcher utilized a frequency distribution in order to tabulate the number of undergraduate versus graduate degrees. Using the new groupings there were 57 teachers (41.3%) with undergraduate degrees reported and 81 teachers (58.7%) reported with graduate degrees. Out of the 138 teachers surveyed, 138 teachers (100%) indicated their level of degree on the demographic survey.

The researcher, through the use of an independent t-test, reported the mean scores between job satisfaction of public middle school teachers in New Jersey with a DFG of I as measured by the JDI, the JIG, the SIG I and the SIG II and the independent variable of highest degree held. The only significant difference between the two groups was noted with the JIG scale. Teachers with an undergraduate degree had a reported mean score of 42.79 and a standard deviation of 9.386 and the teachers with graduate degrees had a reported mean score of 46.26 and a standard deviation of 7.488. Therefore, there was 3.48 point difference between the mean scores for the two groups. MacMillan (1999) discussed the results of his findings and indicated that professional competence is a key contributor to job satisfaction.

“Teachers who are satisfied with their jobs state that they feel positive about what they know and that how they teach does matter in the education of their student. Those teachers also recognize the importance of professional development. Without a sense of professional competence, let alone growth, some degree of professional unease may reel in feelings of dissatisfaction with teachers’ instructional success over the short time, and if such sentiments persist, with their jobs” (MacMillan 1999, p. 40). This study supports the findings of MacMillan

since graduate degrees foster one's belief that he or she has acquired the current instructional strategies or at a minimum have access to their use.

Responding to Null Hypothesis 13

Independent Variable Gender.

The researcher completed a frequency distribution for the independent variable of gender. The researcher developed two categories for gender (male, female). There were 32 males (23.2%) and 105 females (76.1%) that made up the number of teachers that completed the survey. Out of the 138 teachers that completed the surveys, there was one teacher (.7%) that did not indicate their present gender. Therefore, there were 137 (99.3%) teachers that indicated their gender on the demographic survey.

The researcher analyzed the group statistics for the independent variable of gender utilizing an independent t-test. The researcher developed two groups: male and female. There was only a significant difference between the males and females on the SIG I-Pressure Scale. The group that represented the males had a reported mean score of 13.241 and a standard deviation of 5.3796 and the female group had a reported mean score of 15.750 and a standard deviation of 5.4667. The lower mean score indicated that men reported to experience less pressure on the job as reported by the SIG-I Pressure Scale than their female counterparts. There was a difference of 2.509 points between the two groups ($F(130,122.7) = .249, P = .619$). The researcher concluded since that there was a significant difference among the two groups regarding the SIG-I Pressure and the independent variable of gender, it is evident that null hypothesis number thirteen has been rejected. The researcher noted in this study that there were 32 males (23.2%) and 105 females (76.1%) that made up the number of teachers that completed the survey. These

numbers support the statistics of teacher demographic reported by Klecker and Loadman (1999) as it was reported that the national teaching population is made up of 72% female and 28% male. Klecker and Loadman (1999) also noted in their study that females reported to finding their job more challenging than their male counterparts. The more challenging a job is, the more stress an individual experiences. Potter and Swenk (2001) indicated in her findings that stress was the highest order of dissatisfaction since 67% of the 1,827 respondents indicated that they were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their job as a teacher. It was also concluded that females were more stressed than males in this study as evidenced by the larger number of female respondents to the survey. Potter and Swenk reported that females made up 71.22% of the sample, while 28.78% of the sample was male.

Summary of the Hypotheses

Null hypotheses 1, 4, 5, 6, and 11 were retained by this study as proven through the statistical analysis provided for each null hypothesis. Null hypotheses 2, 3, 7, and 8 were rejected in this study. Null hypotheses 9, 10, 12, and 13 were rejected in selected areas of this study. To be more specific please note the following areas in which the hypothesis for 9, 10, 12, and 13 were not confirmed.

Null Hypothesis 9

The null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the JDI Opportunities for Promotion and the independent variable age. The null hypothesis was also rejected specifically with the SIG II-Threat and the independent variable age. All other areas (JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Supervision, People on Present Job, the JIG, and the SIG

I-Pressure) were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Null Hypothesis 10

The null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the SIG II-Threat and the independent variable salary. All other areas (JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, People on Present Job, the JIG, and the SIG I-Pressure) were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Null Hypothesis 12

The null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the JIG and the independent variable highest degree earned. All other areas (JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, People on Present Job, the SIG I-Pressure and the SIG II- Threat) were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Null Hypothesis 13

The null hypothesis was rejected specifically with the SIG I-Pressure and the independent variable gender. All other areas (JDI: Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, People on Present Job, the JIG, and the SIG II-Threat) were not statistically significant, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained in those areas.

