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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was a relationship among job satisfaction, preferred rewards, perceptions of teachers' performance, and selected demographic variables for elementary classroom teachers in North Dakota and Minnesota. Eighty-five teachers from seven selected elementary schools comprised the sample.

Data were gathered by employing the following instruments: the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI), the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), and a preferred rewards instrument designed by the researcher to measure the desirability and availability of various rewards. Teachers also completed a demographic information sheet which was used in the data analysis.

The analysis of the data permitted the researcher to arrive at the following conclusions:

1. Elementary teachers in school districts across North Dakota and Minnesota were highly satisfied with their jobs in general and with their colleagues. They were also satisfied with the supervision they received. At the same time, these teachers were dissatisfied with their present pay and with their opportunities for promotion.

2. Elementary teachers were very homogeneous concerning their perceptions about rewards based on their levels of performance. Performance was not an indicator of which rewards elementary teachers perceive to be most desirable and available.
3. Although elementary teachers were generally dissatisfied with present pay and with opportunities for promotion, those teachers who were considered high performers were significantly more dissatisfied with these two variables than other teachers.

4. The role of the salary in the elementary teachers' household had no bearing on their satisfaction with pay or their perceptions of the desirability and the availability of various rewards.

5. The rewards most preferred that are unmet for over half of the elementary teachers included rewards related to "facilities, equipment and supplies"; "pay"; "working conditions"; and "decision making."

6. The enrollment of the school district may influence teachers' attitudes about rewards. Teachers in larger districts reported that rewards related to "administration," "decision making," "growth," and "related perquisites" were more desirable and available than was true for teachers in smaller districts.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are many challenges which face today's educational leaders: exploding knowledge, expanding technology, declining resources, reduced public support. School leaders are being challenged to do more with less—to manage more frugally and to lead more creatively. In this complicated context the building principal is viewed as the key individual in providing a fertile educational environment (Erlandson and Pastor 1981, Stephens 1974). The principal is directly responsible for the quality of education that is provided in the classrooms of his/her school.

In recent years there has been a plethora of study on the quality of the education being provided in the nation's schools. The findings of these studies have all indicated that education needs to be improved (Adler 1982, Boyer 1983, Cawelti 1984, Sizer 1984, Hunt, duPont, and Cary 1983). Several of the studies have resulted in reports which have contained recommendations on how school improvement might occur.

One area targeted for improvement in the national reports has been the performance of teachers. Certainly student performance is the ultimate concern of education, but, as the reports about the nation's schools have suggested, teacher performance must improve before improvement in student performance can be expected (Adler 1982). The authors of the various reports have suggested that teachers need to become
better prepared, to be more actively supervised, to be more appropriately rewarded, and to become more highly motivated (Hunt et al. 1983). If working with teachers to improve performance of students is accepted as a major responsibility of the building principal, he/she is especially obligated to concentrate on the motivation of teachers. Bruce (1978) claimed that a motivated teaching staff is the key ingredient in an effective school, and the principal is the key person in promoting a motivated staff.

The subject of American education has captured the attention of the nation. The media, public officials, and ordinary citizens, in addition to professional educators have offered suggestions and opinions on how the performance of teachers might be improved. In an attempt to find solutions, much attention has been focused on the methods employed in the private sector.

Business and industry have long studied ways to increase productivity and profit through the incentive systems provided to workers from the assembly line to the top executive (Fein 1976, Katz and Kahn 1978, Latham and Yukl 1975, Campbell and Pritchard 1976) while educational research has lagged behind (Miskel 1982). The theories of Weber (1947), Maslow (1970), McGregor (1966), Alderfer (1977), Vroom (1964), Argyris (1964), and Porter and Lawler (1968) have all been the focus of research in worker motivation, and its application in business and industry. The writings of these theorists and the research that has centered around their theories provide an immense volume of literature for educators to consider when seeking ways to improve teaching performance through motivation.
The use of rewards to increase employee motivation comprises much of the literature on motivation and has been the focus of many research efforts. The importance of pay and other extrinsic rewards have been compared with the intrinsic rewards provided by the work itself.

The effect of pay and its ability to motivate have long been researched and argued (Spuck 1974, Fuller and Miskel 1972, Fein 1976, Frase, Hetzel, and Grant 1982). Fein (1976), a supporter of using pay as a motivator, asserted that pay tied to productivity is the most powerful motivator of performance. He claimed that performance at every level will rise when it is directly connected to one's pay. Fein admitted, however, that the nature of compensation in the public sector, including public schools, makes using pay as a motivator very difficult. Not only is the compensation system not designed to pay employees based on their performance, but the performance levels of many public employees, including teachers, are difficult to measure.

Fein has faced stiff opposition to his position on using pay as a motivator. Deci (1975) asserted that not only is pay not a motivator, it can become detrimental to motivation. Hamner (1982) claimed that most merit pay plans in business and industry are mismanaged or misunderstood and are largely unsuccessful.

The literature from business and industry, then, provides educators with a place to start, ideas to try, and methodologies to replicate. However, it does not provide any clear-cut, definitive answers or remedies. Education is a service profession, not a profit-based operation. The "products" of education are different from those in industry, the nature of work in education is less specific and
routinized, and the criteria for performance are less clearly defined and less easily measured. Education, as a profession, is labor intensive, and opportunities for improvement exist mainly in the improvement of the school's human resources. Little research has been conducted that attempts to discover how to measure and increase the performance of teachers, and the research that has been conducted in education has typically used a very narrow and largely untested theory base (Miskel 1982). These factors create the need for educational research in the area of motivation.

Need for the Study

Steers (1977) indicated that it is the responsibility of management to set up suitable reward systems so that employees can satisfy personal needs and goals while simultaneously pursuing organizational objectives. Cusick (1981) observed that this responsibility is a particularly difficult one for school principals. He noted that a limited array of rewards is available for dispensation by principals. Cusick's study also revealed that principals could not hire, fire, promote, demote, or provide differential pay. These findings indicate that many of the options available to managers in business and industry are simply not available to the building principal.

The present study attempted to measure the attractiveness of a variety of possible rewards that might be available for the principal to use in rewarding teachers. However, it was not designed to determine the "merits" of merit pay. Neither was the study designed to ascertain the effect of salary on teacher motivation and performance since the ability to control that particular reward is beyond the scope
of the building principal. Rather, this study sought to explore the relative desirability of non-monetary rewards that might be employed at the principal's discretion.

Much of the educational research that has been conducted has attempted to measure either job satisfaction or motivation and the rewards that help produce these elements (Fuller and Miskel 1972, Miskel, Glasnapp, and Hatley 1972, Erlandson and Pastor 1981, Bruce 1978, Scott, Hickcox, and Ryan 1977, Gudridge 1980, Heath 1981, Taylor, Rosenbach, and Gregory 1982). The research concerning job satisfaction, motivation, and rewards generally does not include measurements of teacher performance, however, and therefore the research might be considered incomplete. Since the quality of education is directly dependent upon teacher performance, it seems crucial to consider rewards which are related to performance as well as to job satisfaction. This is not to say that satisfaction as a research variable is unworthy of attention. Porter and Lawler (1968) contend, for example, that if a relationship does exist between performance and satisfaction, that satisfaction is the result of high performance. Fuller and Miskel (Miskel 1972) indicated that employees—whether teachers or industrial workers—preferred different types of rewards based on their levels of satisfaction. These findings suggest that principals may be able to use measures of job satisfaction as guides in providing appropriate rewards. However, a satisfied group of teachers does not insure a highly motivated or highly effective group of teachers. Research has demonstrated that there is no causal relationship between job satisfaction and performance (Vroom 1964, Salancik and Pfeffer 1977, Mitchell 1979, Cherrington, Reitz, and Scott 1980). Furthermore, it cannot be
assumed that rewards related to job satisfaction will also be related to performance.

Fruth, Bredeson, and Kasten (1982) conducted a study to determine what type of rewards would retain the outstanding teachers whose primary satisfactions were related to students and curriculum. More such studies are needed. Erlandson and Pastor (1981) reported that the teachers viewed as most outstanding—the highest performers—are most dissatisfied. These studies indicate that principals need information on the relationships between the job satisfaction, performance, and reward preferences of teachers. If it is true that the highest performing teachers are the most dissatisfied, then studies must be undertaken to discover how the reward systems in schools can be improved. It is no longer enough to study just what type of rewards will produce a satisfied teaching staff. Principals need to provide non-monetary rewards within their discretion that will motivate teacher performance.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this exploratory study was eightfold:

1. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between performance ratings of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and the perceived level of job satisfaction.

2. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between performance ratings of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and their preferences for certain types of rewards.
3. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between the perceived level of job satisfaction of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and their preferences for certain rewards.

4. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between reward preferences of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and the following demographic information: sex, age, teaching assignment, years of teaching experience, years of teaching in a particular building, enrollment of the school district, and role of teaching salary in household income.

5. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between perceived level of job satisfaction of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and the following demographic information: sex, age, teaching assignment, years of teaching experience, years of teaching in a particular building, enrollment of a school district, and role of teaching salary in household income.

6. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between performance ratings of teachers (by supervisor and peers) of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and the following demographic information: sex, age, teaching assignment, years of teaching experience, years of teaching in a particular building, enrollment of a school district, and role of teaching salary in household income.

7. To determine which rewards elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota perceived were available to them.

8. To determine which rewards elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota perceived were desirable and which
might, therefore, serve as motivators if those rewards would be awarded based on teacher performance.

Specific answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. Is there a relationship between the performance ratings of teachers (by supervisor and peers) and perceived level of job satisfaction?

2. Is there a relationship between the performance ratings of teachers (by supervisor and peers) and preferred rewards?

3. Is there a relationship between the perceived level of job satisfaction of teachers and preferred rewards?

4. Is there a relationship between certain teacher demographic information and preferred rewards?

5. Is there a relationship between certain teacher demographic information and perceived level of job satisfaction?

6. Is there a relationship between performance ratings of teachers (by supervisors and peers) and certain demographic information?

7. Which rewards do elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota perceive are available to them?

8. Which rewards do elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota consider most desirable?

**Delimitations**

This study was delimited to:

1. Elementary teachers who met one of the following criteria:
   a. they were assigned to a regular elementary classroom
(kindergarten through grade six), or

b. they were assigned to a full-time elementary music position, or

c. they were assigned to a full-time position comprised of half-time elementary music and half-time regular elementary classroom.

2. Public schools with ten or more elementary teachers selected by the researcher to represent varying district enrollments and geographic locations.

Limitations

This study was limited by the inability of the researcher to control:

1. The ability of teachers to accurately discern their perceptions of the desirability and availability of preferred rewards.

2. The ability of the principals to accurately assess each teacher's performance.

3. The ability of the teachers and principals to accurately select the one-third of the teachers from the sample group who were most productive and effective.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized in the following manner:

Chapter I includes the following areas: (1) introduction, (2) need for the study, (3) purpose of the study, (4) delimitations of the study, (5) limitations of the study, and (6) organization of the study.
Chapter II contains a review of related literature.

Chapter III describes the acquisition of and the development of the instruments employed to secure the data, the procedures used to collect the data, and the tests employed to analyze the data.

Chapter IV is a report of the results.

Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations based upon the findings reported in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Motivation

The advent of the twentieth century witnessed the scientific management movement introduced by Frederick W. Taylor. Taylor, who is often referred to as the father of scientific management, spent his life seeking ways to improve efficiency in the work place. Based on systematic data collection and analysis, Taylor simplified operations and made tasks more repetitive. Taylor and contemporaries Frank and Lillian Gilbreth and Henry Gantt relied on time studies as a basis for establishing methods and standards for performing a job (Certo 1980).

Since the early days of the scientific management movement there has been continuing study of organizations by an array of researchers and practitioners. One area of research concerning organizations focused on employees and their motivation to perform their jobs. Management thought concerning employee motivation has evolved in three rather distinct stages: (1) traditional, (2) human relations, and (3) human resources (Steers 1981).

The traditional approach coincided with the period when Frederick Taylor was exerting his influence—approximately 1900-1930. Before that time employees were motivated largely through threat of punishment including the loss of their jobs. Taylor believed that
financial incentives, which permitted workers to earn more by working harder and more efficiently, was a better way to motivate them (Chruden and Sherman 1980).

In 1927, Mayo, Roethlisberger, and Dickson began a series of studies that are commonly referred to as the Hawthorne Studies. These studies ushered in a new approach to employee motivation—the human relations approach. The idea behind this approach was to secure employee compliance by using interpersonal strategies to increase employee satisfaction. This approach was most popular between 1930 and 1960 (Steers 1981).

Since 1960 the literature regarding motivation has viewed employees as human resources. This approach recognizes the complexity of motivation and assumes that many factors such as the nature of the incentive system, social influences, the nature of the job, supervision, worker perceptions, and individual needs and values are all capable of influencing behavior (Steers 1981).

Motivation is defined in a variety of ways throughout the literature. An accepted definition of motivation was provided by Steers (1981) as, "... that which energizes, directs, and sustains human behavior" (p. 53). Steers identified three aspects of motivation inherent in this definition.

First, motivation represents an energetic force which drives people to behave in particular ways. Second, this drive is directed toward something. ... Third, the idea of motivation is best understood within a systems perspective ... it is necessary to examine the forces within individuals and their environments that provide them with feedback and reinforce their intensity and direction (p. 53).
Contained within the present day human resources approach are a number of perspectives on how the concept of motivation can be described. The various motivation theories are grouped into a variety of categories throughout the motivation literature. One commonly used method for discussing the various theories is to divide them into two groups—content and process theories. This way of discussing motivation is consistent with Steers' three-part definition of motivation, and therefore, will be employed by the researcher in the following section.

Content Models

Content models of motivation deal primarily with the first part of the definition of motivation—that which energizes human behavior. Content models of motivation include the need theories which concentrate on which needs provide the impetus to act. Three content theories will be described.

Over forty years old, Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory is one of the more popular theories of motivation in the management and organizational behavior literature (Wahba and Bridwell 1976). This theory has formed the foundation of more recent theories and has provided the basis for a large body of literature targeted at practitioners. According to Maslow (1970) people are motivated by five general needs which are arranged in hierarchical order—physiological, safety, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization needs. The premise of Maslow's model is based on the notion of prepotency which is composed of the deprivation/domination and the gratification/activation components. This means that the deprived need is dominant, but once it becomes
gratified, a need at the next level of the hierarchy is activated. For example, if a person is very hungry the physiological needs will be activated and dominate all the other needs which the person might have. Once hunger is satisfied, that need diminishes, and the safety needs become dominant. This process continues throughout the hierarchy concluding with the need for self-actualization (Farrar 1981). Maslow (1970) explained the theory:

... these physiological needs are the most prepotent of all needs. What this means specifically is that in the human being who is missing everything in life in an extreme fashion, it is most likely that the major motivation would be physiological needs rather than any others. A person who is lacking food, safety, love, and esteem would most probably hunger for food more strongly than for anything else (p. 37).

In a review of the research on Maslow's Need Hierarchy Theory, Wahba and Bridwell (1976) found little empirical evidence to support the theory. They reported no evidence that human needs are classified into five distinct categories, although some studies did show lower order needs (deficiency) and higher order needs (growth) clustering together. There was also no support for the notion of a prepotent hierarchy and little support for the domination/deprivation or the gratification/activation components of the theory. Wahba and Bridwell concluded that the need hierarchy theory is almost untestable. They also identified the most problematic aspect which makes the theory untestable as the basic concept of need. It is not clear what is meant by need primarily because Maslow made no attempt to "provide rigor in his writing or standard definitions of constructs" (p. 234). According to Wahba and Bridwell, Maslow preferred to use logical and clinical insight in formulating his theory rather than well-developed research.
Still, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs model has proven useful in generating ideas about the basic nature of human motives and how they affect the behavior of people at work (Steers 1981).

Another content model of motivation concerned with energizing behavior has been developed by Alderfer (1972). He identified three basic need categories—existence, relatedness, and growth—commonly called ERG. Existence needs include material and physiological desires. Relatedness needs include relationships with significant others while growth needs provide satisfaction for engaging problems that require a person to utilize his capacities fully and may require him to develop additional capacities.

Alderfer views ERG Theory as a modified and theoretically improved version of Maslow's Needs Hierarchy. When Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) wrote a strong critique of need theories, Alderfer (1977) supplied a vigorous retort. He accused Salancik and Pfeffer of holding a highly simplified and inaccurate view of need theory. Wahba and Bridwell (1976) lent some support to Alderfer's defense in their review of research on Maslow's Need Hierarchy. They stated, "Alderfer provides impressive evidence in support of his theory, especially in contrast with that of Maslow" (p. 235).

Through an extensive study of engineers and accountants from industries in the Pittsburgh area, Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959) developed yet another content theory—the motivation-hygiene, or two-factor theory. The study was conducted using a critical-incidents interview procedure in which each subject was asked to describe critical events experienced at work that had resulted, first,
in improved job satisfaction and, second, in reduced job satisfaction (Herzberg et al. 1959). In analyzing the data, Herzberg and his colleagues (1959) discovered that while some factors truly motivated behavior (the motivators), the other factors merely lessened the level of dissatisfaction (hygiene factors). The positively satisfying factors, or motivators, included achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement. The incidents that reduced job satisfaction most frequently involved the feelings of unfairness. These feelings frequently involved personal relations with superiors and peers, technical supervision, company policy, administration, and working conditions. The researchers concluded that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not opposite poles of a continuum. They stressed that one set of factors, the motivators, will produce satisfaction when present while another set, the hygienes, will produce dissatisfaction. If all of the causes of dissatisfaction could be totally eliminated, satisfaction would not result without the presence of the motivators.

