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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The voluntary attrition of qualified teachers is a problem that many school officials are attempting to solve. This type of reduction in teaching staff has a negative influence on a district's instructional programs. This dissertation focuses on one of the possible reasons that may account for voluntary attrition of qualified teaching personnel in school districts, namely low job satisfaction.

Objective of Study

One possible explanation for voluntary teacher attrition is job dissatisfaction, and one of the factors which affects the job satisfaction of teachers is how they perceive their roles. Two of the outcomes associated with the role perception process are role conflict and ambiguity. The objective of this study was to examine whether the two variables, role conflict and ambiguity, can explain a portion of the variance of teacher job dissatisfaction.

An investigation of job satisfaction and role perception using a theoretical model with an empirical base would serve to clarify the association of these two variables. Porter and Lawler (1968) developed a model which indicates that satisfaction is affected by factors which include value of rewards, abilities and traits, perceived probability that effort will lead to reward, and role perception. A model such as this provides a framework which aids in developing research studies. The purpose of this present study is to apply the Porter and Lawler model to discern how perceptions of teachers' roles affect perceived teacher job satisfaction.
Statement of Problem

School districts are presently faced with a mounting problem of voluntary teacher attrition because large numbers of trained regular and special teachers are leaving the profession (Vance & Schlechty, 1982; Bloland & Selby, 1980; La Cour, Earle & Solomon, 1982).

At the national level studies have recognized the issue of teacher attrition. The National Commission on Excellence in Education found "... that the professional working life of teachers is unacceptable, and that a serious shortage of teachers exists in key fields." (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 15). A 1980 National Education Association survey sampled 1,738 public school teachers in the United States and found "... 1 teacher in 10 will leave teaching as soon as possible while another 2 teachers in 10 are undecided how long they will remain in teaching." (NEA, 1980, p. 8E).

Research on teacher attrition has also been conducted at the state level. The findings of a 1981 Michigan study (Smith, 1981) of teaching personnel indicated that the attrition rate of special education teachers was ten percent and the attrition rate of regular teachers was six to seven percent. A study of special education teachers in Louisiana (La Cour, Earle & Solomon, 1982) reported that "Special Education teachers are leaving education or transferring into regular education positions." (p. 38). The study further reported that 3,500 teachers certified to teach special education in Louisiana are not teaching, and in 1979 over 500 special education teachers in the state resigned from their teaching positions.

The literature indicates that local school districts are implementing corrective measures in an attempt to rectify the problem of
voluntary teacher attrition. A tactic used to decrease the attrition rate is to initiate merit pay programs and career ladders for teachers (Burke, 1982; Aldrich, 1983; Toch, 1983). The basic assumptions in the single salary schedule are that additional experience and degrees will make individuals better teachers. This type of a pay schedule uses the same salary increments to reward both high and low performers, and it does not provide for motivational elements (Frymier, 1981). Merit pay provides for additional extrinsic rewards based upon meeting preestablished criteria (Say & Miller, 1982). However, strong opposition from teachers' unions has prevented many districts from implementing such programs (Frase, Hetzel & Grant, 1982; Doremus, 1982).

In a comprehensive sociological study of teachers Lortie (1975) found that "... the career system in teaching continues to favor recruitment rather than retention, and low rather than high involvements." (p. 99). Reed (1979) presented figures in support of this finding. In 1961, 28 percent of teachers had 20 or more years of experience while in 1976 only 14 percent had taught for more than 20 years.

Studies on factors related to teacher attrition indicate that low satisfaction is a primary issue (Gehrke, 1979; Ornstein, 1983). A study by Wangberg, Metzgar and Levitov (1982) indicated that nearly 40 percent of their female subjects would not rechoose elementary teaching as a career. In a study comparing the worklives of Michigan teachers with a national sample of workers Cooke, Kornbluh and Abramis (1982) found that "Teachers are significantly less satisfied with the quality of their worklives, ... and more likely to experience problems with their jobs than are U.S. workers in a nationwide sample." (p. 636).
Research on teacher job satisfaction conducted over a 50 year period indicates changes in the reported job satisfaction among teachers. According to the literature, the number of teachers reporting dissatisfaction is increasing. Older studies report that teachers were satisfied with their jobs. In one of these early studies, Hoppock (1935) found that less than 10 percent of the teachers he sampled reported job dissatisfaction. Likewise, when Hoy and Miskel (1982) reviewed studies of teacher job satisfaction, which spanned 40 years, they reported the number of dissatisfied teachers to be low and stable. More recent studies report an increase in teacher job dissatisfaction. For example, one of the findings of the Five Towns' study of 1963 (Lortie, 1975) was that 78 percent of the teachers sampled would most likely become teachers again. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) found that 72.5 percent of the teachers studied were satisfied, while Sparks (1979) noted dissatisfaction in 46 percent of the teachers he sampled.

Research studies indicate that many variables can influence the level of teacher's perceived job satisfaction. Individual characteristics and needs (Dixon, Shaw & Bensky, 1980; Sykes, 1983; Ornstein, 1983; Clements, 1980; Lortie, 1975) have been identified as factors which affect perceived satisfaction. Studies by Sweeney (1981), Carver and Sergiovanni (1971), Pour (1981), Wangberg, Metzger and Levitov (1982), and Cooke, Kornbluh and Abramis (1982) indicated that the complexity of the education system contributed to teacher dissatisfaction.

Bloland and Selby (1980) reviewed the literature for the purpose of examining factors associated with teacher attrition. The major emphasis of their review, which categorized variables into the areas of Demographic Factors, Professional and Personal Factors, and School Related Fac-
tors, was to research the variable of teacher satisfaction. Included in their findings of factors related to low satisfaction were salary, little opportunity for advancement, and lack of recognition by principals and supervisors. Dissatisfaction due to lack of recognition by administrators was also cited in other studies (Jameson, 1980; Anderson, 1981; Bentzen, Williams & Heckman, 1980; Weller, 1982; Lawrenson & Mc Kinnon, 1982).

The pattern of voluntary teacher attrition is influenced by social changes outside of education as well as changes inside the profession (Jacobsen & Sweet, 1982). There is a shortage of useful information on mobility and attrition in education (Jacobsen & Sweet, 1982) and much of the data that has been collected concentrates on demographic factors not on characteristics of educators who remain and of those who leave education (Bloland & Selby, 1980). Recent studies indicate that this is gradually changing, and the differences between teachers who resign and those who stay are being more thoroughly investigated (Bloland & Selby, 1980; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Lawrenson & Mc Kinnon, 1982; Hawkes & Dedrick, 1983). One study was conducted with graduates of three universities whose first job after graduation was teaching at the elementary or high school level. Results of the study indicated that differences in teachers' satisfaction level were not explained by sex, race, age or college attended but by teachers' skills and abilities (e.g. organization and communication). In addition teachers who resigned and teachers who remained appeared to have a different criterion for success (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982).

Descriptors of teachers who have remained in the teaching profession include those who: value and receive recognition by administrators,
have good organizational skills, are fully certified, and possess an undergraduate degree (Lawrenson & Mc Kinnon, 1982; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982). Those leaving education differ considerably. These individuals have been described as being positive about their ability to: analyze and evaluate data, write effectively, cooperate with a work team, work on long term projects, and persuade others to accept their ideas (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982). In addition this group preferred increased job responsibility, autonomy, the opportunity to learn new things, and to contribute to decision making (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Hawkes & Dedrick, 1983). Also, the teachers who left education advocated increases in the areas of feedback from administrators, staff communication, and salary (Hawkes & Dedrick, 1983; Landsman, 1978; Allred & Smith, 1982; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982). They were found to hold masters' degrees and partial teaching certification (Lawrenson & Mc Kinnon, 1982).

Recently, the role factor has been more thoroughly investigated in an attempt to explain job satisfaction. Teachers' roles have been studied (Cook & Leffingwell, 1982; Dixon, Shaw & Bensky, 1980; D'Alonzo & Wiseman, 1978; Cortis, 1979; Sparks, 1979), and findings indicate that the differences in teacher role perception contribute to the degree of teacher satisfaction. Included in the literature is specific information concerning how teachers perceive their job roles. Role overload (Bensky, Shaw, Gouse, Bates, Dixon & Beane, 1980), role ambiguity (Cooke & Leffingwell, 1982), role definition (D'Alonzo & Wiseman, 1978), and role confusion (Dixon, Shaw & Bensky, 1980) are areas that have been researched. Locke (1976) noted that "... role conflict and role ambiguity should be minimized to avoid dissatisfaction" (p. 1314).
Research has established that an association exists between attrition and low satisfaction (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979; Lawrenson & McKinnon, 1982; Cunningham, 1983) and between role conflict, role ambiguity, and low satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Further identification of a comprehensive framework for conceptualizing job satisfaction would allow systematic experimentation with possible solutions such as merit pay, career ladders and training of administrators which would increase satisfaction and reduce intention to leave.

In summary, voluntary teacher attrition is currently being recognized because it adversely affects the education programs in local school districts. Studies have identified that there is an association between attrition and job dissatisfaction. Researchers have also identified specific variables that affect level of teacher satisfaction. A portion of these studies focus on the variable of teacher role perception and in particular on role conflict and role ambiguity.

**Research Design and Methodology**

The data collected in this study were analyzed to obtain specific information about the relationship of role conflict and ambiguity and teacher job satisfaction. The following questions were addressed: Are there differences in the way principals, regular teachers, and special education teachers perceive role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles? Do regular and special education teachers differ with respect to their perception of job satisfaction? What is the relationship between the way principals and teachers perceive role conflict and ambiguity and teacher job satisfaction? What is the relationship of teachers' tolerance of ambiguity and teacher job satisfaction? What is the relationship of teacher characteristics, role conflict and ambiguity, and job satisfaction?
To answer these questions a random sample of 24 regular and 24 special education teachers was drawn from middle and high schools in an urban central Ohio school system. The subjects were principals, regular and special education teachers. Three factors were examined to determine their influence on reported teacher job satisfaction. First, the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale was administered to principals and teachers to observe how their perceptions of conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles influenced teacher job satisfaction as reported on the Job Descriptive Index. Second, the Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale was administered to teachers to determine how individual tolerance for ambiguity influenced teacher job satisfaction as reported on the Job Descriptive Index. Third, demographic data were collected to study how individual teacher variables influenced reported teacher job satisfaction. The design for this study employed survey techniques.

Limitations

This study was designed to examine the effect of role perceptions on reported teacher job satisfaction. The results of this study apply only to the sample studied and any generalization to the population should be made with caution. Subjects for the present study were randomly selected however, emphasis was placed on willingness of subjects to participate. This study did not address the characteristics within those persons not willing to participate. Data collected from teachers were limited to these instruments: the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire identified those who perceived ambiguous situations to be threatening and those who perceived ambiguity to be desirable; the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale for teachers provided information by examining the role concepts of ambiguity and conflict; the Job Descriptive Index provided
information on perceived job satisfaction; and the demographic information form provided specific information about each subject. Principals in the study recorded their role perceptions of regular and special education teachers on separate forms of the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale.

In research the environmental and personal conditions existing at the time the data are collected can bias the data. The data for this study were collected two to seven weeks after the 1984-85 school year began.

**Definition of Terms**

**Facet satisfaction**

Facet satisfaction identifies components of overall satisfaction, (i.e. pay, supervision, the work itself) which lead to employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

**Full certification**

Full certification describes the certification of teachers who took college level credit hours beyond the required bachelor's degree for the purpose of upgrading a teaching certificate for their current assignment to the status of professional or permanent certification. For the purpose of this study no distinction was made between teachers having professional or permanent certification.

**Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale**

The Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale developed by Budner (1962) is used to identify those who interpret ambiguous situations to be sources of threat and those who perceive ambiguous situations to be desirable.
Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

The JDI is an instrument developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) to measure perceived job satisfaction in five specific areas -- work, supervision, co-workers, promotion, and pay.

Provisional certification

Provisional certification describes the certification of teachers who have not upgraded a teaching certificate for their current assignment by taking college level credit hours beyond the required bachelor's degree.

Regular education teacher

The regular education teacher is an individual whose primary responsibility is to teach academic and/or elective subjects to students at the middle and high school level who are in regular education classes.

Role ambiguity

Role ambiguity results from nonexistent or inadequately communicated information that concerns role requirements and the individual's place in the organization.

Role conflict

Role conflict is the simultaneous occurrence of role sending such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other. The types of role conflict include intra-sender conflict, inter-sender conflict, inter-role conflict, person-role conflict and role overload.

Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale

The Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale developed by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970) provides information by examining the role concepts of ambiguity and conflict.
Role expectations

Role expectations are verbally stated and/or written facts concerning what the occupant of a particular position should and should not do.

Role perceptions

Role perceptions deal with the manner in which relevant individuals and the occupant define the job. It includes the effort perceived by the role occupant and relevant individuals to effectively perform the job, as well as the sent beliefs of relevant others and the occupant.