Demographic Profile

The 20-39 years old teachers made up 49.3% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their age on the demographic survey. The other group represented the 40 years

old and above. This group made up 47.8% of the teachers surveyed that indicated their age on the demographic survey. Teachers in this study taught one or more of the 5–9 grade levels. There were special area teachers (music, physical education, computers, art, world language, and media), special education teachers, and regular education teachers represented. Teachers participating in this study had varying years of teaching experience. Teachers with teaching experience between 0-10 years, made up 42.8% of the teachers surveyed. Teachers with teaching experience between 11–20 years made up 26.8% of the teachers surveyed. Teachers with teaching experience of 21 years and above represented 30.4% of the teachers surveyed. The teachers in this study indicated that their salaries ranged from \$25,000–\$66,000 and above. There were 39 teachers (28.3%) earning a salary between \$25,000-\$45,000, 55 teachers (39.9%) earning a salary between \$46,000-\$65,000, and 39 teachers (28.3%) earning a salary between \$66,000 and above. As the research in this study has proven, teaching is a female dominated profession. This study is not an exception to those statistics. There were 32 males (23.2%) and 105 females (76.1%) that made up the number of teachers that completed the survey. Tenure is given to teachers in New Jersey after the completion of teaching three school years and one day. This study reported to have 38 teachers nontenured and 100 teachers tenured. There were 57 teachers (41.3%) with undergraduate degrees and 81 teachers (58.7%) with graduate degrees.

Implications

The researcher has formulated implications that impact on local and national policy. The importance of studying teacher job satisfaction and the supplementary information developed by the researcher has been presented for job satisfaction related to

the teaching profession. Future research should be done in order to explore the findings of this study.

Local Policy

Although the public middle school teachers in this study have indicated dissatisfaction with the job aspects of pay and the opportunities for promotion and ascertain high levels of stress on a daily basis, they reported having high levels of satisfaction with their job in general. There are many areas that these teachers are satisfied with that comprise the overall feeling of job satisfaction.

From the data collected for this study along with the careful analysis, it can be concluded that each of the DFG I middle schools in Essex County, New Jersey must be meeting many of the needs expressed by the teachers in order to support their high levels of satisfaction. These school districts must continue to maintain this high level of satisfaction by offering the teachers the tools, praise, and support that fosters job satisfaction. It has been proven in this study that the areas of salary and the opportunities for promotion need attention as teachers scored these two areas 'as not satisfied'. Local administrators, school boards, and teacher unions need to assess the exact point of dissatisfaction in these two areas. Although teachers have rated themselves as satisfied overall, the same teachers may be driven from the profession due to the lack of compensation and a desire to earn a higher salary in order to fulfill personal needs and wants of life.

National Policy

Job satisfaction for teachers is important since they represent the adults that are educating our present students and representing our future students. Today we hear about

the improvements that are needed for the school buildings and the further curriculum revisions that are implemented in order to foster a community of learners throughout the nation. We hear little about what needs to be done for teachers nationwide in order to maintain higher levels of job satisfaction or strategies to raise job satisfactions. Generally, if the level of job satisfaction is low in a particular school building, we hope that the building administrators recognize this deficiency. The responses reported for nonprofit organizations using national norms were very similar to those responses for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG I. Therefore, several implications can be made based on current research on teacher job satisfaction. It has been shown that school administrators contribute greatly to the levels of teacher job satisfaction.

“In the end, people who have studied teacher morale agree, it all comes down to principals. Principals have the power to ‘uplift teachers’. Principals, who effectively define their school’s mission, manage the school’s instructional program well, promote a positive climate for student learning, and invite teachers to collaborate on important decisions have the greatest impact on teacher morale.

The lesson for school board members and superintendents: Don’t blame teachers if their morale is low. First look to your principals” (Vernadine, 1997, p. 7).

Opportunities need to be available for teachers to become a part of the decision making process such as identifying the needs of a school, developing a plan, and executing it.

Teachers need to continue to communicate to administrators their needs in order to accomplish their personal and professional goals. Sutherland (1994) concluded that communication is an important aspect in creating an effective school climate.

Building administrators must consider the needs and opinions of the staff but keep a perspective as to what is best for the school as a whole. Teacher commitment is directly linked to job satisfaction. MacMillan (1999) clearly expressed that building administrators should be aware of the many factors that influence teachers' satisfaction with their work and the impact this satisfaction has on teachers' involvement in a school. Various studies that have taken place in different parts of the country have reported in this study that teachers with higher levels of job satisfaction have identified with their school more than those that do not. Therefore, identification with the school clearly illustrates an individual's desire to contribute positively to the mission of the school.