The two-factor theory has been studied extensively in both industry and education. With some variations, industrial employees, secondary teachers, and secondary administrators have tended to relate one set of factors with job satisfaction and a different set with job dissatisfaction (Miskel 1982; Silver 1982).

Studies which replicate Herzberg's methodology by employing the critical-incidents technique tend to confirm the two-factor theory. In education two such studies are representative—Sergiovanni (1967) with teachers, and Schmidt (1976) with administrators. Another
educational researcher, Blumberg (1980) applied Herzberg's methodology to measure teachers' attitudes about supervision. His findings parallel Herzberg's in that the most commonly listed motivators were first, the need to have teaching achievements recognized; second, the need to have professional and personal potential recognized; and third, the need for status and public recognition.

Three studies using rating scales (Weissenberg and Gruenfeld 1968, Halpern 1966, and Armstrong 1971) all reported that motivation factors are better predictors of job attitudes than hygiene factors. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) conducted their study with 96 civil service supervisors. Although their findings generally supported Herzberg, advancement was not viewed as a motivator by their subjects. They speculated that this finding might have been a function of the way advancement occurs. In the civil service, advancement is based largely on seniority rather than on performance.

Wernimont, Toren, and Kapell (1970) conducted a study with 755 scientists and technicians to determine which job factors affected effort and satisfaction. This study and several other studies employing a variety of methodologies failed to substantiate Herzberg's two-factor notion.

In recent years the two-factor theory has been criticized frequently. One of the most common criticisms reported by Medved (1982) is that it is "method-bound," referring to the use of the critical-incident technique. Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) claimed that the theory is weak, while Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) asserted that the theory should either be altered or abandoned. While Hackman and Oldham (1976) credited Herzberg's theory as inspiring practitioners
in the redesign of work, they criticized it in three areas. First, they asserted that separating factors into categories of "motivators" and "hygienes" may have been "largely a methodological artifact" (p. 251). Second, they noted that the concept of individual differences in motivation were not dealt with, but rather the theory assumed that the motivating factors could increase the work motivation of all employees. Finally, Hackman and Oldham said that the theory didn't specify how the presence or absence of motivating factors could be measured for existing jobs.

Schmidt (1976) summarized the criticisms articulated in research studies that have failed to confirm the two-factor theory. They included the following:

1. The theory is too simple.
2. The theory is too rigid.
3. The theory is stated too often in contradictory terms.
4. The results are method-bound and are supportive of the theory only when the full Herzberg interview technique and analysis are used.
5. The interview technique does not lend itself to considering the defensive mechanisms that come into play in the respondents' answers (p. 70).

In spite of the criticisms of Herzberg's theory, it continues to be popular with practitioners, especially those in education, because it is easily adapted to supervisory action at all levels (Hersey and Blanchard 1977). Suggestions on how to implement applications of the theory in educational settings continue to appear in the literature (Medved 1982, Frase et al. 1982, Scott et al. 1977). This theory also continues to dominate some textbooks in educational administration (e.g. Sergiovanni 1979).
Miskel (1982), however, has urged educators to begin to use other theories as the bases for their research and practice. With the lack of empirical support for the theory and the mounting criticism from writers including Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) and Campbell et al. (1970), Miskel has argued that educators place too much faith in this single theory, and consequently they ignore or neglect other theories. Mitchell (1979) pointed out that, "theoretical richness is substantially improved from 10 years ago" (p. 244). He also indicated that all three content theories discussed to this point—Maslow, Alderfer, and Herzberg—"have simply been absent from the current research" (p. 252). While other areas (management, business, industry) have moved on to more sophisticated theories, education has not. Miskel (1982) urged a change in direction when he wrote,

... it is time for scholars in educational administration to reduce their reliance on the model. Mindless replications will not improve the knowledge base. Instead, the state of knowledge indicates that the field should rely more on process models such as expectancy theory (p. 73).

Process Models

While content models deal with only the first part of the definition of motivation, process models embrace all of the components of the definition. These process models seek to explain how behavior is started, directed, sustained, and stopped. Process models attempt to identify the major factors that determine the choice of the task effort. In some cases the process models rely on need theory and in this way content models and process models can be seen as complementary (Alderfer 1977). Process models proceed a step beyond content models
by attempting to specify how different variables interact to influence an individual's behavior. Theories described in this section include equity theory, goal theory, the developing theory referred to as the job characteristics model, and expectancy theory.

**Equity Theory**

Social comparison theories all focus on the individual's perceptions of how fairly they are being treated as compared to some self-selected referent. Equity theory, as first described by Adams (1965) and Weick (1966), is the most popular social comparison theory, and is based on two assumptions about human behavior. First, individuals evaluate their work situation in terms of an exchange process. That is, they measure the contributions that they make with the outcomes they receive in return. Second, individuals compare their situation of inputs and outcomes with others in order to determine the equity of their situation. Equity theory is an intuitive process whereby individuals arrive at a ratio of their outcomes to inputs as compared to the ratio of a referent's outcomes and inputs. A state of equity exists when the two ratios are equal as illustrated in the equation:

\[
\frac{\text{outcome (person)}}{\text{input (person)}} = \frac{\text{outcome (referent)}}{\text{input (referent)}}
\]

(Steers 1981).

According to Weick (1966), dissatisfaction occurs when ratios are unequal, and it is assumed that the greater the discrepancy between ratios, the greater need to reduce the existing inequity. A person will
feel inequity if, while expending great effort, he/she experiences low outcomes (high/low), and concomitantly observes a co-worker (his/her chosen referent) receiving high rewards for the same amount of effort. Even more dissatisfying, however, is the situation in which the person perceives the co-worker receiving high outcomes for low effort (low/high). Inequity is less unattractive when the person is being overre­warded. If not too great, overrewards can be perceived as "good for­tune" or as secretly deserved.

Equity theory postulates that when inequity exists, especially when the person feels underrewarded, dissatisfaction occurs. A change in behavior often results to reduce the perceived inequity and thereby balance the equation. Weick (1966) identified several ways in which inequity can be reduced:

1) By actually altering either inputs or outcomes,
2) by perceptually distorting inputs or outcomes,
3) by leaving the field,
4) by getting the comparison person (referrent) to change, or
5) by changing to another comparison person (referrent) (p. 418).

These techniques provide ways for people to cope with situations they perceive as unfair. Motivation, here, is largely aimed at reduc­ing inequity and the tension it creates. Equity theory views indivi­duals in a constant state of flux striving to understand and control their environment (Steers 1981).

Goal Theory

Goal theory, first introduced by Locke and his associates in 1968, is still evolving and is continuing to show promise as another cognitive process approach to understanding work motivation (Mento,
Cartledge, and Locke 1980). Goal theory describes behavior that is determined by values and goals. The process assumes that the individual is aware of the specific nature of the work environment and will use this knowledge to determine which actions will fulfill his/her individual needs. Choices will also be influenced by the personal value system of the individual. The following illustration summarizes the model.

Values $\rightarrow$ emotions & desires $\rightarrow$ intentions or goals $\rightarrow$ actual behavior and performance (Steers 1981).

Support for the goal model has come from both laboratory and field research efforts. Three generalizations have been repeatedly substantiated by the research. First, specific performance goals elicit higher performance than general goals. Second, the more difficult the goal, the higher the effort if the individual accepts the goal. Finally, when individuals participate in the goal-setting process they tend to be more satisfied (Miskel 1982).

Mento and others (1980) described two components of goal theory --goal specificity and goal difficulty-- and their effects on performance.

Goal theory argues that task performance is regulated most directly by the difficulty and specificity of the goal the individual is trying to attain. Specific goals lead to more complete goal attainment than vague or general goals, and hard goals lead to more effort and higher performance (given sufficient ability) than easy goals (p. 420).

Other components which may influence behavior when using the goal-setting model include feedback on goal effort, peer competition for goal attainment, and goal acceptance. Each of these components may influence the behavior, and therefore, the performance of workers. However, the research to date shows these components as having less
influence than either goal specificity or goal difficulty (Steers 1981). Goal theory is particularly popular because the goal-setting techniques complement and enhance other theories of work motivation, such as expectancy theory and behavior modification.

Job Characteristics Theory

Another developing theory of work motivation is the job characteristic model initially introduced by Hackman and Oldham (1976). At the most elementary level, this theory includes five core job dimensions which are seen as prompting three critical psychological states, which in turn lead to a number of beneficial personal and work outcomes. Each of the core job dimensions corresponds to a particular psychological need state. The first psychological state is the experienced meaningfulness of work which refers to the degree to which the individual experiences the job as being worthwhile. In order to make a job worthwhile three core dimensions—skill variety, task identity, and task significance—should be present. A second psychological state is the experienced responsibility for work outcomes and is reflected in the amount of autonomy that exists on the job. A third psychological state is knowledge of results, and the corresponding job dimension is feedback (Hackman and Oldham 1976). Hackman and Oldham have designed an equation implementing the five core job dimensions to yield what they have termed a Motivating Potential Score (MPS). A simplified version is presented by Steers (1981).

\[ MPS = \frac{(\text{skill variety} + \text{task identity} + \text{task significance}) \times \text{autonomy} \times \text{feedback}}{3} \]
This formula shows that a near-zero score on any of the three factors will reduce the MPS score to near-zero indicating a low level of motivation for the task.

In a recent revision of their work, Hackman and Oldham (1976) presented an alternative framework for understanding the relationship between organizational structure and employee reactions which they called the job-modification framework. This framework suggests that the structural properties of organizations influence employee reactions by shaping the characteristics of their jobs. This two-step process was explained by Oldham and Hackman (1981) as follows:

An alternative framework for understanding the relationship between organizational structure and employee reactions can be called the job-modification framework. Here it is argued that the structural properties of organizations influence employee reactions by shaping the characteristics of their jobs. The explanation again has two steps. First, organizational structure is viewed as significantly affecting the overall amount of challenge and complexity (autonomy, skill variety, task identity, task significance, feedback) in the employees' jobs; second, job challenge and complexity are seen as directly influencing employees' reactions to the work and the organization (p. 68).

Taylor, Rosenbach, and Gregory (1982) applied the MPS in an educational setting. The study was designed to measure the relationship between motivation and organizational climate. The organizational climate survey developed by Rosenbach and Umsot (Taylor et al. 1982) was adapted for use in a school setting. A motivating potential score, or MPS, was calculated for all school employees including administrators, teachers, secretaries, custodians, librarians, cooks, and bus drivers. The most significant findings were that K-6 teachers had higher MPS scores than secondary teachers. The authors speculated that the lower scores for secondary teachers were due to less skill variety and feedback on their jobs. Another finding showed that
teachers in elementary schools which were smaller and more cohesive scored significantly higher in psychological climate and satisfaction with supervisors than teachers in secondary schools.

In reviewing research on Hackman and Oldham's original job characteristics model (Hackman and Oldham 1976), Miskel (1982) found support for this model in several studies. One study, by Erlandson and Pastor (1981), did attempt to apply Hackman and Oldham's method in an educational setting. The researchers used an instrument entitled The Higher Order Need Strength Measure B with 150 secondary teachers. This measure had been normed on industrial workers but had never been used in an educational setting. The study measured higher and lower order needs of the secondary teachers. Two-thirds of the teachers surveyed possessed a predominance of higher order need strengths which included participation in decision making, freedom and independence, and challenge over the lower order need strengths which included factors such as high pay, fringe benefits, and job security.

In spite of the support that has been demonstrated in some studies for Hackman and Oldham's model, Miskel (1982) reported that Hackman and Oldham themselves have acknowledged several shortcomings in their theory. One weakness is that the links between the job characteristics and psychological states may not be as strong as the theory purports. Also, the model treats the job characteristics as if they were completely independent and discrete factors when actually jobs that are high on one characteristic tend to be high on the others as well. Because of these weaknesses, Miskel (1982) warned that this model should be viewed as incomplete and still evolving. He suggested that it be
used as a guide to further research and theory development.

**Expectancy Theory**

Another process model which was originally introduced by Vroom (1964) is most commonly referred to as expectancy theory. This approach is also called valence-instrumentality-expectancy (VIE) theory and value theory. When compared to other theories of motivation, expectancy theory presents a highly complex view of the individual in the organization. This theory addresses the issue of individual differences in the areas of needs and goals. It also recognizes that individuals may perceive different connections between their actions and the achievement of their goals. By permitting individual differences in both need and perceptions, the expectancy-theory formulation is both more flexible and more complex than many of the other process theories (Salancik and Pfeffer 1977). An additional confusing element of expectancy theory exists because one of the sub-components of the theory carries the same name as the theory-expectancy (Hoy and Miskel 1982).

Expectancy theory is based on two assumptions. First, individuals use their abilities to think, reason, and anticipate future events in order to make decisions about their own behavior. Motivation is viewed as a conscious process in which individuals engage; they subjectively evaluate the expected outcomes which should result from their actions and after doing so, choose how they will behave.

The second assumption is not unique to expectancy theory but is shared by other process models. This assumption postulates that forces in the individual and the environment combine to determine
behavior. Forces within the individual such as values and attitudes, for example, interact with role expectations and organizational climate from the environment to influence behavior (Hoy and Miskel 1982).

Vroom (1964) originally presented two models of expectancy theory, the first for the prediction of valences of outcomes, and the second for the prediction of the force of effort toward behavior. The term valence refers to the anticipated satisfaction that is associated with an outcome and should be distinguished from the value—or actual satisfaction—of the outcome. In predicting effort, Vroom focused on the force of effort an individual would expend, and not that individual's level of performance because effort is considered a behavior, while performance is an outcome.

Vroom's original effort and valence models have been combined, and Vroom and others have made a number of modifications of expectancy theory (Mitchell 1974). One highly popular, modified version of Vroom's theory was developed by Porter and Lawler (1968).

In Porter and Lawler's model, expectancy theory contains two basic components—the effort-reward probability component and the valence component (Porter and Lawler 1968). Valence refers to how "attractive or desirable is a potential outcome of an individual's behavior in the work situation" (p. 18). The measurable variable which comprises the valence component is more commonly referred to as rewards. Rewards are defined in the Porter and Lawler model as the "desirable outcomes or returns to a person that are provided by himself or by others" (1968, p. 28). There are two important features of this definition. First, the outcomes or rewards must be positively valued by the individual. Second, these rewards can be either intrinsic or
extrinsic in nature. Intrinsic rewards are those rewards that the individual can award him/herself, such as a feeling of accomplishment. Extrinsic rewards are those rewards which are provided by others, such as praise from a supervisor or a pay increase.

In addition to being valued, rewards must also be perceived as equitable by the individual (Porter and Lawler 1968). 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" (p. 30). The degree to which the rewards an individual receives are perceived to be equitable will influence, in part, that individual's level of satisfaction. Satisfaction, according to Porter and Lawler (1968) is a "derivative variable" and will be discussed later in this chapter.

The valence component of expectancy theory, then, is concerned with the value, or attractiveness an individual assigns to potential rewards. For the valence to be "high" the reward must be viewed as desirable and distributed in an amount the individual perceives as equitable.

\[ \text{Valence} = \text{Value Placed on Potential Rewards} \]

The other component of expectancy theory, the effort-reward probability, has two subcomponents: (1) the probability that performance depends upon effort (expectancy), and (2) the probability that reward depends upon performance (instrumentality). Effort is a key variable in this equation, and must be clearly distinguished from performance. If a student is preparing for a test, effort would be the actual energy expended on studying for that test, while performance
would refer to the score, or grade, which resulted.

Performance—or productivity as this variable is called by some researchers—is the end result of the application of effort. It is what organizations seek from their employees. Performance measures can be purely objective as in units produced or number of sales; however, more often than not, measures are subjective as in supervisory or self ratings.

The effort-performance, or expectancy subcomponent, describes the probability that one's effort will, in fact, result in high performance. This component is mediated by an individual's unique traits and abilities. A person who has no musical abilities will never be a great pianist, no matter how much effort he/she puts into practicing the piano. There are ways in which individuals in work situations can compensate for their lack of some abilities; however, the expectancy subcomponent of the model does imply that, "given two individuals who put forth equivalent effort in a given area of endeavor, the one possessing a greater amount of the relevant trait or ability will accomplish more—he will achieve a higher level of performance" (Porter and Lawler 1968, p. 23).

In the literature, the expectancy component is often referred to as an effort-outcome relationship. In using this term, writers are describing the relationship of behavior to performance (Hoy and Miskel 1982). The relationship is illustrated below.

Expectancy = effort \rightarrow \text{performance}

The second subcomponent of the effort-reward probability is the performance-reward subcomponent, or instrumentality. This
subcomponent deals with the probability that an individual's performance will be rewarded appropriately. The degree of connection that an individual sees between his/her performance and the resultant rewards plays a key role in motivating the individual. Porter and Lawler (1968) hypothesized that the greater the connection an individual makes between performance and rewards, the more likely a person is to exert effort to obtain a high level of performance. In actual work situations, these connections are often quite nebulous or indirect. Some organizations clearly reward their workers for effort, not performance. In many organizations, employees may not see the connection between how they perform and how they are rewarded, or the rewards the organization thinks that the employees want are not attractive to the employees at all (Porter and Lawler 1968). The result of these circumstances is often to substantially reduce the potentially positive effect of the performance-reward, or instrumentality, subcomponent.