Satisfaction

Satisfaction is the degree to which actual rewards meet or exceed the perceived level of rewards. Dissatisfaction occurs when the actual rewards fail to meet or exceed perceived equitable rewards.

Special education teacher

A special education teacher is an individual whose primary responsibility is to teach middle and high school students who qualify for admission to self-contained or mainstreamed special education programs.

Overview of Study

In this chapter the topic of teacher attrition was introduced and the need and rationale for this study was presented. Also included were the problem statement, research questions to be answered, definition of terms, and the limitations related to this study.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature as it relates to this study. Chapter III describes the methodology which was used. Chapter IV offers the findings resulting from this research. Chapter V offers a discussion of the findings and Chapter VI presents recommendations for future research in this area.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature that forms the basis for the conceptual framework used to develop this study. In the previous chapter it was stated that one explanation of voluntary teacher attrition might be low levels of job satisfaction. To provide additional information about job satisfaction the beginning sections of this chapter address several areas of study--definitions and theories of job satisfaction, and the relationship between satisfaction, performance and motivation.

Definitions and Theories of Job Satisfaction

Prior to 1976 more than 3,300 studies on the subject of job satisfaction have been published (Locke, 1976). These studies have focused on many aspects of satisfaction such as combining satisfaction and dissatisfaction into a composit satisfaction of the job as a whole (Hoppock, 1935); accomplishing a task and meeting social needs (Halpin, 1966); fulfilling basic needs (Locke, 1976); and evaluating a job role (Hoy & Miskel, 1982). In spite of the large number of studies on job satisfaction there is no agreement on a single definition. For the purposes of this study satisfaction is defined "... as the extent to which rewards actually received meet or exceed the perceived equitable level of rewards." (Porter & Lawler, 1968, p. 31).

Job satisfaction has been recognized as pertaining to the job as a whole as well as to particular facets of the job. In this study satisfaction is recognized as being comprised of five job facets: pay, promotion, co-workers, supervision, and the job itself. Lawler (1973) refers to these five facets as the most common factors of job satisfac-
tion. On a job satisfaction instrument facet satisfaction scores contribute differently to overall satisfaction, and Lawler notes that pay, work itself, and supervision appear to have a strong influence on overall job satisfaction for most people.

Four major theoretical approaches to job satisfaction have been identified. They are need fulfillment theory, discrepancy theory, equity theory and two factor theory (Ashbaugh, 1982; Wheeless, Wheeless & Howard, 1983; Lawler, 1973).

In the study of satisfaction and motivation a distinction is made between process and content theories. Content theories identify specific needs or values whereas process theories look at relevant variables and how they relate to determine satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Content theories are concerned about what energizes behavior and process theories study how behavior is started, sustained, and stopped (Miskel, 1982).

After reviewing the literature on job satisfaction Locke (1976) identified Maslow's need hierarchy theory and Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory as content theories which "... attempt to specify the particular needs that must be satisfied or the values that must be attained for an individual to be satisfied with his job" (p. 1307).

Maslow's motivation theory (Maslow, 1970) states that man has five basic categories of needs. In order of dominance they include physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and self actualization needs. Maslow's theory supports the belief that "In actual fact, most members of our society who are normal are partially satisfied in all their basic needs and partially unsatisfied in all their basic needs at the same time." (Maslow, 1970, p. 54). Since the
categories are arranged according to dominance chances are that at any point in time the lower or less prepotent needs will be more fulfilled than the higher level needs (Locke, 1976).

Herzberg's theory (Herzberg, 1966) is based upon two separate categories of human needs which are physical needs and needs for psychological growth. This theory asserts that "If man is to be understood properly, these two characteristics must be constantly viewed as having separate biological, psychological and existential origins." (Herzberg, 1966, p. 56). The two factor theory postulates that job satisfaction consists of five motivators which are responsibility, achievement, work itself, advancement and recognition. On the other hand job dissatisfaction is caused by hygiene factors such as supervision, company policy and administration, working conditions and relationships with peers (Herzberg, 1966). Unlike motivators, which are intrinsic to the individual, hygiene factors are extrinsic. They are physical factors associated with the environment surrounding the job (Organ & Hamner, 1982).

Researchers who are advocates of the discrepancy theory of job satisfaction "... maintain that satisfaction is determined by the differences between the actual outcomes a person receives and some other outcome level" (Lawler, 1973, p. 66). There is no consensus in defining what is meant by outcome level. Some researchers believe it is the outcome level that an individual feels he should receive while other researchers hold that it is the outcome level an individual expects to receive (Lawler, 1973).

Equity theory states that "... satisfaction is determined by the perceived ratio of what a person receives from his job relative to what a person puts into his job" (Lawler, 1973, p. 69). Equity theory, unlike
the need and discrepancy theories, specifically recognizes that people compare themselves to others in the process of evaluating their input-output ratio. This theory specifically states how individuals assess their inputs and outcomes in determining their perception of fairness (Lawler, 1973).

Many studies have been conducted on job satisfaction. Since there is no accepted theory to serve as a guide the research has been more successful in creating confusion about relationships and terminology than in providing clarification (Lawler, 1973). Studies have indicated that relationships exist between the organizational dimensions of size, configuration, formalization, and centralization and employee reactions, but "few models have been developed and tested that specify how structural properties influence individuals in organizations" (Oldham & Hackman, 1981, p. 66). Because of this lack of a theoretical framework together with "... methodological complexities, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the number of workers who are not satisfied with their jobs or some facet of their jobs." (Lawler, 1973, p. 80).

Satisfaction, Performance and Motivation

This section begins with a discussion of the relationship between satisfaction and performance. The following topics in this section note a distinction between the study of satisfaction and the study of motivation, and identify two theories of motivation. The section concludes with a description of expectancy theory of motivation and relates it to the Porter and Lawler model.

Concerns of administrators are not limited to employee satisfaction. They encompass other outcome measures such as job performance. Research studies have led to the development of theories which have
attempted to explain the relationship of performance and satisfaction. The three major approaches used to study this relationship are: (a) satisfaction causes performance; (b) performance causes satisfaction; and (c) satisfaction and performance are caused by additional variables primarily rewards (Steers & Porter, 1979).

A primary distinction between satisfaction and motivation is that studies about satisfaction focus on present and past behavior while the study of motivation is oriented toward future behavior (Locke, 1976). There are two predominant theories of motivation, drive theory and expectancy theory. The Porter and Lawler model (Porter & Lawler, 1968) which laid the theoretical framework for this study is based upon the expectancy theory of motivation. Expectancy theory asserts that there is a probability that performance depends upon effort, and that reward is dependent upon performance (Organ & Hamner, 1982).

The preference for, or valence and individual places on intrinsic and extrinsic rewards affects satisfaction and future efforts. The anticipation of positive valent outcomes selectively effects behavior which will lead to a particular outcome. (Porter & Lawler, 1968). There is a difference between anticipated satisfaction from an outcome (i.e. valence) and the actual satisfaction or value that the outcome provides. There are many outcomes which individuals regard as being positively or negatively valent yet they do not anticipate these outcomes to be satisfying or dissatisfying (Vroom, 1964). In addition to physiological needs expectancy theorists include needs for esteem, recognition, and self actualization as determinants of valence (Porter & Lawler, 1968).

The concept of valence includes both the attractiveness of an outcome and the likelihood that certain behaviors will lead to a particular
outcome (Lawler, 1973). Since a specific action can be interpreted as leading to more than a single outcome the combinations of these various outcomes are what influences behavior. If negative consequences (i.e. peer rejection) are associated with good performance there may be no motivation to perform. In this case performing poorly has a stronger force than good performance (Lawler, 1973). The theoretical model of Porter and Lawler, which is depicted in Figure 1, illustrates their belief that the relationship of performance and satisfaction is influenced by other variables (Porter & Lawler, 1968, p. 17).

FIGURE 1: Porter and Lawler Model

(Porter & Lawler, 1968, p. 17)
This model was not developed to provide a total explanation about the relationship between job attitudes and performance, but it does identify some important variables and hypotheses about their relationships (Porter & Lawler, 1968). The following are summary definitions of the terms found in the model:

...value of reward refers to how attractive or desirable is a potential outcome of an individual's behavior in the work situation.

...effort-reward probability refers to an individual's perception of whether differential rewards are based on differential amounts of effort on his part in the work situation.

...effort refers to the energy expended to perform some task, but does not necessarily correlate with how successfully the task is carried out.

...in considering performance we must take into account the relatively long-term characteristics of individuals that remain largely unaffected by momentary changes in their environmental situation, namely their abilities and traits.

...role perception deals with the way in which the individual defines his job -- the types of effort he believes are essential to effective job performance.

...performance refers to a person's accomplishment on tasks that comprise his job.

...rewards are desirable states of affairs that a person receives from either his own thinking or the action of others.

...perceived equitable rewards are defined as the amount of rewards that a person feels is fair, given his performance on the tasks he has been asked to undertake by the organization.

...satisfaction is defined as the extent to which rewards actually received meet or exceed the perceived equitable level of rewards. (Porter & Lawler, 1968, p. 18-32).

Porter and Lawler hypothesized that the value of reward and perceived effort -- reward probability combine to create effort. In turn, effort, which is moderated by abilities, traits and role perceptions, leads to performance. They also hypothesized that every individual establishes a degree of connection between his performance and rewards,
and the stronger that connection the greater the possibility that the person will exert effort to obtain a high performance level. The non-linear line in Figure 1 indicates that rewards are not always related to performance. The relationship between performance and satisfaction is moderated by what each individual perceives as an equitable reward (Porter & Lawler, 1968). A perceived equitable reward is determined by the individual's perception of what he is giving in relation to what he is receiving. It is the comparison of one's inputs (i.e. education, work effort) and outcomes (i.e. pay, intrinsic interest of the job) to the inputs and outcomes of others. When rewards are based on membership and not performance the better performers tend to be the most dissatisfied (Lawler, 1973).

This model provides for feedback in two ways. The first loop is between rewards and effort -- reward probability. The feedback loop starts from the performance rewards connection for two reasons. The recipient may not perceive what is offered to be a reward, and secondly, the recipient may not link the reward to a particular performance. The second feedback loop is between satisfaction and value of reward. Porter and Lawler hypothesized that the satisfaction an individual experiences after receiving certain rewards will affect the values of future rewards (Porter & Lawler, 1968).

This section provided some general information on satisfaction, performance and motivation, and specifically described the model which provided the framework for this study.

**Role Factor**

Research shows that various factors influence the level of teacher job satisfaction. The Porter and Lawler model identifies a number of
variables that affect job satisfaction. This study examined how one of these variables, role perception, explained part of the variance associated with job satisfaction. This study focused on the way role conflict and ambiguity, which are two outcomes of the role perception process, affected teacher job satisfaction. The middle sections of this chapter cite research in the discussion of role-making systems, role ambiguity, and specific types of role conflict.

In relation to the work setting, a role is the part an employee plays in the work group. Successes and failures are not solely dependent on isolated job performance, but rather on how well an employee plays his role. In the process of playing a work role individuals affect the attitudes and actions of their co-workers. In turn, they are likewise affected by the work behaviors and attitudes of other employees (Borow, 1964).

**Role Making Systems**

One of the outgrowths of role theory is to study how individuals behave within organizations. Role concepts are building blocks of social systems and a means for linking the individual and the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Roles can be functional or dysfunctional for both individuals and the organization. Included in the list of dysfunctional consequences are role conflict and ambiguity (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964). Role making systems are the means whereby:

...the participant in the organization (a) acquires knowledge about the content of the constraints and demands placed upon his behavior and the sources of those constraints and demands, (b) receives and sends persuasive communications regarding his behavior in the role, (c) accepts a particular pattern of behavior, and (d) modifies this behavior over time. (Graen, 1976, p. 1202).
The role making system is composed of three subsystems. They are the physical-technological system, the social-cultural system, and the person system. Each individual in the organization has accepted beliefs about each of these subsystems (McGrath, 1976). Theoretically it is the relationship of these three subsystems that determines individual behavior for a particular role at a specific time (Graen, 1976).

Members of an organization accomplish their work by performing roles (Graen, 1976) and role behavior is the result of interaction between two role incumbants (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Role expectations help to define a role however, the expected behaviors are not restricted to the job description. The activities that define a particular role are maintained through the expectations of the role set which are sent to the focal person (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

Katz and Kahn (1966) developed a model based on role episode which includes role sending and role receiving. The model identifies factors which influence the degree of conflict and ambiguity in a particular role. For each role episode there is a role sender and a focal person. A role sender has certain perceived expectations which he communicates to the focal person. The role sender sends a message based on these expectations along with his perceptions of the focal person's behavior. The focal person receiving the message interprets it on the basis of his perceptions concerning his role, the sender's role, and the content of the message. The focal person then responds on the basis of the message received.