Practice

It is important for building administrators, districts administrators and board members throughout the United States to know the specific areas that comprise a teacher's level of job satisfaction. Teachers are the individuals that have the day to day contact with the students. The level of satisfaction drives the level of enthusiasm towards the profession which directly impacts on the students. In many cases if the teacher is satisfied, the students in his or her class appear to be very happy. Teachers possess the power in each school since they are in the trenches each day responsible for the students' self worth and self esteem, the level of the students' achievement, the safety of the students, and the positive outcome of all school initiatives, goals, and objectives.

Building administrators can monitor some of those areas through the checking of lesson plans, informal/formal observations of the teaching staff, feedback from parents and students, and standardized testing among others. The fact is that the teachers are the

individuals responsible for the delivery of the services in the school building. A teacher that is committed is a teacher that is satisfied with one's job.

It is important for administrators and board members to be aware of the deficient areas that lower teacher morale since these deficient areas contribute to the lowering of job satisfaction. Teachers in this study reported to have dissatisfaction with the JDI Opportunities with Promotion. As garnered from this research, it is important to investigate this area since the concept of a promotion in teaching appears to be unclear. In this study, there were a number of teachers that wrote in notes for this section. Some teachers indicated that teaching does not provide opportunities for promotion while others perceived administration as a promotion.

Teachers in this study also reported being dissatisfied with the JDI Salary. Teaching is a profession that does not compensate for every working hour that is dedicated to lesson plans, correcting papers, and conferencing with parents among many other required job related tasks. The implications find one thinking that compensation should possibly be instituted for all of the responsibilities that accompany the job description of teacher.

The researcher identified the level of stress for public middle school teachers. Although teachers in this study reported to have job satisfaction, there were also high levels of stress reported for the teaching profession. This was important to the study since schools need to look at what the stressors are and conduct more research in order to discover the preventatives and remedies for teacher stress. The UK National Health Service (2003) reported that work related stress is a symptom of an organizational problem, not an individual weakness. There are many demands placed on teachers from

building administrators, parents, and the public. Travers and Cooper (1997) indicated that the workload and long working hours contributed to teacher stress. We need to examine those demands and decide if we need to restructure our work environment for teachers.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. This study was completed for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG I only. It is suggested that someone investigate the levels of job satisfaction for the entire county resulting in the research of all of the DFG's for Essex County, New Jersey. Are the other DFG's similar or different to DFG I. If so, in which aspect and why?
2. This study was completed for public middle school teachers in Essex County, New Jersey with a DFG I only. It is suggested that someone investigate the levels of job satisfaction for all grade levels (elementary and secondary) for DFG I.
3. It is suggested that someone investigate the levels of job satisfaction for all grade levels (elementary and secondary) for all DFG's.
4. It is suggested that someone investigate the levels of job satisfaction for all grade levels (elementary, middle, and secondary) for all private schools in the State of New Jersey.

Summary

Chapter 5 presented the summary of the study, discussion of the data analysis, a summary of the conclusions drawn, the implications of the study, and the recommendation for further research.

References

- Abate, F.R. & Jewell, E. (2003). *The New Oxford American Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alt, M.N., & Choy, S.P. (2001). In the middle: Characteristics of public schools with a focus on middle schools. *Education Statistics Quarterly*. Retrieved on February 8, 2003 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/quarterly/fall/elem_middle.html
- Archer, J. (1999). New teachers abandon field at high rate. *Education Week*, 18(27), 20-21.
- Bacharach, S.B. & Mitchell, S.M. (1983). Old wine in new bottles: The quality of work life in schools and school districts. *National Institute of Education*. Ithaca, New York: State University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 178)
- Bacharach, S.B. (1986). The learning workplace: The conditions and resources of teaching. Ithaca, New York: State University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 614)
- Balzer, W., Kim, J.A., Smith, P.C., Irwin, J.L., Bachiochi, P.D., Robie, C., Sinar, E.F., & Parra, L.F. (1997). *Users' Manual for the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General Scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A Study Employing the Experience Sampling Method. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences*, 3, 147-154.
- Black, S. (2001). Morale matters. *American School Board Journal*, 1. Retrieved October 9, 2002 from <http://www.asbj.com/2001/01/0101research.html>

- Bogler, R. (1999). *Reassessing the Behavior of Principals as a Multiple-Factor in Teachers' Job Satisfaction*. Montreal, Province, Canada: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 432 800)
- Bogler, R. (2000). *Two Profiles of Schoolteachers: A Discriminant Analysis of Job Satisfaction*. New Orleans, LA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 440 967)
- Bredeson, P.V. (1989, March 27-31). *Redefining Leadership and the Roles of School Principals: Responses to Changes in the Professional Worklife of Teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 782)
- Brookover, W.B. (1980). *Effective secondary schools*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 088)
- Chapman, J.D. (1988). Decentralization, devolution and the researcher: participation by teachers in the decision-making of schools, *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 26(1), 39-72.
- Chittom, S.A. & Sistrunk, W.E. (1990). *The Relationship between Secondary teachers' Job Satisfaction and their Perceptions of School Climate*. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.
- Derlin, R. & Schneider, G.T. (1994). Understanding job satisfaction: principals and teachers, urban and suburban. *Urban Education*, 29(1), 63-88.