The outcomes or rewards have two levels. They are referred to as first- and second-level outcomes (Mitchell 1974) or direct and indirect outcomes (Silver 1982). The direct outcomes are the immediate results of an action, and the indirect outcomes are the consequences of the direct outcomes. Silver (1982) put these concepts into an educational setting when she wrote:

For example, when a teacher prepares a lesson for class, the result could be a good lesson, a mediocre lesson, or a poor lesson; those are the possible direct outcomes of the act of planning a lesson. If it is a good lesson, the students might be attentive and orderly, they might learn some content, the teacher might feel good, and the principal might recognize the teacher's accomplishment. If the lesson is poor, the students might be inattentive and unruly, they might create an embarrassing disruption, the principal might disapprove, and so forth. These are indirect outcomes of preparing a lesson (p. 552).
Writers refer to the instrumentality relationship as an outcome-outcome one since it relates the outcomes of performance and rewards. The instrumentality portion of the effort-reward component of expectancy is illustrated below.

Instrumentality = performance → reward

The relationships of the component parts of expectancy theory can be expressed in a mathematical equation,

Force of Motivation = Expectancy E (Instrumentality multiplied by Valence):

\[ FM = E \times (IV). \]

This equation expresses the way in which the component parts are thought to affect an individual's motivation. The effort an individual expends combines with a number of personal and environmental factors to yield a certain level of performance. The probability that a given effort will yield an expected level of performance (expectancy, or E) serves as feedback to modify the force of motivation. The individual also assesses the probability that a certain level of performance will result in perceived outcomes (instrumentality or I). In addition, the individual assesses the desirability of those perceived outcomes (valence or V). Since this is a multiplicative relationship, if either expectancy, instrumentality, or valence falls to zero, then the force of motivation also becomes zero (Hoy and Miskel, 1982).

Hoy and Miskel (1982) provided a summarization of expectancy theory when they wrote:
... motivation to behave in a certain way is greatest when the individual believes that: (1) the behavior will lead to rewards (high instrumentality), (2) these outcomes have positive personal values (high valence), and (3) the ability exists to perform at the desired level (high expectancy). When faced with choices about behavior, the individual goes through a process of considering questions such as: Can I perform at that level if I work hard? If I perform at that level, what will I receive? How do I feel about these outcomes? The individual then decides to behave the way that appears to have the best chance of producing positive desired rewards (p. 156).

Although not presented in the equation, Porter and Lawler (1968) recognize the effect of job satisfaction on an individual's force of motivation. They have referred to job satisfaction as, "a derivative variable" (p. 30). Satisfaction is defined as, "the extent to which the rewards actually received, meet, or exceed the perceived equitable level of rewards" (p. 30). It is important to note that satisfaction is affected by the level of rewards actually received and the judgment the individual makes about how equitable that reward level is.

Porter and Lawler (1968) also discussed the relationship between performance and satisfaction. They described four hypothetical performance-satisfaction situations:

Situation #1: Rewards are associated positively with performance differences—i.e., higher performers get higher rewards—but the perceived levels of rewards are approximately the same for high and low performers. In this case, the higher performers would be more satisfied since their perceived rewards were close to their equitable rewards.

Situation #2: Rewards are associated positively with performance differences—i.e., higher performers get higher rewards—and the expected equitable levels of rewards are also in proportion to performance differences—i.e., higher performers expect more. In this situation, low performers would be as satisfied as high performers because the rewards they received were just as close to their expectations as was the case for the high performers.

Situation #3: Rewards are not related to performance differences—i.e., everybody gets about the same level of rewards—and the perceived equitable levels of rewards are approximately the same for high and low performers. Again, high and low
performers would be about equally satisfied, since the differences between perceived equity and reality were about the same for the two groups.

Situation #4: Rewards are not related to performance differences—i.e., everybody gets about the same level of rewards—but the higher performers expect more. Here, high performers would be more dissatisfied than low performers because their equity-reality difference was larger than that of the low performers (p. 37).

In Situation #1, satisfaction would be positive. Situations #2 and #3 would produce almost no satisfaction, or zero, and Situation #4 could expect to produce negative satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Porter and Lawler (1968) hypothesized that when performance is rewarded appropriately, it will have a more direct and positive effect on satisfaction than satisfaction will have on performance. They emphasized that even though feelings of satisfaction can influence future performance, a strong causal relationship does not exist, and in fact, there may be a far stronger causal relationship where performance appropriately rewarded affects satisfaction. The relationship between these two variables is further discussed in a later section of this chapter.

Considerable research on expectancy theory has been generated in the last fifteen years. Since the 1950s and 1960s when the content theories developed by Maslow, Alderfer, and Herzberg dominated the field of motivational research, more than 75 percent of the motivational research has been related to, or based upon, either expectancy theory or the goal-setting approach (Mitchell 1979). The findings of the research have been mixed. One problem has been the failure to consistently define and measure the theory's component parts (Heneman and Schwab, 1972). This has been especially true for the expectancy (effort-performance) factor of the equation. Where attempts have been made to measure the expectancy factor, confusion has resulted because of the
difficulty of measuring the elements of expectancy component. These inadequacies in the studies have, according to Heneman and Schwab (1972), reduced the actual predictive power of the total theory. Campbell and Pritchard (1976) reported that most of the research on expectancy theory is of the correlational field studies variety. This research is designed to investigate employees in their natural work environment and, in doing so, provides a high degree of external validity (Heneman and Schwab 1972).

Lawler and Suttle (1973) in a correlational field study found support for expectancy theory. In examining thirty-four studies, Mitchell (1974) also found general support for expectancy theory. Mitchell's criticisms echoed those of Heneman and Schwab (1972) and dealt with the design of the studies and not weaknesses in the theory. He also found many instances of inappropriate measurement of the components of the theory.

Campbell and Pritchard (1976) criticized the expectancy theory model for appearing too simple while attempting to explain a group of highly complex variables. Still, they stated that "when all is said and done, we think the heuristic value of the expectancy framework will remain as a powerful force in organizational psychology even though its empirical house in not in order" (p. 92).

In spite of the difficulties surrounding the use of expectancy theory, there is a great deal of support for its continued use in field-based research. Hackman and Porter (1968) concluded from their correlational field study that "expectancy theory can be a broadly useful tool in understanding behavior in real world settings" (p. 426). Miskel (1982) also reported the utility of research with an expectancy theory
base, and urged educational researchers to begin to, "rely more on process models especially expectancy theory" (p. 73).

A few studies with an expectancy theory base appeared in the educational literature. Holstrom and Beach (1973) conducted a study of occupational choices made by graduate students in psychology and found that the subjects' evaluations of potential rewards differed significantly according to three occupational preferences—clinical, teaching, research. In general, those subjects who chose clinical practice and teaching as their occupational choices were more concerned with interpersonally-oriented occupational rewards such as helping people.

A study of innovative teaching practices by Stephens (1974) supported expectancy theory and the findings suggested, "... the reward system becomes the crucial factor in a school shaping teacher behavior" (p. 42). This study involved teachers in both innovative and traditional schools. The findings showed that teachers in innovative schools perceived rewards for quality of work, inventiveness, and creativity, while teachers in traditional schools perceived rewards for good relations with superiors and seniority. Teachers in both schools indicated that they personally favored a "supportive" reward system in which teachers were encouraged to be inventive, question well-established ways of doing things, and pursue new and unusual ideas. Only teachers in innovative schools felt that they were rewarded for those behaviors. Also, teachers in both schools perceived that other teachers actually preferred and endorsed restrictive rewards which were designed to maintain the status-quo. Stephens called this paradox between the rewards the teachers personally preferred and those
they perceived other teachers endorsed as, "pluralistic ignorance" (p. 41).

A study by Herrick (1981) was designed to test the relationship between organizational structure and teacher motivation. Teacher motivation was defined in terms of the organization's reward system as measured by expectancy theory. Herrick studied two types of organizational structures—the multiunit and non-multiunit elementary schools. His findings showed that decentralized multiunit schools had a significantly greater level of teacher motivation than non-multiunit schools.

Miskel, DeFrain, and Wilcox (1980) conducted a study which investigated motivation, central life interests, voluntarism, and selected personal and environmental characteristics as predictors of job satisfaction and job performance for teachers in secondary schools and universities. The variables motivation, central life interests, and voluntarism accounted for 47 percent of the variance in job satisfaction for secondary teachers, and 41 percent of the variance in job satisfaction for university teachers. These same variables accounted for 9 percent of the variance in job performance for secondary teachers and 11 percent of the variance in job performance for university teachers.

Expectancy theory is both flexible and complex. Several writers view the theory as complementing other theories, models, and approaches. Alderfer (1977) argued that expectancy theory and need theory are useful separately or together depending on what is to be predicted or explained. He reasoned that, "viewing expectancy theory and need theory as complementary means that one does not have to choose one theory over another" (p. 658). Lawler (1969) argues that although most expectancy
theories do not specify why certain outcomes have reward value, "the reward value of outcomes stems from their perceived ability to satisfy one or more needs" (p. 427). Lawler, thus, recognized the connection between expectancy theory and the security, social, esteem, and self-actualization needs of Maslow's hierarchy.

Connections have also been made between expectancy theory and goal theory. Mento and associates (1980) recognized the effort-performance probability, or expectancy factor of the equation, on the success of goal theory. In goal theory, "specific goals lead to more complete goal attainment than vague or general goals, and hard goals lead to more effort and higher performance (given sufficient ability) than easy goals" (p. 420). Georgopoulos Mahoney, and Jones (1957) and House (1971) discussed the relationship between leaders' behavior patterns and employees' motivation. This relationship, referred to as the path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness, combines elements from the job factors approach, expectancy theory, and an analysis of leadership styles in an attempt to select the best path to available goals.

Silver (1982) suggested that the sixteen job factors identified by Herzberg could be interpreted using the expectancy theory framework as indirect outcomes of people's actions on the job.

The expectancy model suggests that motivation factors are likely to be more highly attractive (or unattractive) than hygiene factors and thus will have more impact on individuals' motivation. In addition, motivation factors are the outcomes more closely associated with one's own effort; therefore, they are more likely to be closely linked with expectancies on a day-to-day basis. For example, a teacher can more readily expect praise (favorable recognition), a sense of accomplishment (achievement), and the satisfaction of having learned something (growth possibility) as outcomes of investing effort in teaching than he or she can
expect a salary increase, more pleasant surroundings, and better supervision as outcomes of that effort (p. 553).

Not all of the research on employee motivation fits neatly under the rubric of a particular theory, and few contain a comparable set of variable measures. Concomitant with the study of worker motivation has been the study of rewards and reward systems, as well as such topics as job satisfaction, employee morale, and employee performance. Studies involving these issues in organizations will be discussed in the following section.

Rewards

Researchers have labored to discern how various rewards affect worker motivation. Practitioners seek to discover how to use rewards to enhance motivation in order to achieve organizational goals more effectively. A major controversy in the reward research deals with the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and the relative importance of each.

Intrinsic and extrinsic are two terms which have been used extensively to describe and classify outcomes, rewards, motives, and needs that are related to internally and externally initiated behavior. Although sometimes the actual distinction between the two terms is difficult to clarify, extrinsic rewards are commonly thought of as any rewards that are provided by the organization or other people. They are external to the individual and include such things as pay, fringe benefits, job title, and office space. Intrinsic rewards are those mediated within the individual and that the individual grants to himself or herself. Examples of intrinsic rewards include pride in accomplishments, achievement, enjoyment of the work itself, feelings
of competence, and self-determination (Lawler 1969).

Traditionally the belief has been held that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards would combine in an additive fashion to increase the motivation strength. Deci (1975), a cognitive theorist, has disagreed with this long-held generalization. He has theorized that where intrinsic motivation exists people motivate themselves out of a desire to perform competently. Conversely, when extrinsic rewards are dominant, people are motivated out of the desire to achieve the reward. Deci maintained that intrinsic motivation is the strongest type of motivation, and that when extrinsic rewards are added the effect is not a positive one.

Deci (1975) postulated that extrinsic rewards can reduce the power of intrinsic rewards in two ways. First, when external rewards are introduced, they may provide conflicting evidence about the person's competence. The individual no longer performs to his/her level of satisfaction, but to someone else's standards. Second, with the introduction of extrinsic rewards the individual may begin to perform the activity for the reward itself. In either case, the "locus of causality," as Deci called it, shifts from within the individual to the external reward. When this happens the extrinsic outcomes can reduce both the feelings of competence and self-determination that provide intrinsic motivation. Continuation of research in this area is needed and will have significance for both the areas of theory and practice. If future evidence shows that intrinsic and extrinsic motivators are not additive, a change in the accepted knowledge about human behavior will result. In practice, the way in which rewards are distributed will certainly be affected, particularly if future research shows that the addition of extrinsic rewards is counterproductive because intrinsic
motivation suffers.

Much of the literature on rewarding teachers encourages the use of intrinsic rewards. An article by Gudridge (1980) is representative of articles which have claimed that teachers do not teach for money but for self-satisfaction, praise, and recognition. Williams (1978) observed that union contracts seek to gain additional resources which meet teachers' physiological and security needs. He claimed that most schools are deficient in meeting the higher order esteem and self-actualization needs which generally are met with intrinsic rewards.

Are intrinsic rewards more effective in motivating members of the educational community or are these motivators viewed as most effective because of the way in which teachers are compensated? In a research action brief published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1980), the author pointed out that teachers have very few extrinsic rewards available to them since they are paid on the basis of education and seniority. The author wondered if teachers have been "forced" to turn to intrinsic rewards because they are the only true rewards available for excellent performance. Spuck (1974) supported this line of reasoning. He stated that since public schools distribute extrinsic rewards to all employees in a similar fashion, they have little effect on influencing behaviors. Therefore, the rewards in educational institutions which are most closely related to individual performance are intrinsic in nature and have the greatest influence on teachers' behaviors.

In a study of elementary teachers, Lortie (1975) concluded that intrinsic rewards may be more meaningful as motivators than extrinsic
rewards because of the nature of rewards or reward distribution. Intrinsic rewards may be more closely related to the effort teachers put forth. Extrinsic rewards are generally not associated with individual performance in educational settings. Lortie, in discussing the relationship between rewards and organizational behaviors, posited the universal manner in which extrinsic rewards are distributed to teachers as the reason for their low degree of effectiveness. He concluded that intrinsic rewards, especially those derived from effective communication with students, are the rewards which teachers value most.

It is usually assumed that the private sector has and utilizes more types of rewards—particularly extrinsic rewards—with workers while the public sector experiences considerably less latitude. However, this might not be as true in practice as it would appear. A considerable body of literature has indicated that most merit pay programs neither adequately reward meritorious performance nor motivate people to perform very well. Goldberg (1977) blamed the failure of merit pay programs on three things: first, the salary structure itself; second, the closed nature of merit pay programs; and third, the multiple objectives that most merit pay programs try to serve. Most experts agree that much of the "merit" in the programs in the private sector is based on seniority and inflation rather than on merit.

An outspoken supporter of paying for performance, or the use of extrinsic rewards, is Fein. Fein (1976) claimed that although many of the arguments for intrinsic motivators sound good, they appeal to only 8 to 12 percent of the workforce. According to Fein, the rest of the workers are motivated by good pay, working conditions, and job security. He indicated that when workers' pay was linked to performance,
productivity levels were higher and workers were generally more satisfied. Fein concluded that efforts to motivate workers through extrinsic rewards have failed because in the real world, most workers are penalized, not rewarded, for improving their performance.

A study by Quinn and Cobb (1980) supported Fein's notion of the importance of extrinsic and monetary rewards. The study found that twenty-five facets of jobs rated by workers in terms of importance could be represented by five dimensions—three of which refer to extrinsic or monetary rewards. The five dimensions were: (1) comfort, (2) challenge, (3) financial rewards, (4) relations with co-workers, and (5) resources.

Fein (1976) allowed that rewarding public sector workers, such as teachers, based on their performance is more difficult than it is in the private sector. He listed the biggest problem as measurement of output, or performance, citing the fact that conventional work measures cannot be used. While rewarding public workers based on performance is practically non-existent, it is still seen as desirable by many writers and researchers in the field.

Using merit pay as an extrinsic reward designed to increase motivation can fail to produce the desired results. This can be explained in the context of equity theory. The employee can perceive inequity in a number of different ways. He/She may perceive that the merit increase is inappropriate—generally too low—when compared with last year's performance. The employee may be very satisfied with the actual dollar amount of the reward, but still fail to be motivated because of the rewards of peers which he/she may perceive were higher
than deserved (Wheeler, Wallace, and Crandall 1982).

Nickerson (1984) described this situation in educational settings.

The teachers or other employees become aware of who receives the merit pay, they compare themselves with those individuals and say, "Wait a minute, I did just as much as that person, but I am not being rewarded. Why should I do more if they are not going to reward me for doing what I am doing very well . . . " (p. 66).

This reaction was supported by Hamner (1982) who pointed out that most employees whom he studied viewed their performance as above average, and therefore, expected to be the recipients of merit pay. In addition, Hamner maintained that although the principle behind merit pay is a sound one, merit pay systems fail to increase motivation because managers either mismanage merit pay programs or do not understand them.