Very often the role sender and the focal person are unaware of each other's perceptions. Consequently, these perceptions are the foundation from which conflict and ambiguity about the role of the focal person
develop. Additional factors which further serve to complicate this interaction are organizational factors, interpersonal factors, and personality factors (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

Graen (1976) developed a model, based on the research of Katz and Kahn (1966), which identifies four discrepancy factors. This interpersonal role-making model involves a leader and a member, and in the process of communicating, these two individuals can experience discrepancies in the areas of expectation, role, feedback, and performance. This model is depicted in Figure 2. (Graen, 1976, p. 1206).

Figure 2: Model of the Interpersonal Role-making Model
(Graen, 1976, p. 1206).
Expectation discrepancy is the difference between the role expectations of the leader and the member. Interpersonal and personality factors of both individuals moderate this discrepancy and they can serve to enhance or inhibit the role making process. Role discrepancy is the difference between what the member perceives to be the leader's expectations and the member's present role behavior. This discrepancy is expected to be related to the member's role attitudes and it is an index of the perceived conflict between the leader's and the member's definition of role. Feedback discrepancy is the difference between the leader's perception of the member's role behavior and the actual behavior. Lastly, performance discrepancy is the difference between what the leader expects and his perception of the actual behavior (Graen, 1976).

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

Role conflict is defined "...as the simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) role sendings such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other". (Katz et al., 1964, p. 184). The types of role conflict include intra-sender conflict, inter-sender conflict, inter-role conflict, person-role conflict and role overload (Katz et al., 1964).

An example of intra-sender conflict is when a person in authority requests a subordinate to acquire information, and at the same time the authority figure prohibits access to the channels that the subordinate needs to use to obtain the information. Inter-sender conflict occurs when the focal person receives different and/or conflicting pressures from two or more individuals in the process of completing a task. With inter-role conflict there are role pressures associated with being a member of one organization that conflict with membership in other organ-
izations. Person-role conflict is the result of role requirements that are in conflict with the individual's beliefs, and it can also occur when an individual's needs and beliefs cause him to behave in a manner that is unacceptable to members of his role set. Role overload is regarded as a type of inter-sender conflict that occurs when individual organizational members expect the focal person to complete a variety of tasks with inadequate time limits. As a result the focal person experiences a conflict of priorities. (Katz et al., 1964).

Role ambiguity results from nonexistent or inadequately communicated information that concerns role requirements and the individual's place in the organization (Katz et al., 1964). Role ambiguity trends to increase with organizational change such as, growth followed by reorganization, changes in technology which affect how the job is performed, and frequent personnel changes (Lyons, 1971).

**Satisfaction, Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity**

Role conflict and ambiguity have been studied in relation to job satisfaction. Results of a study with managers, engineers and scientists at the Goddard Space Flight Center showed that satisfaction was highest when there was a match between experienced and desired role ambiguity (Mc Lean, 1974).

Green and Organ (1973) found that increasing the clarity of a received role only seems to increase satisfaction when the individual perceived some incentive for complying with role expectations. The data suggested that professionals considered role accuracy to be more important than did less skilled employees.

Role conflict and ambiguity are not by nature detrimental. In some instances they may serve as a "... means by which organizations provide
their members with the discretion to respond to new information and to pursue sequentially a set of conflicting but necessary organizational goals" (Van Sell, Brief & Schuler, 1980, p. 26).

In reviewing the literature on role conflict and ambiguity in the framework of the role episode model (Kahn et al., 1964) Van Sell, Brief and Schuler, (1980) identified omissions and conflicting findings. They did note that the instruments used to measure role conflict and ambiguity in these studies were consistent in that they relied heavily on the perceptions of the role incumbent. The most frequently used instrument was the scale developed by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970), and a psychometric evaluation of that scale suggested high construct validity and recommended continued use (Schuler, Aldag & Brief, 1977).

Many of the studies of role conflict and ambiguity are based on the role episode model (Kahn et al., 1964). Alternate paradigms that can provide a theoretical foundation for future research in this area are expectancy models of motivation, information processing models and cognitive theories of behavioral change (Van Sell et al., 1980).

Job Satisfaction and the Individual

The final sections of this chapter provide information about satisfaction and the individual, moderators of job satisfaction, and job satisfaction and teachers.

Researchers recognize that the personal needs of employees affect their job satisfaction (Meltzer & Wickert, 1976, Nord, 1976; Lawler, 1976; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Hopkins, 1983; Lofquist & Dawis, 1969). Recognition of individual needs promotes well being among employees while ambiguity and role conflict have the opposite effect (Mc Lean, 1974).
Viewing an organization as being comprised of individuals with specific needs requires consideration of individual measures of motivation and reaction to various organizational climates in order to place employees in positions that fit their needs and psychological make-up (Lawler, 1976). "Since the mid 1950's, ... research attention gradually has shifted toward examination of the effects jobs can have on the people who do them, and how jobs can be designed so that these effects are desirable for both employees and organizations" (Hackman & Lawler, 1971, p. 283).

Information about job satisfaction is primarily derived through measurement of perception, and it is seldom studied solely on a conceptual basis (Hopkins, 1983). One criticism of many of the job satisfaction studies is that the measurement has often been haphazard, and frequently studies have been restricted to particular geographical and occupational areas (Hopkins, 1983; Lawler, 1973; Van Sell et al., 1980).

The need satisfaction model has played a prominent role in much of the job satisfaction research. Researchers relying on this model assume that individuals have stable and identifiable needs and jobs have stable characteristics (Hopkins, 1983). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes revealed that the use of these models seldom accounts for large proportions of variance in behavior or attitudes (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977).

Prior to 1970 most of the job satisfaction research assumed individual needs were recognized by measuring job satisfaction, but more and more separate indicators of needs are being recognized as moderators of reported job satisfaction (Hopkins, 1983). This awareness led to modifying the need satisfaction theory. The modification reduced the simplifi-
city of the earlier model but it has the advantage of acknowledging differing individual strengths and needs (Hopkins, 1983).

**Moderators of Job Satisfaction**

The effect of individual differences of perception of job satisfaction has been substantiated through the identification of specific independent variables that serve as moderators. Locus of control (Szilagyi, Sims & Keller, 1976; Liem, 1975; Hrycenko & Minton, 1974), job characteristics and organizational structure (Stone & Porter, 1975; Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Oldham & Hackman, 1981), communication (Schuler, 1979), and role conflict and ambiguity (Johnson & Stinson, 1975; Brief & Aldag, 1976; Beehr, 1976) are examples of moderators of job satisfaction.

Results of research conducted by Hackman and Lawler (1971) indicate that job characteristics do affect job satisfaction. It was found that employees with a high desire for higher order need satisfaction tend to be more satisfied when they perceive the job to be high on variety, autonomy, feedback and task identity. Job behavior and job satisfaction are determined by the interaction of job characteristics and individual differences. The data from this study suggest that organizations look beyond matching an employee's skills and abilities to the job. Instead the organization should consider a good fit between an employee and the psychological demands and opportunities associated with the position.

Differences in individuals' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity have been studied in relation to job satisfaction. In a study with military and civil service personnel Johnson and Stinson (1975) reported a tendency for role conflict and ambiguity to be associated with lower job satisfaction and a high likelihood of voluntary termination. These researchers used a modification of the role conflict and ambiguity in-
instrument developed by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970) and found that the need for independence moderates the relationship between role variables and satisfaction. There was a negative relationship between task ambiguity and satisfaction for those subjects low in the need for independence. Similar findings concerning the relationship of role conflict and ambiguity to job satisfaction were reported by Brief and Aldag (1976), Beehr (1976) and Hammer and Tosi (1974).

Keller found the pattern of relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity and satisfaction to be specific in nature. His findings indicated that "... the relationships between job satisfaction and role conflict and ambiguity are better understood when satisfaction is viewed and measured as a multidimensional variable" (Keller, 1975, p. 63).

The Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) and the JDI developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) were used by Keller (1975) in a study where he found that role conflict and ambiguity were associated with different facets of job satisfaction. Role ambiguity was significantly related to low levels of satisfaction with work itself, whereas role conflict was significantly related to satisfaction with supervision, pay and opportunities for promotion. "It appears that experienced role ambiguity and role conflict may be a function of an interaction of job content, role incumbent characteristics, leader behavior and organizational level and dimension of structure." (Van Sell et al., 1980, p. 20.)

Job Satisfaction and Teachers

Researchers report that the teaching profession tends to satisfy the lower order needs of teachers more than it satisfies higher level needs (Ornstein, 1983; Erlandson & Pastor, 1981; Carver & Sergiovanni,
Many researchers have noted that both regular and special education teachers report that their principals and supervisors fail to recognize their efforts (Chapman, 1982; Erlandson & Pastor, 1981; Ashbaugh, 1982; Jameson, 1980; Anderson, 1981; Bentzen, Williams & Heckman, 1980; Chapman & Lowther, 1982; Medved, 1982).

In a study of teachers of emotionally disturbed students, lack of administrative support and lack of recognition were among the top three dissatisfiers of teachers who left teaching (Lawrenson & Mc Kinnon, 1982). For those teachers continuing to teach receiving recognition was a primary satisfier, since recognition received from an administrator has a strong positive relationship to career satisfaction (Chapman, 1982).

In educational research too much emphasis has been placed on the theories of Herzberg and Maslow, and not enough attention has been given to the expectancy theory (Miskel, De Frain & Wilcox, 1980). Silver (1982) wrote about the expectancy theory in terms of implications for administrators. She noted that the educational leaders "... who most consistently link teaching effectiveness with teachers' sense of achievement, favorable recognition, appropriately challenging work, interesting responsibility, career advancement and learning opportunities will have the most professionally motivated teachers" (p. 553).

The interaction of a teacher's personal needs and the organizations role expectation influences a teacher's on the job behavior (Fessler & Burke, 1983; Hoy & Miskel, 1982). Fessler and Burke (1983) developed a model which integrates the concepts of teacher personal needs, role expectations, and job behavior. Role expectations include working hours, lesson plans, teaching methods, and subject matter content. Per-
sonal needs consist of traits and drives that affect behavior, and job behavior is the observed behavior of a teacher in the job situation. This model is depicted in Figure 3 (Fessler & Burke, 1983, p. 71).

The interaction of these concepts have been identified as particular zones which describe the relationship between needs, role expectations, and job behavior.
The relationship of the role of an administrator and the satisfaction of teaching staff is important. A study by Chapman and Lowther (1982) suggests that since greater recognition by administrators was related to greater satisfaction for those remaining in teaching "... the behavior of administrators may take an even greater importance as a correlate of teacher satisfaction" (p. 246). Role conflict and ambiguity between teachers and administrators have been documented in the literature (Cook & Leffingwell, 1982; Dixon, Shaw & Bensky, 1980; D'Alonzo & Wiseman, 1978, Cortis, 1979; Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982). In a study by Sparks (1979) 73 percent of the respondents reported experiencing role conflict with their principals.

This section presented the findings from studies in which teachers reported their degree of satisfaction with teaching. Results of these studies indicated that dissatisfied teachers perceived role conflict. They wanted their efforts to be recognized by administrators and they wanted teaching to meet more of their higher level needs.

In this chapter various definitions and theories of job satisfaction were presented. The dimensions of personal needs and role expectation were then addressed in terms of the effect they have upon teachers' satisfaction with teaching. In particular, role conflict and ambiguity were discussed in relation to the way they moderate reported job satisfaction. As noted in the literature additional research is needed to continue to describe how variables influence job satisfaction. This present study addresses that need by investigating the relationship between perceived role conflict and ambiguity and reported teacher job satisfaction.
Answers to the following research questions provided information about the way principals and teachers perceived role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles. Also, the data were analyzed to determine what portion of teachers' job dissatisfaction could be attributed to role conflict and ambiguity.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The data collected in this study were analyzed to obtain information in response to the following questions:

1. Are there significant differences among the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores for principals, regular education teachers, and special education teachers?

2. Is there a significant difference between the mean score of regular education teachers and special education teachers on the Job Descriptive Index?

3. What is the relationship between scores on the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and the Job Descriptive Index for teachers? How do the scores on the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire affect this relationship?

4. What is the relationship between principals' and teachers' Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores and teacher job satisfaction?

5. Which teacher characteristics (e.g. training, years of experience, type of certification and so forth) are related to the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and Job Descriptive Index scores?
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

A description of how this study was developed and conducted is presented in this chapter. Particular attention is given to the procedures used in selecting the sample, the instruments used in collecting the data, the data collection process and the procedures used to analyze the data.

Sample Selection

The sample for this study consisted of 24 principals, 24 regular teachers, and 24 special education teachers in a central Ohio urban school system. A regular and special education teacher were selected at each of the 24 participating schools. A more detailed explanation of how the subjects were chosen, the size of the sample, and random selection is presented in another section of this chapter. Because of limits of cost and time the researcher restricted the number of participants to 24 principals and 48 teachers. The small sample size restricted the ability to obtain more information about satisfaction measures through the use of stratification procedures.