- Douglas County School District. (2002). Teacher job satisfaction survey executive survey. Retrieved on October 3, 2002 from <http://www.dcsd.k12.co.us/district/communications/teacher.survey.exec.smry.html>
- Duke, D., Showers, B.K., & Imbers, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16, 93-106.
- Erlandson, D.A. & Bifano, S.L. (1987). Teacher Empowerment: What research says to the principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 31-36.
- Halford, J.M. (1998). Easing the way for new teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 55 (5) 33-36.
- Hartzell, G. & Winger M. (1989). Manage to keep teachers happy. *School Administrator*, 46 (10) 22-24.
- Henke, R.R., Choy, S.P., Chen, X., Geis, S., Alt, M.N. & Broughman, S.P. (1997). *America's Teachers: Profile of a Profession* (Report No. 97-460). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Huberman, M. (1993). Professional careers and professional development. In T. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices*. New York: Teachers College Press. 193-224.

- Hunt, J. (2003). Report: teacher retention biggest school woe. Retrieved February 13, 2003, from <http://www.CNN.com/education>
- Jarvis, M. (2002). Teacher Stress: A critical review of recent findings and suggestions for future research directions. *Stress News*, 14 (1) Retrieved on February 11, 2003 from <http://www.teacherline.org/uk/>
- Klecker, B.M., & Loadman, W. (1999). Male elementary school teachers' ratings of job satisfaction by years of teaching experience. *Education*, 119 (3) 504-513.
- Lagana, J.S. (1989). Ready, set, empower! Superintendents can sow the seeds for growth. *The School Administrator*, 20-22.
- Latham, A.S. (1998). Teacher satisfaction. *Educational Leadership*, 55 (5) 82-83.
- Lawler, E.E. (1973). *Motivation in Work Organizations*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- MacMillan, R. B. (1999). Influences of workplace conditions on teachers' job satisfaction. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93, 39-47.
- Maehr, M.L. (1990). *Teachers Commitment and Job Satisfaction. Project Report*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 327 951)
- Maslow, A.H. (1968). *Toward a Psychology of Being* (4th ed.). Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand. 5, 27, 31, 33, 65, 168-170, 177-178, 191, 243.
- National Association of Elementary Principals (1990). Retrieved on February 1, 2003 from <http://www.naesp.org>
- National Center for Education Statistics (1997). Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation. *Statistical Analysis Report*. Retrieved on February 11,

2003 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97471.html>

NJ District Factor Groupings. Retrieved February 26, 2003, New Jersey Department of Education. www.njdoe.org

Oves, M.. (2002). Why do teachers quit? How much time do you have? *The Press*. Atlantic City, NJ.

Parkes, J., & Stevens, J. J. (2000). How professional development, teachers satisfaction and plans to remain in teaching are related: Some policy implications. *Research Report 2000 – 2001*. University of Mexico. Retrieved on February 1, 2003 from <http://www.unm.edu/~parkes/retention.pdf>

Perie, M., & Baker, D.P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics and Teacher Compensation* (Report No. 97-471). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved February 1, 2003 from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs97/97471.pdg>

Potter, P. E. & Swenk, J. (2001). *The National University Teacher Retention and Attrition Survey*. La Jolla, CA: National University. Retrieved from <http://www.nu.edu/newevent/teacher-retention-survey/pdf/teacher.pdf>

Stanton, J.M., Balzer, W.K., Smith, P.C., Parra, L.F., & Ironson, G. (2001). A general measure of work stress: The stress in general scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 61 (5) 866-888.

Stinson, T.D. & Appelbaum, R.P. (1988). Empowering teacher: Do principals have the power? *Phi Delta Kappa*, 70, 313-316.

Sutherland F(1994). *Teachers' perception of school climate*. (Research Report No. 143)

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 214)

Travers C. & Cooper C. (1997). Stress in teaching. In Shorrocks-Taylor D (Ed.)

Directions in educational psychology. Retrieved February 11, 2003 from

<http://www.teacherline.org.uk/>

UK National Health Service (2003). Retrieved February 11, 2003 from

<http://www.teacherstress.co.uk/>

UK National Union of Teachers (2000). Retrieved February 11, 2003 from

<http://www.data.teachers.org.uk/nut/pdfs/stress2000.pdf>

Vernadine, T. (1997). *What Research Says About Administrators' Management Style,*

Effectiveness, and Teacher Morale. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.

411 569)

Wood, G. (1992). *Schools That Work: America's Most Innovative Public Education*

Programs. New York: Penguin Books. xvi-xvii.