Nickerson (1984) agreed with Hamner that it is difficult to argue with the principle of merit pay but, also like Hamner, pointed out that in the educational situations where it has been employed, merit pay has not succeeded in serving as a motivator. Goldberg (1977) is another researcher who emphasized that merit pay plans do not actually reward outstanding performance, and therefore, they fail to motivate workers. Nickerson further maintained that not only did merit pay prove to be an ineffective motivator, it negatively affected one of the factors necessary for school excellence—faculty esprit. He concluded that as much as one might want merit pay to work, it simply doesn't—at least in education.

It is time for the American public, specifically the American school people, to look at the problems inherent in merit pay for teachers. The bandwagon seems to be advocating merit pay. We
need to remember that there are detriments to merit pay as well. There are ways to cure the problems of abuse of tenure. There are ways to reward those who work hard and succeed. Merit pay is not the answer (p. 66).

Spuck (1974) studied the reward structures in public high schools. His study included 497 teachers from twenty-eight high schools in southern California. The sample included teachers from schools that varied in size and ethnic population. The study examined the relationship between eight reward categories and the teacher behaviors of absenteeism, recruitment, and retention. In conducting the study, Spuck developed the Teacher Reward and Satisfaction Scales (TRASS) to quantitatively assess teacher perceptions of reward levels available in public high schools. The study found that intrinsic rewards were highly related to the employee behaviors of recruitment, absenteeism, retention, and turnover.

An Arizona school district reported success with a program of rewarding teachers. The program for excellence in the Catalina Foothills district focuses on rewarding excellent teachers using motivators identified by Herzberg (Frase et al. 1982). The motivation factors that were identified—opportunities for professional recognition for a job well done—have been desirable rewards according to the response of the district's teachers. However, officials of the Catalina Foothills district caution that these motivators will not be effective if hygiene needs are not met first.

Research studies and scholars in both industrial psychology and education have attempted to determine how to most effectively reward employees, which rewards employees prefer, and what effect various rewards have on a variety of other variables such as employee
satisfaction, performance, morale, and turnover. Many of the studies reinforce some form of intrinsic reward system, but the findings vary. The findings of several studies, and the opinions of leading scholars and practitioners are reported in the following section.

Lortie (1975) found that intrinsic rewards were related to job performance, reduced absenteeism, improved peer and superordinate relations, and enhanced the effectiveness of the teacher's classroom behavior.

Porter and Lawler (1968) conducted research in which they modified Maslow's hierarchy to include a sixth step—autonomy needs—which they placed between esteem and self-actualization. Using this additional need, and assuming that physiological needs were adequately met for managerial and professional employees, Porter and Lawler developed the Need Satisfaction Questionnaire (NSQ). In their studies of managers at various levels, Porter and Lawler found that self-actualization was most critical. They also found that esteem, security, and autonomy needs were satisfied more often in middle-management positions than they were for lower-level managers.

Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) adapted the NSQ to the field of education. They found that the largest deficiencies for professional educators were esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. Administrators had fewer esteem needs than teachers and showed a higher need deficiency in the self-actualization step. Trusty and Sergiovanni concluded that self-esteem presented the highest need deficiency for teachers.

A more recent study employed the NSQ in an educational setting and found that administrators exhibited fewer need deficiencies than
teachers on all five subscales. The researchers also found that the greatest area of deficiency for both administrators and teachers was autonomy needs (Miskel 1982).

Other authorities in the field of education have agreed with the findings of Trusty and Sergiovanni. In the Practitioner, a publication for secondary school principals, Bruce (1978) claimed, "the greatest need deficiency levels for teachers, and probably for most American adults, lie in the areas of love and belongingness and self-esteem" (p. 4). Bruce advised building principals to concentrate on providing rewards that will meet the belongingness and self-esteem needs of teachers.

In a study of a unionized manufacturing organization, Rand (1977) asked three groups of workers--upper level managers, foremen, and hourly employees--to rank their preferences of ten rewards. Three of the rewards were considered intrinsic, and seven were extrinsic. All three groups chose "opportunity for growth" and "achievement of sense of accomplishment" as their first and second choices, respectively. These were both considered intrinsic rewards. Pay was chosen fifth by upper management and sixth by both foremen and hourly workers.

In addition to measuring reward preferences, Rand also measured the prediction of the hourly workers reward preferences by upper management and foremen. Their predictions placed pay and job security as the top two choices they expected hourly employees to make. The actual first choice of the hourly workers--opportunity for growth--was predicted to be fifth by upper management and ninth by foremen. This study illustrated the importance of understanding what employees consider important. Such understanding requires continuing and accurate
diagnosis of the reward preferences of employees.

In 1970 Dubin conducted a study of 3,088 industrial workers and developed a three-tiered incentive system which differentiated types of incentives offered according to the satisfaction level of the worker. In general, Dubin found that: first, dissatisfied workers valued extrinsic job factors, autonomy in work, and payoffs from working; second, satisfied workers valued extrinsic job factors (but not necessarily the same ones as dissatisfied workers), and cooperation at work; and third, indifferent workers valued extrinsic job factors, autonomy in work, payoffs for working, and cooperation at work (Fuller and Miskel 1972).

Fuller and Miskel (1972) performed a parallel study with 508 Kansas teachers and administrators. They found that satisfied teachers considered features related to the job and to the school important, that indifferent teachers selected money matters as being more important, and that dissatisfied teachers were most likely to select features related to initiatives of the teachers' association or union.

Fuller and Miskel (1972) modified Dubin's three-tiered incentive system to form a two-tiered incentive system. The lowest tier included features considered important by all groups of teachers and was related to interpersonal relationships, extrinsic work factors, security, and ancillary organizations. The second tier included features important to each specific group of teachers—satisfied, dissatisfied, or indifferent. In this incentive system satisfied teachers would receive intrinsic rewards related to achievement and recognition, indifferent teachers would receive incentives related to autonomy in work and working conditions, and dissatisfied teachers would be provided incentives
emphasizing ancillary organizations.

Heath (1981) conducted a study of 250 private school teachers. Vocational satisfaction was measured using a twenty-eight item instrument and a Likert scale. According to the responses, Heath found that salary ranked twenty-eighth out of twenty-eight items used to predict satisfaction.

The primary purpose of the study was to examine the relationships between faculty burnout and low morale and vocational adaptation. Heath concluded that teachers with the highest adaptation scores—those who regarded teaching as a "calling" rather than a job—required intrinsic rewards in order to achieve satisfaction. Heath also noted that as fewer and fewer intrinsic rewards are present in teaching, teachers seek satisfaction in extrinsic rewards such as increased salary and benefits. Heath warned that increasing extrinsic rewards alone will not reduce the problems of burnout and low morale.

Two other researchers, Chapman and Otteman (1979) studied employee preferences regarding available rewards. Their study examined employee preferences for various compensation and fringe benefit options. The study was based on the expectancy theories of Vroom, and Porter and Lawler. The findings of the study indicated that age and marital status played a significant role in the desirability of some benefits and that sex did not play a significant role. In terms of expectancy theory, the authors stated that traditional wage and benefit programs fail to increase employee motivation because of the lack of emphasis on individual differences in motivation and the individual preferences associated with various organizational rewards. Based on the study findings, the authors recommended that organizations individualize their
compensation systems as much as possible in order to attract and retain effective employees.

A recent theme in the literature on rewards is the notion that rewards should be tailored to each individual as much as possible. Three studies by Miskel, (Miskel et al. 1972, Miskel 1974, Miskel 1977) all found that different employees prefer different rewards. As a result of his research, Spuck (1974) also recommended that reward preferences need to be studied on an individual level—in addition to an organizational level—so that appropriate rewards can be provided. Chapman and Otteman (1979) concurred and stressed that organizations which emphasize individualizing rewards as much as possible will be in a better position to attract and hold an effective work force.

Williams (1978) noted that in developing a strategy for motivating teachers, administrators need to be aware of individual differences. In planning a reward system one particular plan will not motivate all the members of the group. Administrators, Williams advised, must be able to diagnose teachers' needs and match opportunities and rewards to satisfy those needs.

Although the literature makes a strong case for individualizing rewards, there are few suggestions for how to diagnose needs, or how to implement a differentiated reward system. Articles on merit pay provide one suggestion for rewarding individuals differently; however, that differentiation is based on some level of performance, not on needs or reward preferences. Also, merit pay plans suggest one way of rewarding people individually—through their pay. No mention is given to providing other individual rewards that might be attractive to, and motivate, individual employees. While it is difficult to argue with
the contention in the literature that individualizing rewards is desirable, suggestions for implementing programs aimed at individualizing rewards are scarce.

Many of the studies described in the preceding section concerned with measuring preferred rewards included job satisfaction in the list of variables. Preferred rewards and job satisfaction are related because when individuals feel appropriately rewarded some degree of satisfaction results.

Job Satisfaction and Performance

Job satisfaction has received a great deal of attention by researchers apart from its direct tie to rewards, however. Steers (1977) described job satisfaction as one of the most popular indicators used by analysts and investigators to assess organizational effectiveness.

Contrary to the notion that teachers are among the most dissatisfied of the professional groups, studies on faculty burnout, morale, and vocational adaptation by Heath (1981) and Fruth, Bredeson, and Kasten (1982) found that teachers do not differ from other professionals in either the quality or content of vocational satisfaction.

In another study, Miskel and associates (1972) reviewed literature from industry and education and attempted to adapt the information and instruments found in industry to the field of education. This study included a sample of 3400 public school teachers in Kansas and the findings indicated that female elementary and secondary teachers who scored higher on satisfaction were also more job oriented, had a job in which a higher potential for personal challenge and development
existed, where there was less work pressure, and where there were more incentives relating to physical surroundings. Male elementary teachers who scored higher on satisfaction were more job oriented.

A study by Knoop (1980) examined the interrelationships of job satisfaction, job involvement, and job motivation. The study involved 1800 elementary and secondary teachers employed in thirty-two school districts throughout Ontario, Canada. The results of the study showed that educators who were highly involved in their jobs were also highly satisfied with both their jobs and their supervisors. Those who felt they participated in making decisions reported a high degree of job involvement as did those who were highly motivated. Knoop summarized his findings by stating,

Involvement may be high because a person is satisfied with or motivated by, his or her job; or a person may experience high job satisfaction, or job motivation, because of high job involvement . . . if one of these variables is high it may be likely that the other two are also high. Can one not expect people who are involved in their job to be also motivated and satisfied (p. 16).

A strong causal link was once thought to exist between job satisfaction and performance. However, in their systematic review of research, Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) reported that they found no relationship between satisfaction and performance. Mitchell (1979), in another review of research, drew the same conclusion. He stated, "No empirically strong or theoretically compelling relationship between satisfaction and performance is apparent" (p. 248).

A study by Cherrington, Reitz, and Scott (1980) illustrated the absence of an inherent relationship between satisfaction and performance. In the study, two groups of subjects performed the same task. One group
was rewarded and one group was not. Cherrington reported that the perfor-
mance scores between the two groups did not differ. The subjects
performed at equal levels even though one group was rewarded and one
group was not. The levels of satisfaction, however, differed signifi-
cantly. The group that was rewarded was significantly more satisfied
than the group that was not rewarded. The study suggested that although
satisfaction does not cause high performance, satisfaction is still a
variable which merits consideration.

Performance is usually a very subjective measure in education.
There is no definitive way in which to judge performance: Should
student achievement scores be used? Teacher competency tests? Class-
room observations? Is it some combination? In a comprehensive study
illustrated that different attitudes about the nature of teaching
cause different performance measures to be employed. They asserted
that there are four ways of viewing teaching: labor, craft, profes-
sion, or art. The different views bring with them different expecta-
tions for performance. These different expectations can greatly influ-
ence how performance is measured as a research variable, and makes it
a difficult variable to include in research studies. It is, however,
an important factor in the study of motivation and rewards.

Summary

In reviewing the literature on motivation, this researcher was
influenced by the recommendations of Miskel (1982) that educational
researchers begin to employ process theories, such as expectancy theory,
in the study of teacher motivation. Using expectancy theory as a guide,
the variables of performance, rewards, and satisfaction emerged as important variables for further study. The present study focuses upon these variables; the methodology employed is explained in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The problem of this study was to determine which non-monetary rewards were desired by teachers and whether or not the rewards desired varied with either the perceived performance or the job satisfaction of classroom teachers from seven selected elementary schools. The data collected permitted analysis between the variables of job satisfaction, teachers' perceptions of available and desirable rewards, teacher performance ratings and scores, and the demographic variables of sex, age, teaching assignment, teaching experience, years of teaching in a particular building, district enrollment, and the role of the teacher's salary in the household income.

The procedures followed in conducting this study are discussed in three sections: (1) instruments selected and instrument development, (2) sample selection and data collection, and (3) statistical treatment.

Instruments Selected and Instrument Development

Three instruments were employed in the study. The instrument selected to measure job satisfaction had two components. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job In General (JIG) are designed for use together. The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook was consulted.
in selecting this instrument. Bowling Green University holds the copy-
right on this instrument and copies were purchased for use in the
study.

The Job Descriptive Index has five scales: (1) work on present
job, (2) present pay, (3) opportunities for promotion, (4) supervision
on present job, and (5) people on your present job. In addition to the
Job Descriptive Index, the Job In General was administered. The Job In
General is an instrument which was designed to supplement the Job De-
scriptive Index. The Job In General provided a summary for the five
scales of the Job Descriptive Index. All five scales of the Job Des-
cription Index and the Job In General are scaled to yield scores rang-
ing from zero to fifty-four with zero indicating no satisfaction and
fifty-four indicating extremely high satisfaction. For the purposes
of this study, the Job In General was employed as a sixth job satisfac-
tion variable. Each teacher in the study completed this instrument.

The study also attempted to measure teacher performance. Per-
formance is a very subjective element to measure, and yet it is an
extremely important variable in maintaining effective schools. Teachers
who are high performers are desirable employees. Principals are eager
to gain insights related to rewarding and motivating high performing
teachers so that these teachers will continue to work with energy
and commitment.

In this study, high performing teachers were identified in
two ways. The teachers in the study were rated by their principals
using the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI). Two of
the five subsections of the TPAI were used. The subsections used were
designed to measure teachers' performance on classroom procedures and interpersonal skills. These two subsections are organized into two different clusters. Cluster I contains ten items that measure a teacher's performance related to classroom procedures, and six items that measure a teacher's performance related to interpersonal skills. The instruments yielded three scores per teacher—a score on classroom procedures, a score on interpersonal skills, and a total score. Each item on the instrument is behaviorally described with five specific descriptors in order to cause the principal to score the teachers with as much precision as possible. The TPAI was obtained from the College of Education at the University of Georgia. (The subsections of the TPAI used in this study are contained in Appendix A.)

In addition to using the TPAI to identify high performing teachers, principals and teachers in each building were also asked to select the teachers whom they considered to be the most productive and effective from among the sample group in their particular building. Principals and teachers were asked to identify the top one-third of the sample group without ranking them in any order. No specific behavioral criteria were suggested. The instructions stated only that the principals and teachers identify, "the most productive and effective teachers." Teachers were allowed to consider themselves in their selection. A process was employed to ensure that the ratings were anonymous. The researcher prepared a faculty roster and assigned each teacher in the sample group to a corresponding numeral. Teachers and principals selected the top one-third of the group on a prepared page that contained only the numerals. The principals and teachers
then destroyed the lists that contained the names of the participating teachers.

Four groups of teachers emerged based on the selections made by teachers and principals: (1) the group of teachers not selected as the most productive and effective, (2) the group of teachers selected by teachers but not by principals as the most productive and effective, (3) the group of teachers selected by principals but not by teachers as the most productive and effective, and (4) the group selected by both teachers and principals as the most productive and effective.

The third instrument used in the study was developed by the researcher. It was designed to measure the availability and desirability of a variety of different rewards. Herrick (1981) identified sixty-one possible rewards which formed the basis of the reward instrument used in this study (pp. 65-66). (The instrument is contained in Appendix B.) Each of the sixty-one rewards was listed on a separate card. After preliminary examination, the researcher combined reward items and deleted others that were judged to be inappropriate or redundant until fifty-eight items remained. The researcher then grouped items together that appeared to be related in one way or another and labels were created for each group of rewards. Four educational administration faculty members examined these groups of rewards and their respective labels and made suggestions for changes for two of the labels. These categories were then renamed. Nine reward groups existed under the following labels: "progressive administration," "benefits," "participation in decision making," "facilities," "opportunities for growth," "pay," "recognition," "socializing opportunities," and "working conditions." These nine categories and an additional one
titled, "none of the above," were listed. A modified list of fifty-eight possible rewards was also reproduced. These fifty-eight rewards and the ten labels were distributed to a panel of thirteen educational administration graduate students and faculty members. These individuals were instructed to place each reward under the label that seemed most appropriate. If they felt unable to place a reward item under one single label, they were to place it under the label, "none of the above." No attempt was made to describe, explain, or define the meaning of the labels.

The responses were then tallied. Twenty-seven of the rewards were placed under one or the other of the labels by seventy-five percent or more of the panel. These items were then recorded in that specific category. Four of these items appeared redundant and were combined so that twenty-three items remained classified under the nine labels.