To initiate this study the researcher requested permission from the school system to select willing elementary, middle, and high school principals and teachers as participants. The school system gave permission to include schools at the middle and high school level, and supplied a list of those schools and principals. The elimination of schools at the elementary level did not impede the nature of the study and was acceptable to the researcher and her committee.
From the list of schools the researcher randomly selected 12 middle and 12 high schools which offered both regular and special education programs to students. The only selection criterion was that participating schools have a minimum of three special education units to allow for random selection. This also allowed for selecting alternates should the special education teacher selected prefer not to participate. This requirement eliminated three middle and two high schools.

After the schools were selected the researcher arranged to meet with each principal. The meetings were scheduled from August 15, through August 24, 1984. The purpose for meeting was to describe the study, and provide information about the instruments, the time factor, and the consent form. Originally all of the principals agreed to participate. In mid September one principal decided not to have his school participate because of time constraints, and an alternate school was selected.

Once a principal acknowledged that he/she would participate the researcher randomly selected a regular and special education teacher from a list. In two instances the principal preferred to inform his teachers about the study. Then names of teachers, who were willing to participate, were given to the researcher. The teachers were contacted by phone, and before being asked to participate they were given information about the study. All teachers were contacted between August 30 and September 28, 1984. The information given to participants appears in Appendix A.

The subjects participated on a consenting basis and the study was designed so that if a principal chose not to be involved another building was randomly selected. Likewise, if a teacher chose not to be a subject another teacher from the same building was randomly selected. No pres-
sure was exerted to encourage participation. Contacting the teachers by phone gave them the opportunity to decline to participate without personal cost. All subjects were given the researcher's phone number in the event they wished to ask additional questions. Four teachers elected not to be involved and alternates were selected.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher selected specific instruments (Budner, 1962; Rizzo et al., 1970; Smith et al., 1969) to operationalize the variables of role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction which were discussed in Chapter 2. All of the instruments used in this study are described in the following section.

**Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale**

The Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale developed by Budner (1962) was used to identify those who interpret ambiguous situations to be sources of threat and those who perceive ambiguous situations to be desirable. Initially, Budner developed 33 items which conformed to three types of ambiguous situations -- novelty, complexity, insolubility and four kinds of threat responses -- repression and denial, anxiety and discomfort, destructive behavior and avoidance behavior. Budner included items yielding a Pearson r of .35 or higher in the final scale.

Reliability and validity data on the scale were obtained from a total of 17 samples. Pretests and special experiments were conducted with four of the samples. The mean of the scale for these groups was approximately .49 using Cronbach's alpha. The trait being measured is complex and "it is generally true that the more complex the construct and the more complex the measure, the lower will the reliability estimate be." (Budner, 1962 p. 35).
Validity studies were conducted in several ways. This scale was correlated with three other scales designed to measure intolerance of ambiguity and Budner's scale was found to have a high correlation. Testing indicated that any correlation of .27 was significant at the .05 level for a two-tailed test. This scale had a correlation of .50 with the Princeton Scale, .36 with the Coulter Scale, and .54 with the Walk Scale. In addition to correlations, peer ratings and ranking on the basis of brief autobiographies were used to establish the validity on the scale (Budner, 1962).

The scale consists of eight positively worded items and eight negatively worded items. For this study Budner's seven point Likert scale was modified. The score for each of the responses ranges from five (strongly agree) to one (strongly disagree). The negatively worded items were reflected before scoring. A total score was obtained by adding all of the responses. Greatest intolerance of ambiguity would be indicated by a score of 80. This instrument was completed by 48 teachers, and it is found in Appendix B.

**Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale**

The Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale was developed by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970). This instrument provided information by examining the role concepts of ambiguity and conflict. Eight of the fourteen items relate to role conflict, and the remaining six relate to role ambiguity. The items were constructed from a factor analysis of 29 items of two scales -- role conflict and role ambiguity.

In developing these scales only those items loading .30 or greater were considered, and items with higher loadings on both factor I (role conflict) and factor II (role ambiguity) were omitted. In addition the
items were analyzed using Kuder-Richardson internal consistency reliabilities with Spearman Brown corrections. Factor analysis using an image covariance method and rotated using a verimax criterion were used to test the relationships to the definitions of role conflict and ambiguity. In a study by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970) the role questionnaire was administered to two groups having Ns of 199 and 99. Reliabilities for these groups on both of the factors was 0.78 or larger.

The score for each of the responses ranges from five (always) to one (never). The items were summed for each participant then divided by the number of items in the set. Greatest role conflict and ambiguity would be indicated by scores of five. The six items (2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 13) relating to role ambiguity were reflected before scoring. The remaining eight items are concerned with specific types of role conflict: person-role conflict (1, 14); intra-sender conflict (4, 12); inter-role conflict (7); conflicting expectations (5); conflicting requests from others (8); and incompatible standards of evaluation (11) (Rizzo et al., 1970). This instrument was completed by all of the subjects. Principals recorded their perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in the roles of regular and special education teachers on separate forms. This instrument is found in Appendix C.

**Job Descriptive Index**

The *Job Descriptive Index* (JDI) was developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), and copies of the index were purchased from the senior author. The JDI was used to obtain the perceived job satisfaction score of the teachers in the study. The index consists of five subscales: work, supervision, co-workers, promotion and pay. Each subscale contains either nine (promotion and pay) or 18 (work, supervision, co-
workers) adjectives or short phrases. The respondent indicates if the adjective is "true of my job", "not true of my job", or "cannot decide". Weights for direct scoring of the JDI items were determined by the authors. A satisfied response is awarded three points: an undecided response one point; and a dissatisfied response zero points. Greatest satisfaction would be indicated by a maximum score of 27 (nine item subscale), or 54 (eighteen item subscale). Smith suggested that the nine item subscales should be doubled, consequently the maximum total score was 270.

The JDI is a frequently used instrument in the study of organizational behavior (Vroom, 1964; Lawler, 1973: Hoy & Miskel, 1983), and it was thoroughly tested during its development to determine its validity and reliability. Four studies, using different samples and work settings, were conducted to establish both discriminant and convergent validity. Convergent validity requires that instrument measures be significantly similar to other measures of job satisfaction. Discriminant validity indicates that the instrument distinguishes between the subscales that it measures. The JDI scales scored by the direct method show consistency in discriminant and convergent validity (Smith et al., 1969).

Table 1 which was taken from Smith et al (1969, p. 74) depicts the estimated internal consistency for each of the five subscales of the final revised JDI. Time and cost prevented any test-retest estimates of reliability. This index was completed by 48 teachers and is found in Appendix D.
Table 1

Internal Consistencies of Revised JDI Scales
(N=80 males)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Correlations of Random Split-Halves</th>
<th>Correlations Corrected to full length by Spearman-Brown Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Smith et al., 1969, p. 74)

Demographic Information Form

The teacher demographic information form was developed by the researcher. Each of the 48 teachers were asked to provide information about themselves. These data were used to describe how different types of people feel about job satisfaction in relation to how they perceive their roles as teachers. This instrument is found in Appendix E.

All of the forms were coded by building level (BL) and teacher category (TC). The code translates as follows: A-middle school, B-high school, 1-regular teacher, and 2-special education teacher. The data were analyzed in terms of these codes. All of the information collected was regarded as confidential. Information about coding and confidentiality was specifically mentioned when the participants were first contacted and again at the time the data were collected.
Data Collection

In an attempt to insure a 100 percent response rate data were collected at each of the 24 schools. The researcher arranged to meet with the principal, a regular teacher, and a special education teacher for 30 minutes. At these meetings, which were held either in the principal's office or in a conference room, the researcher briefly explained the purpose for the study, described the instruments and how they were coded, and responded to questions. Following this explanation the principal and the two teachers signed a copy of the researcher's oral presentation, which is found in Appendix F, and a consent form. The consent form, which was obtained from the Human Subject's Review Committee at The Ohio State University, assures confidentiality and verifies that the study was explained to the satisfaction of the participants. It is found in Appendix G. The participants received a copy of both these forms. Next, each subject was given an envelope containing the appropriate forms, and was asked to complete the forms in private. All participants returned the completed forms to the researcher. Data collection began September 5 and continued through October 10, 1984. After the data were collected the researcher wrote to each principal thanking him/her and the teachers for their participation. A sample letter is found in Appendix H.

Analysis of Data

All of the data obtained from the teachers and principals were placed on key punch cards. The statistical computation was performed by an Amdahl 470 computer at The Ohio State University Data Center, and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al., 1975) was used to compute all statistical computations.
The five research questions are discussed independently and the discussion includes a description of the statistical procedure used to respond to each question. Exact probabilities are reported for tests of significance. An alpha level of .05 was established apriori.

**Research Question 1**: Are there significant differences among the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores for principals, regular and special education teachers?

Means and standard deviations were obtained for the role conflict and ambiguity scores for principals, regular and special education teachers. The data were analyzed according to school (middle, high school), type (regular, special education), and subjects (principals, teachers). Two 2X2X2 Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine the significance of the independent variables. Role conflict scores were employed as the dependent variable in the first ANOVA. Role ambiguity was the dependent variable in the second ANOVA.

**Research Question 2**: Is there a significant difference between the mean score of the regular education teachers and special education teachers on the JDI?

Means and standard deviations were obtained for the total JDI score and subscales (work, pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers) for regular and special education teachers at the middle and high school level. A 2X2 ANOVA was performed using school level and teacher category as independent variables and total JDI score as the dependent variable. Analyses of JDI subscale scores were calculated using 2X2 ANOVA procedures.
Research Question 3: What is the relationship between scores on the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and the JDI for teachers? How do the scores on the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire affect this relationship?

Correlation coefficients between the mean JDI total score and subscale scores (work, pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers) and the mean role conflict and role ambiguity scores were calculated. Means were computed for teachers scores on the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire. An ANOVA was computed using school level and teacher category as independent variables and intolerance of ambiguity as the dependent variable. Correlation coefficients were computed between the mean Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire and the mean role conflict, role ambiguity and JDI total and subscale scores. Partial correlation coefficients between the mean JDI total and subscale scores and the mean role conflict and role ambiguity scores were computed controlling for intolerance of ambiguity.

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between principals' and teachers' Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores and teacher job satisfaction?

Correlation coefficients were calculated between teacher job satisfaction (JDI) and teachers' and principals' Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores. A stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed with principals' role conflict and ambiguity scores, and teachers' role conflict and ambiguity scores as predictors and JDI scores as the criterion.

Research Question 5: Which teacher characteristics (e.g. training, years of experience and so forth) are related to the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and the JDI?
A squared multiple correlation coefficient was computed between demographic data (sex, assignment, training, experience, building level, certification) and the scores for role conflict, role ambiguity, and JDI. Three stepwise multiple regression equations were calculated each using demographic variables as predictors. Role conflict, role ambiguity, and JDI scores served as the respective criterion variables in the three separate equations.

**Summary**

The method of sample selection, instruments used in collecting data, data collection process, and the procedures used to analyze the data were presented in this chapter. In the following chapter an analysis of the data in relation to the research questions is discussed.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter the data generated from conducting this study are analyzed. First, demographic data are presented and secondly, the data are discussed as they relate to the research questions which were presented at the end of Chapter II.

Demographic Data

In this section the following characteristics of the subjects are reported: (a) teaching assignment and school level, (b) sex, (c) training, (d) years of teaching experience, and (e) type of certification for current assignment.

One half of the 48 teachers had assignments at middle schools and the other half had high school teaching assignments. As indicated in Table 2 at both middle and high school levels 12 (25%) teachers had regular teaching assignments and 12 (25%) had special education teaching assignments.

In this sample of teachers there was a total of 10 males and 38 females. As reported in Table 3 for regular teachers there were the same number of males (4 - 33.3%) and females (8 - 66.7%) at both middle and high school levels. In the case of special education teachers at the middle school there were 2 (16.7%) males and 10 (83.3%) females, and at the high school level all 12 (100%) of the teachers were female.
TABLE 2

TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT AND SCHOOL LEVEL OF PARTICIPATING TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Regular Ed.</th>
<th>Special Ed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Percent</td>
<td>N  Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>12 25</td>
<td>12 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>12 25</td>
<td>12 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3

SEX OF PARTICIPATING TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/School</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the demographic information form training was divided into three areas -- bachelor's degree, master's degree, and master's degree plus additional coursework. As shown in Table 4 of the regular teachers at the middle school level 7 (58.3%) had only a bachelor's degree, 2 (16.7%) had a master's degree, and 3 (25%) had a master's degree plus additional coursework. Regular teachers at the high school level differed slightly in that 8 (66.7%) had a bachelor's degree, 2 (16.7%) had a master's degree, and 2 (16.7%) had a master's degree plus additional coursework. Of the special education teachers with middle school assignments 7 (58.3%) had only a bachelor's degree, 1 (8.3%) had a master's degree, and 4 (33.3%) had a master's degree plus additional coursework. Of the special education teachers with high school assignments 7 (58.3%) had
only a bachelor's degree, 3 (25%) had a master's degree, and 2 (16.7%) had a master's degree plus additional coursework.

TABLE 4
EDUCATIONAL TRAINING OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/School</th>
<th>BS/BA Degree</th>
<th>MS/MA Degree</th>
<th>MS/MA Degree Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three categories based upon the teacher career stages of Yarger and Mertens (1980) were used to describe years of teaching experience: 1-2 years, 3-8 years, and 9 or more years. Table 5 shows that for regular teachers at the middle school 1 (8.3%) had taught 1-2 years, 3 (25%) had taught 3-8 years, and 8 (66.7%) had taught for 9 or more years. All 12 (100%) regular teachers at the high school level had taught for 9 or more years. None of the special education teachers had taught for less than 3 years. At the middle school level 8 (66.7%) had taught for 3-8 years, and 4 (33.3%) had taught for 9 or more years. At the high school level 5 (41.7%) had taught for 3-8 years, and 7 (53.3%) had taught for 9 or more years.

Teaching certification for participants was described in terms of full or provisional certification for the current assignment. Table 6 indicates that for regular teachers at the middle school level 8 (66.7%) had full certification and 4 (33.3%) had provisional certification. At the high school level 9 (75%) of the regular teachers had full certifica-
tion and 3 (25%) had provisional certification. The type of certification held by special education teachers at middle and high school was identical. Seven (58.3%) had full certification and 5 (41.7%) had provisional certification.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/School</th>
<th>Reg Teachers</th>
<th>1-2 Years</th>
<th>3-8 Years</th>
<th>9 Plus Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>66.7</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>33.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/School</th>
<th>Full Certification</th>
<th>Provisional Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>58.3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>41.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, an equal number of teachers had regular or special education teaching assignments at the middle or high school level. There were 28 more females than males in this sample and at all levels the number of females exceeded the number of males. The sample selection process for this study specified that at both middle and high school levels there would be 12 teachers with regular teaching assignments, and 12 teachers with special education teaching assignments. For this sam-
ple of teachers over 50% had only a bachelor's degree. The second largest group was comprised of teachers having a master's degree and additional coursework, and the smallest group consisted of teachers who had a master's degree only. Twenty of the 24 regular teachers taught for 9 or more years. In comparison, the largest number of special education teachers taught for 3-8 years. Over half of the regular and special education teachers had full certification which indicates that they have taken college courses in addition to the required bachelor's degree for the purpose of upgrading a teaching certificate.

Research Questions

In the following section the data which were collected to respond to each of the research questions are analyzed. For each research question the following material is given: a statement of the research question, the statistical procedures used to answer the research question, and the result of the testing procedures. The .05 level was selected apriori and the strength of reported correlation coefficients are interpreted according to Davis (1971): very strong (.70+); substantial (.50-.69); moderate (.30-.49); low (.10-.29); and negligible (.01-.09).

Research Question 1: Are there significant differences among the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores for principals, regular and special education teachers?

Means and standard deviations were computed for the role conflict and ambiguity scores for principals, regular and special education teachers and are found on Table 7. Two 2X2X2 Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were computed to determine the presence of significant differences. Role conflict was the dependent variable in the first ANOVA and role ambiguity was the dependent variable in the second ANOVA. In both
analyses the independent variables were school, type of teacher, and subjects. The results are shown in Table 8. There were no significant differences in the role conflict scores between regular and special education teachers ($F=2.70; df=1,88, p > .05$), between middle and high school educators ($F=3.62; df=1,88, p > .05$), or between teachers and principals ($F=.748; df=1,88, p > .05$). None of the interactions were significant.

An identical result was obtained for role ambiguity scores. There were no significant differences between regular and special educators ($F=2.05; df=1,88, p > .05$), between middle and high school educators ($F=.356; df=1,88, p > .05$), or between teachers and principals ($F=.228; df=1,88, p > .05$). None of the interactions were significant.

**TABLE 7**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY SCALE FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

**Role Conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Reg Ed</th>
<th>Sp Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prin (n=24)</td>
<td>Teach (n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Role Ambiguity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reg Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
ANOVA SUMMARY OF TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY IN TEACHERS' ROLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Conflict</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable Between Type Reg</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>2.702</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sp Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School HS</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.260</td>
<td>3.622</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Subjects Prin</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSchool</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSubjects</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School1XSubjects</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSchXSub</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>30.619</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Ambiguity</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable Between Type Reg</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sp Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School HS</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Subjects Prin</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSchool</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSubjects</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School1XSubjects</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSchXSub</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>28.583</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>.325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.
Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference between the mean score of regular education teachers and special education teachers on the JDI?

Means and standard deviations were obtained for the total JDI score and the five subscales (work, pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers) for regular and special education teachers at the middle and high school levels, and they are found on Table 9.

A 2X2 ANOVA was computed using school level and teacher category as independent variables and total JDI score as the dependent variable. Analyses of JDI subscale scores were also calculated using 2X2 ANOVA procedures, and the results are found on Table 10. The differences between the scores of middle and high school regular and special education teachers on the JDI and its subscales were not significant.

Fiftieth percentile readings of the JDI subscale scores normed for males with fifteen or more years of education are as follows: work, 45; pay, 38; promotion, 22; supervision, 45; and co-workers, 48 (Smith et al, 1969). All of the mean JDI subscale scores for the subjects in this present study are lower than these normed scores at the fiftieth percentile. The limitations associated with using these norms are they were developed in 1969 on a male population. Comparing this sample of teachers with the norms does give a general indication of the teachers' perceived job satisfaction-- namely they are not a highly satisfied group.
### TABLE 9

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE JDI AND SUBSCALES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AT THE MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL**

Maximum Total JDI Score = 270  
Maximum JDI Subscale Score = 54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/School</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reg Teachers</strong> (n=24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>153.000</td>
<td>32.417</td>
<td>22.833</td>
<td>15.833</td>
<td>38.500</td>
<td>43.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>164.083</td>
<td>37.500</td>
<td>21.833</td>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>41.750</td>
<td>46.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>49.024</td>
<td>6.829</td>
<td>16.568</td>
<td>18.829</td>
<td>12.241</td>
<td>6.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sp Ed Teachers</strong> (n=24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>161.833</td>
<td>36.417</td>
<td>18.333</td>
<td>20.667</td>
<td>40.833</td>
<td>45.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>24.360</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>8.815</td>
<td>15.072</td>
<td>11.606</td>
<td>6.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>158.583</td>
<td>35.417</td>
<td>18.833</td>
<td>20.667</td>
<td>42.667</td>
<td>41.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10
ANOVA SUMMARY OF JDI AND SUBSCALES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AT THE MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JDI Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>33.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.333</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>184.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184.083</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSchool</td>
<td>616.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>616.333</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>75527.063</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1716.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Between  |                |    |
| Work     |                |    |
| Type     | 11.021         | 1  | 11.021       | .250    | .120    |
| Sp Ed    |                |    |              |         |         |
| MS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| School   | 50.021         | 1  | 50.021       | 1.136   | .292    |
| HS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| TypeXSchool | 111.021  | 1  | 111.021      | 2.521   | .120    |
| Error    | 1937.746       | 44 | 44.040       |         |         |

| Between  |                |    |
| Pay      |                |    |
| Type     | 168.750        | 1  | 168.750      | .818    | .371    |
| Sp Ed    |                |    |              |         |         |
| MS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| School   | .750           | 1  | .750         | .004    | .952    |
| HS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| TypeXSchool | 6.750   | 1  | 6.750        | .033    | .857    |
| Error    | 9073.605       | 44 | 206.218      |         |         |

| Between  |                |    |
| Promotion|                |    |
| Type     | 216.750        | 1  | 216.750      | .777    | .383    |
| Sp Ed    |                |    |              |         |         |
| MS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| School   | 0.083          | 1  | 0.083        | .015    | .904    |
| HS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| TypeXSchool | 0.083  | 1  | 0.083        | .015    | .904    |
| Error    | 12268.934      | 44 | 278.839      |         |         |

| Between  |                |    |
| Supervision|            |    |
| Type     | 31.687         | 1  | 31.687       | .204    | .654    |
| Sp Ed    |                |    |              |         |         |
| MS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| School   | 77.521         | 1  | 77.521       | .498    | .484    |
| HS       |                |    |              |         |         |
| TypeXSchool | 6.021   | 1  | 6.021        | .039    | .845    |
| Error    | 6845.527       | 44 | 155.580      |         |         |
TABLE 10 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Between</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reg Sp Ed</td>
<td>30.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.083</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>8.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.333</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TypeXSchool</td>
<td></td>
<td>192.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>192.000</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>2713.496</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between scores on the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and the JDI for teachers? How do scores on the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire affect this relationship?

Pearson Correlation Coefficients were calculated between mean JDI total score along with it's subscale scores (work, pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers) and mean role conflict and ambiguity scores. The results of this procedure are found on Table 11. For regular teachers role conflict was significantly and negatively related (.05 level) to the total JDI Score (-.62), and all of it's subscales: work (-.38), pay (-.47), promotion (-.61), supervision (-.42), and co-workers (-.38). All of these correlations showed moderate to substantial associations. For this same group of teachers role ambiguity was significantly and negatively related (.05 level) to the total JDI Score (-.52) and three of it's subscales: work (-.48), pay (-.49), and promotion (-.39). These associations were also in the moderate to substantial range.
For special education teachers role conflict was significantly and negatively related (.05 level) to the total JDI score (-.56) score and three of it's subscales: work (-.57), supervision (-.41), and co-workers (-.50), and these correlations were in the moderate to substantial range. For these same teachers role ambiguity was significantly and negatively related (.05 level) to the total JDI score (-.41) and two of it's subscales: pay (-.36), and supervision (-.37). These correlations showed a moderate degree of association.

These results indicate that the more role conflict and ambiguity that the teachers perceived the less they perceived satisfaction with teaching. Significance on the subscale scores indicates that with increased perception of role conflict and ambiguity teachers perceived less satisfaction with particular job facets.

Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations which were computed for the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire scores for regular and special education teachers. The possible range of scores on this instrument is 16 (low intolerance) to 80 (high intolerance). The mean score for the teachers in this study fall mid-way between the two extremes. This indicates that they do not perceive ambiguity to be either highly desirable or highly threatening. Table 13 reports the results of an ANOVA which was computed using school level and teacher category as independent variables and Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire score as the dependent variable. For this procedure there was no significant difference at the .05 level for either main effects or two-way interactions.

Pearson Correlation Coefficients were computed between the mean Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire score and the mean role conflict,
role ambiguity and JDI total and subscale scores for regular and special education teachers. As indicated on Table 14 for regular teachers intolerance of ambiguity was significantly and negatively related to role conflict (-.36) and significantly and positively related to JDI (.36) and pay (.49) at the .05 level. These correlations show a moderate association. With special education teachers intolerance of ambiguity was significantly and negatively related to role conflict (-.35) and significantly and positively related to JDI (.55), promotion (.42) and co-workers (.52) at the .05 level. These correlations are in the moderate to substantial range.

These results indicate that for these regular and special education teachers high intolerance of ambiguity is associated with low role conflict and high satisfaction. Low intolerance of ambiguity is associated with high role conflict and low satisfaction. Differences occurred on the subscale scores. Regular teachers with a high intolerance of ambiguity expressed high satisfaction with pay, and special education teachers with high intolerance of ambiguity expressed high satisfaction with promotion and co-workers. When low intolerance of ambiguity was present these teachers expressed low satisfaction with the respective facets.

Partial correlation coefficients between the mean JDI total score along with it's subscale scores (work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers) and the mean role conflict and ambiguity scores were calculated controlling for intolerance of ambiguity. The results are reported on Table 15.

For regular teachers role conflict was significantly and negatively related (.05 level) to the total JDI score (-.56) three of it's sub-
scales: work (-.37), promotion (-.58), and supervision (-.39). These correlations were in the moderate to substantial range. For this same group of teachers role ambiguity was significantly and negatively related to the total JDI score (-.48) and two of it's subscales: work (-.47), and pay (-.44) at the .05 level. These correlations indicate moderate associations.

For the special education teachers role conflict was significantly and negatively related to the total JDI score (-.47) and two of it's subscales: work (-.59), and co-workers (-.40) at the .05 level. These correlations are in the moderate to substantial range. For these teachers role ambiguity was significantly and negatively related to the total JDI score (-.42) at the .05 level. This shows a moderate relationship.