Examination of the responses, and questions about the meaning of some of the labels caused the researcher to edit the labels with the aid of the researcher's advisor. The labels were shortened to one word where possible and then a brief descriptor was included with each label. For example, "progressive administration" was altered to read, "administration--nature of and relationship to." These edited labels were then listed. The rewards that had not been placed under one label or another by seventy-five percent of the respondents were then re-examined. After editing, ten new items were created. Thirty-six items were then presented for a second test to another panel of thirteen educational administration graduate students and faculty members. This time each item had to be placed under one of the labels with an attached descriptor. There was no label entitled, "none of the above."
Of the thirty-six items categorized in the second setting, twenty-two were identified by seventy-five percent or more of the respondents as fitting under one specific label. Four additional items were viewed by the researcher as important enough to include in the instrument, even though these items had not been placed under a specific label by seventy-five percent or more of the respondents. The label, "related perquisites" was created to describe these four reward items. Forty-nine items appeared in the final instrument. A table of random numbers was used to determine the order in which the items would appear on the instrument. These forty-nine items formed the ten variables and were analyzed in the preferred rewards instrument. The reward variables were labeled: (1) "administration," (2) "belongingness," (3) "benefits," (4) "decision making," (5) "facilities, equipment, and supplies," (6) "growth," (7) "pay," (8) "recognition," (9) "working conditions," (10) "related perquisites." Each reward variable was comprised of a number of specific items. The variable "administration" contained four items; belongingness contained four items; benefits contained four items; facilities, equipment and supplies contained four items; growth contained six items; pay contained five items, recognition contained eight items; working conditions contained six items; and related perquisites contained four items. (The labels with their descriptors and the specific reward items that comprised these variables are found in Appendix C.)

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) subprogram Reliability Analysis for Scale was used for each group of rewards which comprised each reward variable. The coefficient alpha was analyzed to determine whether or not the reliability of adding the
reward items under the specific labels was greater than examining the reward items singly. The alpha values ranged from .34 to .72. These results indicated that the rewards could be analyzed by groups rather than as single items. (All of the alpha values are found in Appendix D.)

A demographic information sheet was also designed by the researcher to collect specific demographic information from each teacher in the sample. (The demographic information sheet is contained in Appendix E.) Information gathered was related to the teacher's sex, age, teaching assignment, role of salary in the household income, years of teaching experience, years in present building, and enrollment of the district.

Every teacher was assigned a numeral and all three instruments and the demographic information sheets were marked with each teacher's assigned numeral, thus assuring anonymity for respondents.

Sample Selection and Data Collection

Seven elementary schools were selected for the study. The selection was not random. Nevertheless, an attempt was made to obtain data from schools of varying sizes and geographic locations across North Dakota and in western Minnesota.

The superintendent in each of the sample schools was contacted by telephone in early October, 1983, by the researcher's major advisor. Each superintendent was asked for permission to allow the researcher to contact an elementary principal in the district in order to enlist that principal's participation in the study. Each superintendent who was contacted gave permission, and where multiple elementary schools
existed in the district, the superintendent recommended which elementary school should be contacted by the researcher.

The researcher contacted every elementary principal by telephone and explained the purpose of the study, the instruments that would be employed, and the faculty sample that would be needed. Each of the principals contacted expressed a willingness to participate and guaranteed a minimum of ten classroom teachers for the sample. The researcher requested no less than ten and no more than fifteen teachers from each school. Special service teachers were not included in the sample. Classroom teachers, classroom teachers with part-time music assignments, and music teachers were used in the sample. A date and time for the researcher to visit each school to administer the instruments was also agreed upon during the telephone conversation with each principal.

The researcher visited every school and collected data in October and November of 1983. The researcher explained the purpose of the study to the participating teachers, assigned each teacher an identification numeral, distributed the instruments, explained how to complete each instrument, and collected the instruments. During the same visit the researcher left a set of the Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments (TPAIs) with the principal and explained how he/she was to fill out one instrument for each teacher in the sample. The task of completing these instruments required an extensive block of time; therefore, the instruments were left with each principal along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. All principals subsequently completed the instruments and returned them to the researcher within one week.
All instruments were hand scored by the researcher by December 15, 1983. A total of eighty-five elementary classroom teachers completed the instruments. A summary of the study results and a letter thanking the teachers and principals for their participation in the study were mailed on May 10, 1984. (The letter is contained in Appendix F.)

**Statistical Treatment**

The SPSS subprogram *Frequencies* was used to compute the frequency of responses from eighty-five teachers. This program was used to provide a description of the demographic characteristics of the sample. The subprogram, *Frequencies*, was also used in the analysis of the teachers' responses on the preferred reward variables. The responses to each preferred reward item were analyzed. The percentages of the teachers responding to each choice for each item were summed and mean percentages were calculated for each reward variable. For instance, in regard to the variable "benefits," 41 percent of the teachers reported that those reward items were desirable, 14 percent of the teachers reported that those reward items were available, 39 percent of the teachers reported that those reward items were both available and desirable, and 7 percent of the teachers reported that the reward items related to the benefits were neither desirable nor available.

The SPSS subprogram *One Way* was used to test for the significance of mean differences between teachers by group (1. teachers unchosen by principals or teachers, 2. teachers chosen by teachers but not by principals, 3. teachers chosen by principals but not by teachers, 4. teachers chosen by both principals and teachers as most productive
and effective) and the six job satisfaction variables: between teachers by group and the preferred reward variables; between teachers by group and the demographic variables of age, sex, teaching assignment, and role of salary. The SPSS subprogram One Way also tested for the significance of mean difference between the job satisfaction variables and the preferred reward variables, and between the job satisfaction variables and the demographic variables of age, sex, teaching assignment, and role of salary. Finally, the subprogram One Way was used to test for the significance between the preferred reward variables and the demographic variables of age, sex, teaching assignment, and role of salary. Differences in the means were considered significant at 0.05 level.

Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test was used to determine which groups had significantly different means at the 0.05 level. If the analysis of the subprogram One Way indicates that a significant difference between means exists, the HSD test will identify the specific means that are significantly different. There may be significant differences between all the means; however, Tukey's HSD will yield at least one significant difference when the overall F-Test is significant (Roscoe 1975). Where the groups were unequal in size Tukey's Modified HSD for Unequal Cells was employed.

The SPSS subprogram Pearson Corr was used to determine significant relationships between TPAI scores and job satisfaction variables; between TPAI scores and preferred reward variables; and between TPAI scores and the demographic variables of years of experience, years in present building, and enrollment of the district. Relationships between the variables were considered significant at the 0.05 level.
The SPSS subprogram **Reliability Analysis for Scale** was used to determine significant differences between the six job satisfaction variables and between the ten preferred reward variables. Tukey's HSD test was also administered to determine which variables were significantly different at the 0.05 level.

The data collected for this study and the analysis described above are presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present statistics which indicate the relationships found among the three primary variables of performance, job satisfaction, and preferred rewards. This chapter also contains statistics which indicate the nature of the relationships found between these three primary variables and selected demographic variables for the sample group. The relationships among all of the variables were analyzed.

Only statistically significant relationships are analyzed and discussed in this chapter; non-significant relationships are included in observations and conclusions contained in Chapter V. (Appendix G contains the data which demonstrate which relationships were and were not significant.)

The results are presented in eight parts: (1) a description of the sample, (2) analysis of the significant relationships between teacher performance, job satisfaction, preferred rewards, and demographic variables, (3) analysis of the significant relationships between job satisfaction, preferred rewards, and demographic variables, (4) analysis of the significant relationships between preferred rewards and demographic variables, (5) analysis of the significant differences between the job satisfaction variables, (6) analysis of the significant differences between the preferred reward variables, (7) analysis
of the mean percentages of the reward variables, and (8) summary.

Description of the Sample

The sample included eighty-five teachers from seven selected elementary schools in North Dakota and Minnesota. The schools selected represented a range of enrollments and geographic locations. Five schools were located in North Dakota and two schools were located in Minnesota. The enrollments of the school districts from which the seven schools were selected ranged from 374 to 8400 students. The researcher contacted each principal and requested participation from not less than ten, and not more than fifteen of the elementary classroom teachers in each building. Full-time teachers with a combination assignment of a classroom and elementary music were accepted in the sample, as were full-time elementary music teachers. In the schools with lower enrollments, all of the elementary classroom teachers participated in the study in order to obtain data from the minimum of ten teachers per school. In the schools with larger enrollments, each principal used his/her own system of selection ranging from volunteerism to random sampling.

Of the 85 teachers comprising the sample 7 were male, 76 were female, and 2 teachers did not respond to the item. Twenty-six teachers were 30 years of age or younger; 27 teachers were between the ages of 31 and 40; 21 teachers were between the ages of 41 and 50; and 11 teachers were age 51 or older.

Teachers were asked to indicate their present teaching assignment. Their responses were as follows: kindergarten, 7; grade one, 14; grade two, 14; grade three, 11; grade four, 11; grade five, 8; and
grade six, 4 respondents. Nine teachers were assigned to some type of combination arrangement whereby they taught two grade levels, or a half-time classroom and half-time elementary music, or full-time elementary music. Seven teachers did not indicate their teaching assignment.

Eighteen of the teachers in the study had 5 years of teaching experience or less; 23 teachers had between 6 and 10 years of experience, while 30 teachers had between 10 and 20 years of teaching experience. There were 14 teachers who ranged in experience from 20 to 36 years.

Thirty-five of the teachers in the study had served in their present elementary building for five years or less. Eighteen teachers had taught in their present building between 6 and 10 years. Twenty-four teachers had taught in their present building between 11 and 20 years, and 6 teachers had been in their present building for over 20 years. Two teachers did not respond to this item.

Teachers were asked to indicate the role their teaching salary played in their family income. Sixteen teachers indicated that their teaching salary comprised their total household income. Twenty-seven teachers indicated that their teaching salary was the primary income of a multiple-income household, and forty-two teachers reported that their teaching salary supplemented another larger income in their household.

Analysis of the Significant Relationships Between Teacher Performance and Job Satisfaction, Preferred Rewards, and Demographic Variables

This study examined the relationships between the scores of three different instruments and the information from a demographic information sheet completed by each teacher. The three instruments measured teacher
performance, job satisfaction, and preferred rewards. The instances where the relationships between two of the variables were significant are depicted in a series of summary tables. All of the relationships can be displayed in six tables. The significant relationships are depicted in the following summary tables:

- Significant Relationships Between Teacher Performance and Job Satisfaction, Table 1
- Significant Relationships Between Teacher Performance and Preferred Rewards, Table 2
- Significant Relationships Between Teacher Performance and Demographic Variables, Table 3
- Significant Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Preferred Rewards, Table 8
- Significant Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Demographic Variables, Table 9
- Significant Relationships Between Preferred Rewards and Demographic Variables, Table 14

Tables 1, 2, and 3 indicate instances of significance of teacher performance as it related to job satisfaction, preferred rewards, and demographic variables.

Significant relationships identified in the summary tables are examined further. Where no significant relationships existed, further examination of the data will not occur.

Table 4 provides the means for opportunities for promotion, the degrees of freedom used in the analysis of variance calculation, the F-value, and the significance of F are also provided.
### TABLE 1

SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND JOB SATISFACTION

(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work on Present Job</th>
<th>Present Pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision on Your Job</th>
<th>People On Your Present Job in General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers by Group*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Procedures Score</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TPAI Score</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Indicates a significant relationship at 0.05 level

*Group 1 = teachers unchosen  
Group 2 = teachers chosen by other teachers 
Group 3 = teachers chosen by principals  
Group 4 = teachers chosen by both teachers and principals
TABLE 2
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PREFERRED REWARDS
(N=85)

Teachers by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Procedures Score</th>
<th>Interpersonal Skills Score</th>
<th>Total TPAI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No significant relationships)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates a significant relationship at 0.05 level

* Group 1 = teachers unchosen
Group 2 = teachers chosen by other teachers
Group 3 = teachers chosen by principals
Group 4 = teachers chosen by teachers and principals
Table 3

Significant Relationships Between Teacher Performance and Demographic Variables

(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers by Group*</th>
<th>Classroom Procedure Score</th>
<th>Interpersonal Skills Score</th>
<th>Total TPAI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 = teachers unchosen</td>
<td>Group 2 = teachers chosen by other teachers</td>
<td>Group 3 = teachers chosen by principals</td>
<td>Group 4 = teachers chosen by both teachers and principals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Indicates a significant relationship at 0.05 level
### TABLE 4

MEANS AND F RATIO OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS BY GROUP AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>1 (N=51)</th>
<th>2 (N=8)</th>
<th>3 (N=9)</th>
<th>4 (N=17)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 = teachers unchosen  
Group 2 = teachers chosen by other teachers  
Group 3 = teachers chosen by principals  
Group 4 = teachers chosen by both teachers and principals

Those teachers chosen by principals only, and those teachers chosen as the highest performers by both teachers and principals were less satisfied with their opportunities for promotion than the other teacher groups.

Table 5 reports the honestly significant difference between the means of opportunities for promotion for teachers by group.

### TABLE 5

HSD BETWEEN MEANS OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION OF TEACHERS BY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 (N=51)</th>
<th>2 (N=8)</th>
<th>3 (N=9)</th>
<th>4 (N=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Indicates HSD at 0.05 level of significance
There was an honestly significant difference between the teachers in group 1 (teachers unchosen), and between the teachers in both groups 3 (teachers chosen by principals) and 4 (teachers chosen by both teachers and principals). Teachers in group 3 and 4 were significantly less satisfied with their opportunities for promotion than were the teachers in group 1 who were not chosen as high performers by principals or peers.

Table 6 provides the correlation coefficient for each significant relationship between teachers' scores on the TPAI and job satisfaction variables of present pay and opportunities for promotion. The table also provides the level of significance of the correlation coefficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Pay</th>
<th></th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Procedures Score</td>
<td>-0.2666</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-0.2134</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TPAI Score</td>
<td>-0.2443</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher the principal rated a teacher's performance on classroom procedures, the lower the teacher's level of satisfaction was in relation to present pay. Teachers with a higher total TPAI score also
were less satisfied with their present pay. The higher the teacher's score was on classroom procedures, the lower the score on opportunities for promotion. Those teachers who received the highest ratings from their principals on items related to their classroom performance were less satisfied with their opportunities for promotion than were their peers.

Table 7 presents the significant relationships between teacher's scores on the TPAI and their years of teaching experience. The correlation coefficient and the level of significance are provided.

**TABLE 7**

**PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TPAI SCORES AND YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE (N=85)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Procedures</td>
<td>( r = 0.2457 ) ( P = 0.012 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TPAI Score</td>
<td>( r = 0.2040 ) ( P = 0.031 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant relationship between the scores given to classroom teachers in the area of classroom procedures and the total score on the TPAI and their years of teaching experience. Teachers with more years of teaching experience tended to receive higher ratings from their principals on the TPAI than teachers with fewer years of experience.
Analysis of the Significant Relationships Between Job Satisfaction, Preferred Rewards, and Demographic Variables

The researcher also examined the relationships between job satisfaction scores, preferred rewards, and selected demographic variables. Summary tables 8 and 9 follow which illustrate instances of significance between the job satisfaction variables, the preferred reward variables, and demographic variables.

TABLE 8

SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND PREFERRED REWARDS (N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work on present job</th>
<th>Present pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for promotion</th>
<th>Supervision on present job</th>
<th>People on your present job</th>
<th>Job in general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X indicates a significant relationship at 0.05 level
TABLE 9
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION
AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>Role of Salary</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Years in Present Building</th>
<th>Enrollment of District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work on present job</td>
<td>Present pay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision on present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>People on your present job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates a significant relationship at 0.05 level

The significant relationships identified in Tables 8 and 9 are examined further in the following tables.

Table 10 provides the correlation coefficient for each significant relationship between teachers' satisfaction scores as reported on the Job Descriptive Index and the preferred rewards variables of administration and decision making. This table also provides the level of significance of the correlation coefficient.
TABLE 10

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLES AND PREFERRED REWARD VARIABLES

(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision on present job</td>
<td>0.2993</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>0.2525</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant positive relationship between teachers' satisfaction with the supervision they received from their principals and the preferred rewards related to administration. There was also a significant positive relationship between the satisfaction teachers felt for their job in general and both administrative rewards and decision making rewards.

Table 11 provides the mean for satisfaction with present pay for teachers by their teaching assignment. The degrees of freedom used in the analysis of variance calculation, the F-value, and the significance of F are also reported.

The highest means indicate the highest level of satisfaction with present pay. Teachers in combination situations were most satisfied with their present pay. Sixth grade and third grade teachers were the next most satisfied with their present pay. Second grade and kindergarten teachers were the least satisfied with their present pay. The
### Table 11

**Means and F Ratio of Significant Relationship Between Present Pay and Teaching Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K (N=7)</th>
<th>1 (N=14)</th>
<th>2 (N=14)</th>
<th>3 (N=11)</th>
<th>4 (N=11)</th>
<th>5 (N=8)</th>
<th>6 (N=4)</th>
<th>C (N=9)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>7,70</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.0426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K=Kindergarten; 1-6 = grade 1 through grade 6; C=Combination

Differences in satisfaction with pay among teachers by teaching assignment in this study was significant.

Table 12 reports the honestly significant difference between the means of present pay for teachers by teaching assignment.

### Table 12

**HSD Between Means of Present Pay by Teaching Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K (N=7)</td>
<td>1 (N=14)</td>
<td>2 (N=14)</td>
<td>3 (N=11)</td>
<td>4 (N=11)</td>
<td>5 (N=8)</td>
<td>6 (N=4)</td>
<td>C (N=9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Indicates HSD at 0.05 level of significance
K=Kindergarten; 1-6 = grade 1 through grade 6; C=Combination
The teachers in combination assignments were the most satisfied with their present pay. They were significantly more satisfied than the teachers in kindergarten and grades two, three, four and six. Also teachers in grade three were significantly more satisfied with their present pay than teachers in grade four.

Table 13 presents the significant relationships between teachers' satisfaction with three variables: present pay, supervision on present job, and job in general, and enrollment of the school district. The correlation coefficient and the level of significance are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment of District</th>
<th>Present pay</th>
<th>.2214</th>
<th>.021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision on present job</td>
<td>.2211</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in general</td>
<td>.1863</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a negative relationship between teachers' satisfaction with present pay and enrollment of the school district. Teachers in school districts with the lowest enrollments tended to be more satisfied with their pay than those teachers in the districts with larger enrollments.
There was a positive relationship between teachers' satisfaction with the supervision they received and the enrollment of the district. Teachers in the districts with the larger enrollments tended to be more satisfied with the supervision they received from their principals.

A positive relationship existed between the overall level of satisfaction teachers had and the enrollment of the district. Teachers in the districts with the larger enrollments were slightly more satisfied than teachers in districts with smaller enrollments.

Analysis of the Significant Relationships Between Preferred Rewards and Demographic Variables

The relationships between preferred reward variables and selected demographic variables were also examined. The study was designed to detect those demographic variables that affect the preference of teachers for various rewards. Summary Table 14 illustrates the significant relationships between these variables.

The significant relationships between preferred rewards and demographic variables found in Summary Table 14 are examined further in the succeeding tables.

Table 15 provides the means of the responses to the reward variable working conditions made by the teachers by age group. The degrees of freedom used in the analysis of variance calculation, the F-value, and the significance of F are also reported.

There was a significant difference among the various age groups of teachers on their preference for rewards related to working conditions. Since the level of significance was less than 0.05 the researcher concluded that a significant difference existed between two
or more of means reported. The HSD test (Roscoe 1975) was used to determine which means were significantly different. The difference between groups had to be equal to, or greater than, the HSD.

**TABLE 14**

SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PREFERRED REWARDS AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>Role of Salary</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Years in Present Building</th>
<th>Enrollment of District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, equipment and supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related perquisites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*X Indicates a significant relationship at 0.05 level*
TABLE 15
MEANS AND F RATIO OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKING CONDITIONS AND AGE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>4,72</td>
<td>2.820</td>
<td>.0311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 reports the honestly significant differences between the means of teachers by age.

TABLE 16
HSD BETWEEN MEANS OF WORKING CONDITIONS OF TEACHERS BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>21-30 (N=26)</th>
<th>31-35 (N=11)</th>
<th>36-40 (N=16)</th>
<th>41-50 (N=21)</th>
<th>51-70 (N=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>21-35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Indicates HSD at 0.05 level of significance

There was an honestly significant difference between the responses of teachers aged 21-30 and teachers aged 31-35, 36-40, and 51-70.
There was also an honestly significant difference between teachers aged 31-35 and teachers aged 36-40. The differences in responses of these age groups of teachers were noted in their preferences for rewards that dealt with working conditions. Teachers aged 21-30 perceived the items included in the variable working conditions were both more desirable and available than did the teachers in all the other age groups except those aged 41-50.

Table 17 provides the means of the responses to the reward variables related perquisites made by teachers by their teaching assignment. The degrees of freedom used in the analysis of variance calculation, the F-value, and the significance of F are also reported.

**Table 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| K=Kindergarten, 1-6=grade 1 through grade 6; C=Combination

There was a significant difference between the teacher's assignment to various grade levels and their preference for a group of rewards titled "related perquisites." The HSD between teachers at different grade levels are presented in Table 18.

There was an honestly significant difference in the means reported by the teachers in grade six and the teachers in every other grade.
Sixth grade teachers indicated that the reward variable, related perquisites, was perceived as significantly more desirable and available than the teachers in every other teaching assignment.

**TABLE 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>K (N=7)</th>
<th>1 (N=14)</th>
<th>2 (N=14)</th>
<th>3 (N=11)</th>
<th>4 (N=11)</th>
<th>5 (N=8)</th>
<th>6 (N=4)</th>
<th>C (N=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*X* indicates HSD at 0.05 level of significance

K=Kindergarten; 1-6=grade 1 through grade 6; C=Combination

Fourth grade teachers indicated the next highest mean and they perceived this reward variable to be significantly more desirable and available than teachers in the second and third grades. The teachers with a combination assignment perceived that the related perquisite rewards were significantly less available and desirable than teachers in all other grade levels.

Table 19 provides the correlation coefficient for the reward variables, "growth," and "related perquisites" by the teachers according
to their years of teaching experience. The table also provides the level of significance of the correlation coefficient.

TABLE 19

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REWARD VARIABLES AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>-0.2155</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Perquisites</td>
<td>-0.3020</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a negative relationship between the teachers' years of experience and their preference for rewards relating to personal growth. Teachers with more years of experience considered these rewards less desirable and available than teachers with less years of experience. There was also a negative relationship between years of experience and items relating to perquisites, such as the availability of summer work, and private lavatory and locker facilities. Teachers with more years of experience considered these rewards less desirable and available than teachers with less years of experience.

Table 20 provides the correlation coefficient for each of the significant relationships between the reward variables and the enrollment of the district. The table also provides the level of significance of the correlation coefficients.

There was a significant positive relationship between rewards that dealt with administration and enrollment of the district. Teachers
in the district with larger enrollments considered the rewards concerned with administration both desirable and available to a greater degree than teachers in the districts with smaller enrollments.

TABLE 20

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REWARD VARIABLES AND ENROLLMENT OF DISTRICT

(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment of District</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>.2435</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>.2128</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>.2030</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Perquisites</td>
<td>.2081</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a significant positive relationship between rewards that dealt with decision making and enrollment of the district. Again, teachers in the districts with larger enrollments considered the rewards concerned with decision making both desirable and available to a greater degree than teachers in the districts with smaller enrollments.

There was also a significant positive relationship between rewards that dealt with meeting teachers' needs for personal growth and "related perquisites," and the size of the district. Teachers from the districts with larger enrollments considered these rewards both desirable and available to a greater degree than teachers in the
districts with smaller enrollments.

**Analysis of the Significant Differences Between the Job Satisfaction Variables**

The Analysis of Variance calculation between measures for the six job satisfaction variables produced an F-value of 399.5871. The significance of F was less than 0.000001 with 5 and 420 degrees of freedom. Table 21 presents the honestly significant differences between the means of the six job satisfaction variables as measured by the Job Descriptive Index for all eighty-five teachers in the sample group.

### TABLE 21

**HSD BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLES**

(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>People on your present job</th>
<th>Job in general</th>
<th>Supervision on present job</th>
<th>Work on present job</th>
<th>Present pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.81 People on your present job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.82 Job in general</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.20 Supervision on present job</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.24 Work on present job</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.26 Present pay</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.20 Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X indicates HSD at 0.05 level of significance
There was a significant difference between all job satisfaction variables except between "people on your present job" and the "job in general." Teachers were most satisfied with the "people on your present job." There was no significant difference between teachers' satisfaction with the "people on your present job" and the summary variable, "job in general." A perfect score on the job satisfaction variables was a 54; therefore, the mean scores of 47.81 and 47.62 indicate a very high level of satisfaction with these two job satisfaction variables. Although there was a significant difference between the "job in general" variable and "supervision on present job," that variable also could be considered highly satisfying with a mean score of 44.2. There was a significant difference between satisfaction with "supervision on present job" and "work on present job." The mean score for the variable, "work on present job" was 39.24. There was also a significant difference between "work on present job" and "present pay." A mean of 18.26 out of a possible 54 indicates a low level of satisfaction with present pay. An even lower level of satisfaction existed with "opportunity for promotion" which received a mean score of 11.20.

Analysis of the Significant Differences Between The Preferred Reward Variables

The Analysis of Variance calculation between measures for the ten reward variables produced an F-value of 21.2536. The significance of F was less than 0.000001 with 9 and 756 degrees of freedom. Table 22 presents the honestly significant differences in the mean scores of all of the teachers on the ten reward variables.

The reward variable that teachers considered the most desirable and available was "recognition." There was a significant difference
TABLE 22
HSD BETWEEN REWARD VARIABLES
(N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Belongingness</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Facilities, equipment and supplies</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Decision making</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Working conditions</th>
<th>Related perquisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.38 Recognition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33 Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33 Belongingness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 Benefits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 Facilities, equipment and supplies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18 Pay</td>
<td>X X X X X X -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14 Decision making</td>
<td>X X X X X X -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Growth</td>
<td>X X X X X X -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.05 Working conditions</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01 Related perquisites</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates HSD at 0.05 level of significance

between teachers' responses to this variable and every other reward variable. The next two variables that teachers considered to be most desirable and available were "administration" and "belongingness"; however, there was a significant difference between the responses to
these variables and "recognition." There was no significant differ­
ence between the reward variables "administration"; "belong­
ingness"; "benefits"; and "facilities, equipment, and supplies."
There was a significant difference between all of the above variables
and "present pay." Pay as a reward was not as simultaneously avail­
able and desirable as the previously listed variables. There was a
significant difference between "pay" and "decision making." There
was also a significant difference between the reward variables
"decision making" and "growth," and between "growth" and "working con­
ditions." There was also a significant difference between "working
conditions" and the reward variable category, "related perquisites."
Those rewards rated lowest were those in the categories "related perquisi­
tes," "working conditions," "growth," "decision making," and "pay."

Analysis of the Mean Percentages of the Preferred Reward Variables

Table 23 presents the responses reported for each of the pre­
ferred reward variables in mean percentages. The eighty-five teachers
in the sample group indicated that each reward item was either avail­
able or desirable, both available and desirable, or neither available
nor desirable.

Table 23 provides the mean percentages for the four responses on
the preferred rewards instrument. The column headed "desirable"
provides the percentage of teachers that viewed the items comprising
that reward variable as desirable, but not available. The variables
considered desirable, but not available by over 50 percent of the
teachers were: "facilities, equipment and supplies"; "pay"; "decision
making"; and "working conditions." These variables were viewed by
over half of the respondents as desirable but not available and, therefore, indicate areas of greatest dissatisfaction. The variable which created the least amount of dissatisfaction was "belongingness." Only 20 percent of the teachers indicated that this variable was desirable, but not available. Although the mean percent of this variable is nearly 10 percent lower than the next category, it still indicates that one-fifth of the teachers in the sample viewed belongingness rewards as desirable, but not available.
Summary

Data from eighty-five elementary teachers in seven North Dakota and Minnesota schools were analyzed to determine the relationships among three primary variables—teacher performance, job satisfaction, and preferred rewards—and a selected group of demographic variables.

No significant relationships existed between four groups of teachers based on perceptions of their performance and preferred rewards. Teachers who were perceived as among the most productive and effective by their principal or peers were significantly less satisfied with opportunities for promotion and present pay. The teachers with more years of teaching experience tended to receive higher ratings from their principals on the TPAI.

Teachers who indicated a high level of satisfaction with the supervision they received and their job in general also perceived that rewards related to the administration were more desirable and available than other teachers. Teachers who were most satisfied with their job in general perceived that opportunities to participate in decision making activities were both desirable and available to a greater degree than did other teachers.

Although teachers indicated a low level of satisfaction for their present pay, kindergarten and second grade teachers were the most dissatisfied. Teachers in school districts with lower enrollments were slightly more satisfied with their present pay, while teachers in districts with larger enrollments were slightly more satisfied with the supervision they received and their job in general.
There was no significant difference in the types of rewards which teachers preferred based on sex or role of the salary in the household. Younger teachers perceived rewards related to working conditions as both more desirable and available than almost every other age group. Teachers with more years of experience perceived rewards related to growth and specific perquisites significantly less than teachers with fewer years of experience.

Teachers perceived the desirability and availability of related perquisites differently based on their teaching assignment. Sixth-grade teachers perceived that these rewards were significantly more desirable and available than every other group. Concomitantly, teachers in combination assignments perceived these rewards as significantly less desirable and available than every other group.

The size of the enrollment of the school district in which the teachers worked affected their perception of the desirability and availability of four reward variables. Teachers in larger districts perceived rewards related to administration, decision making, growth, and related perquisites as significantly more desirable and available than did teachers in smaller districts.

The teachers in this study were highly satisfied with the other people on their jobs and their jobs in general. They also indicated satisfaction, to a lesser degree, with the supervision they received from their principals. The teachers in the sample were significantly less satisfied with the opportunities for promotion available to them. They were significantly more satisfied with their present pay; however, this variable also received a low rating.
Over half of the teachers in the sample indicated that rewards related to facilities, equipment, and supplies; pay; decision making; and working conditions were not being met. These teachers indicated that these rewards were desirable but they did not perceive them as available.
The purpose of this exploratory study was eightfold:

1. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between performance ratings of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and perceived level of job satisfaction.

2. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between performance ratings of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and their preferences for certain types of rewards.

3. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between the perceived level of job satisfaction of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and their preference for certain rewards.

4. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between reward preferences of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and the following demographic information: sex, age, teaching assignment, years of teaching experience, years of teaching in a particular building, enrollment of the school district, and role of teaching salary in household income.

5. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between perceived level of job satisfaction of elementary teachers from selected
schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and the following demographic information: sex, age, teaching assignment, years of teaching experience, years of teaching in a particular building, enrollment of a school district, and role of teaching salary in household income.

6. To determine whether or not there was a relationship between performance ratings of teachers (by supervisor and peers) of elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota and the following demographic information: sex, age, teaching assignment, years of teaching experience, years of teaching in a particular building, enrollment of a school district, and role of teaching salary in household income.

7. To determine which rewards elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota perceived were available to them.

8. To determine which rewards elementary teachers from selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota perceived were desirable and which might, therefore, serve as motivators if those rewards would be awarded based on teacher performance.

The relationships between the primary variables of teacher performance, job satisfaction, and preferred rewards were analyzed. Also examined were the relationships between each of these primary variables and selected demographic variables.

Teacher performance was measured in two ways. Each teacher in the sample was rated by the principal using the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) Cluster I. This instrument yielded three scores for each teacher: classroom procedures, interpersonal skills, and a total score. Teachers were also grouped into categories based on the perceptions of their productivity and effectiveness by principals.
and peers. Four groups emerged: (1) teachers not chosen as the top one-third of the sample who were most productive and effective, (2) teachers chosen by other teachers but not by principals as most productive and effective, (3) teachers chosen by principals but not by other teachers as most productive and effective, (4) teachers chosen by both their principal and other teachers as being most productive and effective.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was used to measure teachers' job satisfaction with six variables: (1) work on present job, (2) present pay, (3) opportunities for promotion, (4) supervision on present job, (5) people on your present job, and (6) job in general.

An instrument designed by the researcher measured the teacher's perceptions of the availability and desirability of forty-nine reward items. These items were categorized into ten variables and analyzed. The ten variables were related to: (1) administration, (2) belongingness, (3) benefits, (4) decision making, (5) facilities, equipment, and supplies, (6) growth, (7) pay, (8) recognition, (9) working conditions, and (10) related perquisites.

The sample consisted of eighty-five elementary teachers from seven selected schools in North Dakota and Minnesota. Each teacher completed the Job Description Index, the preferred rewards instrument, and a one-page demographic information sheet. Each principal completed the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) for each of the teachers participating in the study. Each principal and each teacher also identified one-third of the teachers participating in the study from their school whom they considered the most productive and effective.
A frequencies distribution, one-way analyses of variance, and product-moment correlations were used to analyze the data. Results of the analyses follow.

No significant relationships were found between teachers' performance and preferred rewards. This study was particularly concerned with discerning whether teachers considered to be high performers—whether measured by their principals on a formal rating instrument, or perceived as the highest performers by their peers—preferred different rewards than other teachers. This study found no significant relationships between these two primary variables for this sample of teachers.

Significant relationships were found between teachers' performance and their satisfaction with both present pay and opportunities for promotion. Teachers receiving the highest ratings by principals were least satisfied with these two variables.

No significant relationships were found between teachers' performance and the demographic variables of age, sex, teaching assignment, role of the salary in their household income, years in the present building or enrollment of the district. A significant relationship did exist between the years of teaching experience and the scores teachers received on the TPAI. Teachers with more years of experience received higher performance ratings from their principals on that instrument.

Teachers who were most satisfied with the supervision they received also perceived that rewards related to administration were more desirable and available than did the other teachers. These teachers also perceived that rewards related to decision making were more desirable and available than did the other teachers.
Teachers in various grade levels expressed significant differences in their degree of satisfaction with their pay. Although all teachers indicated a low level of satisfaction with pay, kindergarten and second grade teachers were the most dissatisfied.

The level of the teachers' satisfaction varied with the enrollment of the district. Teachers from larger districts were more satisfied with supervision and their jobs in general while teachers from smaller districts were more satisfied with their present pay.

No significant relationships were found between teachers' satisfaction and age, sex, years of teaching experience, years in the present building, or role of the salary in the household income. Almost half of the teachers indicated that their salary was the sole or primary income in the household while the other half indicated that their salary was a supplementary income. There was no relationship between the role of the teacher's salary in the household income and job satisfaction with pay, or any of the other satisfaction variables.

The demographic variables of sex and role of the salary in the household income were not significant predictors of reward preferences. However, teachers of various age groups differed significantly on the desirability and availability of rewards related to working conditions. Teachers under thirty years of age perceived that rewards concerning working conditions were more desirable and available than teachers in the other age categories.