Controlling for intolerance of ambiguity had the effect of decreasing the strength of all of the correlations, except for special education teachers' satisfaction with work which slightly increased. Consequently, there are fewer significant negative correlations with the subscale scores than there were when JDI was correlated with role conflict and ambiguity and intolerance of ambiguity was not controlled.
TABLE 11

RELATIONSHIP OF ROLE CONFLICT AND ROLE AMBIGUITY AND JDI SCORES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction With</th>
<th>Reg Teachers (n=24)</th>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>-.3771**</td>
<td>-.4778***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-.4719**</td>
<td>-.4893***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-.6108***</td>
<td>-.3946**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.4150**</td>
<td>-.3149*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>-.3807**</td>
<td>-.1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI Total</td>
<td>-.6181***</td>
<td>-.5176***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, two-tailed
**p < .05, two-tailed
***p < .01, two-tailed

NOTE: An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.

TABLE 12

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AT MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS

Maximum Total Score = 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Reg Teachers (n=24)</th>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>43.083</td>
<td>41.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.299</td>
<td>7.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.167</td>
<td>39.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.474</td>
<td>8.192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13
ANOVA SUMMARY OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS ON INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Between</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type Between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg</td>
<td>18.750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.750</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X School</td>
<td>8.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.333</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>52.083</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.083</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type X School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1972.828</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.

### TABLE 14
RELATIONSHIP OF INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY QUESTIONNAIRE AND ROLE CONFLICT, ROLE AMBIGUITY AND JDI SCORES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Reg Teachers <em>(n=24)</em></th>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers <em>(n=24)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>-.3631**</td>
<td>-.3453**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-.2311</td>
<td>-.1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI</td>
<td>.3591**</td>
<td>.5499***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.0894</td>
<td>.0551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.4949***</td>
<td>.2736*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.2395</td>
<td>.4239**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.1478</td>
<td>.2723*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>.3176*</td>
<td>.5189***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, two-tailed  
**p < .05, two-tailed  
***p < .01, two-tailed

**NOTE:** An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.
TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP OF ROLE CONFLICT, ROLE AMBIGUITY, AND JDI SCORES FOR REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS CONTROLLING FOR INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction With</th>
<th>Reg Teachers (n=24)</th>
<th>Sp Ed Teachers (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>- .3713**</td>
<td>- .4717**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>- .3609*</td>
<td>- .4435**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>- .5791**</td>
<td>- .3592*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>- .3921**</td>
<td>- .2917*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>- .3004*</td>
<td>- .1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDI Total</td>
<td>- .5609***</td>
<td>- .4786**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10, two-tailed
** p < .05, two-tailed
*** p < .01, two-tailed

NOTE: An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.

TABLE 16

RELATIONSHIP OF JDI AND TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY IN TEACHERS ROLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Teachers (n=48)</th>
<th>Principals (n=48)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>-.5608**</td>
<td>.0118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>-.4085**</td>
<td>-.0375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10, two-tailed
** p < .05, two-tailed
*** p < .01, two-tailed

NOTE: An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.
Research Question 4: What is the relationship between principals' and teachers' Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores and teacher job satisfaction?

Correlation coefficients were calculated between teacher job satisfaction (JDI) and teachers' and principals' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles. As seen on Table 16 the results of this procedure indicate that there is a negative and significant relationship at the .05 level between JDI and teachers' perceptions of role conflict in their job roles (-.56). This indicates a substantial relationship. A negative relationship, which is significant at the .05 level, is also seen between JDI and teachers' perceptions of role ambiguity in their job roles (-.41). This correlation shows a moderate relationship.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed with teachers' and principals' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles as predictors and JDI scores as the criterion. The results supported the findings of the correlation procedure used to respond to this research question. Teachers' perceptions of role conflict in their job roles was retained as a predictor of job satisfaction and the remaining three variables, including teacher role ambiguity which showed a moderate relationship to JDI, were not entered into the equation. The multiple R between teacher role conflict and JDI was .561 and the stepwise multiple regression analysis indicated that 31% of the variance in teacher job satisfaction is explained by teachers' perceptions of role conflict in their job roles. Information about the relationship between teachers' and principals' perceptions of role conflict
and ambiguity in teachers' roles does not add significantly to the prediction of teacher job satisfaction.

**Research Question 5:** Which teacher characteristics (e.g. training, years of experience and so forth) are related to the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and the JDI?

A squared multiple correlation coefficient was computed between demographic data (sex, type, training, experience, school, certification) and scores for teacher role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. As evidenced by the figures on Table 17 none of the correlations showed significance at the .05 level. Three stepwise multiple regression equations were calculated each using demographic variables as predictors. Teacher role conflict, role ambiguity, and JDI scores served as the respective criterion variables in the three separate equations. In all three instances none of the variables were entered into the equation. This supported the findings found on Table 17. These results indicate that demographic variables do not significantly contribute to predicting teacher job satisfaction.

**TABLE 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Teacher Role Conflict</th>
<th>Teacher Role Ambiguity</th>
<th>Teacher Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.1529</td>
<td>.0487</td>
<td>-.1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>.2417</td>
<td>.2233</td>
<td>.0209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.1053</td>
<td>.0042</td>
<td>.0165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.0134</td>
<td>.0996</td>
<td>-.1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>.1853</td>
<td>.2094</td>
<td>.0491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>-.1618</td>
<td>-.1593</td>
<td>.2770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** An assigned alpha level of .05 for a two-tailed test was considered statistically significant.
Summary

In this chapter the findings of this study were analyzed. First, the demographic information obtained from the teachers who participated in this research was reported. Secondly, the five research questions were addressed.

In the first question which pertained to differences in the way principals and teachers perceived role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles, it was found that the observed difference in means were not significant. Regular and special education teachers and principals at the middle and high school levels did not differ in perceived role conflict and role ambiguity in teachers' roles.

In response to the second research question it was found that there were no significant differences between the way regular and special education teachers perceived job satisfaction.

In response to the third research question it was found that for both types of educators the more role conflict and role ambiguity they perceived the less satisfied they were with teaching. Differences did exist between the two types of teachers when role conflict and ambiguity were correlated with JDI subscales. There was no significant difference between regular and special education teachers at the middle and high school levels on the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire. When intolerance of ambiguity was correlated with role conflict, role ambiguity, and JDI it was found that for the teachers sampled the more intolerant they were of ambiguity the less they perceived role conflict and the more satisfied they were with teaching. There were differences between the two groups when intolerance of ambiguity was correlated with the JDI subscales. Controlling for ambiguity and correlating job satis-
faction with role conflict and ambiguity did not change the negative significant relationship between total job satisfaction and role conflict and role ambiguity for the teachers, but for the two types of teachers it did reduce the number of negative significant relationships between satisfaction with particular facets of the job and role conflict and ambiguity.

In the fourth research question, which pertained to the relationship of teachers' job satisfaction and teachers' and principals' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles, it was found that a significant and negative relationship existed between job satisfaction and role conflict and ambiguity. Further analysis retained only role conflict as a predictor of job satisfaction for teachers.

In response to the fifth question it was found that none of the teacher characteristics obtained from the teacher demographic information form served as predictors of teacher job satisfaction.

In Chapter V the findings are discussed, and in Chapter VI recommendations for future research are presented.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter begins with a summary of this study which includes a brief re-statement of the problem. Next the findings which pertained to demographic data and the research questions were discussed in terms of the Porter and Lawler Model and other related research.

Summary of the Problem

As stated in Chapter 1 the problem investigated in this study is that one explanation for voluntary teacher attrition is job dissatisfaction, and one of the factors which affects teacher job satisfaction is how teachers perceive their roles. Two potential dysfunctional aspects of the role perception process are role conflict and ambiguity. This study examined teachers' and principals' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles to see how these perceptions affected teacher job satisfaction. The participants were 48 regular and special education teachers and their principals. The teachers were employed by an urban central Ohio school system, and they taught at the middle or high school level.

An investigation of factors which may contribute to teacher job satisfaction seemed important for several reasons. The rationale for this study, found in Chapter 1, and the review of the literature, found in Chapter 2, showed general consensus that teachers are reporting lower job satisfaction than they did in past years. Research has shown that the amount of perceived role conflict and role ambiguity are two of the factors that negatively affect reported job satisfaction (Cooke & Lefingwell, 1982; D'Alonzo & Wiseman, 1978; Dixon, Shaw & Bensky, 1980; Locke, 1976).
The Porter and Lawler model (1968) provided the theoretical framework for this study. This model shows that role perception is one of the factors that is related to job satisfaction. This researcher recognizes that all of these variables contribute to explaining the variance associated with teacher job satisfaction. This study focused upon the variance which could be explained by role perception. Two of the negative outcomes associated with the role perception process are role conflict and ambiguity (Katz et al., 1964).

In reviewing the literature on teacher job satisfaction it appeared that studies were conducted with either regular teachers (Lortie, 1975; Bentzen et al., 1980; Sweeney, 1981) or with special education teachers (Lawrenson & McKinnon, 1982;). No studies were found which compared differences in the perceived satisfaction level of these two types of teachers.

In two areas which are related to satisfaction studies had been conducted which compared differences between regular and special educators. Smith (1981) reported that the attrition rate of special educators exceeded the attrition rate of regular educators. If it is true that dissatisfaction is related to attrition this indicates that special educators appear to be less satisfied than their peers in regular education. Beck and Gargiulo (1983) found that teachers of the mentally retarded experienced fewer and weaker symptoms of burnout than did regular teachers. Since burnout is related to low satisfaction this finding indicates that special education teachers appear to be more satisfied than regular education teachers. Possibly the special educators received more intrinsic rewards and this accounted for their experiencing weaker burnout symptoms. This present study regarded teacher type as an independent
variable to observe if differences existed in their reported level of satisfaction with teaching.

In the school setting there are many opportunities for role conflict and ambiguity to develop which can negatively affect teachers' satisfaction. As a result of mainstreaming interactions between regular and special education teachers have increased, but the changes in teachers' role expectations and responsibilities may not be clearly defined. Administrators who provide supervision may have different role expectations for teachers, and this places the teachers in a role conflict situation. Aside from providing instruction teachers have additional responsibilities (i.e. supervising extra curricular activities, conducting parent and teacher conferences) which can lead to role conflict. In schools with a large number of personnel it is likely that weak links in the communication system may develop between administrators and staff as well as between staff members. Differences in administrative styles can increase the amount of role conflict and ambiguity perceived by teachers. In view of previous research and situations in schools which have the potential to increase role conflict and ambiguity this proposal for an investigation of how perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity can affect teacher job satisfaction appeared appropriate and useful to this researcher.

To operationalize the variables of role conflict, role ambiguity, intolerance of ambiguity, and job satisfaction several instruments were employed. The JDI was administered to teachers as a means of measuring their perceived satisfaction with their job as a whole and their satisfaction with facets of their job. Teachers and principals reported their perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles by com-
pleting the **Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale**. In an effort to control for individual preference for ambiguity the **Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire** was administered to teachers and to provide demographic data teachers were asked to complete a brief questionnaire.

First, the findings which pertained to the demographic data were considered. The demographic data were used to describe this sample, and when the research questions were addressed these data helped to describe how regular and special education teachers at the middle and high school levels felt about job satisfaction in relation to how they perceived conflict and ambiguity in their roles. An analysis of this data revealed the following characteristics. Half of this sample of 48 teachers were employed to teach regular education classes, and the remaining teachers taught special education classes. Twenty-four of the teachers taught in middle schools and 24 had high school assignments.

The largest segment (over 50%) of this sample had only a bachelor's degree. The second largest group in the sample was comprised of teachers who had a master's degree plus additional coursework. The smallest group were teachers who had a master's degree only. The Porter and Lawler model indicates that ability is one of the variables that moderates job satisfaction.

Most of the middle and high school regular education teachers (MS-66.7%; HS-100%) had taught for nine or more years. Of the special education teachers at the middle school level 66.7% had taught for 3-8 years, and at the high school level 53.5% had taught for nine or more years. This finding indicates that the sample may be biased; however, level of experience did not explain any of the variance associated with satisfaction in the stepwise multiple regressing procedure. To control
for the variable of tenure both types of teachers could be studied in relation to their years of experience. A suggested sample selection process would involve comparing beginning teachers with more experienced teachers to observe if there were differences in satisfaction levels between regular and special education teachers who had taught for the same length of time.

Teaching certification for these subjects was described in terms of full or provisional certification. The majority of teachers had full certification. Of the regular teachers at the middle and high school levels 66.7% and 75% respectively were fully certified for their present assignment. Fifty-eight percent of special education teachers at both middle and high school levels had full certification. Research indicates (Lawrenson & McKinnon, 1982) that 63% of the special education teachers who remained in teaching were fully certified. The results of this study concerning certification status support that finding.

The five research questions are now presented together with a discussion of the results of the statistical procedures used to respond to them. There are three parts to the discussion. First, the data were analyzed to see if there were significant differences between the ways principals and teachers at middle and high school levels perceived role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles. A distinction was made between level of assignment to observe if the findings of this study were consistent with the findings of Bentzen, Williams and Heckman (1980) who reported that junior high teachers were more satisfied than high school teachers. Second, the data were examined to observe significant differences in job satisfaction for regular and special education teachers. No studies were found in the literature which compared level of satisfac-
tion of regular and special education teachers. This researcher was interested in finding if there was a difference between these two types of educators on the measure of job satisfaction. The data were further examined to observe the effects of role conflict and ambiguity on teachers' reported job satisfaction. Third, teachers' perceptions of intolerance of ambiguity were analyzed to see if that variable moderated teacher job satisfaction.

**Research Question 1:** Are there significant differences among the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores for principals, regular and special education teachers?

Two ANOVAs were computed in which role conflict and role ambiguity were the respective dependent variables. The results showed that the independent variables of school, type of teacher, and subjects did not have a significant effect on either of the dependent variables. There were no significant differences in the way teachers and principals perceived role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles.

A possible explanation for no significant differences stems from the fact that this sample was biased. This study focuses on the role perceptions of experienced teachers only. The nature of this sample may account for the low teacher role ambiguity scores. Since these teachers have a number of years of experience it is possible that they perceive their job role to be very specific and clearly defined. Controlling for the tenure factor would provide information about the effect of years of experience on teachers perceptions of role ambiguity.

Porter and Lawler (1968) note that when role perceptions of subordinates correspond to those of the supervisor it is more likely that subordinates will apply their efforts to achieve what the organization de-
fines as successful performance. In this study there were similarities in the way teachers and principals perceived role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles. More information could be obtained by testing the model further to see if teachers are directing their work efforts toward achieving what the school system defines as successful performance.

Frequently when role ambiguity is decreased role conflict increases and this was observed in this study. Principals' management styles can affect the degree to which conflict is perceived. Also teachers' perceptions of equity of rewards associated with principals' management styles could affect the amount of role conflict teachers perceive in their work roles.

**Research Question 2:** Is there a significant difference between the mean score of regular education teachers and special education teachers on the JDI?

The results of ANOVAs having school level and teacher category as independent variables and JDI total and subscales scores as respective dependent variables did not indicate significant differences between job satisfaction and school level or teacher type. Since attrition is associated with low levels of satisfaction (Lawler, 1973) one would expect to find that experienced teachers who remain in teaching would report satisfaction with their work. This was not found to be true with this biased sample of moderately to highly experienced teachers. The following are alternate explanations for this finding.

Perhaps these experienced teachers who reported dissatisfaction with teaching have remained because the costs associated with other types of employment were too great for them to risk leaving. Salary, retirement plans, benefits, and number of teaching days may have influenced their decision to stay.
On the other hand, perhaps these teachers do perceive inequities with the extrinsic rewards but they feel satisfied with the intrinsic rewards they receive from teaching. In addition, perhaps many of their needs are met in areas outside of teaching -- for instance, their salary provides luxuries not necessities. This explanation is consistent with the findings of Lortie (1975) who found that married women whose salary provided a second income reported higher satisfaction than males and single women. In view of economic conditions the researcher feels that the first explanation is more realistic.

Information about differences in the satisfaction level of teachers could be obtained by stratifying the sample according to levels of experience. Testing the Porter and Lawler model further and studying the relationship of performance, tenure, and satisfaction would have practical implications for school administrators. Since high performing teachers make more of a contribution to the school system than do low performers it follows that their dissatisfaction could have a more negative effect on educational programs.

The greatest discrepancies between this sample and the norms were in the areas of satisfaction with work and pay. Low teacher satisfaction in these areas are consistent with other research (Bentzen et al, 1980; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979; Gallup, 1984). Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) found that less satisfied teachers assigned more importance to salary increases than did highly satisfied teachers. In most school systems teachers' salary is determined by years of experience and training. Teachers, regardless of performance level, receive increases in salary based on these two criteria. A disadvantage of rewarding everyone equally is that high performers tend to be the most dissatisfied and the most
likely to leave. Since high performers see themselves as having higher inputs they need to receive more than poor performers in order to perceive rewards as being equitably distributed (Lawler, 1973). When differences in pay are tied to differences in performance it is important that this is communicated to employees (Porter and Lawler, 1968).

In a study by Bentzen, Williams, and Heckman (1980) it was found that junior high teachers reported more satisfaction than did high school teachers. Since this sample is biased the findings cannot be compared.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between scores on the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and the JDI for teachers? How do scores on the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire affect this relationship?

When role conflict and ambiguity were correlated with job satisfaction significant negative associations were found for regular and special education teachers. Role conflict and ambiguity are associated with dissatisfaction (Katz et al., 1964). Significant negative associations were found in other studies (Brief & Aldag, 1976; Keller, 1975) and the findings of this study are consistent with those studies. Because of the biased nature of this sample the data may describe years of experience not type of teacher. There were more negative significant correlations for those teachers with nine or more years of experience (regular) than there were for teachers who taught from three to eight years (special education).

In analyzing these results in view of the Porter and Lawler model, it is possible that moderately and high experienced teachers do not perceive the probability that effort leads to reward which increases
felt role conflict and dissatisfaction with particular facets of their job. Information about less experienced teachers is needed to verify if this rationale is accurate.

Another explanation centers around valence. Role ambiguity scores were low and perhaps low ambiguity has positive valence; however, due to a discrepancy between anticipated and actual satisfaction low role ambiguity was not valued and was associated with dissatisfaction. The longer teachers remained in teaching the more this condition existed.

Further research could investigate if beginning teachers differed from moderately and highly experienced teachers in the number of negative significant relationships between role conflict, ambiguity and satisfaction. Because of differences in the number of negative significant correlations between moderately and highly experienced teachers on the correlated measures of role conflict, role ambiguity and satisfaction with job facets this researcher feels the second explanation is more probable.

To measure perceptions of intolerance of ambiguity teachers were asked to complete the Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire. Their mean scores indicated that they did not perceive ambiguity to be either highly desirable or highly threatening. The results of an ANOVA using school level and teacher category as independent variables and intolerance of ambiguity as the dependent variable showed no significant differences between school level or types of teachers. Possibly this is because the study is comparing moderately experienced teachers (special education) with highly experienced teachers (regular). Perhaps there would be a significant relationship between beginning teachers, which are not included in this sample, and more experienced teachers. Future research could address this issue.
When intolerance of ambiguity was correlated with role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction it was found that for this sample the following applied: high intolerance of ambiguity was associated with high satisfaction and low role conflict, and low intolerance of ambiguity was associated with low satisfaction and high role conflict. In a trait based approach to understanding personality Eysneck (1967) believes that neuroticism and extraversion are two important factors. He identified a classification of personality traits that are associated with individuals high or low in neuroticism who tend to be either introverted or extroverted. Persons high in neuroticism tend to have a low tolerance for job ambiguity. Such individuals feel most comfortable in a work situation that is clear cut, has structured tasks, and provides supervision with explicit expectations. Overall, with this sample, the teachers' needs for less certainty tends to increase role conflict which leads to dissatisfaction.

To determine how intolerance of ambiguity affects the relationship of role conflict, role ambiguity, and facets of job satisfaction these variables were correlated and intolerance of ambiguity was controlled. According to the Porter and Lawler model individual traits moderate perceived job satisfaction. In controlling intolerance of ambiguity the findings of this study show that role conflict and ambiguity were still signifi-
cantly and negatively related to total job satisfaction, but there were fewer significant negative correlations with satisfaction with job facets for both groups of teachers.

The trait of intolerance of ambiguity affects the relationship of role conflict, role ambiguity and facets of job satisfaction and this is consistent with the Porter and Lawler model. Controlling for intolerance
of ambiguity had the effect of moderating satisfaction with some of the job facets for highly (regular) and moderately (special education) experienced teachers. To learn more about the relationship of this trait and teaching experience future research could study teachers who possess low, moderate and high amounts of intolerance of ambiguity and observe how tenure in teaching affects it.

**Research Question 4**: What is the relationship between principals' and teachers' Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale scores and teacher satisfaction?

When correlation coefficients were calculated between teachers' job satisfaction and principals' and teachers' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles a significant negative relationship was found between teacher job satisfaction and teachers' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity. The more teachers perceived role conflict and ambiguity the less satisfied they appeared to be with teaching. The results of a stepwise multiple regression analysis retained only teacher role conflict as a predictor of job satisfaction. Teacher role ambiguity was not entered into the equation. These findings support the moderating relationship between role perception and job satisfaction that is shown by the Porter and Lawler model. Teachers' perceptions of role conflict explain some of the variance associated with job satisfaction. The findings are also consistent with another study conducted with public school teachers (Tosi and Tosi, 1970) which reported a significant negative correlation between role conflict and job satisfaction. Investigating additional variables identified by Porter and Lawler would explain more of the variance that is associated with job satisfaction. Principals' perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity in teachers'
roles did not explain any of the variance in teacher job satisfaction. This is consistent with the Porter and Lawler model which shows that satisfaction is moderated by the way an individual perceives his work role.

**Research Question 5:** Which teacher characteristics (e.g. training, years of experience and so forth) are related to the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale and JDI?

When a squared multiple correlation coefficient was computed between demographic data (sex, type, training, experience, school level, certification) and scores for teacher role conflict and ambiguity and job satisfaction none of the correlations were significant. When three stepwise multiple regression equations were calculated using demographic variables as predictors and teacher role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction as respective criterion variables none of the variables were entered into the equation. Perhaps there were no significant differences between individual characteristics and role conflict and ambiguity because these two variables cannot be explained only by individual characteristics. Possibly there is a relationship between role conflict, role ambiguity, certain individual characteristics, and other types of individuals and specific working situations; however, that issue is beyond the scope of this study.

Finding no significant relationships between sex, teacher type, school level and satisfaction is consistent with the Porter and Lawler model which does not show that demographic variables influence satisfaction. Chapman and Hutcheson (1982) also found that teacher's satisfaction level was not explained by demographic data. According to the model, abilities (training and certification) moderate job satisfaction.
The researcher has two explanations for this finding of no significance. First, since differences in teachers' salary are related to membership not performance perhaps teachers do not perceive that educational training and the additional coursework required for full certification affect their performance and subsequent job satisfaction. Another explanation for this finding is that the majority of teachers in this sample had an undergraduate degree only which does not indicate high ability level. This researcher supports the first explanation and feels that if differences in rewards were related to performance differences it would be more likely that teachers would perceive that additional education would improve their performance, and increase their perception of equitable rewards which would have a positive effect on their job satisfaction.

**Conclusions**

From the findings discussed above the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. This sample displayed characteristics of teachers who are likely to remain in teaching -- possession of an undergraduate degree, a number of years of experience, and full certification. The sample is biased since the regular teachers were more experienced than the special education teachers.

2. Principals and teachers in this study displayed similar perceptions concerning the amount of role conflict and ambiguity present in teachers' roles.

3. Both moderately (special education) and highly (regular) experienced teachers appeared to show similar levels of satisfaction with teaching. Neither group reported high satisfaction.
4. Role conflict and ambiguity had a significant negative effect on teachers' total job satisfaction; however, when job facets were studied the number of significant relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity, and satisfaction differed for highly (regular) and moderately (special education) experienced teachers.

5. For teachers participating in this study, high intolerance of ambiguity was associated with high satisfaction and low role conflict, and low intolerance of ambiguity was associated with low satisfaction and high role conflict.

6. Intolerance of ambiguity did not moderate the relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity and total job satisfaction but it did moderate some of the relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity, and satisfaction with particular job facets.

7. Teachers' perceptions of role conflict explained some of the variance associated with satisfaction with teaching.

8. Principals' perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity in teachers' roles did not affect teacher job satisfaction.

9. Knowledge of teacher demographics did not appear to be a factor in the ability to explain teacher job satisfaction.

10. The Porter and Lawler model indicates that role perceptions affect job satisfaction, and this held for the teachers participating in this study.

11. For this sample remaining in teaching was not associated with high job satisfaction.

In Chapter VI recommendations for future research, which are based on the results of this study, are presented.
CHAPTER VI
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In Chapter V both significant and nonsignificant findings obtained from the statistical procedures used to respond to the five research questions were analyzed. These analyses showed that additional research would further explain and clarify particular relationships. In this Chapter the researcher made recommendations and the following discussions addresses future studies in the areas of theory, research and practice.

Theory

Studies focusing on the relationship between satisfaction and turnover have consistently shown that dissatisfied workers are more likely to leave than are satisfied workers (Steers & Porter, 1979). This suggests that those who remain would report satisfaction; however this sample did not appear to be satisfied with teaching. In general, more research needs to be conducted to further examine differences in characteristics of teachers who leave and those who remain in education. It is suggested that future studies investigate the turnover literature to see if there are models that provide a better framework for explaining why dissatisfied teachers remain.