There were significant differences between the enrollment of the district and the teachers' perceptions of the desirability and availability of the reward variables "administration," "decision making," "growth," and "related perquisites." Teachers from larger
districts perceived that these rewards were more desirable and available than teachers from smaller districts.

Teachers with more years of experience were less interested in rewards related to growth and related perquisites than were teachers with less experience.

The data indicated that teachers in this sample were highly satisfied with the people on their present jobs, their jobs in general, and the supervision on their jobs. They were dissatisfied with their present pay and even more dissatisfied with opportunities for promotion.

Teachers perceived that rewards related to recognition were most available and desirable. "Administration"; "belongingness"; "benefits"; and "facilities, equipment, and supplies" were all considered the next most available and desirable of the ten reward variables, while pay was sixth in terms of its availability and desirability.

Further analysis of the data indicated that over half of the teachers considered the following rewards desirable, but not available: "facilities, equipment, and supplies"; "pay"; "decision making"; and "working conditions."

Some of the findings of the study had been anticipated by the researcher. It was not surprising to discover that the perceived performance of the teachers in this sample was not affected by the demographic variables of age, sex, teaching assignment, role of salary in the household income, years of teaching in present building, or enrollment of the district. It was also not surprising that principals tended to give higher scores to teachers with more experience who perhaps
have had more time to establish a professional reputation. Furthermore, it was expected that teachers who wanted to be, and were involved in decision making opportunities, and had opportunities to interact with the administration, would be more satisfied with the supervision they received. Another expected finding revealed that larger districts, by the nature of their size, were generally thought to provide more opportunities for growth and generally had more of the related perquisites at their disposal. Finally, it was not surprising that older teachers were less interested in rewards relating to their growth because these teachers may have had many of their growth needs met over the years by attending workshops, conferences, and graduate classes.

The study also produced some findings which were not anticipated. Although the researcher suspected that high performing teachers were less satisfied with pay and opportunities for promotion, the researcher was surprised that these teachers did not differ in their preferences for various rewards. Another unexpected finding was that the role of the salary in the household income had no effect on the satisfaction level of teachers with their pay, or with the other satisfaction variables. Also the role of the salary provided no differences among reward preferences. It was surprising that with half of the teachers reporting that their incomes were either the sole or primary income in the household, and with the other half of the teachers reporting that their incomes were supplementary to the household income, that there was no difference in either the satisfaction level or the preferred rewards.
Another finding relating to pay indicated that teachers in the smaller districts were more satisfied with their pay than teachers in the larger districts. Smaller districts usually provide a smaller range in their salary schedules; thus teachers in the smaller districts frequently receive less pay than their counterparts in the larger districts. It was beyond the scope of this study to determine what mediating variables caused teachers in smaller districts to be more satisfied with pay.

Another unexpected finding concerned teachers' satisfaction with pay and their overall job satisfaction. It was not surprising to find that the teachers in the sample were largely dissatisfied with their pay. What was surprising was that in spite of their feelings about their pay, the teachers were highly satisfied with their jobs. The entire group of teachers indicated an overwhelming degree of satisfaction both with their jobs in general and with their peers. This data provided a positive view of the teaching profession and tends to refute much of the current negative attention that teaching as a profession has received.

Conclusions

Findings from the study permit the following conclusions:

1. Elementary teachers in selected school districts in North Dakota and Minnesota were highly satisfied with their jobs in general and with their colleagues. They were also satisfied with the supervision they received. At the same time, these teachers were dissatisfied with their present pay and with their opportunities for promotion.
2. Elementary teachers were very homogeneous concerning their perceptions about rewards based on their levels of performance. Performance was not an indicator of which rewards elementary teachers perceived to be most desirable and available.

3. Although elementary teachers were generally dissatisfied with present pay and with opportunities for promotion, those teachers who were considered high performers were significantly more dissatisfied with these two variables than other teachers.

4. The role of the salary in the elementary teachers' household had no bearing on their satisfaction with pay or their perceptions of the desirability and the availability of various rewards.

5. The rewards most preferred that are unmet for over half of the elementary teachers included rewards related to "facilities, equipment and supplies"; "pay"; "working conditions"; and "decision making."

6. The enrollment of the school district may influence teachers' attitudes about rewards. Teachers in larger districts reported that rewards related to "administration," "decision making," "growth," and "related perquisites" were more desirable and available than was true for teachers in smaller districts.

Recommendations

Conclusions for the present study together with insights from the literature permitted the researcher to make the following recommendations. Five policy recommendations are made as a result of this study.
1. National and state legislatures, funding agencies, and institutions of higher education should support efforts to continue research in the area of teacher motivation and other areas of educational research which are designed to improve the quality of education.

2. State legislatures should keep policies broad with the aim of permitting school districts the capacity to reward teachers for performance in ways that are best-suited to each school district. State legislatures must avoid the temptation to provide regulations which require all districts to comply with one "best" method of motivating teachers.

3. School boards, central office administrators, building principals, and teachers need to work together to design policies and negotiated agreements which permit the rewarding of high quality teacher performance.

4. Professional associations need to recognize their responsibility for, and take the lead in, encouraging state agencies to be certain that principals are capably trained and properly licensed to perform as principals before they are allowed to fill those positions.

5. Teacher associations should promote contract language which includes utilizing the principal's discretion in rewarding teachers.

Six recommendations for practice are made as a result of this study.

1. Principals should begin to seek ways to make some rewards contingent upon performance. For this to be successful they need to enlarge the number of rewards presently available and insure that those rewards are valued by teachers.
2. Principals need to continue to develop skills in the supervision and evaluation of teachers in order to assist teachers in improving their performance.

3. School boards and central office administrators need to assist principals in rewarding teachers by providing discretionary funds that may be used to provide teachers with rewards which they value. Principals also need to use their creativity to generate additional resources which can be employed to reward teachers. These resources could be used at the principal's discretion for such items as: travel and registration fees for teachers to attend conferences and workshops; special instructional materials and equipment; pay for substitutes in order to release a teacher to visit another school or classroom, make a presentation at another school or at a conference, attend professional meetings, write curriculum, or work on special projects that will benefit the district. (Although these items present some cost to the district, they are not salaried items, and the total cost to the district may actually represent a small fraction of the budget while providing substantial benefits.)

4. School administrators at both the district and building level need to find opportunities to promote teachers. Teachers could be selected annually for work on curriculum projects, inservice programs, or other areas as ways to recognize their past accomplishments and their expertise. This also allows the district to make use of valuable resources that are available for little or no expense. An excellent teacher might be selected to attend a special conference and then would be responsible for bringing back ideas and providing training for other teachers in formal and informal settings.
5. Teachers need to be included in making decisions that affect the students and curriculum with which they work directly or when the decisions require their support and cooperation. This is one way to recognize the performance and the expertise of the teachers; it may also improve the commitment to many of the decisions that are made.

6. Universities and colleges must select quality students for programs in administration. These institutions must provide programs in administration that include an understanding of organizational behavior. These programs also need to include opportunities for students in administration to develop well-honed skills in supervision and in human relations.

The following recommendations for further study are made as a result of the findings from this study.

1. The same research questions used in this study should be employed with both secondary teachers and special service teachers in order to provide information concerning those groups. Researchers need to discern how similarly or differently the groups of teachers respond in order to provide information which will assist practitioners in developing district-wide policies.

2. The same research questions used in this study should be employed in more diverse settings in other geographic regions in both urban and suburban school districts.

3. Further studies of teacher motivation based on expectancy theory should be conducted. Study efforts need to explore better methods of measuring all of the factors of the expectancy formula. Researchers particularly need to seek better answers to the
instrumentality (performance→rewards) and valence components.

4. Educational researchers need to continue to adapt and develop instruments that will measure the factors of expectancy theory in education.

5. The expectancy factor (effort→performance) has been largely ignored in research on expectancy theory in all sectors, including education. Research efforts need to discern the effect this factor has on teachers' motivation.

6. Researchers need to employ other process theories in research designs. The job characteristics model is an emerging theory which shows promise. The job dimensions of this model—task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy and feedback—may provide additional insights into the complexity of the nature of teaching and its effects on the motivation of teachers.

This study, conducted in a limited geographic region with few subjects and developing instruments, has provided some insights into the study of teacher motivation. The researcher is persuaded that further research should provide more definitive policy and practice recommendations.
APPENDIX A

Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument

Cluster I
TEACHER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT*
CLASSROOM PROCEDURES AND INTERPERSONAL SKILLS SECTIONS

Cluster I

This instrument is designed to measure teacher performance in the areas of classroom procedures and interpersonal skills. Below you will find a list of teacher competencies. Under each competency will be a list of descriptors which describe teacher behavior as it relates to that competency. Read each descriptor. CIRCLE THE NUMBER of the descriptor that most accurately describes each teacher's behavior as you have observed it in classroom settings. Circle ONLY ONE descriptor for each competency listed. Additional instructions are given for some items.

A. Uses teaching methods appropriate for objectives, learners and environment.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Teaching methods are matched to objectives.
b. Teaching methods are matched to learners.
c. Activities are compatible with the learning environment.
d. Lesson is well-coordinated.

B. Uses instructional equipment and other instructional aids.

Scale of Descriptors (Circle the ONE that best describes the teacher's behavior.)
1. Instructional equipment (e.g., projectors) or other instructional aids (e.g., posters, charts) that are available and appropriate are not used.
2. Uses available equipment or instructional aids but has trouble which causes delays. Media presentations or prepared materials do not always fit planned lessons.
3. Effectively uses instructional equipment or other instructional aids at appropriate times in lessons.
4. Highly skillful use of instructional equipment or instructional aids at appropriate times. Media presented blend smoothly with other kinds of instruction.
5. In addition to items in 4, shows evidence of skillfully preparing original instructional materials.

C. Uses instructional materials that provide learners with appropriate practice on objectives.

Scale of Descriptors
1. Materials chosen are irrelevant to the topic or objectives or no materials are used when materials are needed.
2. Materials chosen are related to the topics being studied but not to the objectives.
3. Most materials chosen provide for practice on specific objectives. Some of the practice may be insufficient in quantity to achieve the objectives.
4. Materials chosen are relevant to the objectives. Learners are given ample opportunity to practice the objectives.
5. In addition to the items in 4, formal or informal progress assessment techniques are used to determine whether the practice individual learners receive is sufficient.

D. Gives directions and explanations related to lesson content.

Scale of Descriptors
1. Fails to give any directions or explanations (either written or oral) when there is an obvious need to do so.
   OR
2. Directions and explanations are difficult to understand and no attempt is made to remedy the confusion.
3. Directions or explanations are difficult to understand. Attempts to clarify confusion are largely ineffective.
4. Although most learners appear to understand, the teacher works with the entire group to clarify misunderstandings.
5. Only a few learners misunderstand. The teacher identifies specific learners who have difficulty with directions and explanations and helps them individually.
6. No evidence of learner confusion about directions or explanations is evident.
Clarifies directions and explanations when learners misunderstand lesson content.

Descriptors
1. Discourages learners when they seek clarification of directions or explanations.
2. Ignores learners when they seek clarification of directions or explanations.
3. Restates original communication in nearly the same words if learners do not understand.
4. Gives directions or explanations using different words and ideas when learners do not understand.
5. In addition to the items in 4, the teacher attempts to identify areas of misunderstanding and to restate communication before learners ask. OR
5. No misunderstanding by learners is evident during the lesson.

Uses responses and questions from learners in teaching.

Descriptors
1. Uses negative words or actions to discourage learners from giving responses or asking questions.
2. Ignores learners who wish to be recognized or learner contributions are accepted without disagreement or further comment.
3. Acknowledges learners who wish to be recognized and occasionally asks for learner responses or questions. Responses by the teacher are adequate.
4. Asks for responses or questions frequently throughout the lesson and provides feedback to learners.
5. In addition to the items in 4, the teacher incorporates learner responses and questions into activities.

Provides feedback to learners throughout the lesson.

1. Accepts learner comments or performance without feedback about their adequacy.
2. Responds to negative aspects of student work, but few comments are made about positive aspects.
3. Informs students of the adequacy of their performance. Few errors pass by without being addressed.
4. Helps learners evaluate the adequacy of their own or each others’ performance.
5. In addition to 4, the teacher probes for the sources of misunderstandings which arise.

Uses acceptable written and oral expression with learners.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Speech is understandable.
b. Oral expression is correct.
c. Written material is legible.
d. Written expression is correct.

Helps learners recognize the purpose and importance of topics or activities.

Descriptors
1. The teacher does not designate the purpose or importance of a topic or activity.
2. The teacher fails to relate specific topics or activities to their purpose or importance in a content area.
3. The purpose or importance of most topics or activities studied is conveyed to learners.
4. Topics or activities are taught in context. The teacher explains to the students how topics or activities are but a portion of a larger content area.
5. The teacher encourages (or provides opportunities for) learners either to question or relate to specific topics or activities which are important to a content area.
Demonstrates knowledge in the subject area.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Subject area knowledge that the teacher demonstrates is accurate and up-to-date.
b. Sources of information and learning materials are timely.
c. Discriminates between adequate and inadequate performances, or there are no inadequate performances.
d. There is more than one level of learning.

Communicates personal enthusiasm.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Communicates enthusiasm with eye contact or facial expressions indicating pleasure, concern, interest, etc.
b. Communicates enthusiasm with voice inflections stressing points of interest and importance.
c. Communicates enthusiasm through posture when moving about the room or sitting among students.
d. Communicates enthusiasm with gestures to accentuate points.

Stimulates learner interest.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Appears eager to begin lesson.
b. Uses interesting, unusual or important dimensions or application of the topic or activity.
c. Attempts in a manner that stimulates interest to involve all learners in activity.
d. Personalizes lesson for students.

Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. The teacher appears to know what is to be done.
b. Materials for the lesson are on hand and easily accessible.
c. Goals or plans for the activities are communicated to learners.
d. The importance of the topics or activities is conveyed to learners.
Demonstrates warmth and friendliness.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Seeks information about the interests or opinions of learners.
b. Smiles at learners or laughs or jokes with them.
c. Maintains close contact with learners by sitting or standing near them.
d. Uses names of learners in a warm and friendly way when addressing them.

Demonstrates sensitivity to the needs and feelings of learners.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Reinforces learners when they do well.
b. Encourages learners when they have difficulty.
c. Listens to or accepts ideas from learners.
d. Is courteous when dealing with learners.

Demonstrates patience, empathy and understanding.

How To Rate This Item
1. None of the descriptors is evident.
2. One of the descriptors is evident.
3. Two of the descriptors are evident.
4. Three of the descriptors are evident.
5. Four of the descriptors are evident.

Descriptors
a. Shows patience with or empathy for student performance.
b. Shows patience with or empathy for learners who need additional time or explanation or finish early.
c. Uses language free of sarcasm or ridicule.
d. Shows students through words or actions that their problems or comments are understood.

The items included in this instrument were taken from a larger document entitled, Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments (TPAI). It is available through the following address:
Teacher Assessment Project
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
APPENDIX B

Teachers' Perceptions of Possible Rewards
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF POSSIBLE REWARDS

This instrument is designed to gain information from teachers regarding their perceptions about "possible rewards" that might be available to them. Please read each item below and indicate whether that item is something you would desire, strive for, or want available to you as a result of your efforts as a teacher. Then indicate whether you perceive that the particular item is available (offered) to you, or could be available to you as a result of your efforts as a teacher. See the sample item below.

Available

Sample item:

A. Community recognition of your service to public education.

If you view this item (community recognition for your service to public education) as something that you desire, strive for, or want available to you as a result of your efforts as a teacher, place a check mark in the column titled, DESIRABLE.

OR

If you view this item (community recognition for your service to public education) as something that is, or could be, available to you in your school or community, place a check mark in the column titled, AVAILABLE.

OR

If you view this item as BOTH DESIRABLE and AVAILABLE to you in your school or community, place a check mark in BOTH columns.
1. Adequate time allotted within the school day for class preparation.
2. High job security.
3. An adequate sick leave program.
4. Respect of others for being a member of a profession.
5. Fair and just treatment from administrators.
6. Social get-togethers with other faculty.
7. A community which recognizes and appreciates me as a teacher.
8. The opportunity to discuss problems with administrative personnel.
9. Teaching in a school with a good academic reputation.
10. The opportunity to participate in school policy decision making.
11. Recognition by the administration for outstanding achievements.
12. Respect from the students in my class.
13. Supervisor praise for my teaching achievements.
14. Fewer supervisory duties outside of the regular teaching situation.
15. Being judged an effective teacher by my principal.
16. A medical plan which meets the needs of me and my family.
17. A local school district retirement plan in addition to the existing state plan.
18. Chances for regular pay increases.
19. Teaching the age and ability level of the students that I most enjoy.
20. Opportunities for intellectual stimulation and recreational activities different from my assigned teaching area and grade level.
22. Facilities which are not overcrowded.
23. Participation in developing and applying teacher evaluation instruments and processes.
24. The opportunity to influence school policy.
25. An innovative school administration.
26. Income supplements for extra services rendered.
27. Being judged an effective teacher by my peers.
28. Instructional equipment available when required.
29. A chance to work towards personal goals while in my present position.
30. Less time in formal teaching situations.
31. Not having to teach subjects or use materials I dislike.
32. Adequate custodial services available in my school.
33. An opportunity to influence the goals of the district.
34. Having faculty members in my school with whom I share many common interests.
35. Instructional supplies available when required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>The availability of a coffee room or lounge area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Class sizes as small as I would like them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Provision of career increments within the salary schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>The opportunity to interact socially with administrative personnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>The opportunity to receive bonus pay for work judged as exemplary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>The availability of private lavatory and locker facilities for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>A salary schedule which recognizes teacher competency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Being part of a friendly faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>The availability of ssummer work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation from teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>A generous sabbatical leave plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>The opportunity for advancement within the school district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>A cooperative school administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Freedom to experiment in my own classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Items Comprising the Reward Variables
ITEMS COMPRISING THE REWARD VARIABLES

ADMINISTRATION (Nature of and relationship to)

5 Fair and just treatment from administrators.
8 Opportunity to discuss problems with administrative personnel.
25 An innovative school administration.
48 A cooperative school administration

BELONGINGNESS (Opportunities for companionship, socializing opportunities, support and enjoyment with valued colleagues)

6 Social get-togethers with other faculty members.
34 Having faculty members in your school with whom you share many common interests.
39 Opportunity to interact socially with administrative personnel.
43 Being part of a friendly faculty.