Deciding to terminate is a process and it is likely that this process is mediated by other variables (Steers & Porter, 1979). Mobley (1982) has developed a model consisting of ten phases which describe the turnover process. Knowledge about these stages one goes through in deciding to quit or stay may help explain why dissatisfied teachers continue to teach.
A modification of a model developed by March and Simon (Heneman, Schwab, Fossum, & Dyer, 1983) explains turnover within the expectancy framework. In deciding whether to leave or stay an employee considers how easy it would be to change jobs (expectancy), and this is affected by available alternatives. The employee also considers the desirability of leaving (instrumentality) which is affected by the comparison of valued consequences associated with leaving or staying. The next section considers possible future studies on teacher job satisfaction in the area of research.

Research

After reviewing the literature on teacher job satisfaction this researcher feels that there is a definite need for researchers to use more sophisticated measures. The following suggestions are recommended for future research in the area of teacher job satisfaction.

It is suggested that additional variables in the Porter and Lawler model be studied to explain more of the variance associated with teacher satisfaction. For example, the model could provide the framework for observing the characteristics of teachers who direct their work efforts toward what the school system considers successful performance. This could have implications for developing successful merit pay programs.

Clarifying the relationships that exist among tenure, role conflict, role ambiguity and satisfaction would provide information about the characteristics of teachers who remain. If experienced teachers do tend to perceive more dissatisfaction and higher role conflict than beginning teachers this information needs to be communicated to school administrators. The results would have implications for staff development developing career ladders, and for identifying appropriate administrative management styles.
This study found that for highly experienced teachers there were more negative significant relationships between role ambiguity and satisfaction than reported by moderately experienced teachers. Controlling for tenure and studying perceived role ambiguity and satisfaction relationships would indicate if there were significant differences between beginning teachers and more experienced ones. The results would have implications for modifying teachers' roles to allow for those who prefer structure and those who perceive conflict and dissatisfaction as a result of structure.

This sample was biased because the tenure variable was not controlled. It is recommended that this study be replicated with an unbiased sample to discern if there are differences between regular and special education teachers. Representative samples of elementary, middle, and high school teachers can be used to: (a) stratify JDI scores to identify those who are highly satisfied, moderately satisfied, and dissatisfied; (b) observe if the highly satisfied teachers have a high intolerance of ambiguity and perceive low role conflict, and the dissatisfied have a low intolerance of ambiguity and perceive high role conflict; and (c) observe if differences in satisfaction exist between new and experienced teachers. In addition to using instruments to measure perceptions interview techniques could be used to obtain additional information in areas where there are significant differences. Locke (1976) stated that too much emphasis is placed on the use of measurements to measure perceived satisfaction and not enough attention is given to interviewing techniques.

Low satisfaction with work and pay was evident in this sample and has been the case in other studies. Research shows that satisfaction is
influenced by additional variables primarily perceived equity of rewards (Steers & Porter, 1979). In education there is a need for research that develops approaches which will strengthen the relationship between work and pay. This study pointed out that high intolerance of ambiguity is positively related to satisfaction with pay and promotion. This indicates that teachers like the certainty of knowing what they will be paid and how they will advance along the salary schedule. A recent survey of teachers' attitudes toward the public school indicated that 64% opposed merit pay, but when asked if they felt teachers in their school warranted merit pay 76% responded positively (Gallup, 1984). Researchers need to consider the feelings of teachers concerning structured salary schedules when they propose changes in programs. Transition from a structured uniform approach to a structured individualized approach is needed to provide a stronger link between work and pay, but the change needs to be made gradually and with adequate reinforcement.

Hackman and Lawler (1971) suggested that organizations look beyond matching an employees' skills and abilities to the job. It is important that there is a good fit between employee and the psychological requirements of the job. This study found that preference for structure was associated with high job satisfaction which could have implications for career counseling at the high school and college level. To obtain additional information on preference for structure and satisfaction with teaching, it is suggested that a longitudinal study controlling for intolerance of ambiguity be conducted with college graduates who enter the teaching profession. Over time data would show if those who are comfortable with structure, are more satisfied, perceive fewer role conflicts, and remain in teaching.
The attraction-selection framework indicates that organizations displaying certain structural characteristics attract and/or select employees with particular personal characteristics (Oldham & Hackman, 1981). A suggested study would involve identifying schools that differ on the variable of structure and measuring the teachers' perceptions of intolerance of ambiguity and job satisfaction at each of the schools. The results would provide administrators with information that could influence recruiting, hiring, and staffing practices for teachers.

A moderating factor in this study may have been the strength of the teachers' union. It is possible that through union efforts the roles of teachers have been clearly defined for both teachers and principals. Comparative studies in other urban as well as suburban and rural school systems would provide additional information.

There is a need for studies which show if what is being taught in teacher preparation programs about teachers' roles is related to what administrators expect from teachers in a work situation. Also, studies need to explore if what is being taught to future teachers about their job role leads to satisfaction with teaching. The final section addresses recommended studies at the school district level.

**Practice**

The following recommendations are directed toward future studies which would have implications at the district level for identifying characteristics of satisfied and dissatisfied teachers, and retaining those teachers perceived by the system to be high performers.

It is suggested that school systems experiencing increases in teacher attrition request teachers to volunteer information concerning the factors that influenced their decision to leave teaching. When a
substantial amount of data have been collected and analyzed it would provide the content for a questionnaire which would be completed by teachers within the system who wished to participate. This data would point out similarities and differences between the two groups. At this time much of the information collected has concentrated on demographic data. By learning more about variables associated with voluntary teacher attrition school systems can use research findings to direct their efforts to retain good teachers.

High performing teachers contribute more to the advancement of educational programs than do low performers. Consequently, school systems would benefit if they could satisfy and retain this group of teachers. To be able to do this it is suggested that school administrators: (a) identify teachers they want to retain; (b) know what outcomes are valued by this group; (c) know what outcome is needed to retain the high performing teachers, and (d) be able/willing to provide these outcomes. Often organizations are not prepared to gather the information they need (Lawler, 1973).

To identify high performing teachers school administrators could begin by identifying those teacher performance objectives which support their organizational goals. Then identify teachers within the system who posses these characteristics. Measuring their perceptions of job satisfaction and controlling for tenure would provide information about the relationship of satisfaction and years of teaching experience.

The voluntary merit pay program in Houston (Say & Miller, 1982) used a similar approach to retain high performers. In order to reduce the gap between what was existing in the system and what administrators wanted to happen they initiated a voluntary merit pay program. The administrators
found deficiencies in students' academic performance, staff stability, and shortages of qualified teachers. To reduce these deficiencies they first established criteria to determine which teachers were eligible to participate. Then administrators identified six categories which qualified for incentive pay which ranged from $500 to $3,500 per year. These six categories were directly related to the areas previously found to be weak. The plan had been in operation for three years at the time the article was written and administrators attributed receptivity to teachers' suggestions, and flexibility as key elements in the plan's success.

As the Porter and Lawler model indicated high performers are more likely to be satisfied when they perceive differences in performance to be related to differences in rewards. Measuring for teacher satisfaction both before initiating a merit pay plan and in the years following its conception would assist administrators in determining if teachers are more satisfied as a result of being rewarded on the basis of performance and not exclusively on membership.
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INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS
Information for Participants

My name is Mary Ann Dempsey. I am a doctoral student with the Department of Human Services Education at The Ohio State University. This fall I will be conducting my dissertation research. I have been given permission by your school system to involve principals and teachers who are willing to participate in this study. Before asking if you will be one of the subjects I would like to tell you about the study.

I plan to work with 12 middle school principals and 12 high school principals along with a regular and special education teacher from each of the participating schools. I am interested in seeing if there is a difference in the way principals and teachers perceive role conflict and ambiguity in teachers' roles. I am also interested in seeing how the perceptions of these teachers affect their job satisfaction.

All of the information I collect will remain confidential. The instruments will be coded by building level and teacher category. I am asking the subjects at each school to meet with me for 30 minutes. Part of that time will be used to show you the instruments. You will be asked to complete the forms in private and return them to me in a sealed envelope. Before you complete the instruments I will ask you to sign a consent form.

I will need only 30 minutes of your time. If you are interested in participating I would like to tell you about the instruments.

The Intolerance of Ambiguity Questionnaire consists of 16 items. Teachers will be asked to react to each of the statements by using a five point rating scale which ranges from strongly agree to strongly disagree.
The Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale is a 14 item instrument which will be completed by teachers and principals. Principals will respond in terms of their perceptions about the roles of regular and special education teachers.

The Job Descriptive Index consists of five sections that contain either nine or eighteen adjectives. Teachers will indicate if each descriptor is "true of my job", "not true of my job", or "cannot decide". This index provides a job satisfaction score.

On the final form teachers will be asked to provide demographic information which includes sex, type of assignment, training, years of experience in teaching, certification, and teacher category.

Before I ask if you would participate do you have any questions? Will you participate?

Your principal (give name) indicated (day and time) is convenient for him/her. The number where I can be reached if you need to phone me is 888-8393. When I am out there is a recorder. Please feel free to leave your message and I will return your call.
APPENDIX B

INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY QUESTIONNAIRE
PLEASE NOTE:

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

These consist of pages:

- Appendix B, page 91
- Appendix C, pages 93-95
- Appendix D, page 97
APPENDIX C

ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY SCALE
APPENDIX D

JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX
TEACHER DEMOGRAPHICS

I would like to know a little about you so I can see how different types of people feel about job satisfaction in relation to how they perceive their role as a teacher.

Please indicate your response by putting a circle around the appropriate number.

1. My sex is
   1 MALE
   2 FEMALE

2. I am currently employed as a
   1 REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER
   2 SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER

3. Type of training
   1 BS/BA DEGREE
   2 MS/MA DEGREE
   3 MS/MA DEGREE PLUS ADDITIONAL COURSES

4. Total number of years of teaching experience
   1 1-2 YEARS
   2 3-8 YEARS
   3 9 OR MORE YEARS

5. Present level of teaching assignment
   1 MIDDLE SCHOOL
   2 HIGH SCHOOL

6. Type of certification for current assignment
   1 FULL CERTIFICATION
   2 PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY.
APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF ORAL PRESENTATION
Written Summary of Oral Presentation

Thank you for meeting with me today.

Before I give you some information about this study I want to show you the consent form which you will be asked to sign (pass out forms).

I would like the principal to serve as a witness to my oral presentation and indicate this by signing your forms on the line labeled witness. Since the consent of the principal is also necessary I would like for one of the teachers to act as a witness and sign the principal's consent form. Before I ask you to complete the instruments I will give you copies of the consent form and of this oral presentation.

The purpose of this study is to examine how regular and special education teachers perceive their roles as they relate to the structure of school organizations, and secondly how their attitudes affect their job satisfaction.

The Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale consists of 16 items. As you can see (hold up instrument) you will respond by circling the appropriate symbol. Teachers will complete this form.

The Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale will be completed by principals and teachers. Principals will react to the items in terms of their perceptions of the role of both regular and special education teachers. You are to respond to each item by circling the appropriate symbol (hold up instrument).

This is the Job Descriptive Index (show JD1). There is a list of adjectives for each of the five sections. You are to decide if the word/phrase is "true of my job", "not true of my job", or "cannot decide." This instrument provides a perceived job satisfaction score and it is one of the forms to be completed by teachers.

This form (show form) is a demographic data sheet. The information you teachers provide will help me to see how different types of people feel about job satisfaction in relation to how they perceive their roles as teachers.

As you can see (show code on form) the forms are coded by building level (BL) and teacher category (TC). The code translates as follows: A- middle school, B- high school, 1- regular education teacher, and 2-special education teacher. Data will be analyzed in terms of these codes. All information collected will be regarded as confidential and at no time will subject names or building names be used. After the data is collected all papers bearing the names of subjects will be destroyed.

Do you have any questions?

First I would like to have the consent forms and summary of oral presentation forms signed. Next, I will give you the instruments to complete in private. I will wait here. When you have finished please seal the envelope and return it to me.

Thank you very much!

Date: ________  Signed: ______________________________
(participant)

Signed: ______________________________
(researcher obtaining consent)

Signed: ______________________________
(witness)
APPENDIX G

CONSENT FORM
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

The Effect of Role Perception of Regular and Special Education Teachers on Job Satisfaction

Dr. T.N. Stephens/M.A. Dempsey or his/her authorized representative has (Principal Investigator)

explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ____________________ Signed: ____________________ (Participant)

Signed: ____________________ Signed: ____________________ (Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative) (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ____________________

HS-027 (Rev. 12-81) -- To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
Dear (principal):

I want you, (regular teacher), (special education teacher) to know that I appreciate your participation in my dissertation study. Also, please extend my thanks to (secretary) for her assistance in coordinating our meeting.

A copy of my dissertation will be on file with ________ Public Schools. Again, thank you for your support and cooperation.

Respectfully yours,

Mary Ann Dempsey
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