BENEFITS (Financial rewards other than direct remuneration)

2 High job security.
3 An adequate sick leave program.
16 A medical plan which meets the needs of you and your family.
17 A local school district retirement plan in addition to the existing state retirement.

DECISION MAKING (Appropriate level of discretion, opportunity to participate in and influence decisions)

10 Opportunity to participate in school policy decision making.
23 Participation in developing and applying teacher evaluation instruments.
24 Opportunity to influence school policy.
33 An opportunity to influence the goals of the district.

FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES (Quality and care of facilities; adequacy and appropriateness of equipment and supplies)

22 Facilities which are not overcrowded.
28 Instructional equipment available when required.
Adequate custodial services available in your school.
Instructional supplies available when required.

**GROWTH** (Opportunities for personal and professional growth and development)
Opportunities for intellectual stimulation and recreational activities different from my assigned teaching area and grade level.
A chance to work towards personal goals while in your present position.

Intellectual stimulation from teaching.
A generous sabbatical leave plan.
Opportunities for advancement within the school district.
Freedom to experiment in your own classroom.

**PAY** (Remuneration for work)
Chances for regular pay increases.
An adequate salary schedule.
Income supplements for extra services rendered.
Provision of career increments within the salary schedule.
A salary schedule which recognizes teacher competency.

**RECOGNITION** (Praise, acclaim, respect for professional work and accomplishments)
Respect of others for being a member of a profession.
A community which recognizes and appreciates its teachers.
Teaching in a school with a good academic reputation.
Recognition by the administration for outstanding achievements.
Respect from the students in your classes.
Supervisor praise of your teaching achievements.
Being judged an effective teacher by your principal.
Being judged an effective teacher by your peers.
WORKING CONDITIONS (Factors relating to the nature of the teaching assignment that affect the way in which the teacher will carry out his/her job)

1 Adequate time allotted within the school day for class preparation.
14 Fewer supervisory duties outside of the regular teaching situation.
19 Teaching the age and ability level of students that you most enjoy.
30 Less time in formal teaching situations.
31 Not having to teach subjects or use material I dislike.
37 Class sizes as small as you would like them.

RELATED PERQUISITES (Opportunities for additional salary and privileges as a result of the teaching position)

36 The availability of a coffee room or lounge area.
40 Opportunities to receive bonus pay for work judged as exemplary.
44 Availability of summer work.
80 The availability of private laboratory and locker facilities for teachers.
APPENDIX D

Coefficient Alpha for Reward Variables
### COEFFICIENT ALPHA FOR REWARD VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration (items=4)</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness (items=4)</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (items=4)</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making (items=4)</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, equipment and supplies (items=4)</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (items=6)</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay (items=5)</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (items=8)</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions (items=6)</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related perquisites (items=4)</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Demographic Information Sheet
Please provide information about yourself by either checking the correct category or by completing the blanks.

Teacher number

Sex: 1. Male______
    2. Female______

Age at last birthday: 1. 21-25______
    2. 26-30______
    3. 31-35______
    4. 36-40______
    5. 41-50______
    6. 51-60______
    7. 61-70______

Present teaching assignment (include grade level or subject area; i.e. ½ time elementary music and ½ time 3rd grade)

________________________________________

Full years (including this one) of teaching experience______
(Count part-time experience by adding the fractions together to make full years and give that number)

Years (including this one) of teaching at this particular building______

Enrollment of the school district______

Which of the following statements most accurately describes the role your teaching salary plays within your household.

____ 1. My teaching salary is my (or my family's) only income.

____ 2. My teaching salary is the primary income of two or more sources of income within my household.

____ 3. My teaching salary supplements a larger income of mine or my spouses.
APPENDIX F

Letter to Participating Schools
Dear 

In the months since I visited your school I have analyzed the data which you so willingly provided, and I have completed my dissertation. Your perceptions and attitudes were extremely valuable to me in conducting my research study on teachers' performance, job satisfaction, and preferred rewards.

During my visit to your school I promised that I would send you a summary of my findings when my analysis was completed. Enclosed you will find such a summary. I hope you will find it interesting and informative.

I want to sincerely thank each of you for your participation in my study and your interest in research that is designed to help principals support teachers. I wish continued professional success to each of you.

Again, my thanks.

Sincerely,

Beth S. Randklev
Graduate Student
University of North Dakota
APPENDIX G

Tables Identifying the Relationships Among Performance, Job Satisfaction, Preferred Rewards, and Demographic Variables
## TABLE 24

### RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work on Present Job</th>
<th>Present Pay</th>
<th>Opportunities for Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision on Present Job</th>
<th>People on Your Present Job</th>
<th>Job in General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers by Group*</td>
<td>F 0.355</td>
<td>F 1.437</td>
<td>F 3.230</td>
<td>F 0.676</td>
<td>F 0.939</td>
<td>F 0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.786</td>
<td>P 0.238</td>
<td>P 0.027x</td>
<td>P 0.569</td>
<td>P 0.426</td>
<td>P 0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Procedures**</td>
<td>r-0.1532</td>
<td>r-0.2666</td>
<td>r-0.2134</td>
<td>r-0.0381</td>
<td>r-0.0478</td>
<td>r-0.0310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.162</td>
<td>P 0.014x</td>
<td>P 0.050x</td>
<td>P 0.729</td>
<td>P 0.664</td>
<td>P 0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills**</td>
<td>r-0.0635</td>
<td>r-0.1795</td>
<td>r-0.0286</td>
<td>r-0.0306</td>
<td>r-0.0224</td>
<td>r 0.0374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.564</td>
<td>P 100</td>
<td>P 0.795</td>
<td>P 0.781</td>
<td>P 0.839</td>
<td>P 0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TPAI SCORE</td>
<td>r-0.1236</td>
<td>r-0.2443</td>
<td>r-0.1471</td>
<td>r-0.0370</td>
<td>r-0.0397</td>
<td>r-0.0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 0.260</td>
<td>P 0.024x</td>
<td>P 0.179</td>
<td>P 0.737</td>
<td>P 0.718</td>
<td>P 0.972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at 0.05 level

*ANOVA

**Pearson Correlation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Belongingness</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Facilities, Equipment, Supplies</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Working Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers by Groups*</td>
<td>F.855</td>
<td>F2.283</td>
<td>F .253</td>
<td>F1.911</td>
<td>F2.681</td>
<td>F .350</td>
<td>F .286</td>
<td>F 1.548</td>
<td>F 1.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Procedures**</td>
<td>r .0577</td>
<td>r .0154</td>
<td>r .0616</td>
<td>r .0928</td>
<td>r .0212</td>
<td>r-0.1170</td>
<td>r-0.0115</td>
<td>r .1192</td>
<td>r-0.1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills**</td>
<td>r .1240</td>
<td>r-0.0202</td>
<td>r .0611</td>
<td>r .0078</td>
<td>r-0.0064</td>
<td>r-0.1282</td>
<td>r-0.0316</td>
<td>r .1659</td>
<td>r-0.1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TPAI Score**</td>
<td>r .0887</td>
<td>r .0012</td>
<td>r .0647</td>
<td>r .0620</td>
<td>r .0107</td>
<td>r-0.1280</td>
<td>r-0.0206</td>
<td>r .1453</td>
<td>r-0.1598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significance at 0.05 level

*ANOVA

**Pearson Corr.
TABLE 26
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex*</th>
<th>Age*</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment*</th>
<th>Role of Salary*</th>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience**</th>
<th>Years in Present Building*</th>
<th>Enrollment of District**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F .631</td>
<td>F .129</td>
<td>F1.659</td>
<td>F1.260</td>
<td>r .0921</td>
<td>r -0.0193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1.231</td>
<td>F .635</td>
<td>F .606</td>
<td>F .190</td>
<td>r .2457</td>
<td>r .1545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p .2704</td>
<td>p .6393</td>
<td>p .7487</td>
<td>p .8274</td>
<td>p .012x</td>
<td>p .082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1.384</td>
<td>F .621</td>
<td>F1.016</td>
<td>F .641</td>
<td>r .1152</td>
<td>r .0057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1.434</td>
<td>F .584</td>
<td>F .833</td>
<td>F .165</td>
<td>r .2040</td>
<td>r .0610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at 0.05 level

ANOVA

**Pearson Correlation
TABLE 27

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND PREFERRED REWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Belongingness</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Facilities, Equipment &amp; Supplies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job**</td>
<td>r .0500</td>
<td>r .0714</td>
<td>r .0732</td>
<td>r-0.0320</td>
<td>r-0.0135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Pay</td>
<td>r .0309</td>
<td>r=0.0258</td>
<td>r=0.0258</td>
<td>r-0.0243</td>
<td>r .0686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .779</td>
<td>p .651</td>
<td>p .815</td>
<td>p .825</td>
<td>p .533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>r .1331</td>
<td>r .0008</td>
<td>r .0821</td>
<td>r .0116</td>
<td>r .8484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .224</td>
<td>p .994</td>
<td>p .455</td>
<td>p .916</td>
<td>p .440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision on Present Job</td>
<td>r .2993</td>
<td>r .1145</td>
<td>r .0368</td>
<td>r .1460</td>
<td>r .1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .005x</td>
<td>p .297</td>
<td>p .738</td>
<td>p .183</td>
<td>p .218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>r .1094</td>
<td>r .1121</td>
<td>r=0.1330</td>
<td>r-0.0262</td>
<td>r-0.0367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>r .2525</td>
<td>r .307</td>
<td>r .0182</td>
<td>r .2267</td>
<td>r .0937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .020</td>
<td>p .393</td>
<td>p .869</td>
<td>p .037x</td>
<td>p .394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>Related Perquisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job**</td>
<td>r .0559</td>
<td>r .1266</td>
<td>r .0420</td>
<td>r .0877</td>
<td>r-0.0557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .612</td>
<td>p .248</td>
<td>p .703</td>
<td>p .425</td>
<td>p .613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Pay</td>
<td>r 0.0338</td>
<td>r .1184</td>
<td>r-0.0415</td>
<td>r .0676</td>
<td>r-0.0373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .759</td>
<td>p .280</td>
<td>p .706</td>
<td>p .538</td>
<td>p .735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>r .0130</td>
<td>r .0732</td>
<td>r .0803</td>
<td>r .1683</td>
<td>r-0.1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision on Present Job</td>
<td>r .0563</td>
<td>r .1307</td>
<td>r .1011</td>
<td>r .0286</td>
<td>r-0.0523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .609</td>
<td>p .233</td>
<td>p .357</td>
<td>p .795</td>
<td>p .634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Your Present Job</td>
<td>r-0.1630</td>
<td>r-0.0196</td>
<td>r .0042</td>
<td>r-0.1067</td>
<td>r-0.2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .136</td>
<td>p .858</td>
<td>p .970</td>
<td>p .331</td>
<td>p .060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>r .1535</td>
<td>r .1520</td>
<td>r .1336</td>
<td>r .1619</td>
<td>r-0.0839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at 0.05 level

**Pearson Corr.
### TABLE 28

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex*</th>
<th>Age*</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment*</th>
<th>Role of Salary*</th>
<th>Years of Experience**</th>
<th>Years in Present Building**</th>
<th>Enrollment of District**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work on Present Job</td>
<td>F .028</td>
<td>F .607</td>
<td>F .903</td>
<td>F .324</td>
<td>r .0555</td>
<td>r-0.235</td>
<td>r .0912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .8687</td>
<td>P .6589</td>
<td>P .5095</td>
<td>P .7245</td>
<td>P .307</td>
<td>P .417</td>
<td>P .203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Pay</td>
<td>F1.315</td>
<td>F 1.886</td>
<td>F 2.220</td>
<td>F .939</td>
<td>r-.0793</td>
<td>r-0.0500</td>
<td>r-0.2214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .2548</td>
<td>P .1221</td>
<td>P .0426x</td>
<td>P .3950</td>
<td>P .235</td>
<td>P .327</td>
<td>P .021x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Promotion</td>
<td>F .811</td>
<td>F .426</td>
<td>F 1.179</td>
<td>F .714</td>
<td>r-.1026</td>
<td>r-0.0937</td>
<td>r-0.0244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .3704</td>
<td>P .77894</td>
<td>P .3259</td>
<td>P .4928</td>
<td>P .175</td>
<td>P .200</td>
<td>P .412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision on Present Job</td>
<td>F .308</td>
<td>F 1.584</td>
<td>F .905</td>
<td>F .764</td>
<td>r .1439</td>
<td>r .0982</td>
<td>r .2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .5392</td>
<td>P .1879</td>
<td>P .5075</td>
<td>P .4692</td>
<td>P .094</td>
<td>P .189</td>
<td>P .021x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on your Present Job</td>
<td>F1.129</td>
<td>F .753</td>
<td>F 1.069</td>
<td>F .509</td>
<td>r .0132</td>
<td>r .0388</td>
<td>r .0932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .2911</td>
<td>P .5593</td>
<td>P .3926</td>
<td>P .6032</td>
<td>P .452</td>
<td>P .364</td>
<td>P .198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job in General</td>
<td>F .119</td>
<td>F 1.126</td>
<td>F 1.209</td>
<td>F .447</td>
<td>r .0773</td>
<td>r .0033</td>
<td>r .1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .7313</td>
<td>P .3509</td>
<td>P .3097</td>
<td>P .6410</td>
<td>P .241</td>
<td>P .488</td>
<td>P .044x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Indicates significance at 0.05 level; *ANOVA; ** Pearson Corr.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sex*</th>
<th>Age*</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment*</th>
<th>Role of Salary*</th>
<th>Years of Experience**</th>
<th>Years in Present Building**</th>
<th>Enrollment in District**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>F .034</td>
<td>F .230</td>
<td>F .701</td>
<td>F .851</td>
<td>r-0.0698</td>
<td>r-0.1076</td>
<td>r .2435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td>F .045</td>
<td>F .197</td>
<td>F .566</td>
<td>F .981</td>
<td>r-0.1689</td>
<td>r-0.2249</td>
<td>r .1489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>F .410</td>
<td>F1.011</td>
<td>F .576</td>
<td>F .043</td>
<td>r-0.0335</td>
<td>r .0291</td>
<td>r-0.0702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>F .316</td>
<td>F .201</td>
<td>F .580</td>
<td>F .951</td>
<td>r .0531</td>
<td>r-0.0429</td>
<td>r .2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>F .362</td>
<td>F .488</td>
<td>F .650</td>
<td>F .447</td>
<td>r .0639</td>
<td>r 0.0362</td>
<td>r-0.0739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording Conditions</td>
<td>F1.226</td>
<td>F .848</td>
<td>F .961</td>
<td>F1.494</td>
<td>r-0.2155</td>
<td>r-0.2965</td>
<td>r .2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Perquisites</td>
<td>p .2714</td>
<td>p .4997</td>
<td>p .4662</td>
<td>p .2305</td>
<td>P .024x</td>
<td>p .003x</td>
<td>p .031x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F .165</td>
<td>F .548</td>
<td>F .751</td>
<td>F1.498</td>
<td>r-0.0631</td>
<td>r-0.0935</td>
<td>r .1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .6856</td>
<td>p .7009</td>
<td>p .6297</td>
<td>p .2297</td>
<td>P .283</td>
<td>P .200</td>
<td>P .078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F .311</td>
<td>F .213</td>
<td>F .769</td>
<td>F .768</td>
<td>r .0617</td>
<td>r-0.0031</td>
<td>r .0657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .5787</td>
<td>p .9306</td>
<td>p .6152</td>
<td>p .4671</td>
<td>P .288</td>
<td>P .489</td>
<td>P .275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F .081</td>
<td>F2.820</td>
<td>F .113</td>
<td>F .552</td>
<td>r-0.1009</td>
<td>r-0.0861</td>
<td>r .0466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p .7766</td>
<td>p .0311x</td>
<td>p .9973</td>
<td>F1.579</td>
<td>P .179</td>
<td>P .219</td>
<td>P .336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1.447</td>
<td>F1.108</td>
<td>F3.089</td>
<td>F1.890</td>
<td>r-0.3020</td>
<td>r-0.3349</td>
<td>r .2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P .2325</td>
<td>P .3596</td>
<td>P .0068x</td>
<td>P .1575</td>
<td>P .002x</td>
<td>P .001x</td>
<td>P .028x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*x*Indicates significance at 0.05 level; *ANOVA, **Pearson Corr.
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